In the matter of an arbitration under the Rules of Arbitration of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes

Case No. ARB/21/51

The International Dispute Resolution Centre (IDRC) 1 Paternoster Lane LONDON, EC4M 7BQ

Day 2 Hearing on the Merits Friday, 2nd February 2024

Before:

PROFESSOR GABRIELLE KAUFMANN-KOHLER

MR STEPHEN L DRYMER

PROFESSOR PHILIPPE SANDS

DISCOVERY GLOBAL LLC

Claimant

-A-

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Respondent

Secretary to the Tribunal: JARA MÍNGUEZ ALMEIDA Assistant to the Tribunal: MAGNUS JESKO LANGER

Transcript produced by Anne-Marie Stallard and Emma Lovell

APPEARANCES FOR CLAIMANT

MARK TUSHINGHAM, Twenty Essex
NEIL NEWING, Signature Litigation
COLIN GRECH, Signature Litigation
PIETRO GRASSI, Signature Litigation
BEN PHAROAH, Signature Litigation
ALEXANDER FRASER, Party Representative

FOR RESPONDENT

STEPHEN ANWAY, Squire Patton Boggs ROSTISLAV PEKAR, Squire Patton Boggs TATIANA PROKOPOVÁ, Squire Patton Boggs DAVID ALEXANDER, Squire Patton Boggs JAKUB KAMENICKÝ, Squire Patton Boggs DOUGLAS PILAWA, Squire Patton Boggs CHRISTINA LUO, Squire Patton Boggs JULIÁN KUPKA, Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic ZUZANA JEŠKOVÁ, Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic PETRA LEŠOVÁ, Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic CHRIS LONGMAN, SLR Consulting CLAIRE JORDAN, SLR Consulting EWAN WHYTE, SLR Consulting TIAGO DUARTE-SILVA, Charles River Associates RICHARD ACKLAM, Charles River Associates NICOLE SKAF, Charles River Associates

INDEX

PAGE
MR ALEXANDER FRASER (called)1
Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM2
Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER2
Tribunal questions13
Tribunal questions18
Tribunal questions24
Tribunal questions31
Tribunal questions33
Tribunal questions39
Tribunal questions52
Discussion re procedural matters56
Tribunal questions82
Tribunal questions94
Tribunal questions96
Tribunal questions97
Tribunal questions101
Tribunal questions
Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM122
Tribunal questions
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL

MR MICHAEL	LEWIS (called)150
Dire	ct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM151
Cros	s-examination by MR ALEXANDER152
	Tribunal questions178
	Tribunal questions181
	Tribunal questions183
	Tribunal questions189
	Tribunal questions194
Ques	tions from THE TRIBUNAL210

09:30 1	Friday, 2 February 2024	09:33 1 other things outside the oil and gas sector. I actually
2	(9.30 am)	2 now run a farm down in the West Country which
3	THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everyone. I hope everyone is	3 I inherited a while ago.
4	doing fine, and we are ready for Day 2 of this hearing.	4 Q. When did you last practise law?
5	MR ALEXANDER FRASER (called)	5 A. 1993.
6	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Fraser, are you ready as well?	6 Q. And at the time were you barred in the United Kingdom?
7	MR FRASER: I am.	7 A. I was I qualified as I was admitted to the English
8	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I can see that.	8 Bar and then qualified as a solicitor.
9	For the record, can you confirm to us that you are	9 Q. Thank you.
10	Alexander Fraser?	When was the last time you spoke to Mr Crow, either
11	MR FRASER: I am.	in person or by phone?
12	THE PRESIDENT: You should switch your microphone on and	12 A. Probably in the well, in the last couple of weeks,
13	then leave it on so you don't have to think about it.	13 I would say.
14	You are CFO of Discovery Global.	14 Q. And prior to that, when was the last time you'd spoken
15	MR FRASER: That's correct.	15 to him?
16	THE PRESIDENT: You have provided us with two written	16 A. We've had a few conversations over the last couple of
17	statements, the first one was dated 30 September 2022,	17 years.
18	the second one 18 September 2023; is that right?	18 Q. And when was the last time Mr Lewis spoke to Mr Crow, if
19	MR FRASER: That's correct.	19 you know?
20	THE PRESIDENT: You have your witness statements with you	20 A. I don't know the answer to that question.
21	there in unannotated copies; excellent.	21 Q. Do you know if he has had any contact with him in the
22	You are heard as a witness in this arbitration, as	22 last six months?
23	you know, and you are under a duty to tell us the truth.	23 A. I know they're working on another project in America
24	Can you please confirm this by reading the witness	24 today.
25	declaration into the record.	25 Q. And is that in the oil and gas industry?
	Page 1	Page 3
09:32 1	MR FRASER: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience	09:34 1 A. It is, ves.
09:32 1	MR FRASER: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and	09:34 1 A. It is, yes. 2 O. And they're working together in business on that?
09:32 1 2 3	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and	2 Q. And they're working together in business on that?
2	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.	Q. And they're working together in business on that?A. To the best of my knowledge.
2 3	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have
2 3 4	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have
2 3 4 5	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters
2 3 4 5 6	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent.	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia?
2 3 4 5 6 7	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham.	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am)	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements?	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements?	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not.	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am)	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President.	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My name is David Alexander and I will be asking you	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer? A. I would say I was an acting or temporary chief financial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My name is David Alexander and I will be asking you questions today.	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer? A. I would say I was an acting or temporary chief financial officer in late 2014, informal, if you like, and it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My name is David Alexander and I will be asking you questions today. Could you tell me first, where are you employed	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer? A. I would say I was an acting or temporary chief financial officer in late 2014, informal, if you like, and it became a formal position in the first quarter, I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My name is David Alexander and I will be asking you questions today. Could you tell me first, where are you employed today?	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer? A. I would say I was an acting or temporary chief financial officer in late 2014, informal, if you like, and it became a formal position in the first quarter, I would say March 2015.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My name is David Alexander and I will be asking you questions today. Could you tell me first, where are you employed today? A. Where am I employed today?	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer? A. I would say I was an acting or temporary chief financial officer in late 2014, informal, if you like, and it became a formal position in the first quarter, I would say March 2015. Q. And could you tell us generally what your duties were as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My name is David Alexander and I will be asking you questions today. Could you tell me first, where are you employed today? A. Where am I employed today? Q. Yes.	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer? A. I would say I was an acting or temporary chief financial officer in late 2014, informal, if you like, and it became a formal position in the first quarter, I would say March 2015. Q. And could you tell us generally what your duties were as chief financial officer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So now you know you will be asked a few introductory questions by Claimant, and then we'll turn to Respondent. Mr Tushingham. (9.32 am) Direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Mr Fraser, do you have any corrections to make to either of your witness statements? A. I do not. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. I will now turn the floor to Mr Alexander. (9.33 am) Cross-examination by MR ALEXANDER Q. Thank you, Madam President. Mr Fraser, it's a pleasure to meet you, sir. My name is David Alexander and I will be asking you questions today. Could you tell me first, where are you employed today? A. Where am I employed today?	 Q. And they're working together in business on that? A. To the best of my knowledge. Q. When you went into the Slovakia project, did you have any prior experience on oil and gas regulatory matters in Slovakia? A. Not on I didn't have experience on regulatory matters on oil and gas in Slovakia. I'd seen similar processes in Poland. Q. So when you went on board with Mr Lewis, I understand it was originally as a part-time basis; was that on a part-time basis? A. That's correct. While I was exiting my previous company, I was on a part-time basis with Discovery and then it became full-time as my last job previous job concluded. Q. And when did you assume the title as chief financial officer? A. I would say I was an acting or temporary chief financial officer in late 2014, informal, if you like, and it became a formal position in the first quarter, I would say March 2015. Q. And could you tell us generally what your duties were as

- 09:36 1 working with Mike Lewis, and also to look after the -- to run the accounting for the joint venture in Poland --
 - 3 sorry, in Slovakia. We also had operations in Poland at
 - 4 that time, which were winding down. And that was about
 - 5 it.
 - 6 Q. Did you have any responsibility for monitoring
 - 7 regulatory or legal matters?
 - 8 A. Not at that stage I did not, no.
 - 9 Q. Did you assume those responsibilities later?
 - 10 A. Once I became full-time, I started to take over the
 - 11 responsibility for, I would say for the higher legal
 - matters in Bratislava, initially, and the permitting
 - side in the eastern part of the country was looked after
 - more by the local -- by the team there.
 - 15~ Q. So your duties in that regard would have been assumed
 - roughly in July 2015?
 - 17 A. Yes.
 - 18 Q. When you came into that role, supervising matters in
 - 19 Bratislava, legal matters, did you have an opportunity
 - 20 to review the due diligence work that had preceded the
 - 21 original investment back in March of 2014?
 - 22 A. I had an opportunity to look through it, but the deal
 - had been done by that stage. So there wasn't much
 - 24 I could -- you know, there wasn't -- I probably had
 - a quick look at it but I didn't spend a lot of time

- 09:40 1 A. No.
 - 2 Q. So in mid-2015, shortly after you came on board, your
 - 3 testimony is you did become aware of this? 29(3).
 - 4 A. Let me clarify that. I wasn't aware of that specific
 - 5 provision. I was aware of Article 29 being a route to
 - 6 acquire compulsory access. But that particular
 - 7 subparagraph I was not aware of.
 - 8 Q. And that, of course, you're referring to 29(4), the
 - 9 following provision?
 - 10 A. Mm-hm.
 - 11 Q. Right. Do you recall when you first became aware of
 - 12 29(3), the permission and notice provision?
 - 13 A. I don't recall when, no.
 - 14 Q. But you're confident you have seen it sometime in 2015?
 - 15 A. I can't say that I saw that particular one in 2015. As
 - I say, the day-to-day permitting was handled by other
 - 17 members of the team, including our Czech country
 - manager, who was very experienced, and he was very much
 - 19 our go-to person for all things permitting, very
 - 20 conscientious, and he held our hand to make sure we
 - 21 complied with all aspects of the permitting side,
 - 22 including 29(3).
 - 23 Q. And could you identify that person by name, please?
 - 24 A. Stanislav Benada.
 - 25 Q. And was he Slovak?

Page 7

- 09:38 1 looking at it.
 - 2 Q. Did you see materials concerning the overall regulatory
 - 3 environment of Slovakia?
 - 4 A. Could you be a bit more precise, please? What do you
 - 5 mean by regulatory environment?
 - 6 Q. Well, for example the Geology Act?
 - 7 A. I was -- I understood specific areas of the Geology Act,
 - 8 what was involved in licensing, for example.
 - 9 Q. Do you recall seeing at that time the material that was
 - 10 projected yesterday on the AOG slides concerning
 - 11 Article 29(3); does that ring any bells?
 - 12 A. I became aware of Article 29(3) in, I would say,
 - probably mid- or late 2015.
 - 14 Q. And just so we're clear on that, Article 29(3) is the
 - 15 provision requiring -- in fact, maybe to be fair we
 - ought to put it up on the screen. Could I ask you to
 - pull up R-42, please. And if we could scroll to
 - 18 Article 29, and (3). There we are. Thank you.
 - 19 Let me know when you have had a chance to take
 - a look. (Pause)
 - 21 A. Okay.
 - 22 Q. You may have heard this referred to as the "permission
 - and notice provision"?
 - 24 A. I haven't, no.
 - 25 Q. You haven't?

Page 6

- 09:42 1 A. He is a Czech.
 - 2 Q. Had he had prior experience in the Slovak regulatory
 - 3 environment, do you know?
 - 4 A. He did. He's got 30 years' experience in the Czech,
 - 5 Czechoslovak oil and gas sector. He spent 20 years
 - 6 working for MND, which is a large Czech oil and gas
 - 7 company, and he was country manager for Alpine Oil & Gas
 - 8 since 2006.
 - 9 Q. Before entering sites that were identified for
 - 10 exploration activities, were you aware that there was
 - 11 a requirement under Slovak law to obtain permission of
 - 12 landowner and give them notice?
 - 13 A. Well, we couldn't enter a site until we had an agreement
 - 14 with the landowner to acquire a lease over the site.
 - 15 Q. And what about access to sites?
 - 16 A. Access is just as important as the location itself, so
 - 17 we would do the same investigations on how to get to the
 - 18 location, as to ensuring that we had the rights to
 - 19 operate on the location.
 - 20 Q. And did you participate in the investigation of the
 - 21 Smilno site, as you say, on the just-as-important issue
 - 22 of access?
 - 23 A. I did not, no. That was handled by the local guys,
 - 24 which was Stanislav, Ron Crow, and some of our Polish
 - 25 team, Maciej Karabin and -- well, Maciej Karabin.

- 09:44 1 Q. Now, if I could ask you to turn to your witness
 - 2 statement for a moment at paragraph 35, and I'm going to
 - 3 be asking you about the top of page 13.
 - 4 Now, you are referring here, are you not, to access
 - 5 to the Smilno drilling site; correct?
 - 6 A. Correct.
 - 7 Q. And you testify there:
 - 8 "It was our understanding ..."
 - 9 And let me just pause there. When you refer to "our
 - 10 understanding", who is that?
 - 11 A. The company, I would say, so that's Mike Lewis, Ron
 - 12 Crow, me, Stanislav, and others.
 - 13 Q. And the persons you've just mentioned, they were really
 - the top leadership of the company; correct?
 - 15 A. Yes
 - 16 Q. Now, did you have the understanding yourself that the
 - 17 road was a public road and that no permission was
 - 18 required from any person to use the road; was that your
 - 19 understanding?
 - 20 A. That was our understanding, that's correct.
 - 21 Q. Not quite my question. Was that your understanding?
 - 22 A. That was my understanding.
 - 23 Q. And tell me, sir, how you came to that understanding.
 - 24 A. There were internal reports and also updates which
 - 25 formed the basis of updates circulated to the JV
 - Page 9

- 09:47 1 with the mayor and also with the farm which farmed all
 - 2 the land round about; they would have been the main user
 - 3 of the road. But the mayor told us that the road was
 - 4 publicly accessible.
 - 5 Q. Alright.
 - 6 Now, if possible, Mr Fraser, I'd like to ask you
 - 7 when you are identifying "us" or "we" --
 - 8 A. Sorry
 - 9 Q. -- that you be as precise as possible, because as you
 - 10 know that -- and this is no criticism -- but your
 - 11 witness statement often says "we", and of course we have
 - 12 no idea who that is.
 - 13 A. Mm-hm.
 - 14 Q. So could I ask you to answer that question again with
 - specifically who the persons are that were involved?
 - 16 A. Sorry, could you repeat the question, then?
 - 17 Q. "And there had been conversations with the mayor and
 - also with the farm..."
 - 19 Did you have any conversations with the mayor?
 - 20 A. I did not. Ron Crow did, Maciej did, and Stanislav
 - 21 Benada did.
 - 22 Q. Did you read reports of their conversation with the
 - 23 mayor?
 - 24 A. I read an internal report that said that they had met
 - with the mayor in June or July of 2015.

- 09:46 1 partners, which included an update on matters like
 - 2 securing the location, permitting, access to the
 - 3 location and other matters, such as dealings with
 - 4 contractors. And those reports discussed the progress
 - 5 that was being made on securing the location at Smilno
 - 6 and also the access road.
 - 7 Q. Do you remember reading a report that said specifically
 - 8 that no permission was required from any person?
 - 9 A. Yes, I do. Yes.
 - 10~ Q. And do you know if that report is in this record?
 - 11 A. I don't know offhand.
 - 12 Q. Did you have any discussions with Mr Benada about his
 - 13 availability to testify in these proceedings?
 - 14 A. Yes, I did.
 - 15 Q. And he was not available?
 - 16 A. We asked if he would be willing to testify and he said
 - that he was not willing; he had found the whole process
 - 18 too painful.
 - 19 Q. Well, I'll try to make sure today I don't give you the
 - 20 same experience, sir.
 - 21 And do you recall the explanation for what you
 - assert was a report that said no permission was
 - 23 required?
 - 24 A. The explanation was that the road was a public road, was
 - 25 publicly accessible. And there had been conversations
 - Page 10

- 09:49 1 Q. All three of them?
 - 2 A. Yes.
 - 3 Q. And did you have any conversation with Mr Crow about his
 - 4 availability to testify?
 - 5 A. I did not, no.
 - 6 Q. Do you know if Mr Lewis did?
 - A. I don't know.
 - 8 Q. Alright. And you mentioned another gentlemen, Mr -- is
 - 9 it Karabin?
 - 10 A. Karabin, yes.
 - 11 Q. Did you have any conversations with him about his
 - ability to testify?
 - 13 A. I did not.
 - 14 Q. Do you know if Mr Lewis did?
 - 15 A. I don't know.
 - 16 Q. So what do you recall that the internal report to which
 - 17 you've referred said?
 - 18 A. The internal report said that there had been a meeting
 - in Smilno with the mayor, between the mayor, Stanislav
 - 20 Benada, Maciej Karabin, and a representative of the
 - farm, and they had discussed the use of the road, and subsequently Ron reported to the company --
 - 23 Q. That's Mr Crow?
 - 24 A. Mr Crow, sorry, reported that the road was publicly
 - accessible as a result of that.

- 09:50 1 Q. Did he say anything more about the reasoning provided by
 - 3 A. No, he did not. We were told simply that --
 - 4 Q. Excuse me, that's an answer to my question. You don't
 - 5 need to go on beyond just answering the question, if
 - 6 that's alright.
 - 7 And would it be fair to say that there was no
 - 8 discussion in the internal report to which you've
 - 9 referred -- well, let's back up. There was discussion
 - about historical use of what you've referred to as
 - 11 "the road"?
 - 12 A. That's correct. There was discussion about the
 - 13 historical use, yes.
 - 14 MR DRYMER: Pardon me for interrupting, I don't like doing
 - 15 this. You asked the witness a few minutes ago whether
 - 16 he remembers reading a report, he said yes. You asked
 - 17 him if he knows whether the report is in the record, he
 - said he did not know. Do you know whether that report
 - is in the record?
 - 20 MR ALEXANDER: I don't know what report he is referring to.
 - 21 MR DRYMER: Okay, very good.
 - 22 THE PRESIDENT: And while we are interrupting, at what time
 - does this conversation of your three colleagues take
 - 24 place?
 - 25 A. In June 2015.

- 09:53 1 site? On the issue of access, road access?
 - 2 A. I'm aware that there were several meetings with the
 - 3 mayor during 2015, when this particular location was
 - 4 discussed. I believe -- I'm not sure whether he
 - 5 suggested we look somewhere in that part of that area
 - 6 around the farm, adjacent to Smilno. Or it's possible
 - 7 we said this is where we would like to go --
 - 8 Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, is this a conversation you had
 - 9 with the mayor?
 - 10 A. I'm saying what I was aware of. I didn't have the
 - 11 conversation, but I was aware of that. I'm aware that
 - there were a number of conversations with the mayor.
 - 13 Q. Right. And these conversations you're describing now,
 - were they reported to you in any written form?
 - 15 A. They were. There were updates, I mean, two or three,
 - 16 I don't recall, during 2015, during that time from May
 - to September, say, when we were told about conversations
 - with the mayor about going to drill at Smilno.
 - 19 Q. Let me ask you; if I could ask that R-155 be put up.
 - 20 Can you see that alright, Mr Fraser?
 - 21 A. Yes.
 - 22 Q. I notice that at the very top of the page your name
 - 23 appears. But it appears to be an email from Mr Sýkora,
 - 24 who I understand to be an attorney; is that correct?
 - 25 A. That's correct.

Page 15

09:51 1 THE PRESIDENT: 2015?

- 2 A. Yes, June or July. And it will have been reported,
- 3 I'm pretty sure it was reported to the joint venture
- 4 partners in a follow-up report to partners.
- 5 THE PRESIDENT: Am I not mistaken that in May 2016 your
- 6 lawyer writes to the mayor specifically asking the same
- 7 question?
- 8 A. Asking -- he asked for a declaration, if you like, that
- 9 the road was publicly accessible at that point,
- a declaration that he could show to people.
- But we were told in 2015 that the road was publicly
- 12 accessible.
- 13 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
- 14 Apologies.
- 15 MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President.
- That actually is a helpful segue to what I wanted to
- 17 ask you.
- 18 You remember, of course, the May communication.
- 19 We'll get to it in a moment, but you understand what
- 20 Madam President is asking about. That was a letter by
- 21 Mr Sýkora to the mayor; is that correct?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. And other than the internal report to which you've
- referred, and the May letter, are you aware of any other
- 25 documents that were considered before AOG entered the
 - Page 14

- 09:54 1 Q. He was representing AOG.
 - 2 A. Mm-hm.
 - 3 Q. And that is the email address of the mayor I take it,
 - 4 "smilno2001"?
 - 5 A. I assume.
 - 6 Q. Do you know why your name appears at the top of that?
 - 7 A. I don't know. It's possible that he sent me the email
 - 8 as an attachment and then when I opened it and printed
 - 9 it off, it came up like that. I don't know.
 - 10 Q. Yes, I sort of assumed the same thing, but hard to know.
 - 11 A little unusual in presentation.
 - So let's back up for a second before we get into the
 - 13 letter. Prior to this time, prior to May, are you aware
 - of any documents in the record that refer specifically
 - to the statutory phrase, "public special purpose road"?
 - 16 A. I'm not aware of any documents on the record, no.
 - Q. And were you familiar with that phrase prior to 17 May,"public special purpose road"?
 - 19 A. I became aware of that phrase, I would say, during that
 - spring of 2016, sometime early 2016.
 - 21 Q. And -- but prior to the spring of 2016, you had never
 - been aware of the statutory phrase, "public special
 - 23 purpose road"?
 - 24 A. That's correct. We just thought the road was publicly
 - 25 accessible.

Day 2	He	earing on the Merits ICSID Case N		
09:56	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. So let's go, then, back in time to December 2015, before you entered the site. At that time the only discussion you had had was whether the road was public, but there had been no discussion about whether it was a public special purpose road; correct? A. I wasn't party to any discussions like that. I'm not aware that anyone else was. Q. You don't recall any reports or memoranda of any sort referring to the issue of public special purpose road? A. That's correct. We simply understood it was publicly accessible. Q. And you came to learn that there was a specific statutory provision, as you've just noted. How did you learn that, public special purpose road? A. I believe that I would have had that explained to me by Matej Sýkora. Q. Okay, now what firm what Matej Sýkora with? A. He had his own firm of lawyers called Sýkora & Associates. Q. By whom was he engaged? A. By Alpine. Q. And what was his instruction? What was he asked to provide counsel on? 	09:59 1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE PRESIDENT: 2016? A. 2016, yes. March, April, I don't recall now. But probably March. MR ALEXANDER: Madam President, I THE PRESIDENT: No, I was wondering where his office is, but I see it's not in Bratislava. So it is in a region where Smilno is located. A. Correct. (Pause for a fire alarm test) THE PRESIDENT: I think we're allowed to take action again. Good, so please take action. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. So to return, Mr Fraser, you had earlier said that local matters involving permitting were handled by Mr Benada, even legal matters; is that correct? A. I would say Mr Benada with together with Mr Crow and Maciej Karabin. Q. And in this particular situation where Mr Sýkora was involved, you were copied, you assume, by reason of the presence of your name on the email, you had become involved in that particular work; is that correct? A. That's correct. I mean, once the road was blocked in January, I started to take a more active interest in
	24 25	MR TUSHINGHAM: Apologies. The question was: "And what was his instruction? What was he asked to	24 25	this issue, and I was struggling to he would be able to work satisfactorily with Pavol Vargaeštok because of
		Page 17		Page 19
3 4 5	2 3 4 5 6 7	provide counsel on?" And that would be protected by privilege, and so we would object to this line of questioning. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. You can say whether you want to answer this question or not. The Tribunal has no problem with your answering it. MR ALEXANDER: Madam President, if I may, I was not intending to sell for the entual communications, but	10:02 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the language issue and I was recommended Matej Sýkora by somebody so we brought him on board as well. Q. Now, Mr Fraser, I don't have the pleasure of knowing Mr Sýkora, but I was struck in reading this note by the particular language that was used. Well, first, the simple point: "As a follow-up to our phone call"
1 1 1 1	2	intending to ask for the actual communications, but I was only inquiring as to the nature of the engagement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but depending on what the nature of the engagement is, it may cover the actual questions asked, and they may be privileged. So why don't you try to answer. Why did you retain Mr Sýkora, in general terms?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Were you on a phone call between Mr Sýkora and the mayor? A. No, I was not. Q. And you did not see any note of that phone call other than this email; is that fair? A. That's fair, yes. Q. So as I read this, I found myself sort of curious about

15 A. We retained him -- we retained Mr Sýkora because he

was -- the lawyer we'd been working with until then, who 16

we continued to work with, was Pavol Vargaeštok, whose 17

18 English was not as good. So Matej had a good profile,

19 he was active in the region, he seemed to have good

20 experience, and so we engaged him to work alongside

21 Pavol Vargaeštok.

22 THE PRESIDENT: When did you retain him?

A. Who, Matej Sýkora?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

A. I would say in April, possibly.

Page 18

15 the language used:

16 "... I would like to ask you for information on the

17 nature of the road, specified in the attachment to this

18

19 Now, the attachment I gather was some sort of land

20 record; is that right? If you know.

A. I don't know what the attachment was. It looks like

22 it's a Word document.

23 Q. Do you remember what the attachment was?

24 A. It's possible that it was some advice from him to me on

25 the status of the road.

10:03	1	Q. Right, which would have been shared with the mayor; is
	2	that correct?
	3	A. That's what it looks like, that's correct.
	4	Q. Now, without first speaking to the President, I'm not
	5	going to ask you this question, but, Madam President,

- 6 I would like to inquire about that and request that it
- be produced because it's obviously been disclosed
- 8 outside of the privilege.
- 9 THE PRESIDENT: You want to ask questions or you want to ask
- 10 for production?
- 11 MR ALEXANDER: I would first like to have production, and
- 12 then I would like to ask some questions. But I could
- 13 perhaps ask a few preliminary questions about it even
- 14 before I have, if the Tribunal would be so inclined.
- 15 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, maybe you do so and then of course
- 16 we will give the floor to your opponents to see what
- they think about it, yes. 17
- 18 MR ALEXANDER: Of course, thank you very much.
- 19 MR TUSHINGHAM: Can we just take a moment to confer amongst
- ourselves? I just want to ask a question. 20
- 21 THE PRESIDENT: Can we hear the preliminary questions, or
- 22
- 23 MR DRYMER: There's no application pending at the moment.
- 24 MR TUSHINGHAM: I have no objection, then, to him asking
- preliminary questions.

- 10:07 1 recall when exactly, he would have explained to me about
 - public special purpose road; he discussed it.
 - 3 Q. Now, the language that I mentioned before, that I was
 - 4 intrigued by, suggests that this is a new conversation
 - 5 between Mr Sýkora and the mayor; would you agree with
 - 6
 - Let me be a little more precise. There's no
 - 8 suggestion in his introduction that they had been --
 - 9 other than the immediate -- other than the phone call,
 - 10 there's no suggestion that this had been a topic on the
 - 11 table for a significant period of time; would you agree?
 - 12 A. Are you talking about between Mr Sýkora and the mayor?
 - Q. Yes.
 - 14 A. I mean, I can't comment on that.
 - 15 Q. So then he proceeds to say:
 - 16 "We would like to express our opinion that the road
 - 17 in question is a public special purpose road ..."
 - 18 Do you see that?
 - 19 A. Mm-hm.
 - Q. And that was outlined in more detail in the attached
 - 21 memorandum, as you recall?
 - 22 A. I -- I'm honest -- I don't recall what -- sorry, I don't
 - recall the content of the memorandum, but I expect it
 - 24 would have just covered questions like that.
 - 25 Q. Do you recall how long the memorandum was?

Page 23

- 10:05 1 THE PRESIDENT: You can still, then, if needed, object to
 - a specific question; right?
 - MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. Yes. (Pause)
 - 4 MR ALEXANDER: I'm trying to think how to do this carefully.
 - 5 I guess just for purposes of really the record here,
 - 6 to give you a fair sense of what I would inquire about,
 - 7 I'll ask them and understand that you obviously then
 - 8 may -- you will have your role to perform, I understand
 - 9
 - 10 Mr Fraser, I infer from your testimony and the
 - 11 subject matter of this letter that the content of the
 - 12 attachment concerned Mr Sýkora's analysis of the public
 - 13 service -- I'm sorry, public special purpose road
 - 14 question; is that correct?
 - A. I would think that's correct, yes.
 - 16 Q. So the material was provided -- and do you recall that
 - it included an analysis of the statute? 17
 - 18 A. I don't recall, no.
 - 19 Q. But you are quite sure that this was the first time --
 - 20 the first timeframe that you had heard this phrase,
 - 21 "public special purpose road", the statutory phrase?
 - 22 A. I would say I first got involved with the road issues in
 - 23 January/February of 2016. We engaged Matej Sýkora
 - 24 shortly afterwards, and at some point between the
 - 25 beginning of his engagement and this date, I don't

- 10:09 1 A. I don't, no. Like I say, I'm guessing a page or two.
 - Q. Now, in response, if we could turn to Exhibit R-156.
 - MR DRYMER: Before you do, may I ask one quick question.
 - 4 MR ALEXANDER: Of course.
 - MR DRYMER: Just to pin this down so there's no
 - 6 misunderstanding on the record. In response to
 - 7 Mr Alexander's first question about the attachment a few
 - 8 minutes ago, he asked:
 - "Do you remember what the attachment was?"
 - 10 And your answer was:
 - 11 "It's possible that it was some advice from him to
 - 12 me on the status of the road."
 - 13 Do you remember whether that's what the attachment
 - 14 was?

24

- 15 A. I don't remember. I'm just going on what the attachment
- says -- what it says in the attachment there.
- 17 Oh, sorry, do I recall what the question -- what the
- 18 advice was?
- 19 MR DRYMER: No, do you recall whether or not, I suppose is
- 20 the question, the attachment to this email, R-155, was
- 21 advice from Mr Sýkora to you, writ large?
- 22 A. I don't recall. I'm just going on how the document is
- 23 described there. It's possible that it was a memorandum

in Slovak, because he would have communicated with the

25 mayor in Slovak. But I honestly don't recall.

Page 24

- Day 2 -- Hearing on the Merits Friday, 2 February 2024 10:13 1 10:10 1 THE PRESIDENT: I understood you before to say yes, it was accessible. an analysis of his -- of Sýkora's understanding of the Q. And by May of 2016, you had decided that an alternative 3 concept of public special purpose road. Or was that not 3 approach to the public road concept might be helpful; 4 an assertion but more a maybe? 4 5 A. Correct, more a maybe. I don't recall the attachment. 5 A. I wouldn't describe it as an alternative approach. 6 I don't recall the contents of the attachment. But I would describe it as an additional approach. But yes, 7 looking at the title there, that's what it looks like it 7 we did think that we needed to do something else. Q. Alright. Well, let's take a look, if we can, at some of 8 9 MR DRYMER: May I ask one or two further questions? Again, the events from the time that are documented, which may 10 10 just to be certain. be helpful. 11 Could we pull up, please, C-105. I'll ask you if 11 Do you recall receiving -- you, or the company 12 receiving advice from Mr Sýkora on the nature of 12 you recognise that document, Mr Fraser. This is a 13 the road? 13 purchase contract concerning -- if we have the right 14 A. Yes, we did. 14 document here, I think we do -- the 1/700th share in the 15 MR DRYMER: Do you recall whether that advice was the 15 road purchase. attachment to this email? 16 A. Yes. 16 17 A. I don't recall that, no. Q. Do you recall that transaction? 18 MR DRYMER: Alright, thank you. 18 A. Mm-hm. 19 Excuse me for the interruption. 19 Q. Was that a "Yes"? 20 MR ALEXANDER: That's quite alright. A. Yes, sorry. 21 Mr Fraser, I think if we could now pull up R-156. Q. And how did that particular transaction come into 22 Now, this is dated 6 June 2016, if my memory serves discussion? This is dated 17 December 2015. 23 23 A. That transaction came about because we were already me well, roughly three weeks after the question. 24 You have had a chance to read this letter recently, 24 blocked on the road at Smilno, from about the middle 25 25 of December, and our lawyer considered that one of the have you? Page 25 Page 27 10:15 1 10:11 1 A. Yes. reasons, one of the grounds on which we were being 2 Q. And the statutory phrase "public special purpose road" 2 blocked was that we were -- or that it would strengthen does not appear in his response, does it, sir? 3 our position if we could also buy a share in the road in 3 A. It does not. 4 4 addition to our existing rights. 5 Q. Did you have any further conversation personally with Q. And that transaction went forward pursuant to this 6 the mayor about his choice of words and the lack of any contract; correct? 7 A. It never actually went forward. It was blocked. But reference to "public special purpose road"? 8 A. I didn't have any conversations myself with the mayor the contract was signed. Q. It was declared null and void by the court; correct? 9 about this. I'm sure that Mr Sýkora would have done. 10 Well, I imagine he would have done. 10 A. That's correct. 11 Q. He reported in his response here -- well, I'll ask it 11 Q. And that null and void judgment by the court resulted 12 this way. Did you understand him to be describing the 12 from a recognition of claim by AOG, did it not? historical uses of the road? 13 13 Yes or no?
 - 14 A. Yes, I did.
 - 15 Q. And he noted in particular: "the Village of Smilno is not the owner of the above 16
 - mentioned field track." 17
 - Is that right? 18
 - 19 A. That's correct.
 - 20 Q. Now, the topic of special public -- I'll call it PSPR,
 - 21 that seems to work better. You know what I'm referring
 - 22 to when I say that. That topic had arisen after there
 - 23 had been problems in blockages of the road; is that
 - 24 correct?
 - 25 A. That's correct. We understood the road was publicly

- 14 A. Sorry. That is correct. We decided it was no longer
- 15 worth contesting that claim.
- Q. And I'll confess that in the US that is referred to as 16
- 17 a "confession of judgment"; do you have something
- 18 comparable to that in the UK?
- 19 A. I'm not aware of that phrase. I've heard of people just
- 20 saying we can concede, concede the claim, but ...
- 21 Q. And the claim was conceded in its entirety at a much
- 22 later point in time; correct?
- 23 A. Correct. In June. We applied to concede the claim
- 24
- 25 Q. So in December when this transaction was executed by the

10:17 1 2	parties, the intention was to transfer an interest in the road in order to establish access rights to the	10:21 1	paragraph in particular under "Issues" and I'll give you a moment to read that. (Pause)
3	road; correct?	3	Could I ask you to read the sentence, for the
4		4	record, beginning with the word "We". It's about six
5		5	lines down?
6		6	A. "We are working with our attorney, security,
7		7	construction company and the local police to repeatedly
8		8	remove the vehicle."
9		9	Q. And the next sentence.
			`
10		10	A. "She has legal right to park her car on the road."
11	• •	11	Q. And then there is an assertion of privilege.
12		12	Just for purposes of our record, Madam President,
13	<i>y</i> , <i>y</i>	13	I'm going to try and forgive my cumbersome approach
14	, ,	14	to this, but it's a little tricky sometimes to set the
15	•	15	stage properly.
16		16	So it would appear that the sentence that has been
17	1 1 3	17	blocked relates to the prior sentence. Do you happen to
18	3 · · 3	18	recall that?
19		19	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, can I just take a moment.
20	, ,	20	That trespasses on the legal advice that was
21		21	provided, that has been redacted. So asking for him to
22	•	22	comment on the relationship between one sentence and
23		23	then the redacted advice would be covered by
24		24	privilege. So we would object to that question.
25	her car from the access road; correct?	25	THE PRESIDENT: So the redacted sentence refers to legal
	Page 29		Page 31
10:19	A. We had moved it a number of times. I mean, we	10:23 1	advice given about her right to park?
10:19 1 2		10:23 1 2	advice given about her right to park? MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But
	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were		
2	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner.	2	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But
2	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the	2 3	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on
3	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct?	2 3 4	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just
2 3 2 5	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had	2 3 4 5	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was
2 3 4 5	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you	2 3 4 5 6	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to
2 3 2 5	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of
2 3 2 5 6	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then
2 3 2 5 6 7 8	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here?
2 3 2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this
2 3 2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint
2 3 2 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11 11 12 14	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture
12 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 14	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on — THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the
12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted.
12 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here? MR ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask another question.
12 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report to its partners in C-120. Next page, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here?
12 33 22 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 20	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report to its partners in C-120. Next page, please. A. Sorry, what date is this report?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here? MR ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask another question.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report to its partners in C-120. Next page, please. A. Sorry, what date is this report? Q. This report is dated on the first page, 21 January 2016,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here? MR ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask another question. I understand the position and we may have a further
12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report to its partners in C-120. Next page, please. A. Sorry, what date is this report? Q. This report is dated on the first page, 21 January 2016, "Status Update and Activity Summary"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here? MR ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask another question. I understand the position and we may have a further conversation about that at an appropriate point, but
12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report to its partners in C-120. Next page, please. A. Sorry, what date is this report? Q. This report is dated on the first page, 21 January 2016, "Status Update and Activity Summary"? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here? MR ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask another question. I understand the position and we may have a further conversation about that at an appropriate point, but I don't want to take too much of my time on it at this
12 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 22 24	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report to its partners in C-120. Next page, please. A. Sorry, what date is this report? Q. This report is dated on the first page, 21 January 2016, "Status Update and Activity Summary"? A. Yes. Q. Alright. Now, I want to call your attention to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here? MR ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask another question. I understand the position and we may have a further conversation about that at an appropriate point, but I don't want to take too much of my time on it at this point, if that's alright with the President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, sure.
22 33 22 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 22 22 22 22	understood the road was publicly accessible. We were not relying just on our right as a co-owner. Q. But in the demand it quite explicitly was reliant on the status as co-owner and nothing else; correct? A. Correct. The demand says that. But we had conversations with the mayor, for example, who said: you have a right Q. Excuse me, Mr Fraser, I really would appreciate A. Sorry. Q. Our time is really quite truncated. Now, after that, you had also gone to the police; correct? A. That's correct. Q. Based upon her interference with your right as a co-owner, and that is how it was described to the police, is it not? A. I can't say. Q. Well, let's take a look at the next at the AOG report to its partners in C-120. Next page, please. A. Sorry, what date is this report? Q. This report is dated on the first page, 21 January 2016, "Status Update and Activity Summary"? A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, no, that's not what I said. But asking for him to comment on THE PRESIDENT: No, I understand what you said. I'm just asking a little further, because when I saw that I was somehow annoyed because I would very much like to understand what is in this sentence, right. But of course if there is a legal privilege invoked, then that's it. But you're saying this is redacted because of attorney-client privilege being invoked here? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is my understanding, and that this document was then, of course, shared with the joint venture partners who had a common interest in that advice, given that they were AOG's joint venture partners. So that's my understanding of why the document has been that sentence has been redacted. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Alexander, where do we go from here? MR ALEXANDER: Well, let me ask another question. I understand the position and we may have a further conversation about that at an appropriate point, but I don't want to take too much of my time on it at this point, if that's alright with the President.

Day 2 Hearing on the Merits	ICSID Case No. ARB/21/51 Friday, 2 February 2024
10:24 1 MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser, the word in the that the vehicle had been repeatedly removed, consistent with your understanding? 4 A. I certainly understand that it was removed monce, yes. 6 Q. Alright. 7 THE PRESIDENT: You said "a number of time I mean, verbatim. 9 A. Yes. 10 MR ALEXANDER: Right. And on the comme "She has legal right to park her car on the man I correct that you're going to assert privation for any further discussion about that point? 14 A. I don't know what the redacted words are. So I'm not sure what the argument is about. 16 Q. I understand. 17 THE PRESIDENT: Can I just ask a question? If understand this passage because, on the one had you removed the car, and on the other hand you has a right to be there. So what is it? Why did remove the car if you are aware that she has a park? 23 A. It's not I will be honest, it's not 100% clear We were told we were allowed to remove the I believe we were authorised by the mayor and Page 33	2 A. It enjoined us from going through with the purchase of the share in the road, yes. 4 Q. Well, when I used the phrase "precise conduct", I meant from moving the car. 6 A. Is that what the injunction says? I can't I'm not I can't recall completely. 8 Q. Well, let's scroll down. Do you see the language I'm sorry, I missed it there. That was my mistake. 10 Do you see in the paragraph four lines down from the ad." 11 top: 12 "The first defendant [that is AOG, of course] is obliged to refrain from using the real property" 1 14 And you understand that real property is the field track which is co-owned by Ms Varjanová, and purportedly 16 co-owned by, at the time, AOG? 17 A. Yes, I do understand that. 18 Q. Alright. So it's a dispute between two landowners of the property? 20 A. Mm-hm. 21 Q. Yes? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. And the court enjoined you both from using the track and enjoined you from removing things placed by the
10:25 1 to remove the car. So she may have had a right the car but not block the road. I don't know, it's totally clear, I agree. 4 MR DRYMER: Had you seen this document before arbitration? 6 A. Yes, I had. Yes. 7 MR DRYMER: Okay. Because and I'm stayin anything to do with privilege, but a minute ago said: 10 "I don't know what the redacted words are." 11 A. Mm. 12 MR DRYMER: Presumably, I don't know if you redacted words, but you would have seen the rewords? 13 A. I would have seen them, that's right. 14 MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you.	2 Q. And on the next page, do you see, about probably 15 3 lines down, the language that begins: 4 "The plaintiff was never offered the 1/700th 5 share" 6 Do you see that? 7 A. Yes, I see. ou 8 Q. " was never offered the 1/700th share in common 9 property, which was acquired by the first defendant upon 10 the purchase contract despite the fact that, as 11 a co-owner, she has a legal pre-emptive right to 12 purchase such a co share in common property."

19 that time. Q. Shortly after her application for injunction was filed 20 21 you became aware of it; correct? 22 A. Yes. Yes.

the injunction was issued. Or, actually, the injunction

was issued in February. So I think I became aware about

23 Q. Alright.

17

18

24 And AOG appealed -- oh, I'm sorry. I wanted to

25 cover one more point. On page 3, please.

Page 36

Page 34

Q. And that lawsuit led to a ruling, the issuance of

MR ALEXANDER: I am going to move on to another document.

Could I ask that C-125, please, be pulled up.

Now, you do recall, Mr Fraser, that after the

repeated removal of her car from property of which she

was a co-owner, she filed a lawsuit against AOG; do you

a preliminary measure ruling, which enjoined AOG from

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recall that?

A. Yes, I do.

10:31 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	As part of its consideration of the application, the court notes do you see the paragraph 3 there that is discussed? It's a little more than halfway down the page: "An employee of the first defendant" That again is AOG; do you see that? A. "An employee" Sorry, is that in the third paragraph, is it? Q. Yes, do you see that: "An employee of the" A. Yes, I see. Yes. Q. Do you know that name? A. Yes. Q. And he was employed by AOG? A. Correct. Q. And this relates to the investigation file of the police department; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. Now that includes, as I understand it, Mr Jackiewicz's report that the vehicle was blocking access, and that he "cut the anchor chains using lever shears and moved the vehicle off the road"; do you see that? A. I see that, yes. Q. Did you authorise that to be done, to remove the car from her own property? Page 37	10:34 1 co-owner to remove or relocate [the] parked motor vehicle" Do you see that? A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. Now, if we could go Before we turn to it, do you have any recollection of the court expressing concern about the use of self-help? A. No, I don't. PROFESSOR SANDS: Can I just come in here? It's just a quick question that cuts across. You've mentioned many times in the course of this morning, and also in your first and second witness statements, recourse to the mayor, and I'm just curious: on what basis did you proceed in that way? I mean, was it on the and, again, I'm conscious, I don't want to pry into legal advice or anything, but why did you keep going to the mayor for assistance and advice? And I ask that question because I spend half the year living in a small village in which there are many issues involving the mayor. I think we're all aware of that kind of relationship. So why did you keep going to the mayor on these issues? A. The mayor was supportive. He was keen to see activity in the village. He had he gave us the assurance that
10:32 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 A. I did not. Q. Do you know who did? A. I don't, no. Q. Did you voice any objection to that after you learned it had been done? A. I didn't. I mean, as I say, we had been told we had previously been asked authorised to remove cars from the road by the mayor. Q. And there is no documentary evidence of that in the record, would you agree? A. I think that's correct. Q. Alright. Then if we could go to the next page. Now, do you see the paragraph 3.3? A. Mm-hm. Q. That is this court's listing of the number of co-owners of the property who had filed something with the court, and in 4 you can see that the court describes it as these co-owners: " stating that they have no reservations and agree that the co-owner - the plaintiff, [may] use the said property to park the motor vehicle that she uses." Do you see that? A. Yes, I can see that. Q. And they go on to say that: " they have not given their consent to any 	10:35 1 we could use the road in the first place, so when we 2 later had problems, we did try and involve the mayor, 3 yes. 4 PROFESSOR SANDS: On what basis does a mayor have a right to 5 determine who can and cannot use a particular road? 6 A. He represents I mean, I think our thinking was that 7 he represents the with his council, he represents the 8 village, and he can speak for his council. So we 9 assumed on that basis we knew the council didn't own 10 the road, but we assumed that his statements were 11 gave us the authority were good enough for us, if you 12 like. 13 PROFESSOR SANDS: Even when it became clear that his views 14 were not in, shall we say, coherence with some of the 15 residents of the village? 16 A. I would say that our feeling, that it was a very small 17 number of residents who were not supportive, and that 18 the majority of the village we felt, we understood, was 19 very keen to see us come and commence operations in the 20 village. They were very keen to see us, you know, 21 explore. 22 So I think we felt that, yes, that the mayor gave us 23 comfort and authority, and we thought we had the support 24 of the rest of the village. 25 PROFESSOR SANDS: And what was the nature of the

10:37 1	relationship with the mayor or the council? I mean,	10:40 1	MR DRYMER: Did I hear you correctly?
2	were agreements entered into with the mayor or the	2	A. Correct, yes.
3	council? Were there any financial transactions with the	3	MR DRYMER: What I'd like to know is, did you believe he was
4	mayor or the council?	4	able to speak for council and village as to the desires
5	A. No financial transactions. We presented to the council,	5	of the village, or and/or that he was able to
6	we presented to a public meeting at their request. We	6	pronounce on the legal status of the road? They're two
7	did support the odd initiative of the village, which	7	different things.
8	was, for example, we sponsored a football club. I think	8	A. Mm. We believed he could we believed he advised us
9	there was something else, the Christmas party, something	9	on the legal status of the road, that the advice he gave
10	like that.	10	us, that it was a publicly accessible road, was advice
11	We were keen to show that we were willing to put	11	we relied on. It's true he was not a lawyer.
12	some money into the village. At that stage it was just	12	We knew that he was personally supportive of our
13	small gestures. But, you know, we understood that as	13	activities in the village, but at the same time he made
14	an oil company you need to give something back and we	14	clear he didn't want to speak for the village as
15	were keen to demonstrate that, and that would have been	15	a whole. He believed the village was supportive, but
16	part of the dialogue with the mayor.	16	he said: you're going to have to go and convince them;
17	PROFESSOR SANDS: And did you personally meet with the	17	I'm not going to do it for you.
18	mayor?	18	MR DRYMER: Alright. Thank you. I'll leave it there.
19	A. I did, yes.	19	Thank you very much.
20	PROFESSOR SANDS: On how many occasions? Approximately;	20	MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser, just following up to the
21	I mean, it's a long time ago.	21	Tribunal's questions, you do recall, however, that when
22	A. I would say, four or five? At that stage, most of the	22	he responded to Mr Sýkora's letter, he offered no
23	conversations were actually in Slovak, so it tended to	23	comment on the statutory public PSPR issue; correct?
24	be my Polish or Czech colleagues who would have the	24	A. That's correct, yes.
25	conversation.	25	Q. And if I could ask you now to look at R-150. This, as
	Page 41		Page 43
	1 450 71		1 age 43
10:38 1	I didn't realise he spoke as good English as he	10:41 1	you will see at the top, appears to be a report of the
10:38 1		10:41 1 2	you will see at the top, appears to be a report of the District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police
2	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal	2	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police
2 3	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal	2 3	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that
2 3 4	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to	2 3 4	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová?
2 3 4 5	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project?	2 3 4 5	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both
2 3 4 5 6	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to	2 3 4 5	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to	2 3 4 5 6 7	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you why did you again, you, writ large repeatedly go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the page, please. Over on page 2, if you could take a look
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you why did you again, you, writ large repeatedly go to the mayor with respect to the question of access and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the page, please. Over on page 2, if you could take a look at the third paragraph and read that, please, for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you why did you again, you, writ large repeatedly go to the mayor with respect to the question of access and the road. And I understood you to say that you believed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the page, please. Over on page 2, if you could take a look at the third paragraph and read that, please, for the record, beginning with "Only"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	seems to. PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you why did you again, you, writ large repeatedly go to the mayor with respect to the question of access and the road. And I understood you to say that you believed that he was able to speak for the council and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the page, please. Over on page 2, if you could take a look at the third paragraph and read that, please, for the record, beginning with "Only" A. "Only the relevant court is competent to resolve the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you why did you again, you, writ large repeatedly go to the mayor with respect to the question of access and the road. And I understood you to say that you believed that he was able to speak for the council and the village.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the page, please. Over on page 2, if you could take a look at the third paragraph and read that, please, for the record, beginning with "Only" A. "Only the relevant court is competent to resolve the property relationship and to decide on legitimacy of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you why did you again, you, writ large repeatedly go to the mayor with respect to the question of access and the road. And I understood you to say that you believed that he was able to speak for the council and the village.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the page, please. Over on page 2, if you could take a look at the third paragraph and read that, please, for the record, beginning with "Only" A. "Only the relevant court is competent to resolve the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PROFESSOR SANDS: And on the basis of your personal engagements with the mayor, did you form a view as to what motivated his support of this project? A. He was, I believe, very keen to see investment come into the region. They were losing their young, the young were leaving the region, they were going to Germany, to western Slovakia. There was a big concern about the region dying, and he wanted to see any foreign investor come in. I think there was a lot of people who knew about the historic oil exploration, you know, they knew where they were, they knew there had been interest in the past, and the people we spoke to were keen to see that looked at again. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. MR DRYMER: May I follow up. Not at all surprisingly, Professor Sands has put his finger on, I think, an important issue. He asked you why did you again, you, writ large repeatedly go to the mayor with respect to the question of access and the road. And I understood you to say that you believed that he was able to speak for the council and the village.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	District Prosecutor's Office in the nature of a police report, District Police Department. Do you recall that AOG had filed a criminal complaint against Ms Varjanová? A. There were a number of complaints going in both directions. I recall that. The details of the individual complaints I must admit I don't recall. Q. So let's take a look. I won't take the time to walk through that point. The document, of course, will indicate, as I suggested, that it was a criminal complaint by AOG, so I'm just going to move on to that. Would you agree and take whatever time you need, because this is an important point, Mr Fraser that the claim allegedly infringed upon in this criminal complaint is solely that of a co-owner, and there's no reference to any public right infringement? As I say, take whatever time you need. (Pause) A. Yes, I can see that. Q. Alright. And then if we could turn down further on the page, please. Over on page 2, if you could take a look at the third paragraph and read that, please, for the record, beginning with "Only" A. "Only the relevant court is competent to resolve the property relationship and to decide on legitimacy of

10:44 1 10:47 1 Q. But it is clear that although you say now you didn't parcels of land. Moreover, only the court is competent 2 to uphold the validity or existence of the lease abandon it, you didn't do anything about it, 3 3 agreements." affirmatively, until December of 2016. 4 Q. Do you remember being advised that that was the response A. Yes, that's correct. of the police department to your complaint? Q. The only thing you did was to continue to try to have 5 A. I don't remember the specific details of the response. 6 protesters arrested while they were on the co-owned land 7 I think I remember that it was -- that they were not 7 owned by Ms Varjanová and other residents of Smilno. 8 helpful. 8 A. I mean, in June, for example, we were told by the police 9 Q. Well, you do remember that AOG had filed a criminal 9 to have the car towed. So there was a lot of ambiguity 10 10 complaint -about -- we were getting mixed messages from the 11 11 authorities about it. 12 Q. -- based on its co-owner status, against another 12 Q. Mr Fraser, again, our time is limited. I think it's fair for me to ask -- I won't interrupt you, but I think 13 co-owner; correct? 14 A. Yes. 14 it's fair for me to ask you a question and you to answer 15 Q. It was a classic land dispute, a civil land dispute; 15 that question. 16 correct? 16 I'm going to repeat the question: after the police 17 A. Mm, yes. 17 said only a court can decide this dispute, you opposed 18 Q. And a few days later -- actually a few days previously, 18 her injunction in the Court of Appeals, and the Court of 19 Ms Varjanová had filed a complaint and sought Appeals affirmed the injunction; correct? 19 20 an injunction, and then, a few weeks later, that 20 A. That's correct. 21 injunction was granted; correct? 21 Q. And that injunction remained in place for the balance of 22 22 A. That's correct. 2016 and beyond; correct? 23 Q. And it's also true that AOG, in contrast, did not file 23 A. That is correct. 24 for any affirmative relief or any injunction. Isn't 24 Q. And the only time AOG took affirmative action to 25 that true? 25 establish its right was when it filed a complaint Page 45 Page 47 10:49 1 10:45 1 A. That's true. in December of 2016 after her injunction had been in 2 Q. And in fact --2 place throughout that period; correct? A. You're talking about affirmative action through the 3 A. Well, sorry, we did challenge the injunction, obviously. 3 4 4 Q. Yes, you filed an opposition to the injunction, and courts? 5 we'll come to that in a minute. But on the question of 5 O. Yes. 6 whether AOG had any right, co-owner, public, PSPR, Cesty 6 A. We had conversations with the police before then. 7 Smilno, AOG waited seven, eight months before it ever 7 Q. Yes, I understand. But that's why I asked the question 8 asked a court to decide the question; correct? 8 the way I did. 9 9 A. Are you referring to the hearing -- our appeal against A. Mm-hm. 10 the injunction? Q. So is our record clear that you did nothing in the 11 Q. Actually I'm referring to the fact that in December of courts until December 2016? 11 12 2016, after all the road blockages, after all the 12 A. That is correct. 13 protests, after all the criminal filings, the first time Q. And I'd like to put before you what was filed at that 13 14 AOG filed any affirmative relief was in December in 14 time. If I could call up R-059. Do you have that 15 which it sought an injunction, expressly premised upon 15 document before you, sir? 16 the PSPR theory? 16 A. Yes. 17 A. That's correct. We had relied on publicly accessible, Q. And do you see the date on that document? 17 18 18 A. I do. That's March 2017. 19 Q. Well, in fact, we just looked at documents which make it 19 Q. Right. And it refers somewhere in the text, in 20 clear that you did not rely on publicly accessible 20 paragraph 8, I will represent to you, and you're welcome 21 originally in the complaint you filed with the police. 21 to pull it up, but just in the interests of time: 22 It was limited to co-owner status on the 1/700th: 22 "By request of 2 December 2016, the claimant ..."

23

24 A. Mm-hm.

25 Q. You:

You are the claimant in this action; correct?

Page 48

23

25

correct?

about public accessibility.

24 A. That's correct, but it didn't mean we abandoned our view

10:50 1	ε , ε	10:53 1	say?
2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2	Q. Yes. Number one, it denied the injunction.
3	parties, any actions leading to restriction of the	3	A. Yes.
4	claimant's access and access of persons authorized by	4	Q. And it also said that the PSPR theory that you were
5	the claimant"	5	proposing failed to take account of the rule that a user
6	You recall that being the purpose of the injunction	6	pursuant to a PSPR theory must accept the road as it is.
7	you sought?	7	You remember that, don't you?
8	A. I do.	8	A. I don't remember it now, but it's in the judgment, is
9	Q. And on page 3, if we can turn to that, it says, just	9	it?
10		10	Q. Yes, it is.
11		11	Look at paragraph 13, if you would, please. The
12	* * *	12	underlining is, I believe, in the original of the court.
13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13	Could you read, just for our record, beginning with the
14		14	word "Users"
15		15	A. "Users must adjust themselves to the construction
	_	16	condition and transportation-technical condition of the
16			roads"
17	1 0	17	
18		18	Q. Now, Mr Fraser, that was a huge problem for AOG, wasn't
19	*	19	it, sir?
20	1	20	A. At this point, which is early 2017, we had adopted
21	11	21	a slightly different strategy, so we were a lot less
22	- · ·	22	focused on the judicial process with the road at this
23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	23	stage.
24		24	Q. But you still were relying on law, were you not, in your
25	Q. This was the first time you asked a court to consider	25	activities at the site?
	D 40		D (1
	Page 49		Page 51
10:52 1		10:55 1	A. Of course we were relying on the law. But we were by
10:52 1 2	2016; is that correct?	2	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit,
	2016; is that correct? A. That's correct.		then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we
2	2016; is that correct?A. That's correct.Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did	2	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would
2 3	2016; is that correct?A. That's correct.Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the	2 3	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road.
2 3 4	2016; is that correct?A. That's correct.Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the	2 3 4	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would
2 3 4 5	2016; is that correct?A. That's correct.Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals?	2 3 4 5	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road.
2 3 4 5 6	2016; is that correct?A. That's correct.Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals?A. That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail,
2 3 4 5 6 7	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness 	2 3 4 5 6 7	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? A. I don't believe we did. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir? If I understand your testimony, Mr Fraser, you say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? A. I don't believe we did. Q. Now, Mr Fraser, this ruling raised two, I would submit 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir? If I understand your testimony, Mr Fraser, you say the debate had moved on, or circumstances had moved on,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? A. I don't believe we did. Q. Now, Mr Fraser, this ruling raised two, I would submit respectfully, insurmountable problems to your use of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir? If I understand your testimony, Mr Fraser, you say the debate had moved on, or circumstances had moved on, because you were in discussions with the activists,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? A. I don't believe we did. Q. Now, Mr Fraser, this ruling raised two, I would submit respectfully, insurmountable problems to your use of the PSPR theory that is at the heart of this case, didn't 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir? If I understand your testimony, Mr Fraser, you say the debate had moved on, or circumstances had moved on, because you were in discussions with the activists, I think you said a moment ago; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? A. I don't believe we did. Q. Now, Mr Fraser, this ruling raised two, I would submit respectfully, insurmountable problems to your use of the PSPR theory that is at the heart of this case, didn't it, sir? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir? If I understand your testimony, Mr Fraser, you say the debate had moved on, or circumstances had moved on, because you were in discussions with the activists, I think you said a moment ago; is that correct? A. That's correct, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? A. I don't believe we did. Q. Now, Mr Fraser, this ruling raised two, I would submit respectfully, insurmountable problems to your use of the PSPR theory that is at the heart of this case, didn't it, sir? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir? If I understand your testimony, Mr Fraser, you say the debate had moved on, or circumstances had moved on, because you were in discussions with the activists, I think you said a moment ago; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 2016; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And the court denied your request for an injunction, did it not? Both in the Court of First Instance and in the Court of Appeals? A. That's correct. Q. And in your witness statement, your two witness statements submitted to the Tribunal, you made no mention of this application and this ruling, did you? A. I did not, no. Q. And you never told the police about it either, did you, sir? A. I'm sorry, told the police about the about this court process? Q. Yes. Yes or no? A. No, we did not. No. Q. And you never told any of the ministries you contacted from time to time about this ruling, did you, sir? A. I don't believe we did. Q. Now, Mr Fraser, this ruling raised two, I would submit respectfully, insurmountable problems to your use of the PSPR theory that is at the heart of this case, didn't it, sir? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	then in dialogue with the activists behind this lawsuit, or this litigation, and our understanding was that if we could reach an accommodation with them, then they would no longer block our access along the road. Q. And we're going to come to that in some detail, Mr Fraser. But for now I want to just understand, first of all, would you agree, Mr Fraser, that it would be fair to bring to the Tribunal's attention a ruling directly on the issue of the PSPR theory, since it is at the heart of your claims here? A. We didn't we didn't think it was relevant by then, because, as I say, the debate had moved on. Q. So your testimony to the Tribunal is the fact that a court made the ruling it did about the your failure to carry your burden of proof on the establishment of the PSPR theory, you didn't think that was worth I'll move on. MR DRYMER: May I ask a question before you do, sir? If I understand your testimony, Mr Fraser, you say the debate had moved on, or circumstances had moved on, because you were in discussions with the activists, I think you said a moment ago; is that correct? A. That's correct, yes.

10.57	1	11.00 1	We have been rained at 1 1 1 10
10:57 1	about removing their blockage.	11:00 1	We have been going for an hour and a half now, so
2	A. Mm-hm, correct.	2	I'm wondering whether this would not be a good moment to
3	MR DRYMER: Okay. My question has nothing to do with that	3	have a break before you are going into these questions;
4	particularly.	4	does that make sense?
5	Did you, again the company, or you personally,	5	MR ALEXANDER: That's fine, Madam President, thank you.
6	understand that discussions with the activists, as you	6	MR TUSHINGHAM: Madam President, just one question: would we
7	call them, could resolve the particular question of	7	be able to see a copy of that chronology before the
8	having to use the road in the conditions in which it was	8	break, just so that we are able to
9	at the time? In other words, could the activists allow	9	MR ALEXANDER: It's been circulated.
10	you to gravel the road? Was that your understanding?	10	THE PRESIDENT: I understand that it must have been
11	A. We our understanding was that if the activists could	11	circulated because that's the rule, right?
12	be placated, that they would have no objection to our	12	MR ALEXANDER: Yes.
13	using the road, and I'm sure that that would have	13	MR TUSHINGHAM: Please forgive me, I thought this was a new
14	included upgrading or maintaining the road if required.	14	document.
15	MR DRYMER: And I don't know what your answer will be, but	15	MR DRYMER: What's the document, just for my information?
16	was it the company's understanding, as far as you're	16	Which demonstrative?
17	aware, that with, let's say, the blessing of the	17	MS LUO: It's RD-1.
18	activists, of the local community to upgrade the road to	18	THE PRESIDENT: We're going into a break now, Mr Fraser.
19	the extent required for proper access, that that would	19	Please do not speak to anyone because you are on the
20	resolve the issue that Mr Alexander pointed you to,	20	witness stand.
21	where the court seems to have said: as a PSPR you must	21	Good, thank you.
22	respect the conditions of the road as you find them?	22	(11.01 am)
23	Again, I mean this goes excuse me for not just	23	(A short break)
24	interrupting your answer, but for complicating the	24	(11.20 am)
25	question. This goes to the dichotomy that we were	25	
	Page 53		Page 55
	•		_
10:59 1	discussing a moment ago between the politics of the law,	11:21 1	THE PRESIDENT: So before we start, we just received
10:59 1 2	discussing a moment ago between the politics of the law, if you will.	11:21 1	
2	if you will.	2	an email.
2 3	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes.	2 3	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes.
2 3 4	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough.	2 3 4	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context?
2 3 4 5	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community.	2 3 4 5	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in
2 3 4 5	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we	2 3 4 5 6	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in
2 3 4 5 6 7	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns	2 3 4 5 6 7	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and I wonder, would it be helpful if I gave you a copy of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation now, but we're obtaining one, and so therefore we've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and I wonder, would it be helpful if I gave you a copy of this, and the witness, so that we could have them both	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation now, but we're obtaining one, and so therefore we've given it to you as soon as we're able to find out the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and I wonder, would it be helpful if I gave you a copy of this, and the witness, so that we could have them both at hand? I think it might be easier to read documents	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation now, but we're obtaining one, and so therefore we've given it to you as soon as we're able to find out the position.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and I wonder, would it be helpful if I gave you a copy of this, and the witness, so that we could have them both at hand? I think it might be easier to read documents and put it in this chronology.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation now, but we're obtaining one, and so therefore we've given it to you as soon as we're able to find out the position. So we apologise for the error that originally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and I wonder, would it be helpful if I gave you a copy of this, and the witness, so that we could have them both at hand? I think it might be easier to read documents	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation now, but we're obtaining one, and so therefore we've given it to you as soon as we're able to find out the position. So we apologise for the error that originally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and I wonder, would it be helpful if I gave you a copy of this, and the witness, so that we could have them both at hand? I think it might be easier to read documents and put it in this chronology. THE PRESIDENT: That's certainly fine.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation now, but we're obtaining one, and so therefore we've given it to you as soon as we're able to find out the position. So we apologise for the error that originally occurred, but that's the explanation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if you will. A. Mm, mm. Yes. I mean, I would first of all distinguish between the activists and the local community. MR DRYMER: Yes, fair enough. A. We did not see them as the same at all. They were quite distinct entities, groups of people. But yes, we thought that if we could address them on the concerns which they were very vocal about, they assured us that they would then they would let us have a clear path at that point. So maintaining the road I think was a detail in that bigger picture, I would say. MR DRYMER: Thank you. That's helpful. MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser it is, as you suggest, important to pay attention to the chronology here. We circulated a demonstrative exhibit. Madam President, we may be continuing to move through some other documents as I use this, and I wonder, would it be helpful if I gave you a copy of this, and the witness, so that we could have them both at hand? I think it might be easier to read documents and put it in this chronology.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an email. MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Can you just explain what it is, and the context? MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, Madam President. So it relates to the cross-examination that Mr Alexander was pursuing in relation to Exhibit R-155. During the course of the break, we obviously checked whether the attachment that was being referred to was within the legal team's possession, and it was discovered that it was. The explanation for why it wasn't originally disclosed in response to Slovakia's production request was because a number of documents were sent, they were originally in Slovak, were sent to interpreters in order to conduct a review as to the relevance of those documents. This document was unfortunately by human error missed from that set, and so therefore it wasn't picked up in the disclosure review exercise. We don't have an original an English translation now, but we're obtaining one, and so therefore we've given it to you as soon as we're able to find out the position. So we apologise for the error that originally

-			
11:22 1	THE PRESIDENT: No, we appreciate the explanation and the	11:25 1	conversation can as smoothly
			conversation can go smoothly.
2	fact that you're submitting it.	2	MR ANWAY: We are preparing the translation.
3	MR DRYMER: So it's not privileged?	3	MR DRYMER: Fine; I didn't know if it was on you or the
4	MR TUSHINGHAM: And it's not a privileged document, no.	4	other side.
5	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	5	MR ANWAY: I didn't know either, but we're doing it anyway.
6	MR DRYMER: Mr Alexander, did you note this?	6	MR DRYMER: Very good, thank you.
7	MR PEKAR: Sorry, I was explaining to Mr Alexander the	7	MR TUSHINGHAM: As soon as we receive the translation we
8	content of the document.	8	will send that through, and we hope that that will be
9	THE PRESIDENT: Are there any comments you wish to make now,	9	able to be done as soon as possible.
10	or later, on the document?	10	THE PRESIDENT: So we will soon have two translations, if
11	MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. I don't speak Slovak	11	I understand it correctly. So we couldn't wish for
12	so I would like to read it, and that does raise the	12	more.
13	question of timing, and our time.	13	Good. That's fine.
14	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.	14	MR ALEXANDER: May I proceed?
15	MR ALEXANDER: With the Tribunal's indulgence, I want to	15	THE PRESIDENT: Yes please.
16	just confirm that we would be permitted we have	16	MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President.
17	2.5 hours for each witness, estimated. It may be	17	Mr Fraser, you may recall I had earlier asked some
18	appropriate, given the pace, for which I accept	18	questions about whether the Court of Appeals' decision
19	responsibility, that we re-adjust that somewhat. Would	19	on your injunction application against Ms Varjanová and
20	that be acceptable to you?	20	four or five other parties, whether it created some
21		21	insurmountable problems. I probably should have said
22	·	22	"serious issues for AOG going forward"; do you recall
23		23	that?
24		24	A. Yes.
25	THE PRESIDENT: Obviously if we can stick to about the times	25	Q. I wanted to address one other matter that was raised in
-20	THE TREE ELECTION CONTRACT IN THE SHORT OF MISSING LINES	23	Q. I wanted to address one other matter that was raised in
	Page 57		Page 59
11:24 1	indicated, that allows us to follow the sequence of	11:26 1	the court's decision, and if we could pull that up
2	witnesses as they are organised for each day.	2	again. Maybe it's already up. That's R-59, yes.
3	MR ALEXANDER: Of course.	3	Do you recall the court's discussion about the
4	THE PRESIDENT: But we have some flexibility, so that is not	4	constitutional rights of Ms Varjanová and the other
5	a problem.	5	landowners?
6	The question I was asking myself is if you need to	6	A. I do.
7	have a translation, and then you may still have	7	Q. And do you recall the court's conclusion that the
8	additional questions for Mr Fraser. That might have to	8	impairment of her rights to usual the impairment of
9	be after the lunch break, which would imply that		impairment of her rights to askar the impairment of
		Q	usual ownership rights could only occur in the event
		9	usual ownership rights could only occur in the event
10	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break.	10	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of
10 11	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see.	10 11	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall
10 11 12	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon	10 11 12	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion?
10 11 12 13	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want	10 11 12 13	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for
10 11 12 13 14	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want to ask some questions for it.	10 11 12 13 14	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for an injunction, or in the appeal?
10 11 12 13 14	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want to ask some questions for it. THE PRESIDENT: Fine. So let's proceed now with the other	10 11 12 13 14 15	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for an injunction, or in the appeal? Q. This is in the appeal.
10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want to ask some questions for it. THE PRESIDENT: Fine. So let's proceed now with the other questions, and then we'll revert and see what time we	10 11 12 13 14 15	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for an injunction, or in the appeal? Q. This is in the appeal. A. This is in the appeal. Right.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want to ask some questions for it. THE PRESIDENT: Fine. So let's proceed now with the other questions, and then we'll revert and see what time we get to it.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for an injunction, or in the appeal? Q. This is in the appeal. A. This is in the appeal. Right. Q. Do you remember that?
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want to ask some questions for it. THE PRESIDENT: Fine. So let's proceed now with the other questions, and then we'll revert and see what time we get to it. MR ALEXANDER: Yes, thank you, Madam President.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for an injunction, or in the appeal? Q. This is in the appeal. A. This is in the appeal. Right. Q. Do you remember that? A. I don't recall that.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want to ask some questions for it. THE PRESIDENT: Fine. So let's proceed now with the other questions, and then we'll revert and see what time we get to it. MR ALEXANDER: Yes, thank you, Madam President. MR DRYMER: May I just raise a practical point. You're	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for an injunction, or in the appeal? Q. This is in the appeal. A. This is in the appeal. Right. Q. Do you remember that? A. I don't recall that. Q. Well, in fairness, let me find it for you. If we could
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Fraser remains sequestered during the lunch break. That's the only timing issue I really see. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. Yes, based upon the preliminary description I've received, I will want to ask some questions for it. THE PRESIDENT: Fine. So let's proceed now with the other questions, and then we'll revert and see what time we get to it. MR ALEXANDER: Yes, thank you, Madam President. MR DRYMER: May I just raise a practical point. You're	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	compensation was paid, and that there was no evidence of record that compensation had been offered; do you recall that discussion? A. I'm sorry, is this in the first decision for an injunction, or in the appeal? Q. This is in the appeal. A. This is in the appeal. Right. Q. Do you remember that? A. I don't recall that. Q. Well, in fairness, let me find it for you. If we could

23 A. Page 7 of my witness statement?

24 Q. No. No. This is of the exhibit on the screen, R-59.

22 Q. I beg your pardon?

25 A. Okay. Yes.

Page 58

to be certain that if and when you put questions to any

be, that the witness also has access to some form of

English description or translation so that the

English-speaking witness, whichever witness that might

22

23

24

25

- 11:28 1 Q. I'll point you to two or three sections of this
 - 2 discussion about constitutional impairment. About ten
 - 3 lines down from the top, there is a sentence that begins
 - 4 "With regard ..."
 - 5 "With regard to the above, we can conclude that the
 - 6 only interpretation conformable with the Constitution is
 - 7 that the land owner should consent to such a restriction
 - 8 of ownership right. In addition to consent of the owner
 - 9 that is necessary, existence of an irreplaceable
 - 10 necessity to communicate ... is a precondition for
 - 11 private land use by the public."
 - 12 And then further down, do you see the line, maybe 12
 - lines up, after the notation:
 - "... a publicly accessible public special purpose
 - 15 road may be established also against the land owner's
 - will only if compensation ... is provided to the land
 - 17 owner."
 - Do you see that? That's the point I'm identifying.
 - 19 A. Sorry, where is that?
 - 20 Q. It's a little bit up from 29:
 - "... a publicly accessible public special purpose
 - 22 road ..."
 - 23 Do you see that?
 - 24 A. Sorry. I see, yes.
 - 25 Q. Yes. Do you recall being made aware of the fact that

- 11:31 1 A. Yes.
 - 2 Q. And you were -- you being AOG, and you personally, were
 - 3 aware that that injunction remained in place; correct?
 - 4 A. That's correct.
 - Q. And while that injunction was in place, and you had
 - 6 unsuccessfully appealed it, AOG repeatedly violated the
 - 7 injunction, did it not? It entered the land from which
 - 8 it had been enjoined. That's true, isn't it?
 - A. Well, we maintain that Cesty Smilno entered the land.
 - O Q. I understand what your theory was. But what I'm asking
 - about is the court's order. The court's order never
 - 12 changed, did it?
 - 13 A. Correct.
 - 14 Q. You developed what might charitably be called a new
 - argument, but the court's order never changed, did it?
 - 16 A. That's correct.
 - 17 Q. And while the court's order was in place, and AOG had
 - not sought any affirmative action on its new arguments,
 - 19 you repeatedly entered the site; correct?
 - 20 A. Cesty Smilno entered the site, yes.
 - 21 Q. Well, Cesty Smilno was a subsidiary of AOG, was it not?
 - 22 A. Yes.
 - 23 Q. Perhaps this is as good a time as any to talk about
 - 24 Cesty Smilno.
 - 25 It had been created shortly after the court had

Page 63

- 11:29 1 the court had said any such statute would need to be
 - 2 construed in a way that if there was a forced
 - 3 restriction, compensation would have to be paid?
 - 4 A. I don't recall that. This was in March 2017, and we
 - 5 were not focused on judicial processes by now.
 - 6 Q. Alright.
 - 7 Before we broke I also mentioned that I wanted to
 - 8 spend some time talking about the chronology of events
 - 9 in 2016, and I've placed before you, and circulated to
 - 10 the Tribunal and your counsel, two documents. One is
 - 11 Respondent's demonstrative number 1 (RD-1), and I'd like
 - to ask you a few questions about that first; do you have
 - that before you?
 - 14 A. This is the -- not the timeline, but AOG's changing
 - 15 justifications?
 - 16 Q. No, it is the timeline.
 - 17 A. The timeline, okay.
 - 18 Q. Now, we talked earlier this morning about the regional
 - 19 court having issued an injunction against AOG and third
 - 20 persons acting under its authority, in February,
 - 21 18 February 2016; do you recall that discussion?
 - 22 A. I do.
 - 23 Q. And that injunction stayed in place, was not vacated or
 - 24 otherwise modified, to the end of 2016 and beyond; do
 - you recall that discussion?

Page 62

- 11:34 1 enjoined AOG when its 1/700th share transfer scheme
 - 2 failed: correct?
 - 3 A. That is correct.
 - 4 Q. And it was incorporated, and the transaction was put
 - 5 together for the express purpose of circumventing the
 - 6 injunction?
 - 7 A. Our understanding was that Cesty Smilno was not bound by
 - 8 the injunction.
 - 9 Q. That's not my question. AOG was bound by the
 - injunction; correct?
 - 11 A. Correct.
 - 12 Q. At all times to the end of 2016 and beyond; correct?
 - 13 A. That's correct.
 - 14 Q. AOG caused the creation of Cesty Smilno; correct?
 - 15 A. It did.
 - 16 Q. It was a subsidiary of AOG; correct?
 - 17 A. It was.
 - 18 Q. It had no assets of its own, did it, sir?
 - 19 A. Very small.
 - 20 Q. It had no employees?
 - 21 A. That's correct.
 - 22 Q. It was -- it took direction entirely from AOG; correct?
 - 23 A. It had the same direction as AOG, in the sense of the
 - same managers, that's correct.
 - 25 Q. Mr Fraser, I mean this with respect, but do we really

- 11:35 1 need to take time here talking about whether AOG
 - controlled Cesty Smilno? There's no question about 2
 - 3 that, is there?
 - 4 A. I agree. Cesty Smilno --
 - 5 Q. That's all I need: you agree that it took direction from
 - AOG and AOG alone; correct?
 - A. Or let's say it acted in collaboration with AOG.
 - 8 Q. Well, it had no persons controlling it other than AOG,
 - 9
 - 10 A. The same as people controlled AOG, yes.
 - 11 Q. Exactly. It had no directors and officers of its own,
 - 12 did it, sir?
 - 13 A. They were the same -- they were some of the same
 - 14 individuals as --
 - 15 Q. Right, it was its alter ego, we all know what that
 - 16 means?
 - 17 A. Mm-hm.
 - 18 Q. You agree with that, don't you?
 - 19 A. As I say, it had the same -- some of the same management
 - 20
 - 21 Q. Well, was there any management that wasn't AOG?
 - 22 A. I don't believe so. It had one outside shareholder.
 - 23 Q. And that outside shareholder was the party who, at AOG's
 - 24 suggestion, had contributed its share in the road for
 - 25 the purpose of circumventing the injunction. That's

- 11:38 1 A. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay. So all AOG actually did was to tell people who
 - 3 were bringing equipment over to the road: come on
 - 4 through. That's all that happened, isn't it?
 - 5 A. Cesty Smilno issued authorisations to people to come
 - onto the road. 6
 - 7 Q. As a wholly owned subsidiary of AOG. Alright. Well,
 - 8 I think we have what we need there, don't we. But you
 - 9 will concede, won't you, Mr Fraser, that Cesty Smilno
 - 10 had no independence whatsoever from AOG?
 - 11 A. It obviously pursued -- it pursued a -- the same
 - objectives as AOG, I agree. 12
 - 13 Q. Alright. Now given that, it's also true, isn't it, that
 - AOG never went to the court on an affirmative action to
 - 15 try to legitimise what was going on with Cesty Smilno.
 - 16 All it did was to argue to the police that somehow this
 - 17 changed everything. The rationale had changed. Yes?
 - 18 A. That's correct. And we understood that it had changed. Q. And the net effect of all this was that a share transfer 19
 - 20 that had only days before been found unlawful, to which
 - 21 AOG ultimately confessed judgment, or recognised the
 - 22 claim, another share transfer was made to Cesty Smilno,
 - 23 which AOG still controlled and instructed, and that's
 - 24
 - how the road was used by Cesty Smilno; correct?
 - 25 A. That's correct.

Page 67

- 11:36 1 rather obvious, isn't it, Mr Fraser?
 - A. I mean, we were -- we -- the structure involving Cesty 2
 - 3 Smilno, yes, it was a way to enable us to carry on
 - 4 operations which were not in breach of the injunction,
 - 5 that's what we understood.
 - Q. But if AOG instructed Cesty Smilno, its 100% owned 6
 - 7 subsidiary, to pick up heavy equipment and move it
 - 8 across the road --
 - 9 A. Mm.
 - 10 Q. -- you don't contend, do you, that that's not the action
 - of AOG, do you, sir? 11
 - 12 A. I mean, that's a legal question. I'm --
 - 13 Q. No, I'm not talking about law at this point.
 - 14 I'm talking about factually --
 - 15 A. Mm.
 - 16 Q. -- if somebody in management, in AOG, picks up the
 - phone, there's no one on the other end of the line. All 17
 - 18 they have to do is take the phone and turn it over here.
 - 19 Isn't that right?
 - 20 A. That's correct. But, as I say, our understanding was
 - 21 that it was not in breach of the injunction.
 - 22 Q. We'll get to that. But factually, I just want to be
 - 23 clear that Cesty Smilno had no personnel, or mechanisms
 - 24 of operation, other than what were instructed by AOG;
 - 25 isn't that right?

Page 66

- 11:39 1 Q. And that was, if you look at the other demonstrative
 - I've left there on your table, "AOG's changing
 - 3 justifications to access the road"; do you see that
 - 4 document?
 - 5 A. Yes.
 - 6 THE PRESIDENT: For the transcript, we should say it's
 - page 109 of Respondent's opening presentation.
 - 8 MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Madam President. I apologise.
 - I should try to do better on that.
 - 10 So that was what you discussed in your own witness
 - 11 statement; correct?
 - 12 A. Correct.
 - 13 Q. And later in -- actually, in early 2017, Cesty Smilno
 - 14 also applied for an injunction against Ms Varjanová and
 - 15 other citizens; correct?
 - 16 A. That's correct.
 - 17 Q. But that was not put into the record of this proceeding;

24

- 19 A. For the same reason as the other one. It was not put
- 20 into the record, that's correct.
- 21 Q. So at the same time that the Cesty Smilno share transfer
- 22 scheme was developed, there was also, as we've talked
- 23 about this morning, in May of 2016, there was discussion

between Mr Sýkora and the mayor, which I refer to here

25 as the public special purpose road scheme, and we

- 11:41 1 discussed earlier this morning that the regional court
 - 2 later denied your request for an injunction on the basis
 - 3 of that theory, and that was affirmed; correct?
 - 4 A. Mm-hm. Yes.
 - 5 Q. So as we look back in time, there were three separate
 - 6 rationales employed by AOG to legitimise its access to
 - 7 the road; correct?
 - 8 A. I would add a fourth rationale, which is before the
 - 9 transfer scheme, that the road was publicly accessible.
 - 10 It's on that basis that we entered the road initially.
 - 11 Q. Right. But that's the same rationale as the third
 - point, isn't it? The public special purpose road
 - 13 scheme's
 - 14 A. I'm not a Slovak lawyer. All we knew was that we had
 - been -- we believed on good authority, understood that
 - 16 the road was publicly accessible.
 - 17 Q. But bearing in mind what the police were interested in
 - was in a land dispute, they wanted, as we saw earlier,
 - 19 they made the point: only a court can decide this. No
 - 20 court ever found in favour of AOG on any theory it
 - 21 proffered to justify its access to the road. That
 - didn't happen. No court ever did that, did they, sir?
 - 23 A. That's correct.
 - 24 Q. So if we go back in time, every time, on the timeline
 - 25 I have put before you as Respondent's demonstrative

- 11:45 1 MR ALEXANDER: May I have a moment, Madam President?
 - 2 (Pause)
 - 3 MR TUSHINGHAM: Please forgive me for interrupting, but
 - 4 we've just sent you -- you should be receiving shortly
 - 5 an English translation of the document. I just wanted
 - 6 to let you know that's the case.
 - 7 MR ALEXANDER: Thank you.
 - 8 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 - (Pause)
 - 10 MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser, in connection with the Cesty
 - 11 Smilno scheme, it is true, isn't it, the co-owners were
 - 12 not offered the share that was transferred to Cesty
 - 13 Smilno?
 - 14 A. That is correct, and we were advised that it was not
 - 15 necessary.
 - 16 Q. And you assert good faith because of your reliance on
 - that advice; is that your testimony?
 - 18 A. Yes, our understanding was that -- our understanding was
 - 19 that it was not necessary.
 - 20 Q. But you nevertheless claim privilege over the matter on
 - 21 which you claim legal advice; is that right?
 - 22 A. I believe that's right, yes.
 - 23 Q. Now, I want to return to your witness statement at
 - 24 paragraph 45, if we can, please.
 - 25 Mr Fraser, I want to focus in particular for

Page 71

- 11:43 1 number 1 (RD-1), every time AOG entered the site or
 - 2 upgraded the site to a condition improved beyond how it
 - 3 was first presented, every time any of that activity
 - 4 occurred, we now know that AOG was never able to sustain
 - 5 any position for lawful entitlement to that access and,
 - 6 to the contrary, it did so in violation of a pending
 - 7 court injunction. Isn't that true?
 - 8 A. We don't accept that. I don't accept that. Because we
 - 9 were attempting to enter the road in June on the basis
 - $10\,$ $\,$ of Cesty Smilno's authorisation, which I -- which we've
 - $11\,$ $\,$ already discussed. And I would also remind you that the
 - police actually authorised us to remove vehicles when we
 - 13 attempted to get on the location in June. So we had,
 - 14 you know, we thought good indications that we were
 - 15 entitled to use the road.
 - 16 Q. Despite the fact that you were subject to a court
 - injunction which you don't dispute?
 - 18 A. Despite the fact that AOG was subject to a court
 - 19 injunction, yes.
 - 20 Q. And your position is, as we've described before, that
 - 21 Cesty Smilno, even though it was 100% owned by AOG, and
 - 22 directed and instructed by AOG, and serving its purposes
 - in its use of the road, your position is you had a good
 - faith basis; is that correct?
 - 25 A. That was our understanding, yes.

Page 70

- 11:48 1 a moment on the events of mid-June. That was a period
 - of substantial difficulty for AOG, to put it mildly;
 - 3 would you agree?
 - 4 A. We were trying to drill on Smilno.
 - 5 Q. And you were strapped financially at the time; correct?
 - 6 A. No, that's not correct.
 - 7 Q. That's not correct?
 - 8 A. No
 - 9 Q. You had been working for more than two years to obtain
 - 10 external financing; correct?
 - 11 A. Correct.
 - 12 Q. And despite those efforts, you had been unsuccessful
 - with the exception of the Akard commitment to fund;
 - 14 correct?
 - 15 A. We had secured the Akard funding at the end of 2015;
 - 16 that's correct.
 - 17 Q. Now, when you say "secured", we need to clarify that to
 - some extent, don't we, sir: there was a commitment by
 - 19 Akard to fund, but the extent of that commitment had not
 - 20 yet been funded; correct?
 - 21 A. Not -- the full extent had not been funded, but
 - 22 a significant amount of funds were being disbursed
 - 23 during that year.
 - 24 Q. And there were substantial problems during that year in
 - 25 their making funding in response to cash calls; correct?

- 11:49 1 A. I don't recall that. They continued to fund us up until
 - 2 the end of 2016.
 - 3 Q. You don't recall that. Well, we'll come back to that in
 - 4 a moment. But you don't recall difficulties from Akard
 - 5 funding in the latter part of 2016?
 - 6 A. At the end of 2016 there were difficulties, possibly
 - 7 coming up to the end of the year. But the -- not during
 - 8 the middle of the year, to my recollection.
 - 9 Q. Mr Fraser, it is true that in the early stages of the
 - search for finance, you were looking for between
 - 11 \$15 million and \$30 million, correct? US?
 - 12 A. That's correct. At that stage we were looking to
 - 13 finance both Poland -- Polish activities and Slovak
 - 14 activities.
 - 15 Q. And at the time of mid--- well, let's see. In the end
 - of 2015, you'd received a commitment to fund by Akard,
 - but they had only funded by that point in time
 - 18 1.9 million: correct?
 - 19 A. By the end of 2016, that's correct.
 - 20 Q. Right. And later in that year their funding problems
 - became severe enough that you actually were not being
 - 22 paid; correct?
 - 23 A. By the end of 2016, they would -- they were -- they
 - refused to continue to fund us because of the
 - 25 difficulties we were facing in Slovakia.

- 11:52 1 A. The settlement was, we would repay that money if and
 - when we came into funds in the future. There was no
 - 3 immediate obligation to repay under that settlement.
 - 4 Q. But you released them from any obligation to fund
 - 5 further?
 - 6 A. They had --
 - 7 Q. Is that true?
 - 8 A. Well --
 - 9 O. Is that true?
 - 10 A. They were in default. So we defaulted them out of the
 - 11 agreement.
 - 12 Q. And they were released from the obligation to fund any
 - 13 further, isn't that correct?
 - 14 A. Well, once they're in default, they're released. That's
 - 15 right.
 - 16 Q. And they released you from all potential counterclaims?
 - 17 A. So they assert. They had no potential counterclaims as
 - 18 far as we were concerned.
 - 19 Q. And at that point in -- but, wait. They had no
 - 20 potential counterclaims but you agreed to pay back the
 - 21 money?
 - 22 A. We agreed if at some point in the future we had the
 - funds, we would repay them.
 - 24 Q. And when that release was signed, you had no other
 - 25 external financing in place; correct? You were net zero

Page 75

- 11:51 1 Q. Right. But there's no evidence in the record that they
 - 2 did it on that basis, is there, sir?
 - 3 A. I believe the --
 - 4 Q. Could you answer that question first, "yes" or "no"?
 - 5 A. I thought that there were -- I think the answer is "no",
 - 6 because if I'm not mistaken there are -- there is -- we
 - 7 served a notice of default on Akard for failing to fund
 - 8 at the end of 2016, or early 2017.
 - 9 Q. You served a notice of default on them?
 - 10 A. Yes.
 - 11 Q. And they threatened you with counterclaims?
 - 12 A. They did, yes.
 - 13 Q. Yes. Including a threat of an internal investigation of
 - 14 possible violations of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act
 - by AOG; correct?
 - 16 A. That's what they said, yes.
 - 17 Q. Yes. And as a result of settling those claims, it's
 - 18 true, isn't it, that you agreed to pay back all the
 - money that they had funded you?
 - 20 A. We did agree that.
 - 21 Q. And that settlement put very extreme pressure on AOG,
 - 22 did it not?
 - 23 A. No, not at all.
 - 24 Q. You had no funding -- you had no external funding at the
 - 25 time; correct?

Page 74

- 11:53 1 external financing?
 - 2 A. That's correct.
 - 3 Q. And Mr Lewis had made it absolutely clear that he didn't
 - 4 want to fund anymore, didn't he?
 - 5 A. He had made it -- his strong preference was to fund --
 - 6 was to co-fund, was to have someone else come in. He
 - 7 didn't want to fund the business on his own, which is
 - 8 very common for the oil industry.
 - 9 Q. And towards the time period we're talking about, he'd
 - made it clear that he was not going to fund further,
 - 11 isn't it?
 - 12 A. He -- are you talking about early 2017?
 - 13 Q. Yes
 - 14 A. He -- what we were seeking to do in early 2017 was bring
 - in another investor for part of our commitment, and
 - 16 I expect that Mike would have funded a piece at that
 - 17 point.
 - 18 Q. But that never happened?
 - 19 A. That did not happen, that's correct.
 - 20 Q. Now let's go back to 2016, in June. You were anxious,
 - 21 notwithstanding the injunction, to just go ahead;
 - 22 correct
 - 23 A. Correct. One issue was the licence was -- the licences
 - 24 were coming up for renewal, so we were keen to have some
 - 25 activity before the renewal.

- 11:55 1 Q. And by going ahead notwithstanding the injunction, you
 - 2 took a number of aggressive steps; would you agree, sir?
 - 3 A. I wouldn't agree that, no.
 - 4 Q. Well, you upgraded the road; correct?
 - 5 A. We did.
 - 6 Q. You continued to bring materials to the site over
 - 7 the road; correct?
 - 8 A. Correct. We upgraded the road and brought materials on
 - 9 using a local contractor and with, so far as we were
 - aware, the blessing of the mining authority, which came
 - out and inspected our activities on the road.
 - 12 Q. But you had an injunction against you from using
 - the road; correct?
 - 14 A. AOG did.
 - 15 Q. Yes.
 - 16 A. Not Cesty Smilno.
 - 17 Q. Right. But Cesty Smilno didn't upgrade the road, did
 - 18 they, sir?
 - 19 A. A contractor upgraded the road.
 - 20 Q. Right, and who engaged the contractor, sir?
 - 21 A. I can't recall offhand. I mean, AOG will have paid the
 - bills for the contractor, that is true.
 - 23 Q. And there is no evidence in this record that Cesty
 - 24 Smilno ever engaged anybody, is there?
 - 25 A. That's correct.

- 11:57 1 Q. And that was the majority of the known residents of the
 - 2 community, wasn't it?
 - 3 A. I am not sure it's a majority, actually. The population
 - 4 of the village is about 700. I can also say that
 - 5 I looked down that list of names on the petition and
 - 6 a number of those people actually signed consents for us
 - 7 to -- for AOG or Cesty Smilno to use that road, a number
 - 8 of people on that petition.
 - 9 Q. Right, and there's no evidence of that on the record, is
 - 10 there?
 - 11 A. I can assure you that --
 - 12 Q. And that wasn't in your witness statement, was it, sir?
 - A. No.
 - 14 Q. Mr Fraser, after the petition activity by over 300
 - people from the village of Smilno, the petition was
 - presented to the council of the village, was it not?
 - 17 A. I believe it was, yes.
 - 18 Q. And the council passed a resolution in response to that.
 - 19 Isn't that correct?
 - 20 A. Can you remind me of the resolution, please?
 - 21 Q. I can. (Pause)
 - Let's start with R-109.
 - Before we get into the documents on this point,
 - 24 Mr Fraser, you've made the statement repeatedly in your
 - various witness statements that there was a very small

Page 79

- 11:56 1 Q. Everybody who used the road was engaged by AOG, to the
 - best of your knowledge, isn't that correct? And all of
 - 3 this happened while the injunction remained in place;
 - 4 isn't that right?
 - 5 A. My recollection is that when the contractor entered onto
 - 6 the road, it had -- it was with an authorisation from
 - 7 Cesty Smilno.
 - 8 As I say, the mining authority were aware, the
 - 9 police were aware. No one attempted to stop us.
 - 10 Q. Just the same plan: just go ahead?
 - 11 A. Well, the only person who had an issue was Ms Varjanová.
 - 12 The locals in the village were perfectly happy with the
 - work being done to the road.
 - 14 Q. Mr Fraser, you sued several other villagers for blocking
 - 15 access to the road, didn't you, sir?
 - 16 A. I don't believe any of the others were from the village.
 - 17 They were from some way away. I think the only person
 - on the -- in those proceedings who is from the village
 - is Ms Varjanová, to the best of my knowledge.
 - 20 Q. Mr Fraser, you are familiar with the petition activity
 - 21 that occurred in the village, are you not?
 - 22 A. Yes.
 - 23 Q. And the petition was signed by a majority of the
 - inhabitants of the community, was it not?
 - 25 A. I believe it was signed by about 300 people.

Page 78

- 11:59 1 minority of the village that was opposed to your
 - 2 operations; correct?
 - 3 A. Yes.
 - 4 Q. And you did that based largely on reports from your team
 - 5 on the ground, did you not?
 - 6 A. And what I saw with my own eyes as well.
 - 7 Q. And you did see the petition materials with your own
 - 8 eyes?
 - 9 A. I did not see them at the time. I heard about them, but
 - 10 I didn't see them.
 - 11 Q. Right. Were you receiving reports on this issue from
 - 12 Mr Crow?
 - 13 A. From one of my colleagues I received reports on it, yes.
 - 14 Probably from Maciej Karabin.
 - 15 Q. You don't remember?
 - 16 A. I don't remember who from, no.
 - 17 Q. So in this petition activity there were four members of
 - the committee; do you recall that?
 - 19 A. Yes.
 - 20 Q. And two were affiliated with the municipality itself.
 - 21 So you had before you the presentation of the sheets of
 - the petition, and then there was activity, 341
 - 23 signatures of the citizens of Smilno, and then there was
 - 24 a resolution presented to the council; do you recall
 - 25 that?

Page 80

24 (Pages 77 to 80)

Oay 2 He	earing on the Merits ICSID Case N		
12:01 1 2 3 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I do. Q. And the council took action on it; do you recall that? A. I don't, to be honest. Q. Let's take a look at R-015. You recall, do you not, Mr Fraser, that the petition was opposed to the operations of AOG in Smilno; do you recall that? A. I do. Could we see the wording of the petition, please? Q. Yes, we can. But before we do that, let's look at the votes taken by the municipal council; do you see that? I think it was a there were four votes of the council in favour, zero against, and one abstention; do you recall that? A. Yes. Q. Alright, now let's go back to the language of the petition. R-107. Can I trouble you to read for the record the petition language at the top, please? A. Mm-hm: "We, the undersigned residents, disagree with the activities related to exploration area 'Svidník - Oil and Combustible Natural Gas' that with their consequences have an impact on the environment in municipality Smilno. 	12:04 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that there was a very, very small minority. And earlier today in your testimony you said that Ms Varjanová was the only person who was opposed to the activities of Smilno; correct? You said that earlier? A. I think I said she was the only person that I was aware of who was included, from Smilno, who was in the legal in the lawsuit. Q. I see. But you would agree that there was a substantial show of concern and opposition to AOG's activities by virtue of this petition activity? A. I agree that the petition activity the petition has a lot of names on it. We don't know how the petition was obtained. And when it came actually to demonstrations or any activity against our activities at Smilno, there were very few residents of Smilno who were participating in that. Q. How many people showed up for the demonstration in Prešov? A. I don't recall precisely. I was there. But my recollection is it may have been it may have been I really don't actually recall. 50 or more, certainly. Q. You don't remember 200 being the number associated with that demonstration? A. I don't recall.
25	We therefore request that the Municipal Council of Page 81	25	Q. Alright. Page 83
	<u> </u>		
12:02 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Smilno and the mayor of Smilno express their disapproval of exploration area 'Svidník - Oil and Flammable Natural Gas' as well as all of the geological works in the exploration area and related activities that intervene in or have an impact on the environment in Smilno." Q. Do you recall the vote we just looked at, which was four in favour, one abstention, and as I recall, the mayor did not vote; correct? A. Mm-hm. That's correct. Q. We'll hear from him later, but do you recall his position essentially being that it was his responsibility to remain neutral? A. Yes, I recall that. PROFESSOR SANDS: Sorry, could you just tell us what it is they were voting for, because it didn't say it on the document you showed us. MR ALEXANDER: The language of the petition itself.	12:06 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Back to the June timeframe, I'd like to pull up R-122. This is a 14 June 2016 memorandum from Mr Benada; is that correct? A. Benada. That's correct. Q. To you, with a copy to Mr Lewis and Mr Karabin. This is a communication among the four top management people in the company; correct? A. That's correct. Q. And it was at this point in time just a moment, please. May I have a moment, Madam President? THE PRESIDENT: Sure. (Pause) MR ALEXANDER: Let's turn to page 3, please, of this document, R-122. Do you see a discussion concerning White & Case? A. Yes.
18	PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you.	18	Q. It was at this point in time that AOG had begun to

19

23

24

25

20 A. Not at all, no.

take a step back.

consider a potential treaty claim; correct?

21 Q. Isn't that what's being discussed in this memorandum? 22 A. Well, there is a comment there about a description of

to -- I'd been asked just to find out -- sorry. I'll

a conversation with White & Case. I had been asked

25 (Pages 81 to 84)

20 21

22

23 A. Mm-hm. Yes.

19 MR ALEXANDER: To be clear, Mr Fraser, our case is not that

this was a legally binding event. It was intended as

activities of AOG. You understood that, didn't you?

another AOG witness, Mr Lewis, have taken the position

an expression of interest and concern about the

24 Q. And I raise it because, as we said before, you and

10.00			
12:08 1	There was some concern as the licences were being	12:11 1	Q. That's all I need.
2	renewed that there might be opposition from these	2	A. It's true.
3	activists who were becoming so very vocal, and there was	3	Q. You submitted a recognition of claim, and the effect of
4	a concern that our licences might not be renewed.	4	that was a declaration by the court that the 1/700th
5	Q. But they were renewed.	5	share transfer scheme was null and void; correct?
6	A. They were renewed, but we didn't know that at this	6	A. That's correct. We conceded the claim in order to have
7	point. This was in June.	7	the interim injunction lifted.
8	So we did, just as a precautionary measure, just	8	Q. But that didn't happen, did it, sir? That injunction
9	think about, because we had an investor after all at	9	was never lifted, was it?
10	that point, think about whether or not we should what	10	A. It was in 2017, finally.
11	any recourse by way of arbitration might be. That line	11	Q. After all the relevant events had transpired and you had
12	of inquiry was nothing more than that conversation with	12	been consistently going and using the land in violation
13	White & Case and it went nowhere and was dropped. And	13	of the injunction. We've already established that.
14	the licences were renewed shortly thereafter.	14	But what else was happening, Mr Fraser? There was
15	Q. Let's talk about another event that was in the backdrop	15	another the share transfer scheme was the foundation
16	to the June events. The Court of Appeals had found that	16	of Cesty Smilno, as we've already covered; correct?
17	AOG had acted with mala fide in its conduct and	17	A. Yes.
18	relationship to the local community; correct?	18	Q. And we already covered the fact that there was no offer
19	A. Are you talking about the appeal against the injunction?	19	of a preemption right as part of that scheme, although
20	Q. Yes.	20	that conduct had previously been found unlawful;
21	A. They didn't use the words "mala fide", did they?	21	correct?
22	Q. Yes. Let's turn to R-63, page 6.	22	A. We understood it's correct that there was no offer of
23	MR DRYMER: May I close R-122?	23	a preemption right, because we understood it was not
24	MR ALEXANDER: Yes, you may.	24	required.
25	I'm referring in particular to the third paragraph.	25	Q. And later you proceeded to argue the Cesty Smilno scheme
	Page 85		Page 87
	-		
12:10 1	Could you read that, please, sir, beginning with "As	12:13 1	and the PSPR scheme to police, to the prosecutor, to
12:10 1 2	Could you read that, please, sir, beginning with "As to"?	12:13 1 2	and the PSPR scheme to police, to the prosecutor, to various governmental authorities, despite the fact that
2	to"?	2	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that
2 3	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"?	2 3	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial
2 3 4	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG.	2 3 4	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct?
2 3 4 5	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there?	2 3 4 5	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted.
2 3 4 5	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"?	2 3 4 5 6	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the
2 3 4 5 6 7	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out	2 3 4 5 6 7	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From such a point of view, the conduct of Defendant 1 lacks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting with the mayor in 2015, where we discussed the use of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From such a point of view, the conduct of Defendant 1 lacks any bona fide trait."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting with the mayor in 2015, where we discussed the use of the road.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From such a point of view, the conduct of Defendant 1 lacks any bona fide trait." Q. And after that finding was made, it is true, isn't it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting with the mayor in 2015, where we discussed the use of the road. Q. You may recall my question was directed to submissions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From such a point of view, the conduct of Defendant 1 lacks any bona fide trait." Q. And after that finding was made, it is true, isn't it, that AOG submitted its recognition of claim?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting with the mayor in 2015, where we discussed the use of the road. Q. You may recall my question was directed to submissions to a court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From such a point of view, the conduct of Defendant 1 lacks any bona fide trait." Q. And after that finding was made, it is true, isn't it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting with the mayor in 2015, where we discussed the use of the road. Q. You may recall my question was directed to submissions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From such a point of view, the conduct of Defendant 1 lacks any bona fide trait." Q. And after that finding was made, it is true, isn't it, that AOG submitted its recognition of claim? A. It is true. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting with the mayor in 2015, where we discussed the use of the road. Q. You may recall my question was directed to submissions to a court. A. I apologise. There are no submissions to the court,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to"? A. The third paragraph begins "Defendant 1"? Q. Yes. That's AOG. A. So "Defendant 1", you want me to start there? "Defendant 1"? Q. That's fine. A. "Defendant 1 must have expected from the very beginning that a legal construct allowing it to carry out geological exploration on a third party land through a (already invalid) purchase of a tiny co-ownership interest may fail. As to whether Defendant 1 acted in good faith, it can be reliably stated that the conduct of Defendant lacked elementary caution. Defendant 1 could have been well aware that purchase of a minuscule co-ownership interest without respecting the pre-emption right is very close to violation of ownership rights. It is evident that business activities of Defendant 1 were based, from the very beginning, on mala fide manner of communication with owners of the affected land. From such a point of view, the conduct of Defendant 1 lacks any bona fide trait." Q. And after that finding was made, it is true, isn't it, that AOG submitted its recognition of claim?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	various governmental authorities, despite the fact that those cases were never prosecuted for a judicial determination until many months later; correct? A. Our objective was to get the interim injunction lifted. That was our priority. That's why we conceded the claim, or dropped the case sorry, the claim. Yes. Q. So if you look again, Mr Fraser, at the document marked "AOG's changing justifications to access the road". Do you have that in front of you? A. I do. Q. It is true, isn't it, that these schemes occurred over a chronology of time? Is that right? In other words, the 1/700th share transfer scheme came first? A. As I say, we as I've said I meant to say earlier, we originally accessed the road on the basis that it was publicly accessible. Q. But no document that you submitted to court is consistent with that statement, is it, sir? A. I believe there's a memorandum, or a record of a meeting with the mayor in 2015, where we discussed the use of the road. Q. You may recall my question was directed to submissions to a court.

12:15 1 2	that's correct. Q. And the Cesty Smilno share transfer scheme came within	12:36 1	THE PRESIDENT: So, Mr Alexander, whenever you are ready, you can proceed with your questions.
3	days of the court's ruling on the first scheme, correct?	3	MR ALEXANDER: Alright.
4	A. It came shortly afterwards, correct.	4	Thank you, Madam President, thank you,
5	Q. And it also involved a share transfer, correct?	5	Mr Tushingham; glad we were able to get that worked out,
6	A. It did.	6	thank you.
7	Q. And then the public special purpose road scheme, we saw	7	Mr Fraser, on the screen momentarily we will have
8	earlier, began with the discussion with the mayor. You	8	the new Exhibit R-155A, the revised exhibit that just
9	will recall Mr Sýkora's letter to the mayor?	9	reflects the agreement of counsel and Madam President's
10	A. Mm-hm.	10	comment.
11	Q. And with that	11	I'm just going to wait for the document. (Pause)
12	A. My recollection is that with Mr Sýkora we were	12	Madam President, I understand the document is going
13	discussing public special purpose road at about the same	13	to be available momentarily. Alright. Thank you.
14	time as we started the Cesty Smilno structure.	14	Mr Fraser, just to explain what has transpired here.
15	MR ALEXANDER: Madam President, I wonder if this might be	15	This is the attachment to the earlier Exhibit 155, which
16	I apologise for taking a break prematurely, but I wonder	16	you will recall was the letter from Mr Sýkora to the
17	if this might be an opportune time to look at that	17	mayor.
18	translation and then I could perhaps streamline what	18	A. Mm-hm.
19	I have left at the same time, which might have value.	19	Q. And these documents were attached to it, and I want to
20	THE PRESIDENT: How much time do you need for that?	20	give you a fair moment here to read them both.
21	MR ALEXANDER: Would 15 minutes be acceptable?	21	A. Mm-hm.
22	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.	22	Q. And when you have had a chance to do that let me know
23	MR ALEXANDER: Thank you.	23	because I will have a few more questions for you.
24	THE PRESIDENT: What we might then do is shorten the lunch	24	(Pause)
25	break somewhat? So we will not take the lunch break	25	A. Can I page down? (Pause)
	Page 89		Page 91
12:16 1	now. I don't think that is your suggestion, right?	12:39 1	Okay.
2	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser	12:39 1 2	Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your
2 3	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be	2 3	Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment
2 3 4	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and	2 3 4	Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material?
2 3 4 5	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can.	2 3 4 5	Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material?A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before.
2 3 4 5 6	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be	2 3 4 5 6	Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material?A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before.Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that
2 3 4 5 6 7	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material?A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before.Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of R-155 with attachment, and specifically the translation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the above-mentioned special purpose road?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of R-155 with attachment, and specifically the translation as it was provided by the Claimants but then with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the above-mentioned special purpose road? Who [is responsible for] the management and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of R-155 with attachment, and specifically the translation as it was provided by the Claimants but then with the correction by Mr Pekar, will be filed by the Respondent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the above-mentioned special purpose road? Who [is responsible for] the management and maintenance of this special purpose road?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of R-155 with attachment, and specifically the translation as it was provided by the Claimants but then with the correction by Mr Pekar, will be filed by the Respondent as new Exhibit R-155A; is that fine?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the above-mentioned special purpose road? Who [is responsible for] the management and maintenance of this special purpose road?" Do you see those questions?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of R-155 with attachment, and specifically the translation as it was provided by the Claimants but then with the correction by Mr Pekar, will be filed by the Respondent as new Exhibit R-155A; is that fine? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is acceptable to the Claimant, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the above-mentioned special purpose road? Who [is responsible for] the management and maintenance of this special purpose road?" Do you see those questions? A. Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of R-155 with attachment, and specifically the translation as it was provided by the Claimants but then with the correction by Mr Pekar, will be filed by the Respondent as new Exhibit R-155A; is that fine? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is acceptable to the Claimant, yes. THE PRESIDENT: Good.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the above-mentioned special purpose road? Who [is responsible for] the management and maintenance of this special purpose road?" Do you see those questions? A. Yes, I do. Q. And then the second portion of the attachment is what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Then we try and wrap up the examination of Mr Fraser before the lunch break. I'm not sure if that will be possible, because it also depends on re-direct and Tribunal questions. But we'll go as far as we can. MR ALEXANDER: Just to be fair, I'm not sure that I will be able to wrap up before lunch with Mr Fraser, but I realise that THE PRESIDENT: That confirms my doubt then. My doubt was on other grounds, but it reinforces it. Let's take 15 minutes now. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: And, Mr Fraser, you know you are still under the same admonition. (12.17 pm) (A short break) (12.35 pm) THE PRESIDENT: We understand now that the new version of R-155 with attachment, and specifically the translation as it was provided by the Claimants but then with the correction by Mr Pekar, will be filed by the Respondent as new Exhibit R-155A; is that fine? MR TUSHINGHAM: That is acceptable to the Claimant, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Mr Fraser, does seeing these documents refresh your recollection at all about whether you saw the attachment before, the actual material? A. I don't believe I did see these attachments before. Q. Alright. Bearing that in mind, would you agree that these appear to be a letter from Alpine to the mayor? That one, of course, is there is a signature line for Mr Benada; do you see that document? A. If you could scroll up, please. Yes, I see. Q. Alright. And you have had an opportunity to read that? A. I have. Q. And in that letter, Mr Benada has asked three specific questions: "(i) Is the aforementioned field road a public or non-public special purpose road? (ii) Is the Town of Smilno the owner of the above-mentioned special purpose road? Who [is responsible for] the management and maintenance of this special purpose road?" Do you see those questions? A. Yes, I do.

- 12:41 1 by Mr Baran, which draft, as part of the attachment, was
 - 2 forwarded by Mr Sýkora to the mayor, and it proposes
 - a draft response to the draft letter; do you see that?
 - 4 A. I do

6

- 5~ Q. Now, if you would turn, please, to 156, R-156, which
 - should be coming up momentarily.
- 7 I'm sorry, I may not have spoken clearly enough.
- 8 We're trying to pull up R-156. (Pause)
- 9 Alright, now we took a look at this before, but now
- that we have the benefit of what the attachment
- included -- and if we could just trouble you to scroll
- down so the witness can see that that is the entirety of
- the substance, anyway, of the letter.
- 14 So this is Mayor Baran's actual response, is my
- understanding; do you agree?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Now, it's apparent from that response that the mayor
- 18 responded only to the second of the three draft
- 19 questions; would you agree?
- 20 A. Is the second one about who is the owner of the track?
- 21 Q. Yes:
- 22 "The [town] of Smilno is not the owner of the above
- 23 mentioned [special purpose road]."
- 24 A. Mm, he's only responded directly to the second one,
- 25 I agree.

Page 93

- 12:45 1 MR TUSHINGHAM: I don't know the answer to that question.
 - 2 MR DRYMER: Because the witness I believe said he hadn't
 - 3 seen these at the time.
 - 4 PROFESSOR SANDS: Yes.
 - 5 MR ALEXANDER: I thought he'd said he doesn't recall now
 - 6 having seen them.
 - 7 MR DRYMER: I don't mean to put words in anybody's mouth.
 - 8 Maybe you want to clarify that so that I'm not mistaken.
 - $9\,\,$ THE PRESIDENT: And you will correct me: you said you
 - 10 believe you have not seen them?
 - 11 A. Correct
 - 12 MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you, Madam.
 - 13 MR ALEXANDER: Mr Fraser, you may recall we looked at your
 - name at the top of the email?
 - 15 A. Mm.
 - 16 Q. And -- is that a "Yes"?
 - 17 A. Yes, sorry.
 - 18 Q. And your conclusion from that was that -- and you
 - 19 recalled being copied on the email; correct?
 - 20 A. I don't recall being copied on the email, in that my
 - 21 name is not in the CC line.
 - 22 Q. Mm-hm.
 - 23 A. I -- it's possible that he may have sent me the email
 - 24 afterwards, similar to a BCC, I guess.
 - 25 Q. But you don't dispute that you were in the loop on this

Page 95

- 12:44 1 Q. Yes. And he did not ever use the phrase "public special
 - 2 purpose road" in his response, did he, sir?
 - 3 A. He did not.
 - 4 Q. And there is no response to either the first or the
 - 5 third questions drafted for him by Mr Sýkora; would you
 - 6 agree with that?
 - 7 A. I would think that the first question is meant to be
 - 8 a response to his other two questions.
 - 9 PROFESSOR SANDS: Could I just ask, just in relation to this
 - document and the previous one that we just looked at,
 - 11 R-155A, I think it is, R-155A has the first page, which
 - is the request. And the second page, I assume, is
 - 13 drafted by AOG. Am I right in thinking it's drafted by
 - 14 AOG and is the response that was requested?
 - 15 MR ALEXANDER: That's my understanding.
 - 16 PROFESSOR SANDS: Is that correct?
 - 17 MR TUSHINGHAM: I don't know the answer to that question,
 - 18 I am afraid.
 - 19 PROFESSOR SANDS: It's just that in relation to the answers
 - 20 to your questions, and I assume you're getting there,
 - 21 it's the relationship between the answer that was hoped
 - $\,\,$ 22 $\,\,$ for, on the one hand, and the answer that emerged, on
 - the other.
 - But we don't know what the second page is; is that
 - 25 right?

Page 94

- 12:46 1 discussion?
 - 2 A. I don't believe -- I believe I was in the loop.
 - 3 Certainly I was well aware when the letter came back
 - 4 from the mayor.
 - 5 Q. And there's, I believe, agreement by counsel in our
 - 6 submission of this new exhibit, that both of these --
 - both the questions and what appears to be a draft
 - 8 response for the town of Smilno were the attachment?
 - 9 MR TUSHINGHAM: Oh, I'm sorry. We are talking at
 - 10 cross-purposes. We accept that that was the attachment
 - 11 to the email.
 - 12 MR ALEXANDER: Yes.
 - 13 MR TUSHINGHAM: And forgive me if we've misunderstood that,
 - 14 you've misunderstood what I said. But I think I may
 - 15 have misunderstood your original question, or
 - 16 Professor Sands' question, which was: do we know that
 - 17 AOG drafted that? And I don't know the answer to that
 - 18 question. But of course we accept that this was the
 - 19 attachment to the email from Mr Sýkora.
 - 20 PROFESSOR SANDS: I mean, it gives the impression of being
 - the hoped-for answer. Am I wrong? Because it sets out
 - three questions.
 - 23 MR TUSHINGHAM: It gives that impression. Yes, we're not
 - 24 going to quarrel with that.
 - 25 PROFESSOR SANDS: I'm not pushing in any direction; I'm just

- 12:47 1 trying to work out what these documents are. I have no view one way or the other. But on a first reading
 - 3 I wondered whether it was the actual answer given by the
 - 4 mayor, but it was undated, and now having looked at it
 - 5 in comparison to 156, that appears to be not the case.
 - 6 MR TUSHINGHAM: The only point I would make is if you go
 - 7 back to the email from Mr Sýkora it does refer to
 - 8 a telephone call that had taken place between the mayor
 - 9 and Mr Sýkora. So it is possible that the draft
 - 10 reflected that conversation.
 - Now, I am simply speculating there. I don't know.
 - We may have to explore with the mayor.
 - 13 THE PRESIDENT: It seems to me that the position is
 - 14 relatively clear and we can move on.
 - 15 MR ALEXANDER: Thank you.
 - 16 MR DRYMER: Who was giving instructions to Mr Sýkora at that
 - time on behalf of the company?
 - 18 A. Me. I was.
 - 19 MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you.
 - 20 MR ALEXANDER: Could we pull up Mr Fraser's witness
 - 21 statement at paragraph 55.
 - 22 MR DRYMER: First witness statement?
 - 23 MR ALEXANDER: Yes. (Pause)
 - Let me know when you have had a chance to finish
 - 25 reading 55.

- 12:52 1 do you agree?
 - 2 A. 11 hours on the 17th, certainly.
 - 3 Q. And then on the 18th between 8.00 and 7.00?
 - 4 A. Right.
 - 5 Q. Right, so 11 hours each day. And did you ask him to
 - 6 make this report to you?
 - 7 A. I did.
 - 8 Q. And what was your reason for requesting this report?
 - 9 A. I specifically wanted a record of the intervention of
 - 10 the prosecutor.
 - 11 Q. And there was, however, additional information provided
 - by Mr Vargaeštok, correct, AOG's attorney?
 - 13 A. Do you mean in that statement?
 - 14 Q. Yes.
 - 15 A. Yes.
 - 16 Q. He reviewed the events that he'd observed that were
 - significant to him; is that fair?
 - 18 A. I think that's fair, yes.
 - 19 Q. It includes reports of protester activity and location
 - of that activity.
 - 21 A. Could I see the second page, please?
 - 22 Q. Certainly.
 - 23 A. Yes, I agree.
 - 24 Q. And he discusses the arguments that he purports to have
 - 25 made to the prosecutor; do you see that?

Page 99

12:50 1 A. Okay.

- 2 Q. Mr Fraser, this was not the only report that you had
- 3 concerning the events of the timeframe you're describing
- 4 here in 55; correct? This was not the only report you
- 5 had
- 6 A. I received reports from a number of people.
- 7 Q. Alright.
- 8 Now -- if you will bear with me one moment,
- 9 Madam President. (Pause)
- 10 I'd like you to look now at C-161, and, Mr Fraser,
- 11 I'd like you to bear in mind that I'm only talking about
- what's in the record, alright?
- 13 A. Mm-hm.
- 14 Q. So it's way too late to be introducing matters not in
- the record, so I want to focus on what's in the record;
- 16 okay?
- Now, this is a report from the attorney for both AOG
- and Cesty Smilno; correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. And it, by its label, purports to be a report of the
- 21 three days, the 16th through the 18th; would you agree?
- 22 A. I would agree.
- 23 Q. But as I read it, it appears that Mr Vargaeštok from the
- Slamka firm was present only on the 17th and the 18th,
- but was there for what appears to be 11 hours each day;
 - Page 98

- 12:54 1 A. I see that.
 - 2 Q. And the location of the police and various activities.
 - 3 A. Yes.
 - 4 Q. There is no mention of anything to do with the Crow
 - 5 incident, is there, sir?
 - 6 A. No, there is not.
 - 7 Q. And are you aware of any other documents in this record
 - 8 that describe anything concerning the Crow incident from
 - 9 anybody else there? Just, is it in the record?
 - 10 A. And the Crow incident being?
 - 11 Q. What you described in paragraph 55 of your witness
 - 12 statement.
 - 13 A. Him being struck. You're saying, sorry, the question
 - 14 is?
 - 15 Q. Are there any other documents in the record that relate
 - to this, other than the report of Mr Vargaeštok?
 - 17 A. I believe there may be a photograph or two.
 - 18 Q. And those are the photographs we've seen of Mr Crow in
 - 19 the wheelchair, and Mr Crow standing near the
 - automobile?
 - 21 A. That's correct.
 - 22 Q. And that's all you're aware of? Documents in the
 - 23 record
 - 24 A. When you say "the record", do you mean --
 - 25 Q. Of this proceeding.

- 12:56 1 A. Of these proceedings. That's all I'm aware of, yes.
 - 2 MR DRYMER: Excuse me, I believe you were in the room during
 - 3 the opening statements?
 - 4 A. Mm.
 - 5 MR DRYMER: So you saw part of a video that was presented;
 - 6 you're aware of the video?
 - 7 A. Yes.
 - 8 MR DRYMER: I consider that a document in the record.
 - 9 Perhaps I misunderstood.
 - 10 MR ALEXANDER: We do too. I appreciate the clarification.
 - 11 MR DRYMER: Thank you. Thank you.
 - 12 A. Yes.
 - 13 MR ALEXANDER: Now, Mr Fraser, I would like you to turn to
 - 14 C-340. Let me know when you have had a moment to review
 - 15 this.
 - 16 A. Okay.
 - 17 Q. This was a meeting you had requested; is that right?
 - 18 A. Yes, I think that's right.
 - 19 Q. And you attended this meeting?
 - 20 A. I attended it, yes.
 - 21 Q. Was the discussion in Slovak?
 - 22 A. It was in Slovak, yes.
 - 23 Q. And did you -- you, I assume, did not have
 - 24 a contemporaneous translator with you?
 - 25 A. I think I did have a contemporaneous translator.
 - Page 101

- 12:59 1 there to mention the possibility of litigation.
 - 2 Obviously it wouldn't have been couched in that language
 - 3 in a conversation with the police officers, but we may
 - 4 have mentioned the possibility of litigation.
 - I think we had at least one lawyer present with us,
 - 6 if not two.
 - 7 Q. But it was clear and unambiguous that you threatened
 - 8 Mr Cicvara with litigation, correct? There was no doubt
 - 9 about that in your mind?
 - 10 A. I think we indicated that we could take him to court,
 - 11 yes.

5

- 12 Q. Well, the words you chose to Mr Lewis, the CEO, to
- 13 express what happened at the meeting.
- 14 A. Mm-hm.
- 15 Q. You said:
- "We threatened them with litigation ..."
- 17 That's what happened, isn't it?
- 18 A. Well, you don't always use the same language across the
- 19 table as you do in an internal communication.
- 20 Q. I understand, but you don't have any memory of what
- 21 language was spoken across the table in Slovak?
- 22 A. I do not.
- 23 Q. You are essentially speculating on that point, aren't
- 24 you?
- 25 A. I'm not speculating, no. I was being -- I was aware of

Page 103

- 12:57 1 Q. A colleague?
 - 2 A. I don't recall. It could have been a colleague or it
 - 3 could have been a professional interpreter.
 - 4 Q. Alright. But do you believe this is a fair and accurate
 - 5 statement of the conversation as translated to you?
 - 6 A. Yes, I agree.
 - 7 Q. And this, of course, was an email to the CEO and you
 - 8 drafted the email?
 - 9 A. Correct.
 - 10 Q. Now, calling your attention -- your purpose in going to
 - 11 this meeting was to seek agreement that there could be
 - 12 a special purpose road involved in Smilno; correct?
 - 13 A. That's correct, essentially, yes.
 - 14 Q. And he was unwilling to agree with that suggestion;
 - 15 correct?
 - 16 A. That's correct.
 - 17 Q. And you wrote:
 - "We threatened them with litigation ..."
 - Were you the speaker on that?
 - 20 A. I might have been. I don't recall.
 - 21 Q. You don't recall.
 - Was that something that you had pre-cleared with
 - 23 Mr Lewis, that if things didn't go well, you would
 - threaten them with litigation?
 - 25 A. I'm sure that I had his authority. I mean, I put it

Page 102

- 13:00 1 the content of the discussion.
 - 2 Q. Now, in the next paragraph you wrote:
 - 3 "We have decided to try and fence the whole track if
 - 4 possible."
 - 5 "The whole track" meaning the access road?
 - 6 A. That's correct. That's what that refers to, yes.
 - 7 Q. And if that's not possible, you wrote:
 - 8 "... we will put a gate across the entrance to the
 - 9 track."
 - 10 Correct?
 - 11 A. That's what I say there, yes.
 - 12 Q. And that work would start:
 - "... tomorrow, and on fencing the track next
 - 14 week..."
 - That suggests there already were contractors who had
 - been engaged to do the work.
 - 17 A. Well, there were contractors engaged to come and fence
 - the location, so I think the thought there was that
 - 19 after they'd finished fencing the location, they would
 - then be instructed to fence the track.
 - 21 Q. Alright.
 - 22 A. As it happens, we didn't fence the track. It was
 - an idea and it was dropped.
 - 24 Q. Whose idea was it?
 - 25 A. I expect that it came about in discussions with someone

13:02 1	in our legal team, and probably including the farm as	13:04 1	Q. Let's pull up R-142, please.
2	well, the main interested party.	2	Now, there are a number of questions I have for you
3	But I think we probably then revisited it with the	3	on this document, Mr Fraser. This is labelled in the
4	farm and it was dropped as a result of that.	4	"Regarding" line as a "Notice of Default"; correct?
5	Q. But there's no indication of that in this document, is	5	A. Yes.
6	there?	6	Q. And it's a lengthy letter written by Mr Lewis, and sent
7	A. No.	7	to the principals of Akard and one of the funders who
8	Q. Is there any other email that would corroborate what	8	apparently was part of the Akard group; is that your
9	you're saying now, that you're aware of?	9	understanding?
10	A. There are other emails referring to contacts with the	10	A. Yes.
11	farm. But I don't think there's any emails referring to	11	Q. And this is the first time that Mr Lewis had put them on
12	the farm, for example discussing this with us.	12	formal notice agreed? of default?
13	Q. Or the plan, as you've just described, to drop the	13	A. Yes, I agree.
14	fencing idea.	14	Q. But there had been a number of discussions as a run-up
15	A. Well, that's that is the only reference so far as	15	to this notice which had raised significant concerns
16	I'm aware to the fencing idea, and we dropped it,	16	about the status of their ability to continue to fund;
17	I believe the next day.		· ·
		17	do you agree?
18	MR DRYMER: Excuse me, who was involved in the decision to	18	A. I think that I I believe that's right, yes.
19	drop it?	19	Q. Now, Mr Lewis was reporting here that in the second
20	A. I think that we just had a meeting with the with	20	paragraph:
21	a number of police officers with our two of our legal	21	"We believe that all of the efforts in 2016 have
22	advisors present, and we had felt that we were we had	22	paved the way for operations to re-commence
23	felt that at some point we felt that they would agree	23	in January/February 2017."
24	with us on the special purpose road issue. We were very	24	And then Mr Lewis went on to note that his funding
25	frustrated that that had not happened. And in the	25	arrangement was exclusive with Akard; do you recall that
	Page 105		Page 107
			G
13:03 1	discussion afterwards, I think the suggestion came up:	13:07 1	discussion?
13:03 1 2	discussion afterwards, I think the suggestion came up: well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone	13:07 1	discussion? A. Yes.
	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone	2	A. Yes.
2 3		2 3	A. Yes.Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this
2 3 4	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction	2 3 4	A. Yes.Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with
2 3 4 5	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued	2 3 4 5	A. Yes.Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere;
2 3 4 5 6	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that.	2 3 4 5 6	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Yes.Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct?A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis'
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not? A. I think that they may have been I don't recall when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of arrearages?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not? A. I think that they may have been I don't recall when they got behind on their payments, but it was perhaps	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of arrearages? A. Yes, I would have done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not? A. I think that they may have been I don't recall when they got behind on their payments, but it was perhaps around this time. I don't recall now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of arrearages? A. Yes, I would have done. Q. Did you draft the letter?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not? A. I think that they may have been I don't recall when they got behind on their payments, but it was perhaps around this time. I don't recall now. Q. Well, they certainly had already received the notice of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of arrearages? A. Yes, I would have done. Q. Did you draft the letter? A. No. Well, sorry, I don't recall, to be precise. But it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not? A. I think that they may have been I don't recall when they got behind on their payments, but it was perhaps around this time. I don't recall now. Q. Well, they certainly had already received the notice of default by this point in time?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of arrearages? A. Yes, I would have done. Q. Did you draft the letter? A. No. Well, sorry, I don't recall, to be precise. But it may have been a joint effort. I don't recall who took
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not? A. I think that they may have been I don't recall when they got behind on their payments, but it was perhaps around this time. I don't recall now. Q. Well, they certainly had already received the notice of default by this point in time? A. No, they had not. That came in December.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of arrearages? A. Yes, I would have done. Q. Did you draft the letter? A. No. Well, sorry, I don't recall, to be precise. But it may have been a joint effort. I don't recall who took the lead on it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	well, could we look at fencing the road, has anyone thought about that. And there would have been some kind of conversation with the farm to see what their reaction was, and then it was dropped. It was never pursued after that. MR DRYMER: Thank you. MR ALEXANDER: You agree it would have been fairly difficult to track the entire I'm sorry, to fence the entire track and maintain a position that it was a public road; you would agree with that, wouldn't you, sir? A. That could have been one of the reasons why we dropped it. I don't recall. Q. Now, the very last line: "How are you getting on with Akard?" That's a reference to the funder that we discussed earlier, and by this time the picture was quite grim there, was it not? A. I think that they may have been I don't recall when they got behind on their payments, but it was perhaps around this time. I don't recall now. Q. Well, they certainly had already received the notice of default by this point in time?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes. Q. One of the real challenges that AOG was facing at this time was that it had an exclusive relationship with Akard, and could not seek external funding elsewhere; correct? A. We were committed to working with Akard exclusively. Q. And Akard was in arrears on its funding obligations to the tune of almost \$190,000, according to Mr Lewis' letter. A. That's correct. Q. And that arrearage related to cash calls that had been made for the period, if you look at page 5 of 5, for the period from 23 October to 29 October. Mr Lewis was essentially providing a running balance of the defaulted amounts that were overdue; agree? A. Yes, I agree. Q. And as the CFO, had you helped him prepare this table of arrearages? A. Yes, I would have done. Q. Did you draft the letter? A. No. Well, sorry, I don't recall, to be precise. But it may have been a joint effort. I don't recall who took

- 13:09 1 beginning of paragraph 2, "We believe that all of the
 - 2 efforts in 2016 have paved the way ...", to suggest that
 - 3 it was the capital challenges that AOG was then facing
 - 4 because of these arrearages that were causing the delay?
 - $5\,$ A. No, they were withholding money because they were
 - concerned about the delays in our operations.
 - 7 Q. But when we review the exchange of documents, such
 - 8 a statement is not present in any of the documents, is
 - 9 it?
 - 10 A. Could we go back to the first page, please?
 - 11 Q. I may have misunderstood your answer, Mr Fraser. Your
 - point is that there may have been delays in the
 - 13 operations --
 - 14 A. Period.
 - 15 Q. -- period?
 - 16 A. Yes.
 - 17 Q. Okay.
 - So now let's look at the status of the funding at
 - 19 that point in time. What was their total commitment at
 - that point in time?
 - 21 A. Just under -- they committed under the agreement to just
 - 22 under \$4 million.
 - 23 Q. And at that point in time, at the top of page 2, they
 - 24 have advanced approximately 1.95 million; correct?
 - 25 A. That's correct.

- 13:12 1 A. Correct.
 - 2 Q. And despite repeated efforts on AOG's part, both you and
 - 3 Mr Lewis, they never were in a position, or apparently
 - 4 willing, to proceed to that next step of formalising the
 - 5 agreement; correct?
 - 6 A. I don't recall why they delayed -- why that side was
 - 7 delayed. But I do recall that the delays in our
 - 8 operations was a factor for them.
 - Q. And that reluctance to complete the formal agreement
 - 10 that had been contemplated had led to some significant
 - tension in the relationship; correct?
 - 12 A. I think that's right, yes.
 - 13 Q. He had noted there had been disagreements and confusion
 - as to responsibilities. That's in the bottom of the
 - third paragraph. And that as a result the relationship
 - had been severely strained. Is that consistent with
 - 17 your recollection?
 - 18 A. I'm sorry, which page are you on?
 - 19 Q. I'm on page 2, third paragraph, under the section
 - 20 "Formalizing the agreement".
 - 21 A. Yes, I would agree.
 - 22 Q. Now, on page 3, Mr Lewis wrote that:
 - 23 "As communicated regularly throughout 2016, Alpine
 - 24 experienced significant operational delays in Slovakia
 - 25 due to protester activities and their legal challenges."

Page 111

- 13:11 1 Q. And at that time you had had to defer salary; correct?
 - 2 A. Yes.
 - 3 Q. And Mr Lewis reports that he had as well. 90,000 and
 - 4 210,000 respectively, for a total of 300,000; correct?
 - 5 A. That's correct.
 - 6 Q. Had Mr Benada's salary also been deferred?
 - 7 A. No.
 - 8 Q. So you were the only two?
 - 9 A. Correct.
 - 10 Q. And the second paragraph also notes that a number of
 - 11 Alpine invoices had remained unpaid. Was that your
 - 12 understanding?
 - 13 A. Yes, that must be correct.
 - 14 Q. And the original understanding with Akard had been that
 - 15 there would be a formal second-stage agreement; do you
 - remember that?
 - 17 A. Yes, I do.
 - 18 Q. I may be wrong, but I've understood it that there was
 - sort of a letter of intent in the original stages of the
 - deal, but it was contemplated that there would be
 - a formal funding arrangement?
 - 22 A. Well, there was something called an initial funding
 - agreement, which was intended to be replaced by a more
 - substantial document, and that didn't happen.
 - 25 Q. That never happened?

Page 110

- 13:14 1 Do you see that?
 - 2 A. Yes.
 - 3 Q. Had you told Akard that the protesters had been
 - 4 successful in their legal challenges?
 - 5 A. I am sure they would have had a good understanding of
 - 6 the overall picture, so they would have known about the
 - 7 injunction, I expect.
 - 8 Q. But I think I need to understand why you're sure,
 - 9 because did you forward to them the detail on the
 - various court actions that had been proceeding in 2016
 - 11 and early 2017?
 - 12 A. Well, here we're talking about late 2016, or mid-2016.
 - I mean, Mike had the relationship with Akard so he
 - maintained most of the dialogue with them. I supplied
 - some financial information. But I was involved in some
 - 16 conversations with them, and to the best of my knowledge
 - they were well aware of all the issues we were facing.
 - 18 Q. Do you think they were well aware that throughout 2016
 - you were conducting operations without compliance withan injunction?
 - 21 A. I think they would have been aware of the existence of
 - the injunction, and they would have been aware that we
 - were looking to find means of drilling on that location.
 - 24 Q. Despite the injunction?
 - 25 A. Without being caught by the injunction.

13:16 1 Q. Mm-hm.

- Now, the particularly challenging news at a meeting
- 3 on December 1 was Akard's disclosure that Akard/CVP had
- 4 not invested any of its own funds. Were you aware of
- 5 that before that disclosure to you?
- A. Could you show me that in the letter, please?
- 7 Q. Yes, I'm sorry. It's right underneath the
- 8 "December 2016 Proposals".
- 9 A. We were aware that Akard was a consortium of investors,
- so I think we assumed that they would procure funds to
- invest, and they might not necessarily come from Akard
- 12 LLC, but they might come from co-investors.
- 13 Q. But you were not, prior to this December 1 meeting
- that's being described here, you were not aware at that
- point that all the investment were from third parties
- and that these third parties were done?
- 17 A. I believe that -- Mike and -- sorry. My -- I think that
- 18 Mike was closer to Akard than I was, so he will have had
- a better understanding of the dialogue with them. But
- 20 I think we simply -- we regard them as an investor with
- a co-investor, and we didn't differentiate between funds
- that came from them or from a co-investor brought in
- alongside them.
- 24 Q. But what the news was here was there wasn't going to be
- any more funding from Akard?

Page 113

- 13:21 1 Q. Yes. They certainly did. But I mean, they hadn't
 - 2 responded to his proposal on refunding only a portion of
 - 3 the money.
 - 4 A. No, I believe they demanded the payment of the balance.
 - 5 Q. And given the challenges that the cash shortfall had
 - 6 created at the time, Discovery actually made a proposal
 - 7 to Akard to acquire AOG; correct?
 - 8 A. To acquire Alpine ... yes, that's correct.
 - 9 Q. But Akard didn't respond to that proposal either?
 - 10 A. Correct.
 - 11 Q. So in the next paragraph, Mr Lewis goes on to report
 - that Discovery Group was in a critical position;
 - 13 correct?
 - 14 A. Yes.
 - $\,$ 15 $\,$ Q. And as CFO, did you share the view that Discovery was in
 - 16 a critical condition -- position?
 - 17 A. We were short of funds, yes. At that point.
 - 18 Q. Right. But my specific question is: did you agree with
 - 19 Mr Lewis that the position had become critical?
 - 20 A. Yes, I do. Yes.
 - 21 Q. And that was made critical by the fact that under the
 - 22 notice of default section, in the second paragraph,
 - 23 Discovery noted that it has "no alternative sources of
 - 24 capital in place"; correct?
 - 25 A. We didn't -- that's correct. We had no other investors

Page 115

- 13:19 1 A. That's correct. And that was due to the delays in
 - 2 operations.
 - 3 Q. And they had forwarded earlier in December, I assume,
 - 4 but correct me if I am wrong, but there was a -- in
 - 5 response to some earlier negotiations there was
 - 6 a partial payment against the arrearage on the cash
 - 7 calls of \$25,000; do you recall that?
 - 8 This is at the bottom of page 3.
 - 9 A. Yes, I recall that.
 - 10 Q. But that shortly after wiring the money, they made
 - demand to return it. They being Akard.
 - 12 A. That's correct.
 - 13 Q. And despite the fact that AOG, if you go to the top of
 - page 4, was, and I quote:
 - 15 "... extremely short on funds because of Akard/CVP's
 - 16 failure to meet cash calls, DG [Discovery Group] once
 - 17 again accommodated Akard/CVP and agreed to refund the
 - 18 [money]."
 - 19 Correct?
 - 20 A. Yes.
 - 21 Q. And at that time Discovery Group reported that it had
 - only 10,000 available to refund, so noted that the
 - balance of \$14,800-and-miscellaneous would need to be
 - 24 deferred, and there was no response from Akard; correct?
 - 25 A. They responded to this notice, yes.

Page 114

- 13:24 1 lined up.
 - 2 Q. And then he concludes in the final paragraph beginning
 - 3 on that page, that it has no other alternatives other
 - 4 than to send the notice of default, making specific
 - 5 demand for the payments.
 - 6 And then in the final paragraph, after the table
 - 7 that you indicate you helped prepare, he wrote:
 - 8 "If [Discovery] finds itself obliged to enforce
 - 9 a default against [Akard], it intends to immediately
 - seek alternative sources of funding with a view to
 - ensuring the continuation of its operations."
 - But then he writes:
 - "Although it is not legally obliged to do so,
 - 14 [Discovery] will also seek to ensure, but without legal
 - obligation on its part, that [Akard] ultimately received
 - the return of its \$1.95 Million investment."
 - 17 A. That's what it says, yes.
 - 18 Q. And it was prepared to return the money, notwithstanding
 - 19 Akard's persistent default on funding its obligations;
 - 20 correct? That's what it says.
 - 21 A. That's correct. I think that Mike was keen to avoid
 - a big legal battle at that point with Akard.
 - $\,$ 23 $\,$ Q. And it's clear that a potential legal battle was
 - 24 brewing; correct?
 - 25 A. If we had -- it could have been brewing, I don't know.

13:25 1	We obviously resolved the situation with Akard, reached	13:29 1	Akard from funding obligations, AOG never obtained any
2 3	a compromise. But Mike was happy to offer to make them whole if and when he was in funds to do so.	2	additional external financing?
		3	A. Not from any third party investors, that's correct.
4	Q. And if we step back from the minutiae a second, Akard is	4	Q. And Mr Lewis made it clear, both to you and to the other
5	delinquent on funding. No other alternative sources are	5	JV partners, that he was not going to be contributing
6	available. He's not prepared to invest anymore, and	6	any further funds; correct?
7	he's offering out of the gate to return their funds;	7	A. That's correct.
8	correct?	8	Q. Including even payments towards the licence; is that
9	A. He's offering to return them if and when, if you like.	9	correct?
10	Q. If and when.	10	A. I forget what he actually said, but he did make some
11	And the reason he's doing that is because he wanted	11	more payments into the company, towards licences, for
12	to avoid litigation. What claims had they threatened at	12	example.
13	that point in time?	13	Q. And then on 3 October 2017, that would be C-382. If we
14	A. I don't believe they had threatened any claims. They	14	could turn to page 3, at the bottom of that page.
15	did reply to their notice of default. But I don't think	15	This begins a discussion of the withdrawal of one or
16	they they had not threatened any claims.	16	all parties it reports a discussion of that, and
17	Q. Well, that reply is at R-143. We'll take a moment to	17	I note that Mr Lewis was himself the secretary of the
18	look at that right now. And I'm going to wrap up after	18	meeting. Does that mean he kept these minutes?
19	that, Madam President, just to keep you posted where we	19	A. He would have kept them. If that's what it says, he
20	are.	20	kept the minutes, yes.
21	THE PRESIDENT: I think everybody is hungry, yes.	21	Q. Yes. It says under item 1(b) on the first page:
22	MR ALEXANDER: I know, and I am too! I apologise for going	22	"Michael Lewis agreed to be the Secretary for the
23	over.	23	meeting."
24	I'm not going to take the time, because we're all	24	So back to page 3, under the heading "Legal and
25	hungry, to read through this in any detail. The	25	financial consequences relative to", the joint operating
	Page 117		Page 119
13:27 1	document is clear on its face.	13:32 1	agreement, and then under the Slovak law section, do you
2	But the one point I did want to note is the	2	see that?
2 3	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain	2 3	see that? A. Yes.
2 3 4	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there	2 3 4	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of
2 3 4 5	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in	2 3 4 5	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section:
2 3 4 5 6	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct?	2 3 4 5 6	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long
2 3 4 5 6 7	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5%
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when. If and when AOG had the ability to do so; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5% interest in the project and stay involved to the extent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when. If and when AOG had the ability to do so; correct? A. That's correct. There was no firm agreement to refund,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5% interest in the project and stay involved to the extent desired by the partners"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when. If and when AOG had the ability to do so; correct? A. That's correct. There was no firm agreement to refund, but it was it was, yes, if I had the funds in fact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5% interest in the project and stay involved to the extent desired by the partners" That's over on page 4.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when. If and when AOG had the ability to do so; correct? A. That's correct. There was no firm agreement to refund, but it was it was, yes, if I had the funds in fact in the previous letter he says "without legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5% interest in the project and stay involved to the extent desired by the partners" That's over on page 4. Then he noted in conclusion:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when. If and when AOG had the ability to do so; correct? A. That's correct. There was no firm agreement to refund, but it was it was, yes, if I had the funds in fact in the previous letter he says "without legal obligation".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5% interest in the project and stay involved to the extent desired by the partners" That's over on page 4. Then he noted in conclusion: " Alpine was going to [need] to seek additional
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when. If and when AOG had the ability to do so; correct? A. That's correct. There was no firm agreement to refund, but it was — it was, yes, if I had the funds — in fact in the previous letter he says "without legal obligation". Q. And may I have a moment, Madam President? (Pause)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5% interest in the project and stay involved to the extent desired by the partners" That's over on page 4. Then he noted in conclusion: " Alpine was going to [need] to seek additional funding keep the partners informed But Alpine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But the one point I did want to note is the suggestion over on page 2, whether DG had made certain representations. It was a strong response that there had been no default and, in fact, it was AOG that was in default. That was the gist of it; correct? A. I think that's correct, yes. Q. Right. And there was a suggestion that "whether DG/Alpine has complied fully with all laws and regulations, including the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act" needed to be investigated further; do you see that? A. I see, yes. Q. And after this exchange of letters, the net result was a settlement agreement. They were released fully from all funding obligations. Discovery was released from all claims, including those that had been threatened from this letter. And it agreed to refund almost \$2 million, everything they'd put into it, if and when. If and when AOG had the ability to do so; correct? A. That's correct. There was no firm agreement to refund, but it was it was, yes, if I had the funds in fact in the previous letter he says "without legal obligation".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	see that? A. Yes. Q. You are reported to have said in the last sentence of that section: "Alex said that he feels that it could be a long process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail." Was that an accurate record of what you had said at that meeting? A. I expect it was, if it's in the minutes, yes. Q. And then when I read Mr Lewis' report, he sounded decidedly more pessimistic; do you agree? A. Yes. Q. And he wrote that: " AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it. Alpine suggested that it would like to reduce to a 5% interest in the project and stay involved to the extent desired by the partners" That's over on page 4. Then he noted in conclusion: " Alpine was going to [need] to seek additional

13:33 1	the licence fee."	14:24 1 do you recall that?
2	Is that consistent with your recollection of	2 A. I do.
3	Mr Lewis' assessment of the situation?	3 Q. And you were asked whether you knew whether that report
4	A. Yes. I mean yes, because it was dependent on	4 was in the record?
5	Mike Lewis' support at that point.	5 A. Yes.
6	Q. Because it was dependent on Mike Lewis'	6 Q. And your answer was "I don't know".
7	A. Well, because the only source of funding	7 Could I show you, or could you please be shown,
8	Q. Was Mike Lewis?	8 document C-281. Do you see that this is an email from
9	A. Yes.	9 Mr Lewis dated 5 August 2015 in which you are copied?
10	Q. And without any external financing and without Mike	10 A. Mm-hm, yes.
11	Lewis' financing, it was game over at that point;	11 Q. Could you please turn to page number 2. And do you see
12	correct?	the section the sentences beginning:
13	A. We carried on for a period of time. But we struggled to	13 "Smilno location"
14	raise any external finance. So at that point it was	14 And then the following paragraph. Could you just
15	game over.	read that to yourself. (Pause)
16	MR ALEXANDER: Thank you, Mr Fraser.	16 A. Yes.
17	Madam President, that concludes my	17 Q. Was that the internal report that you were referring to
18	cross-examination.	in your witness statement?
19	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	19 A. Yes, that's correct.
20	So I suggest we take the lunch break now, and then	20 MR TUSHINGHAM: I have no further questions to ask by way of
21	move on to re-direct examination and Tribunal questions.	21 re-examination, so I am now in the Tribunal's hands.
22	Mr Fraser, during the lunch you continue to be	22 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. This refers to the actual
23	sequestered, so I'm sure the Claimant will arrange for	drilling site, or does it include the road?
24	you to have lunch somewhere, but on your own,	24 A. It refers to both. The third-last paragraph says
25	unfortunately.	25 "Smilno location", and that's the discussion of the well
	D 101	D 122
	Page 121	Page 123
13:34 1	Should we be back at well, what do you want,	14:26 1 location.
13:34 1 2	Should we be back at well, what do you want, 2.15, 2.30?	
	•	
2	2.15, 2.30?	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on.3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph:
2 3	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President.	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph:
2 3 4	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative.	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road."
2 3 4 5	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise.	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
2 3 4 5	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise?	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely.	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20.	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser.	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm)	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, please. MR DRYMER: Shall I begin?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm)	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, please. MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm)	 2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume.	 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, please. MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. (2.26 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too.	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on 15 a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn.	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on 15 a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were 16 going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on 15 a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were 16 going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you 17 did. 18 At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few short questions by way of re-examination of Mr Fraser.	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on 15 a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were 16 going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you 17 did. 18 At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement 19 sir, could I ask you to pull that up for the witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few short	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on 15 a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were 16 going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you 17 did. 18 At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement 19 sir, could I ask you to pull that up for the witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few short questions by way of re-examination of Mr Fraser. Do you recall that Mr Alexander asked you some	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on 15 a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were 16 going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you 17 did. 18 At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement 19 sir, could I ask you to pull that up for the witness. 20 I'm sorry, I don't know the gentleman's name. Thank
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few short questions by way of re-examination of Mr Fraser. Do you recall that Mr Alexander asked you some questions early on in your testimony about whether you	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, 9 please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on 15 a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were 16 going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you 17 did. 18 At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement 19 sir, could I ask you to pull that up for the witness. 20 I'm sorry, I don't know the gentleman's name. Thank 21 you. Let me go there now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few short questions by way of re-examination of Mr Fraser. Do you recall that Mr Alexander asked you some questions early on in your testimony about whether you understood that the road was a public road? A. Yes.	2 THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. 3 A. Correct and then the next paragraph: 4 "Access road is a public road." 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 6 No further questions. 7 MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, please. 10 MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? 11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. 12 (2.26 pm) 13 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL 14 MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you did. 18 At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement sir, could I ask you to pull that up for the witness. 20 I'm sorry, I don't know the gentleman's name. Thank you. Let me go there now. 21 I'll ask you just to read the paragraph to yourself
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few short questions by way of re-examination of Mr Fraser. Do you recall that Mr Alexander asked you some questions early on in your testimony about whether you understood that the road was a public road?	THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, please. MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. (2.26 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you did. At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement sir, could I ask you to pull that up for the witness. I'm sorry, I don't know the gentleman's name. Thank you. Let me go there now. I'll ask you just to read the paragraph to yourself just for a moment, sir; you don't need to read it out loud. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2.15, 2.30? MR ALEXANDER: Yes, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but it was an alternative. MR ALEXANDER: I was distracted, I apologise. MR TUSHINGHAM: Could we say 2.20 as a compromise? THE PRESIDENT: We can say that, yes, absolutely. So 2.20. MR ALEXANDER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Fraser. (1.35 pm) (Adjourned until 2.20 pm) (2.24 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think we're ready to resume. Mr Fraser, I hope everybody had a good lunch, and you too. Mr Tushingham, I think it's your turn. Re-direct examination by MR TUSHINGHAM Q. Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few short questions by way of re-examination of Mr Fraser. Do you recall that Mr Alexander asked you some questions early on in your testimony about whether you understood that the road was a public road? A. Yes. Q. And you referred to an internal report about	THE PRESIDENT: And then it goes on. A. Correct and then the next paragraph: "Access road is a public road." THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further questions. MR TUSHINGHAM: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions? Yes, please. MR DRYMER: Shall I begin? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. (2.26 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: In no particular order, but I will start now on a related point, if I may. I didn't know that you were going to take us here, Mr Tushingham, but I'm glad you did. At paragraph 9 of your second witness statement sir, could I ask you to pull that up for the witness. I'm sorry, I don't know the gentleman's name. Thank you. Let me go there now. I'll ask you just to read the paragraph to yourself just for a moment, sir; you don't need to read it out loud. (Pause)

1407	4	MD DDVMCD. Then I V C	14.21 1	MD DDVMED. V
14:27		MR DRYMER: Thank you. You reference a meeting on-site.	14:31 1	MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: No this is as Lundarstand it an extract
	2	You mention two agreements:	3	MR TUSHINGHAM: No, this is, as I understand it, an extract from the Land Registry in respect of plot number C, and
	4	"It was agreed that there was no issue about using the Road"		the way of using the plot numbered 22, that is where it
	5	And:	5	
	6	"It was also agreed that the Road needed to be	6	says: "Land, on which an engineering structure is built -
	7	adjusted to reflect [certain] coordinates"	7	road, local and special-purpose road"
	8	And at the end you say:	8	MR DRYMER: I see.
	9	"A minute of the meeting was signed by all parties."	9	MR TUSHINGHAM: And that is the parcel that's referred to in
	10	You refer us to Exhibit C-280. Could I ask that be	10	these minutes at C-280.
	11	shown? Thank you.	11	MR DRYMER: I see.
	12	Is this the minute you're referring to? And let me	12	Alright, well, I'm going to leave it there, well,
	13	ask a more fulsome question so that you understand.	13	unless the witness has something he would like to add.
	14	I don't see reference to agreement on either of those	14	No. Alright, and I'll look forward to further
	15	points in there. I don't know if maybe you'll tell	15	explanations in due course.
	16	me well, you read it otherwise?	16	Thanks. A couple of other questions, if I may.
	17		17	At paragraph 42 of your second witness statement,
	18	says there a minute of the agreement. It's not actually	18	this is a discussion regarding financing and Romgaz's
	19	the agreement itself. And my understanding is it was	19	conduct, and JKX's notice of its intention to withdraw.
	20	a verbal agreement and this is just a note of the	20	The notice from JKX is help me with the
	21	points. But it doesn't say "agreed". I agree with you.	21	exhibit number 185. Could I ask that that be pulled
	22	MR DRYMER: Okay, and just to be clear, counsel, I've	22	up, please. (C-185).
	23	looked, I can't do more, at the Slovak version. I don't	23	Could you scroll down to the last paragraph of the
	24		24	JKX email. Right, there it is.
	25	than this, but if I'm wrong, please correct me and	25	Yes. You may or may not know the answer to this
		Page 125		Page 127
14:29	1	correct the record.	14:33 1	question because I'm going to ask you what the sender
	2	MR TUSHINGHAM: Mr Drymer, do you see in this document C-280	2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				meant But the second to last paragraph first sentence
		it refers to:		meant. But the second to last paragraph, first sentence reads:
	3		3	reads:
	3	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C,	3 4	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are
	3	it refers to:	3 4 5	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale."
	3 4 5	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up	3 4 5 6	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX
	3 4 5	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))."	3 4 5 6 7	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for
	3 4 5 6 7	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes.	3 4 5 6	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the
	3 4 5 6 7 8	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed	3 4 5 6 7 8	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia?
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause)	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due course. It was just to help you with your effort to understand what was being referred to in these minutes. MR DRYMER: Ah, I understand. It refers to this.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got that right. I'll tell you in one sec. Yes.
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due course. It was just to help you with your effort to understand what was being referred to in these minutes. MR DRYMER: Ah, I understand. It refers to this. MR TUSHINGHAM: Exactly.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got that right. I'll tell you in one sec. Yes. Paragraph 99, on the second page at page 36, there's
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due course. It was just to help you with your effort to understand what was being referred to in these minutes. MR DRYMER: Ah, I understand. It refers to this. MR TUSHINGHAM: Exactly. MR DRYMER: Well, this is a reference to correcting the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got that right. I'll tell you in one sec. Yes. Paragraph 99, on the second page at page 36, there's a sentence, the second line:
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due course. It was just to help you with your effort to understand what was being referred to in these minutes. MR DRYMER: Ah, I understand. It refers to this. MR TUSHINGHAM: Exactly. MR DRYMER: Well, this is a reference to correcting the coordinates in the cadastral register, I imagine?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got that right. I'll tell you in one sec. Yes. Paragraph 99, on the second page at page 36, there's a sentence, the second line: " Mr Harakal, told us unofficially that the
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due course. It was just to help you with your effort to understand what was being referred to in these minutes. MR DRYMER: Ah, I understand. It refers to this. MR TUSHINGHAM: Exactly. MR DRYMER: Well, this is a reference to correcting the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got that right. I'll tell you in one sec. Yes. Paragraph 99, on the second page at page 36, there's a sentence, the second line: " Mr Harakal, told us unofficially that the
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due course. It was just to help you with your effort to understand what was being referred to in these minutes. MR DRYMER: Ah, I understand. It refers to this. MR TUSHINGHAM: Exactly. MR DRYMER: Well, this is a reference to correcting the coordinates in the cadastral register, I imagine? MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, the document on the screen at C-139?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got that right. I'll tell you in one sec. Yes. Paragraph 99, on the second page at page 36, there's a sentence, the second line: " Mr Harakal, told us unofficially that the outcome of the process had already been decided by his
	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it refers to: " location of the access road on Parcel Type C, Serial No. 945 (unrecorded ownership sheet - built-up area (road))." MR DRYMER: Yes. MR TUSHINGHAM: If it assists you to look at the title deed of that parcel, that is at C-139, and that may explain what these minutes are about. So do you see in this document MR DRYMER: Alright. I was going to say you're welcome to argue that in due course. But now that it's up I'll look at it, sure. (Pause) Sorry, you're ahead of me and I'm slow to catch up. Are you suggesting that this helps me find reference to these two agreements? MR TUSHINGHAM: No. It may be we can deal with this in due course. It was just to help you with your effort to understand what was being referred to in these minutes. MR DRYMER: Ah, I understand. It refers to this. MR TUSHINGHAM: Exactly. MR DRYMER: Well, this is a reference to correcting the coordinates in the cadastral register, I imagine?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reads: "For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are also up for sale." Now, I look at that and it suggests to me that JKX might have been exiting a number of its investments for reasons wholly unrelated to any act or conduct by the Republic of Slovakia or, in fact, any facts related to Slovakia. They had their own reasons to divest. What do these words mean to you? Why would he be telling you that he is exiting Hungary as well as Slovakia? A. I would think just in the interests of openness that he would mention that, I think. We had a very good relationship with JKX. It was a very, very open relationship. So I expect he was just being complete. MR DRYMER: Okay. Thank you. If I could ask you, please, to turn to your first witness statement, paragraph 99. And I hope I've got that right. I'll tell you in one sec. Yes. Paragraph 99, on the second page at page 36, there's a sentence, the second line: " Mr Harakal, told us unofficially that the

14:35 1	superiors in Bratislava. He did not say what the	14:38 1	MR DRYMER: Yes.
2	outcome would be, nor did we ask."	2	A we were again a very small operation, I actually had
3	I have a question mark next to "nor did we ask".	3	a colleague who was in charge of legal affairs, but
4	Why wouldn't you have asked? Why didn't you ask?	4	I did have in the distant past some legal experience.
5	A. In hindsight it would have been a good thing to ask. At	5	So there I was involved as chief financial officer
6	the time it was a meeting in Slovak where I was	6	but had some input on the legal side and a little bit on
7	an observer rather than a participant, and I didn't	7	the PR side, just because we were a small team.
8	really feel I could kind of I didn't really want to	8	MR DRYMER: I understand. And I think you've put your
9	be the foreigner butting in on a conversation between	9	finger on, at least from a definitional standpoint,
10	a Slovak official and our Slovak colleagues. But it	10	which doesn't mean much, that this is a big role for
11	would have been a good idea to ask, I will accept that.	11	a CFO, if you will, in a traditional description of
12	MR DRYMER: Thank you. It's true I'd forgotten, actually,	12	one's functions?
13	your testimony earlier, that these meetings were taking	13	A. Yes.
14	place in Slovak, and you were hearing part of it live,	14	MR DRYMER: And I believe, Madam President, and sir, that
15	but probably not all of it live.	15	those are my questions. Thank you very much.
16	A. Yes. Yes.	16	PROFESSOR SANDS: Hello, and thank you very much for being
17	MR DRYMER: At the very outset of Mr Alexander's examination	17	with us.
18	this morning, he asked you several questions about your	18	I'm just following on actually from Mr Drymer's last
19	role with Discovery, and Alpine, with the companies, if	19	question, just against the background of the
20	you will, and you describe how your role evolved a bit	20	conversations we've been having over the course of
21	over time.	21	today, and this dispute at this single site, the Smilno
22	That reminded me of points that had occurred to me	22	site. Just stepping back now with the passage of time,
23	as I was reading your witness statements, before	23	would you say it's a fair characterisation that the
24	listening to you and meeting you today, which is that it	24	heart of this dispute was one concerning the use of
25	seems to me and please correct me if this is wrong,	25	a plot of land, and competing views as to who had rights
	D. 120		D 101
	Page 129		Page 131
14:36 1	but it seems to me that your role evolved eventually so	14:39 1	over that plot of land, the characterisation of the
2	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project,	2	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be?
2 3	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational.	2 3	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the
2 3 4	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description	2 3 4	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site?
2 3 4 5	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that	2 3 4 5	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the
2 3 4 5 6	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem	2 3 4 5 6	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would
2 3 4 5 6 7	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget	2 3 4 5 6 7	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it, this expanded role with Discovery in this project, was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing something different, if you like, in the area.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it, this expanded role with Discovery in this project, was it something you had experienced in past employment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing something different, if you like, in the area. PROFESSOR SANDS: That view and I'm being very careful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it, this expanded role with Discovery in this project, was it something you had experienced in past employment opportunities, or past projects?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing something different, if you like, in the area. PROFESSOR SANDS: That view and I'm being very careful not to express a view as to what this thing was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it, this expanded role with Discovery in this project, was it something you had experienced in past employment opportunities, or past projects? A. Not exactly, but I would say there's something similar,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing something different, if you like, in the area. PROFESSOR SANDS: That view and I'm being very careful not to express a view as to what this thing was you've articulated the view from your perspective as CFO
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it, this expanded role with Discovery in this project, was it something you had experienced in past employment opportunities, or past projects? A. Not exactly, but I would say there's something similar, in a sense, in that my previous company, where we were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing something different, if you like, in the area. PROFESSOR SANDS: That view and I'm being very careful not to express a view as to what this thing was you've articulated the view from your perspective as CFO of Discovery. But, of course, others held a different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it, this expanded role with Discovery in this project, was it something you had experienced in past employment opportunities, or past projects? A. Not exactly, but I would say there's something similar, in a sense, in that my previous company, where we were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing something different, if you like, in the area. PROFESSOR SANDS: That view and I'm being very careful not to express a view as to what this thing was you've articulated the view from your perspective as CFO
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	as to encompass virtually every facet of this project, from the legal to the financial, technical, operational. Beyond, if you will, the sort of limited description that Mr Alexander suggested to you this morning, is that a correct impression that I would have had? You seem almost to have been the chief operating well, forget the titles: the operating mind of the project on the ground? A. I would say I would more or less agree with that, save for technical. I didn't really have any input on the technical side. But certainly finance, legal and PR, I got involved in the PR MR DRYMER: PR, the political side, exactly. A. Yes, yes, all those aspects. MR DRYMER: And I recall from your witness statement your description of your previous activities. So what I want to ask is: is this, however you would characterise it, this expanded role with Discovery in this project, was it something you had experienced in past employment opportunities, or past projects? A. Not exactly, but I would say there's something similar, in a sense, in that my previous company, where we were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	thing called a track or a road or whatever it may be? I mean, how would you characterise the heart of the issue on this particular site? A. It's true we had competing views about the nature of the plot of land. I mean, actually, I think I would probably to a small degree, because I think to all intents and purposes, in our perception, this road was used as a road. The only entity that's ever been stopped from using it was Alpine Oil & Gas. So as far as we could see, it was a road, it was a right of way. So I don't feel that others saw it as anything different than a road. Our view was that the dressing it up as a piece of private agricultural land was a convenient legal fiction, and it didn't reflect the realities. So I would say that it was more about it was more about whether it was more about, for us, a very small group of individuals stopping people coming in and doing something different, if you like, in the area. PROFESSOR SANDS: That view and I'm being very careful not to express a view as to what this thing was you've articulated the view from your perspective as CFO of Discovery. But, of course, others held a different

apparently, the local police, more than one Slovak court. Against that background, did it not give you pause for thought as to whether the characterisation that you've put on that space is the correct one? You seem to be saying, if I've understood you correctly, that all those other folks just got it wrong in their characterisation. Is that your position? A. I would say that we got mixed signals from the police. Sometimes they said "Remove the car"; sometimes they didn't. So far as the courts were concerned, it's true that we met a brick wall with the injunction, and the refusal of the injunction. I think for us what defines the environment a lot was the PR aspect, and I would say that the people who were opposed to us were very effective communicators, very good, and I have to acknowledge that. And they were very good at creating an atmosphere we became famous in Slovakia, actually. We could go to a meeting in Bratislava in the ministries and they would say: oh, we've heard all about you, don't worry, you're famous, you know, you're on the national news. We were a small company in a distant part of Slovakia, and yet we were very famous because these activists would go and you know, they would lobby in Bratislava, they would disrupt ministerial meetings, their Facebook posts were	14:45 1 claim. It took four months to close that claim, for 2 judgment to be issued on that, and it took another, 3 whatever, six months after that before the injunction 4 was finally lifted. So it felt like the system was 5 rigged against us. 6 PROFESSOR SANDS: I understand that's your perspective. 7 I mean, you've got a legal background, so you have some 8 knowledge of how these things are done. One of the 9 things that is quite striking for me is when you were 10 discussing earlier the preparation of the report on the 11 status of the road and so on and so forth, there doesn't 12 appear to have been, prior to your acquisition, 13 a detailed due diligence on exactly these kinds of 14 issues. 15 I mean, one knows I live in a small village in 16 France, and every time you've got to do some activity, 17 you need some sort of permissions, and the amount of 18 time you spend on finding out in advance and getting 19 legal advice on what you can do and what you can't do. 20 And yet here you're talking about a significant 21 investment, and yet there doesn't appear to have been 22 and we heard from your counsel in effect 23 a confirmation a really detailed due diligence in 24 relation to these kinds of issues of ownership, of 25 access, of rights, in advance of investing and of
14:43 1 aggressive, both against us and against the government.	14:46 1 getting involved really actively in the project.
2 So for us it was I think we we did wonder if	2 I'm just wondering whether you might observe whether
3 the position of the courts was also affected by the	3 that's a fair characterisation and whether now, with the
4 atmosphere, by the public atmosphere.	4 benefit of hindsight, you might not have taken steps
5 And the police, yes, I mean, my impression was there	5 earlier to inform yourselves on the regulatory and legal
6 were policeman we could speak to who said: of course	6 situation in Slovakia.
7 it's a road. But the ones that counted, they were not	7 A. Mike and I have worked together in Poland, where we had
8 prepared to take that view. 9 PROFESSOR SANDS: And you mentioned the courts. What was	8 drilled a number of wells there. Ron Crow had also
 9 PROFESSOR SANDS: And you mentioned the courts. What was 10 your reaction to the decisions of the two court 	 worked in Poland and Hungary. We had we took comfort also from Stanislav Benada's experience, he was, you
11 decisions in relation to the injunction?	11 know, a veteran of the Czechoslovak oil industry.
12 A. We were appalled. You know, we thought it was	12 There is some oil and gas activity across the Czech
absolutely ridiculous that an asset which is worth	13 Republic and Slovakia not a lot, but there is some
14 €100 we paid €100, I'm sure much more thamnyone	and we weren't aware of any of these kinds of issues
locally would have paid for a 1/700th share in that	being problematic; we perceived it as
16 road. They wouldn't have probably paid €10. That that	an investor-friendly country, like Poland, for example.
asset could be protected by an interim injunction, to	17 That's true, the Polish oil and gas sector is much
us, was absolutely a perversion of justice. It was	larger, but the land ownership issues are pretty
very, very oppressive, we considered, and we were very	19 similar.
surprised that it wasn't reversed on appeal.	So, I think a small company is probably not going to
So, yes, we found and then it was impressive.	21 invest a lot of money in legal due diligence before
It took a month to obtain that injunction, a month to	22 an acquisition into these sorts of issues, I would say.
hear an appeal on it, which was rejected, and then we applied to because the only way we could see getting	23 And when it got nearer the time of actually looking at
 applied to because the only way we could see getting ourselves out of this injunction mess was to concede the 	 specific locations, you know, we did all that was required in terms of leasing the location itself, for
Page 134	Page 136

14:48 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	example, for which we used lawyers. The road at Smilno, I think we relied on the statements we had from the mayor and the farm. PROFESSOR SANDS: Okay. Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Just following up on your role. We've already discussed the fact that your role was beyond the responsibilities of a CFO, as it is usually understood in a company, and it encompassed a lot that I would have thought was in the CEO's attributions, and I was	14:51 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	fight about? A. Essentially it was for them it would be put on an environmental level. It was that: you're going to harm the environment. And there was really almost nothing we could say that we found that could make them comfortable on that. I would say that, just going back, if I may, to your previous question? THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
10 11	wondering how the tasks were apportioned between yourself and Mr Lewis?	10 11	A. Stanislav Benada had discussions with VLK, which is the organisation behind them, from early 2015 onwards, or
12	A. I would say that Mike Lewis was very much in charge. It	12	even 2014. There was quite a bit of there were
13 14	was his company. And to the extent that I got involved in, for example, meetings with government officials,	13 14	various conversations between Ms Varjanová and AOG representatives, including Stanislav and Mike Lewis,
15	that would be in consultation with him. It might be	15	in December 2015.
16	because he was in another country at the time. But any	16	
17	important meeting, I mean a meeting with the minister,	17	
18	Mike would come over.	18	•
19	I saw myself as supporting him in areas like public	19	
20	or government relations, or public relations, I manage	20	•
21	a lot of it myself, reporting back to him. But	21	THE PRESIDENT: So why did it change in 2017?
22 23	government relations was at the end of the day his responsibility and I would support him.	22 23	A. I suppose a slightly different approach, which was that we had someone who had been helping us since the
23	THE PRESIDENT: In your witness statement, it's the first	23	beginning of 2016 who was very local, quite well
25	one, in paragraph 92 on page 32, 33. If someone could	25	connected locally, who was I would describe him as
			·
	Page 137		Page 139
14:50 1	pull this up. You say that early 2017 you started	14:53 1	a local fixer, if you like, helped set things up, set up
2	engaging with the activists.	2	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists.
2 3	engaging with the activists. A. Mm.	2 3	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he
2 3 4	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive	2 3 4	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me
2 3 4 5	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do	2 3 4 5	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had
2 3 4 5 6	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it	2 3 4 5 6	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He
2 3 4 5	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do	2 3 4 5 6 7	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue.
2 3 4 5 6 7	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them,	2 3 4 5 6	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for instance?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to let it all hang out. But at the end of the day it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for instance? A. So we would say she's a resident of Smilno, but she's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to let it all hang out. But at the end of the day it didn't really change anything. You know, it didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for instance?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to let it all hang out. But at the end of the day it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for instance? A. So we would say she's a resident of Smilno, but she's one of the small group of activists. There were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to let it all hang out. But at the end of the day it didn't really change anything. You know, it didn't actually remove the hostility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for instance? A. So we would say she's a resident of Smilno, but she's one of the small group of activists. There were probably a couple at each location, roughly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to let it all hang out. But at the end of the day it didn't really change anything. You know, it didn't actually remove the hostility. THE PRESIDENT: Did it not change when you offered to do the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for instance? A. So we would say she's a resident of Smilno, but she's one of the small group of activists. There were probably a couple at each location, roughly. THE PRESIDENT: And these activists, what do they I mean,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to let it all hang out. But at the end of the day it didn't really change anything. You know, it didn't actually remove the hostility. THE PRESIDENT: Did it not change when you offered to do the preliminary EIAs?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	engaging with the activists. A. Mm. THE PRESIDENT: And actually it was quite a productive engagement, if I understand well. Why did you not do this earlier? Did it occur to you later that maybe it would have been a better approach to engage with them, rather than have these confrontations? A. There actually had been quite a lot of engagement with activists from the outset. But it's just that it went into a on a more serious level, if you like, at this stage, but THE PRESIDENT: Just to be clear, I understood you before to say you are making a distinction between the activists and the local residents of the village? A. Yes. Yes, very much so. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: So where do you classify Ms Varjanová, for instance? A. So we would say she's a resident of Smilno, but she's one of the small group of activists. There were probably a couple at each location, roughly. THE PRESIDENT: And these activists, what do they I mean, usually, at least the way I understand it, activists	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	meetings and so forth, and he knew one of the activists. I had known him for quite a long time. And when he started working for us he said, you know: do you want me to say anything to Mr Ferko and we thought we had nothing to lose and he was quite a smart chap. He was able to create the right conditions for a dialogue. I was a new face in terms of meeting the activists, so I could go along and slightly say: this is a new person, you can say things to me, whatever, which you haven't said already, or I'll give it a different hearing. So that helped. And I was very receptive to them. I went there were two colleagues, Peter being one and another colleague, Igor Melus. I tried to, you know, just tried to it was like, you know, sort of trying to think, bit like being on a psychiatrist's couch or something, you just want to let it all hang out. But at the end of the day it didn't really change anything. You know, it didn't actually remove the hostility. THE PRESIDENT: Did it not change when you offered to do the preliminary EIAs? A. I wouldn't say so, no. We made a lot of propositions,

14:55 1	1	14:57 1	and so that's when I went to the hospital.
2	tell you about the drilling mud they were very	2	But, yes.
3	concerned that the drilling mud contained toxic	3	PROFESSOR SANDS: Just one follow-up actually, if I may.
4	chemicals, which it didn't. So we addressed all these	4	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, sure.
5	issues, many of which would have been addressed in the	5	PROFESSOR SANDS: Just a follow-up, just in response to the
6	past, but we did it again.	6	questions from the President.
7	But at the end of the day, when we filed these	7	You come across as very balanced and very
8	preliminary EIA applications, okay, they objected to	8	reasonable, I have to say. That's a positive. That's
9	them, as Ms Varjanová said in her witness statement, but	9	very positive. You don't display anger about the
10	the dialogue on other channels continued, you know, the	10	activists, as you call them, or local residents or
11	opposition through other channels.	11	property owners, however one characterises them.
12	When we went to I tried to get a new location	12	A. Mm.
13	next to Smilno at a place called Šarišské Cierne, which	13	PROFESSOR SANDS: In those circumstances, looking at that
14	is described in here. But again, the same activists	14	type of reaction from a local community which, for right
15	were then lobbying people in Šarišské Cierne to create	15	or for wrong, doesn't want oil exploration on the edges
16	opposition. Nothing had really changed, that was our	16	of its village, which seems to be what it's about, what
17	perception, despite us making all the right noises and	17	is a state to do? I mean, that's an expression of
18	being as conciliatory and as accommodating as possible.	18	a democratic society; the days where a state can just
19	It didn't make any difference.	19	impose its will or a company can come in and say: this
20	THE PRESIDENT: Then I have another question. You were here	20	is what we're going to do.
21	yesterday and you have seen the video of the incident	21	And you're obviously very experienced in that, you
22	with Ron Crow.	22	have been involved in this world, you know this is what
23	A. Yes.	23	happens. What is a state to do in those circumstances?
24	THE PRESIDENT: It's on the record under R-37.	24	Because effectively you've got stiff opposition, it may
25	A. Mm.	25	be a small number of people or a large number of people,
	7 444		D 419
	Page 141		Page 143
14:56 1	THE PRESIDENT: I didn't really understand: what happened	14:59 1	but there's opposition. And in those circumstances is
14:56 1 2	THE PRESIDENT: I didn't really understand: what happened there?	14:59 1 2	but there's opposition. And in those circumstances is it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of
	there?	2	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of
2 3	there? A. Well	2 3	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree
2	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean,	2	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so
2 3 4	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the	2 3 4 5	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic?
2 3 4 5	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand	2 3 4	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was
2 3 4 5	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the	2 3 4 5 6 7	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but
2 3 4 5 6 7	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A. He was struck by a car. No damage. Some bruising.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was opposed to us in the village apart from Ms Varjanová and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A. He was struck by a car. No damage. Some bruising. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but one doesn't put on a cast for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was opposed to us in the village apart from Ms Varjanová and her brother. All the other people who came in, who were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A. He was struck by a car. No damage. Some bruising. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but one doesn't put on a cast for bruising.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was opposed to us in the village apart from Ms Varjanová and her brother. All the other people who came in, who were there, they were brought in from outside.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A. He was struck by a car. No damage. Some bruising. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but one doesn't put on a cast for bruising. A. Yes. I mean, I have asked him again and he said: well,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was opposed to us in the village apart from Ms Varjanová and her brother. All the other people who came in, who were there, they were brought in from outside. When we tried to drill in and if you look at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A. He was struck by a car. No damage. Some bruising. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but one doesn't put on a cast for bruising. A. Yes. I mean, I have asked him again and he said: well, you know, I was in shock when it happened and later on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was opposed to us in the village apart from Ms Varjanová and her brother. All the other people who came in, who were there, they were brought in from outside. When we tried to drill in and if you look at the photograph of the protesters, there's 23 of them out of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A. He was struck by a car. No damage. Some bruising. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but one doesn't put on a cast for bruising. A. Yes. I mean, I have asked him again and he said: well, you know, I was in shock when it happened and later on in the day it started it got stiff, it stiffened up,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was opposed to us in the village apart from Ms Varjanová and her brother. All the other people who came in, who were there, they were brought in from outside. When we tried to drill in and if you look at the photograph of the protesters, there's 23 of them out of a village of, you know of whom only a small a number of those, not all, a number are from Smilno.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there? A. Well THE PRESIDENT: I mean, it looked faked, frankly. I mean, at least that's what I see, but then, what was the purpose of this scene? I mean, how did you understand this? Had you seen the video before? A. I've seen the video before because it was in at the Respondent's THE PRESIDENT: Because it was in the record; you had not seen anything before. A. True. I had not seen it before this arbitration. THE PRESIDENT: But the incident had been reported to you at the time? A. Yes. Yes. And obviously Ron went to the local hospital and had his leg put in a cast or you know, in a cast. What I heard at the time was that he had been knocked, exactly what I've put in my witness statement. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A. He was struck by a car. No damage. Some bruising. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but one doesn't put on a cast for bruising. A. Yes. I mean, I have asked him again and he said: well, you know, I was in shock when it happened and later on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it unreasonable what the outcome was, in the face of such opposition? I mean, reasonable people may disagree on what's desirable or not. But, actually, is it so problematic? A. I mean, the opposition was as small as it was determined. That's the thing. It was very small, but they made up for that by their resourcefulness and being very, very committed. I know that there's a petition with 300-and-something signatures on it. We question how all those signatures were arrived at, but that's probably a separate matter. We also know that our time in the village we spent a lot of time in Smilno. I lived there for a couple of weeks at a time in that hotel. My colleagues did as well. We knew a lot of people there. I mean, I would say I don't think I met anyone who was opposed to us in the village apart from Ms Varjanová and her brother. All the other people who came in, who were there, they were brought in from outside. When we tried to drill in and if you look at the photograph of the protesters, there's 23 of them out of a village of, you know of whom only a small

15:00 1 The same thing when we were on the location 2 in November, the same number of protesters, half of them 3 came in a coach, in an minibus from a village called 4 Pakostov an hour away, and this little group was able to 5 disrupt operations wherever we went. 6 So, is that representative of the community, or is 7 that just, you know, are they holding the community to 8 ransom? I'm not sure which is the answer. 9 PROFESSOR SANDS: But I'm asking a slightly different 10 question. I'm asking about the responsibility of the 11 state. Because these proceedings are not about the 12 town, they're not about the individuals. It's about 13 Slovakia. What is a state to do in those circumstances? 14 I mean, you are familiar in the UK with similar 15 situations in relation to coal mining in Cumbria or the 16 government's decision to issue new oil and gas licences. 17 There won't be millions on the streets, but there will 18 be a number of people who will feel very strongly about 19 it who will make a lot of noise about it and it will end 20 up going to the courts and the courts will end up taking 21 decisions, and some people won't. 23 That, at a time in which the environment is of 24 greater consciousness, is an issue which all democratic 25 states face. So is it your position that the state	15:03 1 that's where we were sacrificed to political 2 considerations. 3 PROFESSOR SANDS: But aren't you describing something that 4 happens in pretty much every country? You've observed 5 the debate on fracking in the United Kingdom; the 6 investors who were behind that would have gone to 7 various people and got the thumbs up and the green light 8 and it would have been authorised, and then it goes 9 higher up and the authorisation is overturned. Isn't 10 that just the nature of modern, democratic society? 11 A. I think to a degree yes, but you still need to follow 12 your own rules, and that's why we would say we were let 13 down, is that they stopped following their own rules or 14 they interpreted them in a way that was prejudicial or 15 biased or arbitrary. That's our complaint, really, is 16 that we were forced out by a misapplication of the 17 rules. 18 PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you very much. 19 MR DRYMER: I have one follow-up and then I have a question 20 that I forgot to put to you earlier. If you will 21 indulge me. 22 First of all, let me echo, I think you heard me say 23 off-mic, I too consider you a forthright, calm witness, 24 which is much appreciated. 25 I understand exactly what you've just explained to
15:01 1 somehow behaved unreasonably in failing to allow you to proceed? 3 A. We think the state was captured, in a sense, by this small group, and was it was a coalition government, so the parties were slightly jockeying for influence between themselves. Probably no one wanted to if you put your hand up on behalf of a foreign investor you're going to be outflanked by somebody who is speaking up for the little Slovak guy. 10 So it was much more convenient to support, you know, the local Slovak I mean, call them community or 12 PROFESSOR SANDS: You don't get to vote in Slovak elections? 13 A. Exactly. Yes. And that's what we feel happened at the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Environment, and we had a great relationship with the Ministry of the Environment at a working level. Stanislav had known these ladies, Ms Mat'ová and Ms Janova, he had known them for more than 10 years. You know, he would go in there a lot and we'd discuss a lot of issues with them. 20 Same thing with the mining authority or other authorities. It was easy to build a good relationship at a working level, and we felt that we were very welcome from the point of view of the operational people in the Ministry of Environment. The problems started when it went higher up and it became political, and	15:04 1 Professor Sands regarding your sense of grievance, just to use that word, with respect to the political authorities at a state level. 4 Do you say the same thing still with respect to the courts? In other words, do you believe the courts were prejudiced against you, discriminated against you, acted I'm not putting legal meaning to any of these words. Do you think the courts were influenced by political considerations? 10 A. If I'm honestly speaking sorry 11 MR DRYMER: Of course you are honestly speaking. 12 A. I'm always honestly speaking. 13 MR DRYMER: We take that for granted here. 14 A. Sincerely. But the answer is yes, I do, actually. 15 I think the prevailing political environment was sufficiently strong that that or some similar influence, that it put pressure on the courts. I do feel that. 18 MR DRYMER: Okay. I'll leave it there. That was the follow-up. 20 Now, the question I forgot to ask you was this. 21 Perhaps I missed something, and if you can tell me it's been answered or if counsel can correct me, so much the better. 24 But you will recall the long discussion with Mr Alexander which led to counsel agreeing to file the

15:06 1	missing attachment	5:20 1 THE PRESIDENT: Amongst other titles.	
2	A. Yes.	2 You have provided us two written state	
3	MR DRYMER: to your lawyer's letter to you.	first one says 30 September 2022 on the	
4	A. Yes.	4 was but the signature page says 30 Dec	cember 2022. Is
5	MR DRYMER: That whole discussion was premised on the idea	5 that right?	
6	that you alluded to written advice that you received	6 MR LEWIS: Yes, ma'am.	
7	from Mr Sýkora, right. It turns out, it seems, that the	7 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, it does.	
8	attachment to the letter was not such written advice to	8 And the second statement says 15 Sept	
9	the company from Mr Sýkora.	9 the first page and it was signed on the 16	th.
10	A. Mm.	10 MR LEWIS: Yes, ma'am.	
11	MR DRYMER: So I'd like to ask: do you recall whether or not	11 THE PRESIDENT: Okay. You're heard as	
12	you received written advice from Mr Sýkora on the	a witness you are under a duty to tell us t	
13	question of the status of the road?	Can you please confirm you should have	
14	A. We received various bits of written advice from him,	a witness declaration. Here it is, yes. Ca	n you please
15	including on the on how best to go forward, one of	read it into the record.	
16	which resulted in the Cesty Smilno approach. I believe	16 MR LEWIS: I solemnly declare that upon a	-
17	we did also I believe there will have been something	17 conscience I shall speak the truth, the wh	ole truth, and
18	covering the status of the road, but I can't	18 nothing but the truth.	
19	specifically remember it now. But I believe there was.	19 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So we sha	
20	MR DRYMER: Fine. And I gather, then correct me if I am	from your counsel, and then we'll turn to	the Slovak
21	wrong, you've just answered my second question, which	21 Republic's counsel.	
22	would have been: do you recall whether that advice is in	22 (3.21 pm)	
23	the record? And I think you said you don't recall.	23 Direct examination by MR TUSHIN	IGHAM
24	A. Well, I suspect it's not on the record, I suspect it	24 Q. Thank you, Madam President.	
25	will have been sorry, in the bundle for the	25 Mr Lewis, I understand that you wish t	to make one
	Page 149	Page 151	
		į.	
15:07 1	arbitration?	5:21 1 correction to paragraph 32 of your first witne	ess
15:07 1 2	arbitration? MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that.	5:21 1 correction to paragraph 32 of your first without 2 statement. Could you please be shown that p	
			oaragraph.
2	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that.	2 statement. Could you please be shown that p	paragraph. nink that's
2 3	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the 	paragraph. nink that's
2 3 4	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure.	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the the second witness statement. It's the first w 	paragraph. nink that's itness
2 3 4 5	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough.	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I th the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. 	oaragraph. nink that's itness olease
2 3 4 5	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President.	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p 	oaragraph. nink that's itness olease
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p explain the correction you wish to make to the 	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser.	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p explain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? 	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance.	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p explain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end 	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much.	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement. It's the first w the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p explain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end sentence, I would like to strike that, please. 	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break,	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p explain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that 	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute	 statement. Could you please be shown that p The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p explain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? 	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding at begins
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis?	2 statement. Could you please be shown that p 3 The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I th 4 the second witness statement. It's the first w 5 statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. 6 Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p 7 explain the correction you wish to make to th 8 paragraph? 9 A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end 10 sentence, I would like to strike that, please. 11 Q. So you would like to strike the sentence tha 12 "This includes"? 13 A. Yes, sir.	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding at begins
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you.	2 statement. Could you please be shown that p 3 The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I th 4 the second witness statement. It's the first w 5 statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. 6 Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p 7 explain the correction you wish to make to th 8 paragraph? 9 A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end 10 sentence, I would like to strike that, please. 11 Q. So you would like to strike the sentence tha 12 "This includes"? 13 A. Yes, sir. 14 Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding at begins
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm)	2 statement. Could you please be shown that p 3 The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I th 4 the second witness statement. It's the first w 5 statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. 6 Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you p 7 explain the correction you wish to make to th 8 paragraph? 9 A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end 10 sentence, I would like to strike that, please. 11 Q. So you would like to strike the sentence tha 12 "This includes"? 13 A. Yes, sir. 14 Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish 15 either of your witness statements?	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding at begins th to make to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break)	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first witness statement. It's the first witness statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you presplain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The endest sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't.	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding at begins h to make to please now answer any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break)	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first witness statement. It's the first witness statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you pexplain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The endest sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. Could you	paragraph. nink that's itness please nis ding at begins h to make to please now answer any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break) (3.19 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think everybody is back and we are	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first witness statement. It's the first witness statement. It's the first witness statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you presplain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The ending sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. Could you questions that Mr Alexander will have for your	paragraph. nink that's itness blease nis ding at begins h to make to please now answer any pu.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break) (3.19 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think everybody is back and we are ready to resume.	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you pexplain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. Could you questions that Mr Alexander will have for you (3.22 pm)	paragraph. nink that's itness blease nis ding at begins h to make to please now answer any pu.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break) (3.19 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think everybody is back and we are ready to resume. MR MICHAEL LEWIS (called)	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you pexplain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. Could you questions that Mr Alexander will have for you (3.22 pm) Cross-examination by MR ALEXAND	paragraph. nink that's itness blease nis ding at begins h to make to please now answer any bu. DER b be asking you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break) (3.19 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think everybody is back and we are ready to resume. MR MICHAEL LEWIS (called) THE PRESIDENT: Can you please confirm to us, sir, that you	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first witness statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you pexplain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. Could you questions that Mr Alexander will have for you (3.22 pm) Cross-examination by MR ALEXAND Q. My name is David Alexander. I'm going to	paragraph. nink that's itness blease nis ding at begins h to make to please now answer any bu. DER b be asking you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break) (3.19 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think everybody is back and we are ready to resume. MR MICHAEL LEWIS (called) THE PRESIDENT: Can you please confirm to us, sir, that you are Michael Lewis?	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first witness statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you presume the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The ending sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. Could you questions that Mr Alexander will have for your good of the strike the sentence.	paragraph. nink that's itness blease nis ding at begins h to make to please now answer any bu. DER b be asking you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR DRYMER: Yes, excuse me, I mean that. A. I imagine it will have been treated as privilege but I'm not 100% sure. MR DRYMER: Fair enough. Thank you. Those are my questions, Madam President. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. I think I have no further questions. This was a long examination, Mr Fraser. Thank you very much for your assistance. MR FRASER: Thank you very much. THE PRESIDENT: Should we take a not too long a break, maybe, so we may have another one later a ten-minute break now and then we'll hear Mr Lewis? MR TUSHINGHAM: That's fine by us. Thank you. (3.08 pm) (A short break) (3.19 pm) THE PRESIDENT: Fine, I think everybody is back and we are ready to resume. MR MICHAEL LEWIS (called) THE PRESIDENT: Can you please confirm to us, sir, that you are Michael Lewis? MR LEWIS: I am.	The first witness statement of Mr Lewis. I the second witness statement. It's the first w statement. Specifically, I think, page 13. Paragraph 32, yes. Mr Lewis, could you pexplain the correction you wish to make to the paragraph? A. Yes. It's actually on the next page. The end sentence, I would like to strike that, please. Q. So you would like to strike the sentence that "This includes"? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you have any other corrections you wish either of your witness statements? A. I don't. MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. Could you questions that Mr Alexander will have for you (3.22 pm) Cross-examination by MR ALEXAND Q. My name is David Alexander. I'm going to questions on behalf of the Slovak Republic; a to meet you, sir.	paragraph. nink that's itness blease nis ding at begins th to make to please now answer any pu. DER b be asking you a pleasure

•			•
15:22 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 22 22 22 23	was interesting that you would be describing some soft market conditions that you experienced early in your career. Tell me, sir, why you thought that was relevant to this proceeding? I don't disagree: I'm just curious what your view is. A. The oil price does impact activities. In 1986 I was newly out of a boom, and it hit me the hardest, and I think that that is something, as a responsible oil person, that you keep in mind all the time so that you're able to react and spend your money wisely. Q. And in that particular market, what sort of do you have a rough memory of what the percentage drop in the market was? A. The percentage drop was roughly not too dissimilar to what we experienced during this project. From about \$100 I think, yes, it made \$100 down to well, no, that's not true. I remember selling oil for \$5.85 at one point in that particular bust, so that was much more extreme, but it's similar to this. Q. Mm-hm. This decline, I guess it peaked shortly after your purchase at about 107; does that ring a bell? A. I believe that's correct. Q. And dropped below 30?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	time. So that is hardly a comparison to what happened historically here, except in the oil business. But the response to I'm sorry, could you repeat the question? Q. What happens to oil exploration when you get this kind of bottom fallout? A. Obviously in the one that we're referencing in 1986, it was a terrible time. This one did not have those devastating effects. People continued to explore. The shale gas market slowed down dramatically because the costs there are so high. But the type of exploration we were doing here, so long as we could lower the costs substantially, which you typically can do in an environment like this, we had every expectation that we would be able to overcome this oil price and still make the project profitable, even if it took a while to rebound. Q. You, of course, testified in your own statement that you had read Mr Fraser's statement and thought that it was true and accurate; do you recall that? A. Yes, sir. Q. Look if you would well, I'll tell you what. In the interests of time, and I'm happy to pull it up if you'd find it necessary, but it's a short sentence I wanted to read to you, so you let me know if you'd like to have it
15:24 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	handy for him, and I won't put too much burden on the person having to operate the exhibits. Would it be helpful if I handed you one as well? THE PRESIDENT: Yes please. (Handed).	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	pulled up. A. Yes, sir. Q. He's talking about the decline in the 2014-2015 and beyond. He says he describes the prices first, and then he says: "Against this backdrop, from August 2014 onwards it gradually became much more difficult to raise equity capital in the oil and gas sector, as investor sentiment deteriorated." Do you agree with that? A. It did deteriorate during that period of time, yes.

12 that the dip lasted a long time, and then the pandemic

13 came along. With some improvement during a stretch in

2018. 14

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. A fair characterisation?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Not very precise, but in the ballpark.

19 In your early experience of a soft market, what

happens to oil exploration during a decline that steep? 20

A. Well, first I would not characterise this as a soft --2.1

22 or, sorry, the prior event as a soft market. That was

23 a devastating period of time when not only the oil

24 business cratered but the real estate business cratered

and several other industries all cratered at the same 2.5

Page 154

It did deteriorate during that period of time, yes.

Q. Right. And you agree it became much more difficult to 12

13 raise equity capital?

14 A. As a general rule, yes. Yes.

15 Q. The reason I ask is, you obviously have had a very

successful career, you were a pioneer in fracking, as 16

I understand it, and through that experience put your 17

name on the map in the United States, and then were

19 invited to continue in Europe; correct?

21 Q. And you had built up a remarkable network of contacts in

22 the industry, including the investor network?

A. I had some contacts in the investor network. Most of my

24 relationships were technical, though.

Q. But in any event, in this market, after having purchased

- 15:30 1 AOG in March of 2014, you went to work on raising
 - 2 external financing immediately; fair?
 - 3 A. Not really. We -- I fully intended to investigate this
 - 4 project to determine what the upside of it actually was.
 - 5 As I entered the project, I had some basic
 - 6 understanding of the potential, some great enthusiasm
 - about the area, but until I got in and really plugged in
 - 8 at the data, I thought it would be better to have
 - 9 someone alongside us, to help defray the costs, lower
 - 10 the risks for me, if it was easy to do.
 - And so we surfaced that to a few people, Alex in
 - 12 particular surfaced that to a few people, to see if we
 - 13 could get someone to come alongside us, understanding
 - that it was early days, that the work had not been done
 - to really identify prospects to the point of being ready
 - to drill, but that they would come alongside and help us
 - 17 develop this play.
 - 18 Q. You engaged some financial advisors; correct?
 - 19 A. Yes.
 - 20 Q. And whom did you engage?
 - 21 A. Jean-Michel was a friend of Alex's. I don't remember
 - the name of his company but we engaged with them.
 - 23 Q. Do you remember the deal essentially that was involved
 - there? Clermont Energy? Does that ring a bell?
 - 25 A. Clermont, that's correct --

- 15:34 1 Q. And they brought some potential investors to the table
 - 2 for discussions?
 - 3 A. Yes. That's my recollection.
 - 4 Q. And it is true that despite strong efforts, the investor
 - 5 sentiment remained in the tank and you got no takers;
 - 6 right?
 - 7 A. Well, I wouldn't characterise this as an all-out effort.
 - 8 Again, we were looking for someone to come alongside us.
 - 9 It wasn't an investment in a well, like many investors
 - 10 were used to. It was an unusual project requiring
 - really someone that was in the business that wanted to
 - 12 participate in the development of the projects.
 - 13 So it was a difficult funding effort anyway, and
 - then the fact that it was early days. So I wasn't
 - surprised that it was difficult. It would have been
 - wonderful to have someone come along with a big bag of
 - money and fund, but I was perfectly willing to go ahead
 - 18 without it
 - 19 Q. But you did make it clear to Mr Fraser when he came on
 - board, and this became part of his major work, didn't
 - 21 it, trying to find financing?
 - $22\,$ $\,$ A. It was part of it. I wouldn't characterise that as his
 - 23 major position, no.
 - 24 Q. He was CFO, but I understand he had a broad variety of
 - other duties. But you asked him to -- you made clear to

Page 159

- 15:32 1 Q. And -- I'm sorry, go ahead.
 - 2 A. Umm ...
 - 3 Q. Well, that's alright.
 - 4 A. I don't really ... I'm sorry.
 - 5 Q. Let's put it in a point of time first. That agreement
 - 6 is R-123, if I could ask you to bring that up.
 - You may want to take a moment and look at that.

 8 A. Is there a way to make that bigger, please? The old
 - 9 eyes. Okay.
 - 10 MR TUSHINGHAM: Sorry, if I may just -- please forgive me
 - for interrupting. Mr Lewis, there is also a screen to
 - 12 your right.
 - 13 A. That one's actually easier to see, so thank you.
 - 14 MR ALEXANDER: So my first -- and, again, if you need more
 - time to read, just let me know. It's not a race.
 - 16 A. I'm fine so far.
 - 17 Q. Okay. This transaction with Clermont envisioned raising
 - 18 15-30 million; do you see that?
 - 19 A. Yes, sir.
 - 20 Q. And that was for exploration projects in both Poland and
 - 21 Slovakia; correct?
 - 22 A. Yes.
 - 23 Q. And how long was Clermont Energy in the picture for you?
 - 24 A. I am not sure how we terminated that arrangement. But
 - 25 certainly -- certainly for a year or so.

Page 158

- 15:35 1 him that you did not want to finance this by yourself?
 - 2 A. I think I was pretty clear that I would prefer to have
 - 3 someone come alongside us and help fund the project.
 - 4 That's my recollection, anyway.
 - 5 Q. Were you also at the time personally funding exploration
 - 6 in Poland?
 - 7 A. I was.
 - 8 Q. And as events evolved, you continued to have some drain
 - 9 in the Poland ventures, which also impacted your
 - 10 capacity to invest in the Slovak ventures; correct?
 - 11 A. Yes, the Polish activities did cost, but they were --
 - the people, the office, the software, everything was
 - also used for the Slovakia project. So it really wasn't
 - that much of an extra cost to continue funding the
 Polish effort while doing the Slovakian one. And the
 - geology is very similar, so the people that I had on
 - board I was doing a lot of training and trying to
 - 18 educate these guys, so it was good for them anyway.
 - 19 Q. So if you could turn to paragraph 34 of your witness
 - statement. That's your first witness statement.
 - 21 A. Okay.
 - 22 Q. And you will see about four lines down the sentence
 - begins "My expectation ...". If you can just read that
 - 24 to yourself. (Pause)
 - 25 A. Yes.

- 15:38 1 Q. So the model that you had in mind was that you would
 - 2 invest in the cost of the first three wells, and your
 - 3 business model anticipated that revenues generated from
 - 4 that would then become the funding source for any
 - 5 further drilling?
 - 6 A. Well, this is the model that I typically had been using
 - 7 and continue to use, where I would fund the start-up of
 - 8 a programme, and then, as it further developed,
 - 9 hopefully the project would then fund itself. So it's
 - not unusual for me to think like that.
 - 11 Q. Would it be fair to say that in that model, early
 - results can be pretty significant for the outcome of the
 - 13 project?
 - 14 A. Of course they can. Yes.
 - 15 Q. And if you had -- let's go back to the question of your
 - willingness to finance personally. What amount did you
 - have in mind to finance for the first three wells?
 - $18\,$ $\,$ A. If I recall, something like a couple million was my
 - 19 expectation.
 - 20 Q. And what were you estimating the per-well cost to be for
 - 21 the first three wells?
 - 22 A. Roughly a million to a million-two (1.2 million).
 - 23 O. In the --
 - 24 A. Excuse me, that's for 100%. Our net would have been
 - 25 500 or so per well.

- 15:42 1 the Carpathians. Could you ...
 - 2 O. Maybe I've forgotten where it was. Where were your
 - 3 estimates from?
 - 4 A. Northern Poland, I believe, is where I quoted.
 - 5 Q. Do you remember saying that they could be as high as --
 - 6 somebody quoted you a number, sort of an almost
 - 7 ridiculous number of as high as 50 million?
 - 8 A. Yes, and that may sound ridiculous because we were so
 - 9 successful in getting it down, but there are -- anyway,
 - 10 yes. Yes, I recall.
 - 11 Q. But as things developed in Slovakia, the costs you were
 - 12 having to incur personally substantially exceeded your
 - initial ballpark for 2 million.
 - 14 A. Well, unfortunately we weren't drilling. So it was just
 - overhead costs. I had anticipated that that would
 - 16 continue for some period of time until the drilling
 - started. But obviously it extended for a much longer
 - 18 period.
 - 19 Q. Now, given the extension of time and the lack of
 - 20 progress you were making, did you ever reconsider the
 - 21 approach that you had in mind, which was to continue to
 - 22 look for external financing?
 - 23 A. Reconsider? For sure. As it became more difficult, the
 - 24 prospect of outside financing became more attractive.
 - 25 Q. The -- your interest in outside financing became more

Page 163

- 15:40 1 Q. Now, back to the Clermont Energy, that's R-123 again,
 - 2 you earlier noted that you were contemplating financing
 - 3 at 15-30 million, and you were contemplating how many
 - 4 wells in Poland and Slovakia?
 - 5 A. I'm sorry, I don't recall. I think I read three,
 - 6 a minute ago.
 - 7 Q. Yes. In the first paragraph under the "Proposed
 - 8 transaction", if we could highlight the first sentence.
 - 9 Again, you can read it to yourself, but:
 - "... in order to fund the development of up to three
 - oil and gas exploration projects ... [in] Poland and
 - 12 Slovakia..."
 - 13 A. That sentence ... must not be the right one. (Pause)
 - 14 Q. It's three lines down under "Proposed transaction" on
 - the right-hand side of the page is the part I'm calling
 - 16 attention to.
 - 17 A. That is three projects. That would not be wells.
 - 18 Q. I see. And how many wells were you contemplating?
 - $19\,$ $\,$ A. I don't remember. There were several in Poland, and
 - 20 then several in Slovakia.
 - 21 Q. You had mentioned also in your witness statement that in
 - your early activity in Poland, you'd gotten some very
 - 23 high estimates for the cost of drilling in the
 - 24 Carpathians; do you recall that testimony?
 - 25 A. I don't believe I mentioned any very high estimates in

Page 162

- 15:44 1 attractive?
 - 2 A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
 - 3 Q. Right. Now, with Clermont, they were not able to bring
 - 4 anything ultimately to the table; correct? Actual
 - 5 funding?
 - 6 A. Yes, that's correct.
 - 7 Q. Who did you go to next? Does the name Gulf Shores ring
 - 8 a bell?
 - 9 A. I believe Gulf Shores came out of the Clermont
 - 10 relationship.
 - 11 Q. That's what it looked like to me but it wasn't said
 - 12 quite explicitly, but that was all part of Clermont.
 - But you also had a preliminary agreement of some sort
 - with Gulf Shores?
 - 15 A. Again, I'm pretty sure that came out of the Clermont
 - 16 introduction.
 - 17 Q. Mm-hm. Did Gulf Shores succeed in bringing anything to
 - the table?
 - 19 A. No, they didn't.
 - 20 Q. And when did you begin discussions with Akard?
 - 21 A. Sometime in 2015.
 - 22 Q. The agreement is dated 23 October 2015; does that help
 - 23 at all?
 - 24 A. Thank you. Yes, it does. It would have been shortly
 - 25 before that.

Page 164

45 (Pages 161 to 164)

- 15:45 1 Q. Alright. And did you know the people involved with
 - 2 Akard from your prior experience?
 - 3 A. I did not, no.
 - 4 Q. How did they come to you?
 - 5 A. I believe it was a friend at church. I'm -- I'm not
 - 6 certain.
 - 7 Q. So could we bring up C-282, please. Take a moment and
 - 8 look at that, and you can ask for the next page whenever
 - 9 you're ready. I just want to give you a moment to have
 - 10 a look.
 - 11 A. Okay. (Pause)
 - 12 Okay.
 - 13 Q. What was the deal with Akard?
 - 14 A. That they would fund our operations for a few wells.
 - 15 I believe it was three or two. And that we would
 - 16 ultimately put the Alpine asset in a newco, a new
 - 17 corporation that we would split 50/50.
 - 18 Q. And as I recall, there was a series of steps in the
 - 19 financing. Depending upon how things went in option 1,
 - 20 they had an option to go to a second position; do you
 - 21 remember that as well?
 - 22 A. Yes, sir, I do.
 - 23 Q. So with Akard there were significant problems getting
 - the deal even documented, weren't there?
 - 25 A. The particular individual was a difficult person, so.

- 15:49 1 you in when things started to come off the rails?
 - 2 A. It was late 2015, because I remember talking to him
 - 3 while I was skiing. So it must have been December 2015.
 - 4 Q. Were you skiing in the High Tatras, I hope?
 - 5 A. No, sir, I was not.
 - 6 Q. It's a lovely area!
 - You put in, I should say you loaned about 2 million
 - from January 2013 through to September 2015 into the
 - 9 project; correct?

8

- 10 A. I don't know if it's a loan or investment. I didn't
- 11 characterise it really any way on purpose. It was money
- the company needed. It's my company. I funded it. But
- yes, I haven't looked at those numbers. 2 million
- sounds about right, though.
- 15 Q. But I do want to pay attention to how the money went in.
- 16 How did it go in?
- 17 A. My money was in whenever it was needed. Which is
- a practice that I have with my businesses. I don't like
- 19 to fund too much in advance. And at this point in time
- when we did this transaction, I know that the 230 came
- 21 in, and I am pretty sure that the next tranche as well
- 22 came in.
- 23 Q. You're referring now to Akard's contribution?
- 24 A. Correct, because that's the only other funding that came
- 25 in

Page 167

- 15:47 1 He meant well, and it was just very precise in the way
 - 2 he wanted the numbers and the charts and the verbiage to
 - 3 be, because he was a real estate guy and I'm not a real
 - 4 estate person, but apparently they're more precise than
 - 5 we are in the oil and gas business.
 - 6 So yes, it did take some time to do that.
 - 7 Q. To borrow one of my favourite Texas phrases, was it his
 - 8 first rodeo?
 - 9 A. I believe it was.
 - 10 Q. Yes. And I'm sure he did some diligence about you and
 - 11 AOG. You probably did a little diligence about him?
 - 12 A. I did some. The way he met me -- I wish I could recall
 - 13 how -- that person apparently talked me up pretty good,
 - 14 because he really didn't ever question our technical
 - abilities and, I mean, as far as that was concerned, we
 - 16 never really discussed that further.
 - 17 Q. So the full farmout -- I guess it was a farmout
 - 18 agreement that was contemplated for the first layer, for
 - 19 first option -- that never actually got documented?
 - 20 A. No, I don't believe it did.
 - 21 Q. And did that lack of documentation create any problems
 - for your relationship going forward?
 - 23 A. The problems existed before the lack of documentation,
 - 24 which is why that never occurred.
 - 25 Q. So how far into the deal were you on -- what month were

Page 166

- 15:51 1 Q. I was referring actually to your funding.
 - 2 A. Okay. Well, mine just came in as it was needed, as it
 - 3 always has been.
 - 4 Q. To borrow an analogy back to those real estate guys, you
 - 5 were the construction lender?
 - 6 A. I don't know the real estate business well enough to say
 - 7 that
 - 8 Q. You were!
 - 9 A. Okay!
 - 10 Q. Take a look at C-142 -- sorry, R-142. So this was a --
 - and again, this is a lengthy letter, you might remember
 - this letter. January 2, it was your notice of default
 - 13 to Akard.

19

- On the first page of that letter you say -- do you
- see there at the "Background", down at the bottom:
- 16 "I loaned about \$2.0 Million from January 2013
- through September 2015 to pay for almost all of DG's
- share of the geological and geophysical work required to
 - progress the Alpine project in Slovakia."
- Was that a true statement?
- 21 A. I assume so, because I wrote it.
- 22 Q. Alright. And when you loaned money to the company, did
- you execute promissory notes? I mean did the company?
- 24 A. I don't remember any of that. I don't remember. It
- wasn't something I would have worried about.

- $15.53 \quad 1 \quad Q. \quad You were essentially loaning to your own company, so$
 - 2 formalities weren't too important?
 - 3 A. I would say I was investing in my own company. Whether
 - 4 it was a loan or treated that way for tax purposes or
 - 5 not, that's beyond my pay scale.
 - 6 Q. So as you sit here today, you don't know whether this
 - 7 statement that you loaned money was the case, or some
 - 8 other structure might have been used; you just don't
 - 9 have any memory of it?
 - 10 A. The loan language, I'm not certain about that. I may
 - 11 have been advised to say it that way. I don't know.
 - But in my mind all along it was an investment, and
 - if I could treat it as a loan and get it back from
 - an investor group, then wonderful. But it was what it
 - 15 was
 - 16 Q. So in terms of the mechanics of how you would advance
 - 17 funds, did you advance it from another company, or did
 - 18 you advance it from your own resources?
 - 19 A. Hm. I have a number of sources I could have used.
 - 20 Q. But you don't have any memory of it?
 - 21 A. I don't remember one way or the other, no.
 - 22 Q. But basically people on the ground had been given the
 - 23 project, as cash needs came along would send you
 - 24 an email?
 - 25 A. It wasn't quite that informal, no.

- 15:56 1 Q. Now. Same question for Akard.
 - 2 A. I don't believe there's anything in these documents, no.
 - 3 Q. Do you recall how much your total personal investment
 - 4 was to the Polish projects that were being developed at
 - 5 the same time you were working in Slovakia?
 - 6 A. I remember around 2017 that I was at 6-point-something
 - 7 million in all of these projects to Discovery. But
 - 8 I don't remember a breakdown per project.
 - Q. Okay. Did you have some good fortune in Poland? Did
 - 10 you generate some producing wells that you were able to
 - move into production? On the projects that were the
 - subject originally of the deal with ...
 - 13 A. The project with the Polish oil and gas company did not
 - 14 go well in the end, so no, we did not. We were not
 - 15 successful there.
 - Our own little project there, the drop in oil and
 - 17 gas prices made that subeconomic. So I had to drop
 - 18 that

11

- 19 So overall, there was no return to that investment,
- 20 to date.
- 21 Q. Now, you had made, as you earlier noted, and I read with
- interest your discussion of your experience in fracking,
- you had made a substantial contribution to that work and
- received substantial rewards as a result; is that fair?
- 25 A. Yes.

Page 171

- 15:55 1 Q. Okay. Tell me how it was, please.
 - 2 A. I'm pretty sure that in every case Alex would have been
 - 3 the one that was telling me the need and I was working
 - 4 out payment with him. Or through him.
 - 5 Q. And did you sometimes mix the sources of the funds,
 - 6 sometimes from your personal account, sometimes from
 - 7 another business?
 - 8 A. Well, let's make sure we're talking about the same
 - 9 thing --
 - 10 Q. I'm talking about the 2 million that you said you
 - 11 loaned.
 - 12 A. Alright, but it doesn't say -- what I would have done,
 - any transaction that I would have made would have been
 - 14 to Discovery first, and then Discovery would have
 - disseminated that to Alpine as needed. As long as we're
 - saying that, please rephrase, or please ask me again.
 - 17 Q. Well, is there any evidence in the record that you
 - advanced funds to Discovery as opposed to AOG, that
 - 19 you're aware of?
 - 20 A. I don't think I ever advanced funds to Alpine.
 - 21 Q. My question, though, was a little different.
 - 22 A. Okay.
 - 23 Q. Is there any evidence in the record of the entity to
 - whom you advanced funds?
 - 25 A. I don't believe there is.

Page 170

- 15:58 1 Q. And you're probably tempted to be modest, but you're
 - 2 allowed to brag when somebody asks you a question that
 - 3 calls for immodesty.
 - 4 So when you say your name was put on the map in
 - 5 connection with fracking in the US, what do you mean by
 - 6 that?
 - 7 A. I was the team leader and the geologist and the main
 - 8 technician for, or technical person for the development
 - of fracking and horizontal wells, while I was with Lyco
 - 10 Energy. We started the Bakken play up in Montana,
 - North Dakota, which ended up being a world-class field.
 - 12 At the same time we were doing that, the Barnett shale
 - 13 play in Texas was happening, and neither of us knew what
 - 14 the other was doing. We thought we were the only ones,
 - but turns out we weren't.
 - But that project developed for several years while
 - 17 I was with Lyco and then I did that on my own for
 - 18 several years after that. The result was I was swamped
 - with speaking engagements and all sorts of things. So
 - it was a very fun time. A very good part of my career.
 - 21 Q. And you met some folks there who knocked on your door
 - 22 later about going to Europe?
 - 23 A. No. I got a phone call from -- I believe from London,
 - 24 from a guy that used to come to Dallas quite often. And
 - 25 he had heard of me from somewhere, and invited me to go

16:00 1 to Europe.

- 2 O. And you said yes?
- 3 A. After some struggling with the decision, yes, I did say
- 4 yes
- 5 Q. And when was that?
- 6 A. 2007.
- 7 Q. And was your work in -- your initial work in Europe, was
- 8 that conventional drilling, or was that for what we've
- 9 been loosely describing as fracking?
- 10 A. The first that we did, that I did, was with 3Legs, and
- 11 that was horizontal wells with fracks in a gas play in
- 12 northern Poland.
- 13 Q. And that was successful?
- 14 A. I thought it was successful. ConocoPhillips with all
- 15 their overhead did not.
- 16 Q. And you were invited to speak in a conference in
- south-eastern Poland a few years into that work?
- 18 A. Actually, near the beginning, I believe it might even
- 19 have been 2007, yes, in Czarna.
- 20 Q. And how far is that from Slovakia?
- 21 A. Very close. Maybe 40 miles, 30 miles.
- 22 Q. And did you meet some folks from Slovakia there?
- 23 A. I did not. Not that I knew of.
- 24 Q. And what did you speak on at the conference?
- 25 A. I spoke on the potential of the Carpathians and -- but

Page 173

- 16:04 1 Q. You are aware that several EU Member States at one time
 - 2 or another had fracking bans imposed?
 - 3 A. Later, after I had done the work in northern Poland,
 - 4 yes
 - 5 Q. And what timeframe was that, that it became a hotbed of
 - 6 activity in Europe?
 - 7 A. I don't remember, but I would assume it's 2013,
 - 8 something like that, and onward.
 - 9 Q. Shortly before your acquisition of AOG?
 - 10 A. It may have been.
 - 11 Q. Now, you've testified, as had Mr Fraser, that you had no
 - 12 plans for fracking in Slovakia; correct?
 - 13 A. We had no plans for any what is called unconventional
 - 14 activities, whatsoever.
 - 15 Q. And would you agree with me, sir, that there was nothing
 - in your licence agreements or any other documentation
 - 17 with Slovakia that would have precluded your use of
 - 18 those activities?
 - 19 A. That's true.
 - 20 Q. And when you arrived in Slovakia, a lot of activist
 - 21 attention was focused on the question of whether that
 - 22 was your plan for Slovakia; correct?
 - 23 A. Well, to be clear, there were only three or four
 - 24 activists that were asking any questions of us at all.
 - 25 And we made it clear every single time that there was

Page 175

- 16:02 1 mostly on the aspects of horizontal drilling and
 - 2 fracking and horizontal wells.
 - 3 Q. Right. And by that point in your career that was really
 - 4 your primary area of expertise. That's not to take away
 - 5 anything from your other knowledge, but that's where you
 - 6 had been focusing for some time?
 - 7 A. I had a long career in conventional -- now it's called
 - 8 conventional -- vertical well drilling, that was also
 - 9 very successful. But certainly the horizontal and
 - 10 fracking was an important part of my career, and
 - an important aspect of why I went to Europe.
 - 12 Q. And do you recall both in the United States and in
 - 13 Europe that there was a fair amount of controversy from
 - 14 environmental groups, for example, around fracking?
 - 15 A. Yes, I do.
 - 16 Q. And you had a fair amount of exposure to environmental
 - groups, protest activities, litigation. You'd had that
 - 18 rodeo too?
 - 19 A. No, sir, I hadn't.
 - 20 Q. You had not?
 - 21 A. No.
 - 22 Q. So had any of the projects you'd been involved with had
 - any controversy associated with them?
 - 24 A. "Controversy" is a very broad word. If you mean on the
 - scale of demonstrations, I don't believe so, no.

Page 174

- 16:06 1 not only no intention on our part, but there was no
 - 2 reservoir for which that technology would be applied.
 - 3 Q. Now, you have made the statement that there were three
 - 4 or four activists that you were dealing with; did I hear
 - 5 that right?
 - 6 A. As far as people that we were talking -- that I was
 - 7 talking to, at town hall meetings, things like that, it
 - 8 was really just two or three, maybe four.
 - 9 Q. Do you remember a press conference that was held in
 - 10 Prešov?
 - 11 A. I do.
 - 12 Q. And there was quite a large number of people there,
 - wasn't there?
 - 14 A. I'm sorry, it was a room full of press, if that's what
 - 15 you mean?
 - 16 MR DRYMER: Are they people?!
 - 17 A. Yes, sir. I'm sorry! I'm sorry, yes, you're right.
 - 18 MR ALEXANDER: That was fairly early on in your work in
 - 19 Slovakia; correct?
 - 20 A. I don't recall that being early on. Certainly we had --
 - well, it was late 2015, I believe? Something like that.
 - 22 Q. Do you recall the petition activity undertaken, for
 - 23 example, in Smilno?
 - 24 A. I remember hearing about it. Alex was responsible for
 - that. So I would hear from him, but I wasn't actively

16:08 1 involved in that.

- Q. Mr Lewis, you and I have the pleasure, as do all of the 2
- 3 professionals in this room, of working and living in
- 4 democratic societies. Correct?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. And you accept that in democratic societies,
- 7 particularly in the EU, the state is expected to make
- 8 room for, tolerate, even protect the right of protest.
- 9 A. I can't comment on that. I don't know.
- 10 Q. Well, certainly in the United States you're familiar
- 11 with protests from time to time?
- 12 A. I am, but I have never looked into the legality of it,
- 13
- 14 Q. Well, you remember hearing about the first amendment?
- 15 A. Of course, yes.
- 16 Q. The right to free speech, assembly, and the right to
- 17 petition the government?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You wouldn't be surprised to know that there are 19
- comparable protections in the EU legal order, would you? 20
- 21 A. I would not be surprised.
- 22 Q. And you accept the fact that the state cannot take any
- 23 action to stop people from exercising those rights?
- 24 A. Again, this is not something that I can comment on.
- 25 I don't feel comfortable.

Page 177

- 16:11 1 A. Yes, sir. Yes, thank you for clarifying.
 - MR DRYMER: Well, that's my question. I'm not sure what
 - 3 Mr Alexander wanted, but that's what I'm interested in.
 - 4
 - 5 MR ALEXANDER: Well, thank you, because you said it much
 - better than I did. That's what I was trying to get to.
 - MR DRYMER: I don't think so, but thank you.
 - MR ALEXANDER: Before you purchased AOG, you met with the
 - folks at San Leon?
 - 10 A I did
 - Q. And were they forthright in explaining to you what their 11
 - 12 perception was of the environment in the various
 - 13 locations where you planned projects?
 - 14 A. In hindsight, no.
 - 15 Q. Did you discuss with them whether there were any
 - organised environmental groups?
 - Does the name VLK ring any bells? 17
 - 18 A. That name did -- I did not know that name at the time.
 - 19 I learned that later. I don't believe they disclosed
 - 20 anything of the sort, as I was looking into that
 - 2.1 project.
 - 22 Q. Did you inquire about anything like that?
 - 23 A. I inquired about their experience working with the
 - 24 Ministry, their experience running the seismic, and they
 - told me they had never had a problem. So to that

Page 179

- 16:10 1 Q. I don't think there's any controversy about that right
 - in this case, but I just wanted to make sure that you
 - 3 appreciated that there is a right for citizens to
 - 4 organise and be heard on matters of public interest; you
 - understand that? 5
 - 6 A. I would assume that's the case.
 - 7 Q. And having done business in the EU, you are, of course,
 - 8 familiar with the EU legal order's tolerance for public
 - participation in the environmental impact assessment
 - 10 process. You're not a stranger to that, are you?
 - 11 A. Although I bore the brunt of that activity, I am no
 - 12 expert in the process itself.
 - 13 Q. Do you accept for purposes of our discussion that the EU
 - 14 and Slovak legal order accept the right of citizens to
 - 15 be heard during that process?
 - 16 A. Again, I can't comment. That's not something I am
 - 17 an expert on at all.
 - 18 MR DRYMER: Whatever may have been the legal situation --
 - 19 nobody's asking you whether you have an appreciation as
 - 20 a lawyer or a constitutional scholar, or professor of
 - 21 international law -- when you invested, did you
 - understand that it was possible that there might be 23 community expressions of positions around the location
 - 24 of your wells, around the fact that you were drilling at
 - 25 all for oil?

Page 178

- 16:13 1 extent, I was comfortable.
 - 2 Q. And how long after -- so, let's be clear. I just want
 - 3 to make sure. Your testimony is that before you
 - 4 invested you had no understanding of organised
 - 5 environmental groups active in the area?
 - 6 A. I had no knowledge of specific organised groups, if
 - 7 that's what you're asking?
 - 8 Q. Okay.
 - 9 A. No, I did not.
 - Q. What about the general presence of groups or people of
 - 11 environmental interest -- environmental causes; were you
 - 12 aware of that?
 - 13 A. I am not sure what scope we're talking about. Inside
 - 14 Slovakia? Inside that area?
 - Q. In the area of your concessions.
 - 16 A. Please ask the question again?
 - Q. Before you invested --17
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. -- did you have any understanding of whether there were
 - 20 active environmental groups in the areas of your
 - 21 concession who might have interest in your plans?
 - 22 A. I don't believe I did.
 - Q. And tell us if you would, please, whether that's the
 - 24 kind of inquiry you would ordinarily make before
 - 25 investing in a new geographic area?

Page 180

49 (Pages 177 to 180)

22

- 16:15 1 A. I thought that the questions I had asked about, had they
 - 2 had any problems working through the seismic, which is
 - 3 quite intensive on the ground, they would have had to
 - 4 relate with a lot of people, and the fact that that
 - 5 operation went smoothly, that they didn't come forward
 - 6 with any difficulties there, and then had gotten ready
 - 7 to drill a well and hadn't run into problems there, told
 - 8 me that it wasn't a problem there. That's really all
 - 9 I knew at the time.
 - 10 MR DRYMER: I don't want to interrupt again, but I'm going
 - 11 to ask a similar question to what I asked a moment ago,
 - because I'm not sure if you are answering a question
 - 13 regarding an awareness of specific groups and specific
 - protests, or whether you're saying that you never
 - 15 contemplated the possibility that members of the
 - 16 community might express concerns related to
 - 17 environmental issues at your concession sites.
 - 18 A. Certainly I considered it a possibility. With all of
 - 19 the noise around the oil business at that time, I wanted
 - 20 to make sure that when we went into this project, that
 - 21 we took a proactive view as to what we were doing and
 - what our goals were, what our intentions were, so we
 - 23 didn't have the kind of demonstrations that ultimately
 - 24 we did have. Thank you.
 - 25 MR ALEXANDER: You are familiar generally with the events of

- 16:18 1 A. Personally, I think that's it. I may have asked Marek
 - 2 Jackiewicz, another geologist that worked for us during
 - 3 that time. But I knew he couldn't because he has also
 - 4 a full-time job that would have prevented him to.
 - 5 I think that's it.
 - 6 Q. Did you explore with them whether they could get leave
 - 7 for a couple of days to travel or appear by video? Did
 - 8 you explore any of those options with them?
 - 9 A. No. sir. I did not.
 - 10 Q. Did you -- do you know whether any of your other
 - colleagues asked if, for example did Mr Fraser ask if
 - someone could come and testify?
 - 13 A. I know that he called Stanislav Benada, who was
 - unwilling to come. I don't recall if there was anyone
 - 15 else.
 - 16 Q. Did he tell you whether he'd explored with Mr Benada the
 - 17 possibility of travel for a couple of days,
 - reimbursement for costs, or appearing by video?
 - 19 A. Yes, he did.
 - 20 Q. And what did Mr Benada say?
 - 21 A. He had no interest.
 - 22 MR DRYMER: May I ask a question, counsel? Did you put
 - 23 those questions to Mr Fraser himself, that specific
 - 24 question?
 - 25 MR ALEXANDER: With respect to Benada, yes.

Page 183

- 16:16 1 2016 at Smilno, are you not?
 - 2 A. Most of them, yes.
 - 3 Q. And you talked about them in your witness statement over
 - 4 several pages. In most of those reports, you're
 - 5 reporting on information you learned from your
 - 6 colleagues on the ground in Slovakia; is that fair?
 - 7 A. Much of this, yes.
 - 8 Q. And did you, in connection with this arbitration, ask
 - 9 any of these colleagues if they would be available to
 - 10 come testify about the events that they observed on
 - 11 a first-hand basis?
 - 12 A. Yes, I did.
 - 13 Q. And to whom did you speak?
 - 14 A. Ron Crow, Maciej Karabin.
 - 15 Q. I'm just interested, not in what they would have said or
 - what you even talked about, but did you ask them, did
 - 17 you ask Mr Crow if he could come?
 - 18 A. I asked him if he was available to do so if needed.
 - 19 Q. And did you ask Mr Karabin?
 - 20 A. The same question, yes.
 - 21 Q. And did they both say yes, they would be willing to come
 - 22 if needed?
 - 23 A. Ron said yes, Maciej said probably not, because he has
 - a full-time job that would have conflicted.
 - 25 Q. Who else did you ask that question to?

Page 182

- $16{:}20\quad 1\quad MR\ DRYMER:\ Right.\ I'm\ not\ sure\ I\ recall\ these\ specifics.$
 - 2 The record is what it is. I just want to be clear.
 - 3 I just wondered whether you're asking about details --
 - 4 MR ALEXANDER: You're correct. I did not ask about those
 - 5 details.
 - 6 MR DRYMER: Right. So I suggest that he would have been the
 - 7 better witness to get that evidence from about his
 - 8 conversation with Mr Benada.
 - 9 But, anyway, that is what it is.
 - 10 MR ALEXANDER: So in 2016 over the course of that year, and
 - 11 having spent a lot of time with Mr Fraser on it I don't
 - intend to replough the ground, but you were aware
 - generally that there were protests --
 - 14 A. Yes.
 - 15 Q. -- at Smilno? You were aware there was litigation going
 - 16 on
 - 17 A. Yes.
 - 18 Q. And you were aware that there were interactions with the
 - 9 police where people were making complaints to the police
 - about your activities and vice versa?
 - 21 A. Yes.
 - 22 Q. And at the end of 2016 you had suffered a number of
 - 23 adverse rulings from -- in litigation; is that true?
 - 24 A. A number of them. I'm aware -- from litigation I think
 - 25 there's only one that I'm aware of.

- 16:22 1 Q. You have before you a demonstrative exhibit that shows
 - 2 a timeline; do you see that there, sir?
 - 3 A. Yes, sir.
 - 4 Q. Were you aware that an injunction had been obtained by
 - 5 Ms Varjanová and had been affirmed by the Court of
 - 6 Appeals? Were you aware of that?
 - 7 A. I was aware of the injunction, yes.
 - 8 Q. Were you aware that it was in place from February of
 - 9 2016 through the end of the year and beyond?
 - 10 A. At the time I really let Alex handle that. I wasn't
 - 11 keeping track of that. I knew that it had happened, but
 - 12 I did not know whether it was still active or not.
 - 13 Q. If you had known that AOG was entering the access road
 - in breach of an injunction, as CEO would you have put
 - 15 a stop to that?
 - 16 A. I can't just answer that "yes" or "no". I would have to
 - 17 know the facts behind the situation. I mean, on the
 - 18 surface of it, it sounds pretty cut and dried. But
 - 19 I would have to understand what was behind it all.
 - 20 Q. What's the cut-and-dried answer to the question whether
 - 21 you would have approved of violations of an injunction?
 - 22 A. Provided there are no extenuating circumstances, I would
 - obviously want to obey the law.
 - 24 Q. Were you aware that AOG had asserted that the road in
 - 25 question was a public special purpose road, and that

- 16:26 1 a bell?
 - 2 A. That looks correct.
 - 3 Q. And then there was some improvement through the balance
 - 4 of that year; do you see that?
 - 5 A. I see that the oil price stabilised around \$50, which
 - 6 was the most important aspect of it, yes.
 - 7 Q. Now, was the price level in 2016 impacting at all your
 - 8 ability to attract external investors?
 - 9 A. I'm sure.
 - 10 Q. And do you think if prospective investors had conducted
 - an appropriate due diligence process and learned that
 - 12 you had been enjoined from accessing drilling sites, and
 - 13 had unsuccessfully litigated your theories of access to
 - the drilling site, do you think that would have
 - an impact on investors?
 - 16 A. I... that's a lot of speculation.
 - 17 Q. No, it's actually not, Mr Lewis. The fact that those
 - injunctions were in place, and that you did not have
 - 19 success in establishing any legal entitlement to the
 - 20 access road, that's not in -- that evidence is before
 - 21 this Tribunal. So let's assume that's the case.
 - 22 Do you think if investors had asked you or
 - 23 Mr Fraser, "How are things going with that protest group
 - I hear you've been working with?", do you think that the
 - 25 news of those injunctions would have impacted potential

Page 187

- 16:24 1 that statutory basis was an attempt to justify its use
 - 2 of the road? Were you aware of any of that?
 - 3 A. I know I was told that it was a public road and that we
 - 4 were able to use it, and that was what our counsel told
 - 5 me. So that's what I relied upon.
 - 6 Q. Were you told that up until December of 2016, AOG and
 - 7 its subsidiaries had never taken any legal action
 - 8 affirmatively to stop protester blockings of the access
 - 9 road?
 - 10 A. No.
 - 11 Q. Were you aware that litigation was filed in December
 - and January of 2017 on behalf of both AOG and
 - 13 a subsidiary called Cesty Smilno, but that the
 - 14 applications for injunction were refused in both cases;
 - were you aware of that?
 - 16 A. Not specifically. I knew that Cesty Smilno existed;
 - that Alex was investigating that as an option to being
 - able to use the road that the protesters were blocking.
 - 19 But, again, I did not get into the details of that.
 - 20 Q. So in that same period of time, if we look at C-41,
 - 21 which I think you still have before you, it's the graph
 - of the -- this is your exhibit. Do you see that there?
 - So if we look at 2016, the period of 2016, that
 - appears, until the pandemic, it looks like the first
 - quarter of 2016 is as low as it got; does that ring

Page 186

- 16:28 1 investors in?
 - 2 A. I think that any investor is going to trust that the
 - 3 operator is doing whatever is necessary to remedy the
 - 4 situation and would have assumed that was the case, as
 - 5 I did with Alex. Things like that happen, you deal with
 - 6 them, you fix them and you move on, and most investors
 - that would be interested in a project like this would
 - 8 understand that those things happen.
 - 9 Q. And they'd be more interested in the technical merit of the project?
 - 11 A. I'm not sure what you're asking me. I'm sorry.
 - 12 Q. Well, it's not a sophisticated question, because I'm not
 - 13 an oil guy. But I assume investors know something about
 - 14 the business, and what they're really interested in is
 - the technical merit of the prospect, a picture for the
 - 16 project?
 - 17 A. Well, most investors are actually interested in the
 - 18 financial merit, rather than the technical. The
 - 19 technical needs to be right so that they can rely on the
 - 20 financial
 - 21 Q. Right. Okay. And that's the sense in which the low oil
 - 22 price can have impact on their perception of the
 - 23 financial merit.
 - 24 A. Yes, true.
 - 25 Q. Yes, okay.

Page 188

51 (Pages 185 to 188)

16:30	MR DRYMER: Wouldn't they be interested in a very	16:32 1 MR DRYMER: Fair enough.
2	unsophisticated question: whether or not you can	2 A. I hope that answers your question.
3	actually get access to the location where you say	3 MR DRYMER: Thank you. Thank you.
4	there's a lot of oil at a good price?	4 MR ALEXANDER: Mr Lewis, do you remember, towards the end of
:	A. Certainly. Certainly, and as I had every expectation	5 the fourth quarter of 2016 and going into 2017, having
(that the problem would be resolved when Alex first told	6 the discussion about the possibility of talking to the
,	me about it.	7 key activists to see if you could find any common ground
8	MR DRYMER: Remind me again when I wanted to call him	8 with them?
9		9 A. I remember that that's what Alex suggested. At that
1		point in time, I was getting pretty fed up. But he
1		believed he could make some headway by doing that.
1:		12 Q. And if you turn now to paragraph 83 on page 29 of your
1:		13 witness statement.
1.		14 A. Yes, sir.
1:		15 Q. Third line down, towards the middle of the page:
1		16 "I agreed with Alex Fraser that it seemed that we
1		17 had little choice"
1		18 Let me just stop there for a second.
1:		19 A. I'm sorry, I've got to stop you: which paragraph,
2	·	20 please?
2		21 Q. It's you see the page 29?
2:		22 A. Yes.
2		23 Q. Three lines down:
2		24 "I agreed with Alex Fraser"
2.		25 A. Yes, sir.
	A. Right.	2.5 A. 100, SH.
	D 100	
	Page 189	Page 191
	Page 189	Page 191
	rage 189	Page 191
16:31	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to
16:31	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any
	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them."
2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any
2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them."
3	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that?
2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir.
2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that?
2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir.
2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant?
	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant.
3 3 4 3 9 10	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant?
2 3 4 3 4 4 3 4 4 4 1 1	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that?	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to
2 2 3 3 3 4 3 4 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had
2 2 3 3 3 3 3 1 1 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's
2 2 3 3 4 3 3 4 9 1 1 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: — in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that …? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust
1 1 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told had they been told that two levels of courts	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust 15 the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings
1 1 1 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told had they been told that two levels of courts had said: you cannot access the Smilno site unless the	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust 15 the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings 16 on numerous occasions, there was no interest seen in
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told had they been told that two levels of courts had said: you cannot access the Smilno site unless the people living there allow you?	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust 15 the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings 16 on numerous occasions, there was no interest seen in 17 them of what the truth was, or all they wanted was
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told had they been told that two levels of courts had said: you cannot access the Smilno site unless the people living there allow you? A. Again, I would have wanted to know some more background	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust 15 the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings 16 on numerous occasions, there was no interest seen in 17 them of what the truth was, or all they wanted was 18 to stir up the public, so I didn't see how this would
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	MR DRYMER: — in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told — had they been told — that two levels of courts had said: you cannot access the Smilno site unless the people living there allow you? A. Again, I would have wanted to know some more background to the issue, because I did not. I would certainly have	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to talk to the key activists to see if we could find any common ground with them." Do you see that? A. Yes, sir. Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? A. Yes, sir. Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. Were you reluctant? A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings on numerous occasions, there was no interest seen in them of what the truth was, or all they wanted was to stir up the public, so I didn't see how this would lead anywhere different than that.
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told had they been told that two levels of courts had said: you cannot access the Smilno site unless the people living there allow you? A. Again, I would have wanted to know some more background to the issue, because I did not. I would certainly have told them it existed, but at the same time I would have	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust 15 the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings 16 on numerous occasions, there was no interest seen in 17 them of what the truth was, or all they wanted was 18 to stir up the public, so I didn't see how this would 19 lead anywhere different than that. 20 But nevertheless, because Alex felt that way,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told had they been told that two levels of courts had said: you cannot access the Smilno site unless the people living there allow you? A. Again, I would have wanted to know some more background to the issue, because I did not. I would certainly have told them it existed, but at the same time I would have had an expectation of a solution before I told them.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust 15 the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings 16 on numerous occasions, there was no interest seen in 17 them of what the truth was, or all they wanted was 18 to stir up the public, so I didn't see how this would 19 lead anywhere different than that. 20 But nevertheless, because Alex felt that way, 21 I wanted to support him in that effort. 22 Q. And you were soon pleasantly surprised by the results of
1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	MR DRYMER: in the oil and gas business. It's not mine either, but I have a completely different approach. I'm like the guy who watches the guys ride the bull. You're riding the bull. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: I understand that investors by their nature hope and expect that the operator will overcome problems. But surely there are certain problems which an investor can understand may be insurmountable. There might be laws or regulations in place that are insurmountable and can't simply be overcome even by the most savvy operator. Is that? A. That's absolutely correct. Thank you. MR DRYMER: What's your sense about whether the investors you were speaking to may have thought, had they been told had they been told that two levels of courts had said: you cannot access the Smilno site unless the people living there allow you? A. Again, I would have wanted to know some more background to the issue, because I did not. I would certainly have told them it existed, but at the same time I would have had an expectation of a solution before I told them. MR DRYMER: Okay.	16:34 1 Q. " that it seemed that we had little choice but to 2 talk to the key activists to see if we could find any 3 common ground with them." 4 Do you see that? 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Q. And you confirmed that. You agreed with that? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. So the phrase "it seemed that we had little choice" sort 9 of intrigued me. It sounded like you were reluctant. 10 Were you reluctant? 11 A. I was to the point of wondering whether it was time to 12 exit the programme, because of all the hurdles that had 13 come up, and this seemed the last possibility, and it's 14 not something that I thought would work. I didn't trust 15 the activists at all. They had disrupted our meetings 16 on numerous occasions, there was no interest seen in 17 them of what the truth was, or all they wanted was 18 to stir up the public, so I didn't see how this would 19 lead anywhere different than that. 20 But nevertheless, because Alex felt that way, 21 I wanted to support him in that effort. 22 Q. And you were soon pleasantly surprised by the results of

25

25

solution either.

Page 190

introduction of the requirement for an EIA was something

16:35 1 that I did r	not ever think we could get through.	16:39 1	A. Oh, I didn't realise I was.
2 Q. So you w	vere concerned about the introduction of the	2	Because the activists, to me, had been so
3 requirement	nt for an EIA?	3	unreasonable. When people got unreasonable, I guess
4 A. I was ver	y concerned, yes.	4	that's the term that I used.
5 Q. Alright.	So let's look, if you would, please, at	5	People that
6 Exhibit R-	-	6	PROFESSOR SANDS: So it does have a pejorative element?
7 I unders	stand this to be an email from Mr Fraser	7	A. It does for me, yes, sir. Because
8 dated 5 Fe	bruary 2017, with a long list of addressees.	8	PROFESSOR SANDS: And what are the characteristics of
	f we could trouble you just briefly to ask you	9	an activist? What makes someone unreasonable?
	the roles of each of these people?	10	MR DRYMER: Don't say he has a beard!
	s our PR person out of, I believe, Bratislava.	11	PROFESSOR SANDS: Or that he cares about the environment.
	Bacová. I don't think I know Andrea.	12	A. It is I mean, anybody that cares about the
	a had attended a meeting with the minister	13	environment is I mean, I love talking about the
	I think she was a lawyer. Viktor certainly	14	environment, because we do so much to protect it and
15 was.	, , ,	15	I'm so interested in it myself.
	ir Miškovcík. I feel like I should know	16	It's the people that really don't care what your
	but it's not coming to me.	17	answer is, they're just there to make noise and get
	n Matej Sýkora had also been an attorney for	18	angry and stir people up that are the problem for me,
19 us, a lawye		19	and that's what I I term those as activists.
	CCs were to Mr Benada, he was in a management	20	PROFESSOR SANDS: So there's a sense that they don't have
	vakia on the ground; correct?	21	a genuine commitment to the cause they espouse, or, in
	d us a great deal, yes.	22	the case of Ms Varjanová, who seems to have been
	s his actual title; do you remember?	23	a particularly a bee in the bonnet for your side of
	consultant. I don't know that he ever had	24	things, what's the problem with her? She lives there.
25 a title per s		25	A. I'm sorry?
	Page 193		Page 195
16:20 1 0 11:-14 0-	-1.1 9 W-!1 41 4 9	16.40 1	DDOEEGGOD GANDG GL 1' 4
	uld you go on? We're almost through there?	16:40 1	PROFESSOR SANDS: She lives there.
2 A. Imelus was	an engineer who did work for us.	2	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the
2 A. Imelus was3 Peter Zdina	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't	2 3	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was
2 A. Imelus was3 Peter Zdina4 remember Pe	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter.	2 3 4	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of G	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't tter. course I remember, he worked for us as	2 3 4 5	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdin: 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as nd engineer.	2 3 4 5 6	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdin: 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion.
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do.	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdin: 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of of 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate?
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local.	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't eter. course I remember, he worked for us as nd engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ster. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes.
A. Imelus was Peter Zdina remember Pe Maciej of G a geologist ar Q. Now, the su who Ferko is A. Yes, I do. Q. Who was he A. A local. Q. Was he an a A. I try not to geo	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as nd engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know? ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you.
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to co 14 probably was	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't teer. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to co 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as nd engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he characterise Can I just ask, what do you mean by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later.
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of G 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to G 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"?	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ster. course I remember, he worked for us as and engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he standard to you mean by characterise Can I just ask, what do you mean by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room
A. Imelus was Peter Zdina remember Pe Maciej of G a geologist ar Q. Now, the su who Ferko is A. Yes, I do. Q. Who was he A. A local. Q. Was he an a A. I try not to G probably was PROFESSOR S "an activist"? A. I'm sorry, ye	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ster. course I remember, he worked for us as and engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know? ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he s. SANDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by eah, that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's
A. Imelus was Peter Zdina remember Pe Maciej of G a geologist ar Q. Now, the su who Ferko is A. Yes, I do. Q. Who was he A. A local. Q. Was he an a A. I try not to G probably was PROFESSOR S "an activist"? A. I'm sorry, ye	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know? ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he s. ANDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by ceah, that's SANDS: It has a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of G 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to c 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, yo 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know? ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he d. ANDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by eah, that's SANDS: It has a very y a lot.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings.
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of G 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to G 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, ye 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu 20 PROFESSOR S	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as nd engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he chanDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by cah, that's chanDS: It has a very y a lot. chanDS: It has a rather pejorative tone?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings. But when you say that Ms Varjanová, by way of
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to co 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, ye 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu 20 PROFESSOR S 21 A. I'm sorry, ye	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as nd engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he characterise him as that, but I suppose he characterise him as that, what do you mean by cah, that's can I just ask, what do you mean by ala, that's can I thas a very y a lot. can I like the guy a lot.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings. But when you say that Ms Varjanová, by way of example, may have been using environmental concerns as
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to co 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, ye 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu 20 PROFESSOR S 21 A. I'm sorry, ye	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as nd engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he chanDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by cah, that's chanDS: It has a very y a lot. chanDS: It has a rather pejorative tone?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings. But when you say that Ms Varjanová, by way of example, may have been using environmental concerns as a pretext, or to put it in Professor Sands' words, may
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of G 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to G 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, ye 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu 20 PROFESSOR S 21 A. I'm sorry, ye 22 PROFESSOR S	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know? ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he d. SANDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by eah, that's SANDS: It has a very y a lot. SANDS: It has a rather pejorative tone? eah, I like the guy a lot. SANDS: And I am just wondering why you keep using	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings. But when you say that Ms Varjanová, by way of example, may have been using environmental concerns as a pretext, or to put it in Professor Sands' words, may not have actually felt an adherence to the views that
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to c 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, ye 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu 20 PROFESSOR S 21 A. I'm sorry, ye 22 PROFESSOR S 23 that phrase? 24 A. Which phrase	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know? ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he d. SANDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by eah, that's SANDS: It has a very y a lot. SANDS: It has a rather pejorative tone? eah, I like the guy a lot. SANDS: And I am just wondering why you keep using	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings. But when you say that Ms Varjanová, by way of example, may have been using environmental concerns as a pretext, or to put it in Professor Sands' words, may
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to c 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, ye 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu 20 PROFESSOR S 21 A. I'm sorry, ye 22 PROFESSOR S 23 that phrase? 24 A. Which phrase	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he characterise him as that, but I suppose he chanDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by ceah, that's GANDS: It has a very y a lot. GANDS: It has a rather pejorative tone? cah, I like the guy a lot. GANDS: And I am just wondering why you keep using see, I'm sorry?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings. But when you say that Ms Varjanová, by way of example, may have been using environmental concerns as a pretext, or to put it in Professor Sands' words, may not have actually felt an adherence to the views that she's expounding, and she told you just to go home, are
2 A. Imelus was 3 Peter Zdina 4 remember Pe 5 Maciej of 6 6 a geologist ar 7 Q. Now, the su 8 who Ferko is 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Who was he 11 A. A local. 12 Q. Was he an a 13 A. I try not to c 14 probably was 15 PROFESSOR S 16 "an activist"? 17 A. I'm sorry, ye 18 PROFESSOR S 19 A. I like the gu 20 PROFESSOR S 21 A. I'm sorry, ye 22 PROFESSOR S 23 that phrase? 24 A. Which phrase	an engineer who did work for us. ak. Sorry, it's been too long, I don't ter. course I remember, he worked for us as ad engineer. bject is "Meeting with Ferko". Do you know ? ctivist? characterise him as that, but I suppose he characterise him as that, but I suppose he chanDS: Can I just ask, what do you mean by ceah, that's GANDS: It has a very y a lot. GANDS: It has a rather pejorative tone? cah, I like the guy a lot. GANDS: And I am just wondering why you keep using see, I'm sorry?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes, and on numerous occasions I tried to discuss the project with her, and all she would ever say to me was "Go home". There was no discussing with her. So I mean, I respect that she didn't want me there, but to stir people up on the basis that we were somehow polluting the water, no. That was just a means to her end, in my opinion. PROFESSOR SANDS: And so was her expression of view illegitimate? A. I think she mischaracterised our operations on several occasions, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: Thank you. MR DRYMER: Let me follow up on that if I may. By doing that now I won't come back to it later. An expression I suggest most people in the room understand is NIMBY, "not in my back yard". It's an expression that I haven't read anywhere in any of the pleadings. But when you say that Ms Varjanová, by way of example, may have been using environmental concerns as a pretext, or to put it in Professor Sands' words, may not have actually felt an adherence to the views that she's expounding, and she told you just to go home, are

16:42 1	village? I mean, what motivation do you ascribe to her?	16:45 1	an unfortunate thing that oilfield machinery is
10.42 1	A. She owned a ski resort 2 kilometres away, rather close,	2	unsightly, no matter how you dress it up.
3	and she had a ski resort with a spa pool there, and some	3	But had she gone about it, look, I that that's
		4	- I
4	lodging. So of course her tourist trade, I'm sure she felt that it would be impacted by our operations. At		all it was, I'd have been: fine, I'm sorry, you know,
5	* * *	5	we'll do what we can to help you. And we probably would
6	least that's the way I explained it to myself. Because	6	have. I do a lot of things in communities when I drill
7	that's the only thing that makes sense to me.	7	and complete wells. I want people to be happy, and us
8	But the other aspect of that is the publicity that	8	to be part of that community.
9	would come from her activities couldn't hurt the ski	9	But she never gave us a chance to go there, so
10	resort either. So but those are purely my opinions.	10	PROFESSOR SANDS: Because she just didn't want you there.
11	MR DRYMER: Well, I'm only asking your opinion, of course.	11	A. She just did not want us there. Yes, sir.
12	And what about the activists who come from other	12	MR ALEXANDER: Mr Lewis, my colleagues have reminded me I am
13	villages?	13	taking too much time. So I'm going to try to speed up.
14	A. I'm sorry, what's the question?	14	MR DRYMER: It's not entirely your fault.
15	MR DRYMER: Well, excuse me, what motivated activists; what	15	MR ALEXANDER: Well, no, no, but I'm going to try to speed
16	about the people that you would consider activists that	16	up so we might be able to finish with you this evening.
17	didn't live right next to the Smilno site; what's your	17	A. Yes, sir.
18	opinion about their motivations for doing so?	18	Q. So with that goal in mind, I appreciate your succinct
19	A. Again, when I tried to address their supposed concerns,	19	answer to a few questions here.
20	they talked over my answers. They weren't the least bit	20	Take a look again at R-117. You've seen this
21	interested in the facts. In our town meetings, when we	21	before. It was you were copied on it, and some of
22	would talk about the chemistry and the drilling mud,	22	the follow-on correspondence. Did you have a chance to
23	we'd get three words out and they would talk over us.	23	look at it in preparing for your testimony here today?
24	I mean, they just never had given us any inkling that	24	A. I have seen this, yes.
25	they were really there to address environmental	25	Q. And the first thing Mr Fraser writes:
			P 400
	Page 197		Page 199
16:44 1	concerns. There was something political going on, in my	16:47 1	"This meeting seems to have been surprisingly
16:44 1 2	concerns. There was something political going on, in my opinion. That's the only way I can explain it.	16:47 1 2	"This meeting seems to have been surprisingly productive."
2	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it.	2	productive."
2 3	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you.	2 3	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there
2 3 4	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the	2 3 4	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised
2 3 4 5	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape	2 3 4 5	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did
2 3 4 5 6	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski	2 3 4 5 6	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised?
2 3 4 5 6 7	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting	2 3 4 5 6 7	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging admiration for her? That actually, here is someone who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been disruptive and problematic.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging admiration for her? That actually, here is someone who is a local resident, who we were told owned part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been disruptive and problematic. Q. Alright.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging admiration for her? That actually, here is someone who is a local resident, who we were told owned part of the land, had a business, she was defending her interests.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been disruptive and problematic. Q. Alright. And you I don't mean to diminish any of this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging admiration for her? That actually, here is someone who is a local resident, who we were told owned part of the land, had a business, she was defending her interests. What's wrong with that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been disruptive and problematic. Q. Alright. And you I don't mean to diminish any of this email, I think it's all important, but in the interests
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging admiration for her? That actually, here is someone who is a local resident, who we were told owned part of the land, had a business, she was defending her interests. What's wrong with that? A. Again, if she had done that honestly, I would have no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been disruptive and problematic. Q. Alright. And you I don't mean to diminish any of this email, I think it's all important, but in the interests of time I am going to move on quickly to the comment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging admiration for her? That actually, here is someone who is a local resident, who we were told owned part of the land, had a business, she was defending her interests. What's wrong with that? A. Again, if she had done that honestly, I would have no problem with that, and I addressed that in many other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been disruptive and problematic. Q. Alright. And you I don't mean to diminish any of this email, I think it's all important, but in the interests of time I am going to move on quickly to the comment about Mr Lukacs who:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	opinion. That's the only way I can explain it. MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you. PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to be clear about that, why isn't the question of environmental amenity and landscape an environmental concern? I mean, if you ran a ski resort, would you feel relaxed about someone putting an oil rig right outside your ski resort? A. No, and I I can sympathise with her, I absolutely can. I know that the impact of what we were doing would not have affected much of the scenery, but it would have to some extent, of course. So yes, I can understand her position. What I take issue with is the means that she used to address that. It was just not truthful. PROFESSOR SANDS: Parking her car. A. Well, that too, yes. PROFESSOR SANDS: But don't you have a sort of grudging admiration for her? That actually, here is someone who is a local resident, who we were told owned part of the land, had a business, she was defending her interests. What's wrong with that? A. Again, if she had done that honestly, I would have no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	productive." And his sentence after, indicating who was there well, first of all, did you learn why he was surprised that Lukacs, Sabo and Barthus from VLK showed up? Did you understand why he was surprised? A. I think he had arranged the meeting with Ferko and Andrejco, and the fact that they showed up was the surprise. Q. And you knew by this point that VLK was an environmental activist group? A. Oh, yes, sir. Q. And did you share his view that it was a positive sign that they had showed up and wanted to talk about their concerns? A. No, sir. I did not. Q. You did not think that was positive? A. No, because their actions at too many locations had been disruptive and problematic. Q. Alright. And you I don't mean to diminish any of this email, I think it's all important, but in the interests of time I am going to move on quickly to the comment

about environmental impact but more about local politics and acceptance having previously had doubts about whether to attend the meeting, having heard the discussion he was glad he [did]." Did that give you any hope that there might be something positive come out of this? A. I don't believe so. The man had been so disingenuous so many times, I really did not trust it. Q. And as you read on further, Mr Fraser identified that: "The most important element in promoting trust would be to comply voluntarily with the preliminary environmental procedure for all wells." And he said that was "doable"; do you see that? A. Yes. Q. I have gathered from your prior answers that that did not probably thrill you either? A. It did not. Q. Did you let Mr Fraser know that you did not approve of that? A. Yes, I did. Excuse me, it wasn't that I didn't approve; I just did not like it. Q. Alright. Were you willing to support it? A. To an extent, yes. Q. But only to an extent? A. Yes, sir. Page 201	16:51 1 Smilno, and in the latter part of these meetings that 2 you had unsuccessfully applied for an injunction in your 3 own interests. I'll represent that to you. 4 In view of that, you really didn't have any choice 5 but to meet with them; wouldn't that be fair to say? 6 A. That's the way Alex viewed it, and the way he explained 7 it to me that made sense, yes. 8 Q. And if you would look, please, at C-166. 9 A. And, if I may, certainly that wasn't the only option 10 available to us, but it seemed by far the best one at 11 the time. 12 Q. Now, C-166 is before you, and I'd like you to look at 13 the first paragraph in particular, and within that first 14 paragraph I'm particularly interested in discussing with 15 you, six lines down, the sentence that begins: 16 "On the basis that" 17 And I'll represent to you that this was a draft of 18 the press release dated February 2017. C-166. 19 A. Yes, sir. 20 Q. Do you see that language? 21 A. Yes, sir. 22 Q. And now if you would turn to 171, C-171, you will see 23 that the language I highlighted, or rather that our 24 assistant highlighted, is not in that version, 171. The 25 language to the effect that "VLK and the local community
16:49 1 Q. So, again, rushing through this, big picture, you no 2 doubt learned that further meetings were held? 3 A. Yes, sir. 4 Q. Including with Ms Varjanová? 5 A. I was not aware of that. 6 Q. Did you ever tell Mr Fraser to stop these meetings, they 7 weren't going anywhere? 8 A. Not at this time, no. 9 Q. Did you understand that Mr Fraser at one point proposed 10 the possibility of getting together, trying to find 11 common ground, listen to their concerns, and document 12 all of that in a joint press release? Did you become 13 aware of that? 14 A. I did, and Alex also expressed concern about their true 15 intent, but told me that he was willing to take the risk 16 to go along with it because it really was our last 17 opportunity. 18 Q. And in fact at that point, you were low on funding; 19 correct? 20 A. Well, the company was being funded as needed, and I was 21 funding as little as I needed to. It isn't that the 22 money wasn't there; it's just I didn't want to spend any 23 more than we had to. 24 Q. And I'll represent to you that the evidence in the case 25 is that you were still the subject of an injunction at	16:53 1 will accept the outcome without filing an objection 2 or appeal"; do you see that? 3 A. I remember Alex commenting about this and saying, that 4 takes the teeth out of it, that makes them totally 5 unaccountable. But, again he said "I don't see that we 6 have any choice", so he suggested that we go with it, 7 and I said okay. 8 Q. So would you agree, sir, that, rather than view it as 9 taking the teeth out of it, the activists were making 10 clear to you that they were going to have the right to 11 participate in the environmental impact assessment 12 process, because, after all, that was their number one 13 priority going into the discussions? 14 A. We had given them numerous opportunities to participate, 15 and in every case they caused disruption, delay for no 16 reason. I was under no pretext that this was going to 17 be any different. And Alex felt a little more 18 optimistic than I did, but it was I felt that it was 19 very doubtful that they would be willing to go along 20 with whatever we presented without causing political 21 making it a political tool instead of allowing us to 22 continue. 23 Q. It is true, isn't it, Mr Lewis, that since the date of 24 this agreement there's never been another protest at any 25 of the three sites that were involved in the

16:55 1	activists with the activists that you were meeting	16:59 1	too quickly, but these are minutes of the operating
2	with?	2	committee of 3 October 2017. You are the secretary of
3	A. I don't know the answer to that.	3	the meeting. And they're signed by all three JV
4	Q. It's also true that there's never been another road	4	partners.
5	blockage at any of the sites; were you aware of that?	5	I want to call your attention to the third paragraph
6	A. I don't know that we've tried to do anything that they	6	on page 3 and under "The Slovak law", and in particular
7	would have blocked us. So it's I guess the answer	7	the sentence that reads:
8	would be yes, on that basis.	8	"Alex said that he feels that it could be a long
9	Q. You authorised Alex to release this press release;	9	process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail."
10	correct?	10	Do you see that?
11	A. I did.	11	A. No, sir, I don't, sorry.
12	Q. And you're not aware of any document where the activists	12	Q. Okay, it's page 3, paragraph 3 at the bottom of the
13	or anybody in the community or any governmental agency	13	page.
14	forfeited it or otherwise waived their right to	14	A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I see.
15	participate in the environmental impact assessment;	15	Q. Yes, I didn't say that very clearly?
16	you're not aware of any such thing, are you?	16	A. Okay.
17	A. No, I'm not.	17	Q. Alright, and then "JKX said" and then the next
18	Q. And Alex never told you that that was the deal: that	18	sentence:
19	they weren't going to have anything to say in the	19	"Alex said that he feels that it could be a long
20	environmental impact assessment process?	20	process, but that he felt we will ultimately prevail."
21	A. No, he made it very clear that they had promised to not	21	Did you understand him to be talking about the
22	disrupt our operations going forward. But then soon	22	environmental impact assessment process?
23	thereafter started disrupting our negotiations, and	23	A. Sitting here today, I cannot tell you one way or the
24	therefore we came to the place where it was just not	24	other.
25	worth going forward anymore.	25	Q. There was a tone of some optimism in the comment; would
23	wording for ward any more.	23	Q. There was a tone of some optimism in the comment, would
	Page 205		Page 207
16:56 1	Q. Well, let's try to be a little clearer about what was	17:00 1	you agree with that?
16:56 1 2	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you	17:00 1 2	A. I would agree with that.
	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be	_	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to:
2	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate	2	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have
2 3	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed	2 3	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for
2 3 4	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate	2 3 4	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the
2 3 4 5	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed	2 3 4 5	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it."
2 3 4 5 6	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at	2 3 4 5 6	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the
2 3 4 5 6 7	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was?	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement. Q. So would you agree that none of the other governmental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed at that meeting?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement. Q. So would you agree that none of the other governmental agencies or institutional commenters on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed at that meeting? A. It is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement. Q. So would you agree that none of the other governmental agencies or institutional commenters on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed at that meeting? A. It is. Q. Right. You had concluded at that point that you were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement. Q. So would you agree that none of the other governmental agencies or institutional commenters on the environmental review process had ever made any commitment that they could not participate in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed at that meeting? A. It is. Q. Right. You had concluded at that point that you were going to wrap it up, hadn't you, sir?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement. Q. So would you agree that none of the other governmental agencies or institutional commenters on the environmental review process had ever made any commitment that they could not participate in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed at that meeting? A. It is. Q. Right. You had concluded at that point that you were going to wrap it up, hadn't you, sir? A. I was fed up, yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement. Q. So would you agree that none of the other governmental agencies or institutional commenters on the environmental review process had ever made any commitment that they could not participate in the assessment process?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed at that meeting? A. It is. Q. Right. You had concluded at that point that you were going to wrap it up, hadn't you, sir? A. I was fed up, yes, sir. MR ALEXANDER: Alright. That concludes my examination.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the subject of the agreement. I'll represent to you that there's nothing in this document that could be construed as a forfeiture of their right to participate in the assessment process, because it was a guaranteed right under the law. But they did, as I understand it, commit not to disrupt work sites, block things, that sort of thing. Does that refresh your recollection at all about what the agreement was? A. Certainly implied in the agreement was that they would be working with us on the EIA to make sure that they understood and did not see any problems with our operations. But in fact we got more of the same when we started submitting documents. They objected and disrupted and caused all sorts of difficulties that were non-rational. Which was not the spirit of the agreement. Q. So would you agree that none of the other governmental agencies or institutional commenters on the environmental review process had ever made any commitment that they could not participate in the assessment process? A. I'm aware of none.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I would agree with that. Q. And then turn, if you would, to: "Mike Lewis (Alpine) stated that AOG doesn't have the funding in-place to continue to battle, or for arbitration, suggesting that Alpine doesn't have the horsepower or appetite for it." Do you agree that's what you communicated to the JV partners at that meeting? A. Yes, it is. Q. And that you proposed to reduce your interest to 5%, and stay involved you can scroll the page for him, please. And then the final note was: "But Alpine didn't feel that it would be able to pay its share of the license fee." Is that an accurate report of your views expressed at that meeting? A. It is. Q. Right. You had concluded at that point that you were going to wrap it up, hadn't you, sir? A. I was fed up, yes, sir. MR ALEXANDER: Alright. That concludes my examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

17:01 1	addition, getting late in the day. So I suggest we take	17:18 1	you, nor Mr Fraser, had first-hand evidence?
2	a short break now, and then wrap up this examination; is	2	A. I left that up to counsel, that decision. After asking
3	that fine, Mr Tushingham?	3	him one time and relaying that to counsel, I don't think
4	MR TUSHINGHAM: Sure, of course, Madam President. I can	4	I've asked it again.
5	tell you now that I don't have any re-examination, if	5	MR DRYMER: Excuse me. Counsel, object to my question, if
6	that assists you.	6	an objection is appropriate.
7	THE PRESIDENT: Fine, that is good. But that is not yet the	7	I don't understand what you relayed to your counsel.
8	last word, in the sense that we're not all going home	8	You said you relayed it to them once and then you left
9	right now, because the Tribunal may have a few	9	it. What did you relay to them?
10	questions.	10	A. I related that Ron had said he would be available if
11	MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes, of course.	11	needed.
12	THE PRESIDENT: So, Mr Lewis, while you are on the witness	12	MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you.
13	stand you cannot communicate with anyone. But you can	13	You said something very early in your testimony
14	have a coffee or whatever you wish, of course.	14	today, which I found well, I found a lot of your
15	MR LEWIS: Yes, ma'am.	15	testimony very interesting, and all of it very helpful,
16	THE PRESIDENT: Let's take 15 minutes and resume at 5.15.	16	but this is something I hadn't quite considered nor
17	(5.02 pm)	17	taken from your written evidence.
18	(A short break)	18	You alluded to the fact that this was a difficult
19	(5.16 pm)	19	funding effort these are my words now by virtue of
20	THE PRESIDENT: So I see everybody is ready for the last	20	the fact that this was at the early stage, and it was
21	stretch of the day.	21	the funding of a project rather than a particular well.
22	Do you confirm that you have no re-direct questions?	22	A. Yes, sir.
23	MR TUSHINGHAM: I have no re-direct.	23	MR DRYMER: My apologies to all if I missed this distinction
24	THE PRESIDENT: Good. Fine.	24	in the written materials. Could you elaborate shortly
25	So do my colleagues have questions for Mr Lewis?	25	on why this was difficult, and what you mean as to this
	Page 209		Page 211
17:17 1	PROFESSOR SANDS: I don't.	17:20 1	being a particular funding effort rather than a typical
2	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you?	2	funding effort?
2 3	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause)	2 3	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared
2 3 4	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm)	2 3 4	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash
2 3 4 5	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	2 3 4 5	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared
2 3 4 5 6	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis.	2 3 4 5 6	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony. I don't have a transcript reference, but I noted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question anyways.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony. I don't have a transcript reference, but I noted down that you said that Mr Crow told you that he would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question anyways. You said at some point that this I can point to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony. I don't have a transcript reference, but I noted down that you said that Mr Crow told you that he would be available to testify if needed; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question anyways. You said at some point that — this I can point to a transcript reference (page 167, line 16), it's at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony. I don't have a transcript reference, but I noted down that you said that Mr Crow told you that he would be available to testify if needed; is that correct? A. Yes. Yes, he did.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question anyways. You said at some point that this I can point to a transcript reference (page 167, line 16), it's at 15.51, if counsel wants to look at it. You said "My
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony. I don't have a transcript reference, but I noted down that you said that Mr Crow told you that he would be available to testify if needed; is that correct? A. Yes. Yes, he did. MR DRYMER: At any point in time did you, or your lawyers on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question anyways. You said at some point that this I can point to a transcript reference (page 167, line 16), it's at 15.51, if counsel wants to look at it. You said "My dollars were"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony. I don't have a transcript reference, but I noted down that you said that Mr Crow told you that he would be available to testify if needed; is that correct? A. Yes. Yes, he did. MR DRYMER: At any point in time did you, or your lawyers on your behalf, tell Mr Crow that his testimony would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question anyways. You said at some point that this I can point to a transcript reference (page 167, line 16), it's at 15.51, if counsel wants to look at it. You said "My dollars were" "My money was [wherever] it was needed."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE PRESIDENT: No. Do you? MR DRYMER: I have a couple, if I may. (Pause) (5.17 pm) Questions from THE TRIBUNAL MR DRYMER: Hello again, Mr Lewis. A. Hello, sir. MR DRYMER: I've got a couple of questions for you. Some are particularly related to statements that you made in writing and some are related to your statements made orally today. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Let me begin by following up on a question that Mr Alexander put to you in respect of Mr Crow. I want to be sure I've understood correctly, and please don't hesitate to correct me, I'm not here to put words in your mouth; I want to be sure I've understood your testimony. I don't have a transcript reference, but I noted down that you said that Mr Crow told you that he would be available to testify if needed; is that correct? A. Yes. Yes, he did. MR DRYMER: At any point in time did you, or your lawyers on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	funding effort? A. When I typically go to sources for funding, I'm prepared with prospects, places to drill, expectations of cash flow and all those things, and I just was not prepared at the time that Gulf Shores, for instance, was brought on board, or even the initial period there where Clermont was looking for people for us. So, I mean, I had a general idea, I could wave my arms, but I didn't have anything that specifically I could point to that I would typically have in a package for an investor. So that made it difficult for Clermont, it made it difficult for us to relay what I expected the potential to be. And the cash flow to look like. MR DRYMER: Okay. And I wonder whether this might actually relate to my next question. Whether it does or doesn't is irrelevant because I'm going to ask the question anyways. You said at some point that this I can point to a transcript reference (page 167, line 16), it's at 15.51, if counsel wants to look at it. You said "My dollars were"

17:21 1	A. Yes, sir.	17:24 1	it was a no-brainer to me that stepping across the line
2	MR DRYMER: "I don't like to fund too much in advance."	2	was going to be the same kind of geology, and
3	A. Yes, sir.	3	expectations of not the same, but very close to the
4	MR DRYMER: Do you recall that?	4	performance that we had seen there, and the expectations
5	A. Yes, sir.	5	I had there, had I been allowed to drill there.
6	MR DRYMER: Now, let me put to you two propositions which	6	I didn't describe and please stop me if I get too
7	I understand are suggested by the Republic in these	7	long-winded here, I tend to do that but the Polish
8	proceedings: that, first of all, your Slovak operations	8	oil and gas company had lifted their skirts, as it were,
9	were effectively living hand to mouth and were	9	for us to go into their data room and evaluate all of
10	eventually starved of cash. And the second one is that	10	their fields, so we had access to data that
11	your unwillingness to fund in advance resulted in	11	theoretically no one in the world other than us had.
12	a lack, or an insufficient technical and legal due	12	And that gave us an insight as to how to predict these
13	diligence. My understanding is these are elements of	13	reservoirs and what to expect at this project.
14	the case brought here with the defence.	14	So, again, it was a very easy thing for me to get
15	Have you got any comment about that and how that	15	into and feel very comfortable doing.
16	might relate to your willingness or unwillingness to	16	MR DRYMER: What about the concept of legal due diligence?
17	fund too much in advance?	17	Was that related in any way to funding, cash, or
18	A. Yes, sir.	18	A. No, sir. No. No, sir. I asked the questions that
19	MR DRYMER: Go ahead.	19	I thought I should ask, that I felt I needed to ask with
20	A. Thank you for bringing that up.	20	regard to this project, and San Leon indicated they did
21	At no time did I starve the company for cash: we	21	not have any legal problems that would be an obstruction
22	always paid our bills, we always knew that salaries,	22	to us; in fact, had proceeded and been successful in
23	et cetera, would be paid. This company has always paid	23	their seismic and initial operations toward drilling.
24	its bills.	24	So I had no indication, and I thought I'd asked the
25	But I'm not going to pile up a million dollars in	25	right questions, I had no indication from them that
	D 040		D 444
	Page 213		Page 215
17:23 1	the bank just so that everybody can look at it. I mean.	17:26 1	there was a problem.
17:23 1	the bank just so that everybody can look at it. I mean, there was always the money available to do what we were	17:26 1 2	there was a problem. MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you.
17:23 1 2 3	there was always the money available to do what we were		MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you.
2	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard.	2	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to
2 3	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about,	2 3	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could
2 3 4	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was	2 3 4	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in
2 3 4 5	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your	2 3 4 5	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could
2 3 4 5 6	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself	2 3 4 5 6	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to fund too much in advance?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please. A. Looks like the computer is having a problem.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to fund too much in advance? A. May I ask, are you talking at the beginning of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please. A. Looks like the computer is having a problem. MR DRYMER: There we go. No problem that can't be overcome,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to fund too much in advance? A. May I ask, are you talking at the beginning of the project?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please. A. Looks like the computer is having a problem. MR DRYMER: There we go. No problem that can't be overcome, right, by a savvy operator such as our technician here!
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to fund too much in advance? A. May I ask, are you talking at the beginning of the project? MR DRYMER: Yes, at the time you invested. Excuse me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please. A. Looks like the computer is having a problem. MR DRYMER: There we go. No problem that can't be overcome, right, by a savvy operator such as our technician here! A. Could you hit the "No" button please, so that I can read
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to fund too much in advance? A. May I ask, are you talking at the beginning of the project? MR DRYMER: Yes, at the time you invested. Excuse me. I should have been precise, and thank you for clarifying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please. A. Looks like the computer is having a problem. MR DRYMER: There we go. No problem that can't be overcome, right, by a savvy operator such as our technician here! A. Could you hit the "No" button please, so that I can read underneath it. There we go.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to fund too much in advance? A. May I ask, are you talking at the beginning of the project? MR DRYMER: Yes, at the time you invested. Excuse me. I should have been precise, and thank you for clarifying that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please. A. Looks like the computer is having a problem. MR DRYMER: There we go. No problem that can't be overcome, right, by a savvy operator such as our technician here! A. Could you hit the "No" button please, so that I can read underneath it. There we go. MR DRYMER: Now let me look for it. There it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there was always the money available to do what we were doing and never a spectre of running out in that regard. What I talked to Romgaz in that last exhibit about, what I relayed to Akard in that communication there, was that: without your funding, the vacancy that your funding provides means I have to kick in. Alpine itself is going to run out of money. I'm going to have to fund, is the inference. I didn't follow in with that each time, which is why I think it's been interpreted that way. But I never had any intention of leaving the company without funds to pay its bills and do what I had approved to do. MR DRYMER: What about the issue of insufficient due diligence? That's my understanding of one aspect of the defence's case. Have you got anything to say about that and how it may or may not relate to an unwillingness to fund too much in advance? A. May I ask, are you talking at the beginning of the project? MR DRYMER: Yes, at the time you invested. Excuse me. I should have been precise, and thank you for clarifying that. A. Yes, sir. The work that we had done in southern Poland	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR DRYMER: Right, very good. Thank you. Two more questions, and these relate specifically to statements in your first witness statement. Sir, could I ask you, please, to put that or you've got that in front of you, I believe? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Could you take a look at paragraph 89 of your first witness statement? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And here you say: " JKX informed us of its intention to withdraw from the project." A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And you referred to Exhibit C-185. There I would like that put on the screen for the witness's benefit, please. A. Looks like the computer is having a problem. MR DRYMER: There we go. No problem that can't be overcome, right, by a savvy operator such as our technician here! A. Could you hit the "No" button please, so that I can read underneath it. There we go. MR DRYMER: Now let me look for it. There it is. A. Excuse me, there's a window.

17:27 1	What about on the small screen?	17:30 1 cease your activities in Slovakia?
2	A. Okay, go ahead.	2 A. I was certainly teetering on that already. But
3	MR DRYMER: This is, you see at the bottom there, it's	3 MR DRYMER: And that's what I'm trying to explore.
4	an email from Mr Wayland at JKX to Mr Fraser and	4 A. Yes, sir. This act here by the government was
5	Mr Crow, and I don't think you're oh,	5 a complete violation of law, in our opinion according
6	"mike@discovery", I guess that's you?	6 to Alex, I should say because they changed our
7	A. Yes, sir.	7 licence, changed the terms of our licence, and again
8	MR DRYMER: And here's where JKX is telling you, "We're	8 I'm relying on Alex's interpretation, but according to
9	going to withdraw".	9 him, it was a violation of what they were allowed to do.
10	At the bottom, second to last paragraph, it reads:	10 MR DRYMER: Until that point you were still committed to
11	"For your information, the JKX Hungary assets are	11 continuing to invest in Slovakia?
12	also up for sale."	12 A. And I did, yes, sir. Yes.
13	This is a question I asked your friend and colleague	
13	•	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
15	here and I put this same proposition to you. I read	15 THE PRESIDENT: I was somewhat surprised when I was looking
16	this, it arguably looks like JKX is exiting a number of	at some of the documents, like the Opcom committee, or
17	jurisdictions, not only Slovakia. Therefore, maybe they	the Opcom meetings, about the complaints about the MT
18	had reasons that had nothing to do with Slovakia for	survey that were not fully interpreted. Some complaints
19	selling its various Central European interests. Do you	as well about the seismic data.
20		And then I was surprised that at the same time you
21	know whether they had their own reasons to divest?	21 are planning on drilling two wells in very short time at
22	A. Yes. Ritchie, I know Ritchie, the gentleman who wrote	the end of 2014, and then two again in Q1 of 2015, and
23	this, Mr Wayland, I know him quite well. We went out to	I wasn't really and I don't see really a drilling
24	dinner just after this email came in, and he expounded	plan. So what was your way of operating in these sites?
25	on the difficulties that they were having. They were in	25 A. Firstly, with the seismic and the MT, I don't remember
	Page 217	Page 219
17.20 1		17.00
17:29 1	financial trouble that had nothing to do with Slovakia	17:32 1 any complaints. There was there's always room for
2	and were he wanted me to come look at several of	2 seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains
2 3	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed	2 seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains 3 that: we wish it was better.
2 3 4	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading	 seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that
2 3 4 5	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point.	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee
2 3 4 5 6	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia?	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir.	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct?	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir.	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding?	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir.	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement.	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir.	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question.	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward:	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA requirement into our licence was the final straw"	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am. And I did not answer your last question because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA requirement into our licence was the final straw" I'm trying to understand "final straw". Is this the	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am. And I did not answer your last question because I can't remember it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA requirement into our licence was the final straw" I'm trying to understand "final straw". Is this the point in time, or is it not the point in time, when	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am. And I did not answer your last question because I can't remember it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA requirement into our licence was the final straw" I'm trying to understand "final straw". Is this the point in time, or is it not the point in time, when Discovery first came to the conclusion that due to the	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am. And I did not answer your last question because I can't remember it. THE PRESIDENT: No, the last question was that, for instance, in September 2014 you say: by the end of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA requirement into our licence was the final straw" I'm trying to understand "final straw". Is this the point in time, or is it not the point in time, when	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am. And I did not answer your last question because I can't remember it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA requirement into our licence was the final straw" I'm trying to understand "final straw". Is this the point in time, or is it not the point in time, when Discovery first came to the conclusion that due to the	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am. And I did not answer your last question because I can't remember it. THE PRESIDENT: No, the last question was that, for instance, in September 2014 you say: by the end of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and were he wanted me to come look at several of their assets to see if I was interested, and indeed I did look at several of them. They were offloading most everything at that point. MR DRYMER: Okay. That's helpful. I don't know about everything, but I read it this way too. They had financial problems unique to them that had nothing to do with the activists in Slovakia? A. No, sir. MR DRYMER: Is my understanding correct? A. That's correct, yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Or at least that was your understanding? A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: Thank you. Yes, paragraph 93 of your witness statement, your first witness statement. A. Yes, sir. MR DRYMER: And this, madame, is my last question. The first sentence is very straightforward: "The introduction of the new preliminary EIA requirement into our licence was the final straw" I'm trying to understand "final straw". Is this the point in time, or is it not the point in time, when Discovery first came to the conclusion that due to the conduct of the Slovak Republic, it would you would	seismic to be better and, I mean, everyone complains that: we wish it was better. But the MT work, that was a technology that I included at the permission of the operating committee that I'm very familiar with, it has done me a lot of good, that was a way to go quickly to an interpretation and get justification for drilling a location. And now I forgot your last question, I'm sorry. THE PRESIDENT: No. It's not a mainstream tool, you acknowledged at some point, the MT data? A. Yes ma'am. It's a technology that only a very few people know about. I have used it extensively and I know where it works, where it doesn't work. I use it on all my projects. I've got a project at south Texas right now that it is the fundamental tool, because it works so well in that shale sand environment like this. THE PRESIDENT: And it works whatever the depths? A. Down to about 15,000 feet, which is fine for this project and the other one. Yes, ma'am. And I did not answer your last question because I can't remember it. THE PRESIDENT: No, the last question was that, for instance, in September 2014 you say: by the end of the year we will have drilled two wells. And then a little

17:34 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	you prepared you have prepared a budget for 2015, and one sees that you have two wells in Q1 2015, all of which didn't materialise. So I was not sure how the operation worked or how it was planned. A. Yes, ma'am. We had a first of all, it took longer for the partners to get their AFEs signed than we had hoped. That was two or three months' difference. As far as getting the wells drilled though, it was this process of finding the right location, and as we dealt with the issues of getting rights of way and permissions and things like that, that took longer than I expected, and our engineer as well. So it did slow the process down. But I'm trying to remember when the THE PRESIDENT: We can go to the documents, but I don't think that is the purpose now. I'd just like to understand in general how you're running your operations. A. Ah, well I typically thank you, now I understand. In all the projects, at least in the last many years, I try to get into a place where I can drill a well as quickly as possible, because where a major	17:38 1 built the location. We had already spent the initial, 2 I don't remember how much, but let's say €50,000, 3 something like that, to build the location, so I hate to 4 leave a location and, you know, have to reclaim it. 5 That's a larger waste of money than I would like to 6 have 7 THE PRESIDENT: It depends how much time you save an 8 much production you can get out of the well in the end; 9 right? 10 A. Yes, and that was our first gas well. The others were 11 oil. 12 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that was a question too, because a 13 some time in your witness statement you say that you 14 will prioritise gas, and then you insist for months and 15 months on Smilno, which is precisely an oil well. 16 A. No, ma'am. Smilno was a gas well. 17 THE PRESIDENT: No, you would you would prioritise and Smilno was a gas well. 19 A. The advantage of oil wells is you don't need the gas 20 pipeline infrastructure. 21 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 22 A. So the quickest way to get cash flow is to go to an oil 23 well. But the big elephant for this project is the gas, 25 because at that time, anyway, the gas price was nothing	ıt
17:36 1	decide, you know, on various aspects where the best	17:39 1 but looking fantastic.	
2 3	possible place is, I think that's a waste of time. If I can find a place that is quality and will provide both	2 So I really truly thought that the gas well was the ticket, and pushed in that regard.	
4	some cash flow but, more importantly, the proof of	4 THE PRESIDENT: But there was no pipeline close by, so	i+
5	concept, then that's what I seek to do. It makes	5 would	10
6	everything profoundly easier.	6 A. There is I'm sorry.	
7	So when I was pushing to drill as many wells as	7 THE PRESIDENT: So you have to build the pipeline to joi	n
8	possible, that was the point: let's get some wells	8 another pipeline?	
9	drilled, let's get happy and move on.	9 A. Yes, ma'am, but the pipeline that we could connect to	
10		was between 9 and 15 kilometres away, not so far, and	
11		that was doable, in my view. And once we had a test, it	
12	-	would have made a lot of difference in that regard.	
13		13 THE PRESIDENT: You are a very successful businessmar	n, and
14	you had a good relationship with the State Forestry, as	we've read about this, and it was mentioned today as	
15		well, and this was obviously not a success.	
16	state land, and could you not have found another	16 A. Yes, ma'am.	
17	location, especially considering your method of drilling	17 THE PRESIDENT: What was the reason? Was it because	of the
18	has been quick wells?	activists? How do you explain it? If we take now a big	
19	A. It takes some time to get to the point where partners	19 picture view?	
20		20 A. I'm not preaching my case when I say that it was	
21		21 ultimately the governmental blockage that caused me to	
22		change my mind. When that EIA came down, I	
23		everything that Alex and I have talked about, and	
24		others, Ritchie Wayland and others, there are so many	
25	The reason I kept going on Smilno is because we had	25 ways for people like the activists to insert political	
	Page 222	Page 224	

2	agendas into the EIA process. We felt that it just was never going to come to an end. HE PRESIDENT: So you considered that it was the EIA that was really the nail in the coffin? That was the nail in the coffin. Yes ma'am. HE PRESIDENT: Mm-hm. And that was the preliminary EIA that you offered, or was it the full EIA? Well, every indication was, and I don't remember if this is an official correspondence, but every indication was that once we did the preliminary, the full EIA was going to be required. Which takes at least two years, and HE PRESIDENT: Well, it depends on the outcome of the preliminary EIA. If I'm HE PRESIDENT: Well, we can check that. I think we got to the end of one of those. I'm tired, I don't remember. But I think we got to the end of one	17:44 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	never an end to how much you can do. You have to at some point say: okay, we've done enough, let's go. THE PRESIDENT: Fine. No further questions from anyone. Mr Lewis, thank you very much for your help. MR LEWIS: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: That brings us to you can A. Okay. THE PRESIDENT: whatever. You don't have to sit there while we close for the day. Tomorrow we have quite a large number of witnesses. I assume this is because the examinations will be relatively condensed. Is that the plan? Yes? Good. It would be good if we can get through them tomorrow. MR TUSHINGHAM: We will try our best. THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
	of those and we were told that we had to go to the	17 18	MR TUSHINGHAM: I think obviously we had originally anticipated well, exactly. We're going to try our
	formal EIA. I may be mistaken, but I know that I felt	19	best to finish by the end of tomorrow.
	that that's where we would end up.	20	THE PRESIDENT: Good. Excellent.
	HE PRESIDENT: Mm-hm. And so what's the effect on all this	21	Anything to be raised before we close for the day?
	of Ms Varjanová's car blocking the road? Is this part	22	No?
	of the issue, or?	23	MR TUSHINGHAM: Nothing from our side.
	Well, because the police didn't do anything about it, we certainly weren't going to, you know, exacerbate the	24 25	THE PRESIDENT: No. Good. Then have a good evening, everyone.
25 .		23	
	Page 225		Page 227
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 TH 11 12 13 14 15 16 A. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	problem by doing something crazy. We were trying to live under the law. And there just wasn't any way around that without governmental help. So it was very frustrating. It was a very simple thing for the police to enforce what I understood to be the law, that she was blocking a public road. And she had no real reason to do that other than to block us. So it was pretty cut and dry for me. I hope that made sense. HE PRESIDENT: Yes. You said before that you thought the engagement with the what you call activists could not be productive because they were not really listening. Would more engagement with the local population have helped? Or do you feel it wasn't it would not be fruitful, or you have done as much as you could? We did a lot, despite the allegations otherwise. We did a lot of community effort in Smilno. I personally was involved in several social events. I was in the restaurant, visiting with people as much as I could, and I honestly, there were only very, very few that objected to our operations. There were Ms Varjanová, for the reasons we've said. But the rest, the two or three other real active activists were not even from Smilno. So there was no way to fight that. And there's	17:45 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	(5.45 pm) (The hearing adjourned until 9.30 am the following day)
	Page 226		Page 228

abandon 472		1111 10710	166 10 160 1	105 5 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 5 5	110 20 120 1	
abmiditis 166.15 ability 12:12 107:16 ability 12:12 ability 12:12 107:16 ability 12:12	A	acquisition 135:12	166:19 168:1	106:6 114:10 116:6	118:20 120:1	Alexander's 24:7
bability 12-12 07-15						
18612 1373 1783 1802 2062 2073 2074	abandoned 46:24				-	
Also 1978 Also 1978 Also 1978 Also 1979 Also						
able 1992.4 4223 439.4 1288 2199.4 addition 284 61.8 217.24 43.5 \$57.8 \$6.22 25.99 70.4 90.7 91.5 86.12 148.7 86						
3-35-57-8-56-22 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-13-18-7 3-65-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-7 3-65-13-12-18-11-12-18-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-		T				
2009-07-91-5 2007-91-15 2						
2002.05 1407 1454.05 1451.05						
153.11 155.15 156.16 164.31 71.10 186.4 168.13 79.16 208.14 208.14 208.14					S	
48.32 36.318 66.10 defress 163.54.9 42.15.20 47.12 53.53 63.28 68.81 67.21 77.12 67.22 67.						
67:14 812 177:23 59:25 197:19.25 53:23 60:2 88:8 78:10 126:15 158:1 alluded 149:6 211 addressed 141:4,5 93:12 93:23 addresses 193:8 141:17 181:2 141:6 159:17:2 131:9 217:2 13						O
208:14 39:14 18:67 208:14 208:14 18:91 9:23 above-mentioned 92:19 absolutely 76:3 122.7 abstention 81:12 82.7 accept 51:6 57:18 70:8 3 20:18 19:11 177:6.22 178:13,14 20:14 18:8,14 20:23 acceptance 201:2 9:4 10:2.6 15:1.1 19:2.2 13 acceptance 201:2 9:4 10:2.6 15:1.1 19:2.2 13 acceptance 201:2 9:4 10:2.6 15:1.1 19:2.1				•		
above 26:16 61:5 93:22 93:22 134:13,18 190:13 198:9 abstention 81:12 82:7 accept 51:6 57:18 70:8 70:8 96:10,18 129:11 177:6.22 178:13,14 204:1 accept 57:20 89:21 90:23 129:10 177:6.22 178:13,14 204:1 accept 57:20 89:21 90:23 89:21 90:23 143:10 176:25 176:4 191:7 192:2 120:4 192:1 1						
1982/2 200-18 2						
addresses 93.8 adjust 12.2 13.9 13.9 11.12 13.9 11.12 13.9 11.12 13.9 11.12 13.9 11.12 13.9 11.12 13.9 13.9 11.12 13.9 11.12 13.9						almost 108:9 118:17
92:19 3boolutely 76:3 122-7 134:13.18 190:13 130:15 10:15 226:23 226:23 226:23 226:23 226:24 236:25		active 18:19 19:23	addressees 193:8	162:9 164:15		130:7 139:4 163:6
absolutely 76.3 122.7 34:13,18 190:13 198:9 abstention 81:12 82.7 accept 51: 6 57:18 70.8 70:8 96:10,18 10:177.6,22 178:13,14 204:1 acceptable 57:20 89:21 90:22 38:10,14,20,22,23 38:10,14,20,22,23 39:10,26 15:1.1 29:24,275 37:20 40:2.6 15:1.1 29:24,275 37:20 40:2.6 15:1.1 29:24,275 37:20 40:2.6 15:1.1 29:24,275 37:20 40:2.6 15:1.1 20:21,19 20		180:5,20 185:12	adherence 196:23	168:11 170:16	107:7,8,25 108:5,7	168:17 194:1
134:13,18 190:13 22.7 abtention 81:12 82.7 accept 15:6 57:18 70.8 96:10,18 129:11 177:6,22 138:10,14,20,22,23 138:12 143:10 175:24 20:21 22:22 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:21 20:23 20:2		226:23	adjacent 15:6	177:24 178:16	108:8 110:14 112:3	alone 65:6
198.9 astention 81:12 82.7 accept 81:6 57:18 70:8 96:10,18 activists 57:2.22.25 36:9,11,18 54:5 53:6,9,11,18 54:5 53:6,9,11,18 54:5 53:6,9,11,18 54:5 53:6,9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:9,11,18 54:5 36:1,14 204:1 38:10,14 202.2,23 34:02.6 15:1,1 38:10,14 202.2,23 34:02.6 15:1,1 39:2,15 195:2,19 34:02.6 15:1,1 39:2,15 195:2,19 34:02.6 15:1,1 39:2,15 195:2,19 32:1,15 195:2,19 32:1,15 195:2,19 32:1,15 195:2,19 32:1,15 195:2,19 34:1,18 19:1,18 12:1 36:1,18 14:1,18 12:1 36:1,18 14:1,18 12:1			adjourned 122:11	180:16 181:10	112:13 113:9,11,18	along 52:5 140:9
abstantion 81:12 82.7 accept 51:6 57:18 70:8 76:10.18 20:91:1177:6.22 20:91:1 activists 52:2.2.2.25 53:69.11.18 45:5 23:69.11.19 29:24.12 45:12.24 40:69.59:19 46:12.0 46:13.13 11:19 4 admiration 198:19 46:12.18 46:19 10:13.23 4 admiration 198:19 20:12.10.45 21:0:6 4 admiration 198:19 20:12.10.65 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:13.25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:13.25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:13.25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:12.24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:0:24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:0:24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:0:24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:0:24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:0:24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:0:24 21:0:6 21:0:25 21:0:6 20:0:24 21						
accept 51:6 57:18 70:8 200:11 30ijusted 125:7 198:23 199:20 117:1,4 199:1 34oingside 18:20 164:20 165:2,13,23 34oingside 18:20 113:23 157:9,13 34oingside 18:20 113:23 157:9,13 34oingside 18:20 34o						169:12,23 202:16
This short Thi						
129:11 177:6,22 53:6,911,18 54:5 33:23 138:2 138:10,14,20,22,23 138:10,14,20,22,23 138:10,14,20,22,23 140:2.8 141:14 140:21 159:21 109:22 140:2.6 15:1.1 140:2.8 141:15 169:18 218:21,117 179:22 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:4 191:7 192:2 170:18,20,24 131:19 133:2 134:1 134:19 133	•					S
159:8 140:4:1 159:8 160:3 169:9:1 169:1						113:23 157:9,13,16
Access 7:68:15.16.22 143:10 175:24 143:10 175:24 143:10 175:24 143:10 175:24 143:10 175:24 143:10 175:24 143:10 175:24 143:10 175:24 167:19 169:16.17 167:19 169:16.17 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 83:14 177:12 81:12 81:14 177:12 81:14 177:12	178:13,14 204:1					
access 7:6 8.15.16,22	acceptable 57:20			C		Alpine 8:7 17:21 92:7
access 7:6 8:15,16,22 176:4 191:7 192:2 167:19 169:16,17 77:12 81:12 83:14 Akard/CVP's 114:15 120:24 129:19 9:4 10:2,6 15:1,1 29:2,4,25 37:20 197:12,15,16 204:9 205:1,1,12 218:9 214:18 214:18 85:19 114:6 116:26 133:19 133:2 134:1 170:2 176:24 168:19 170:15.2 208:4,25 37:20 205:1,1,12 218:9 224:18,25 25:11 226:24 170:18,20,24 advantage 223:19 advantage 223:19 advantage 223:19 advantage 223:19 advantage 223:19 agencies 206:19 188:5 189:6,9,11 208:4,6,14 214:20 208:4,6,14 214:18 204:21 25:12,15 38:18 16:18 185:13 186:8 187:13,20 189:3,12 24:21 25:12,15 38:18 160:21 11:25 39:17,18 43:9,10 31:20,23 32:1,15 33:18:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 202:14 203:6 204:3<	89:21 90:23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_			
132:10 165:16 169:18 213:2,11,17 29:2,4,25 37:20 29:11,12 218:9 205:11,12 218:9 205:11,12 218:9 224:18,25 226:21 226:24 224:18,25 226:24 224:18,25 226:24 224:18,25 226:24 226:24 234:18 233:21 234:1 235:15 236:10 166:11 270:21 206:4,12	acceptance 201:2		•			, ,
197:12,15,16 204:9 292:4,25 37:20 42:21 49:4,42,2 23 52:5 53:19 58:24 68:3 69:6,21 70:5 78:15 88:9 104:5 124:4 126:4 135:25 78:15 88:9 104:5 124:4 126:4 135:25 78:18 86:18 187:13,20 189:3,12 190:17 215:10 accessed 88:16 accessibility 46:25 accessible 10:25 11:4,18 184:20 12:25 14:9,12 16:25 17:11 27:1 30:2 43:10 46:17,20 61:14,21 69:9,16 88:17 accessing 187:12 22:11 accommodated 114:17 accessing 187:12 22:11 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 14:18 accommodating 12:9:8 account 51:5 170:6 account 51:						
205:1,1,12 218:9 205:1,1,12 218:9 224:18,25 226:11 226:24 224:18,25 226:11 226:24 224:18,25 226:11 226:24 24:18,25 226:11 226:24 23:19 24:18 25:12,15 24:4 126:4 135:25 185:13 186:8 185:13 186:14 185:13 186:17 185:13 186:14 185:13 186:17 185:13 186:14 185:13 186:17 185:13 186:17 185:13 186:17 185:13 186:14 185:13 185:19 191:9,16,24 192:20 106:22 123:25 185:13 186:14 185:15 189:0,91 191:9,16,24 192:20 202:14 203:6 204:3 207:8,19 210:6 204:3 207:8,19 210:6 204:3 207:8,19 210:6 204:3 207:8,19 210:6 204:3 207:8,19 210:6 204:3 204:4 204:4 207:8,19 210:6 204:3 204:4 204:4 204:12 207:13 614:15 204:4 204:4 204:12 207:13 614:15 204:14 185:15 185:10 185:		,				
170:18,20,24						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
deciding						1 1
78:15 88:9 104:5 124:4 126:4 135:25 185:13 186:8 187:13,20 189:3,12 190:17 215:10 accessed 88:16 accessibility 46:25 12:25 14:9,12 16:25 17:11 27:1 30:2 43:10 46:17,20 61:14,21 69:9,16 88:17 accommodated 114:17 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 accounting 50:2 17:18 84:21 182:18 21:25 8:10 43:18 26:21 8 adverse 184:23 adverse 214:11,18 adverse 184:23 adverse 214:11,18 adverse 184:23 agency 205:13 aggressive 77:2 134:1 aggres 225:1 aggressive 77:2 134:1 aggres 23:5,11 34:3 33:13:15 24:8 39:31:31:5 24:8 39:31:15 24:3 39:17,18 43:9,10 71:17,21 135:19 54:1 162:6 181:11 advisors 105:22 77:14 169:11 52:8 65:4,4,518 18:7 19:4,12 21:11 38:12 39:35:18 36:2 43:10 46:17,20 61:14,21 69:9,16 88:17 accommodated 114:17 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 43:10 46:17,20 63:18 67:14 accommodation 52:4 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 3dverse 184:23 adverse 184:23 agency 205:13 aggressive 77:2 134:1 aggres 23:5,11 34:3 34:8 41:21 52:23 54:1 162:6 181:11 aggres 23:5,11 34:3 34:8 41:21 52:23 54:1 16:26 181:11 aggres 23:5,11 34:3 34:8 41:21 52:23 54:1 16:26 181:11 aggres 23:5,11 34:3 34:8 41:21 52:23 54:1 16:26 181:11 aggres 23:5,11 34:3 35:1 38:10,20 44:12 52:9 13:20 14:15 33:1 38:10,20 44:12 52:9 13:20 14:15 33:6 32:14 29:20 22:19 23:10 2:11 38:12 39:3 39:24 46:14 40:11 21 38:12 39:3 39:24 46:14 40:11 21 38:12 39:3 30:24 46:14 40:11 21 38:12 39:3 30:24 46:14 40:11 21 220:11 38:12 39:12 35:12 56:7 57:6,7 220:12 30:22 3						
Advice 20:24 24:11,18 agendas 225:1 aggressive 77:2 134:1 aggnessive 77:2 134:2 22:31 and segnessive 77:2 134:1 aggnessive 77:2 134:1			C			
185:13 186:8 73:14 77:11 81:21 24:21 25:12,15 31:20,23 32:1,15 32:42 83:3,9,14 31:20,23 32:1,15 32:42 83:3,9,14 31:20,23 32:1,15 32:42 84:21 52:23 32:42 33:3,15:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 223:1 alright 11:5 12:8 1 ago 3: 3 13:15 24:8 207:8,19 219:6 224:23 224:23 22						-
187:13,20 189:3,12 182:422 83:3,9,14 86:18 100:2 111:25 39:17,18 43:9,10 31:20,23 32:1,15 39:17,18 43:9,10 36:20 saccessibility 46:25 160:11 174:17 149:68,12,14,22 advised 43:8 45:4 12:25 14:9,12 16:25 17:14,18 184:20 197:9 219:1 activity 30:23 39:24 70:3 76:25 78:20 43:10 46:17,20 61:14,21 69:9,16 88:17 accessing 187:12 222:11 accommodated 114:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 72:21 70:26 83:13 70:12 72:21 70:26 83:13 70:12 72:21 70:26 83:13 70:12 72:21 70:26 83:13 70:12 72:21 70:26 83:13 70:12 73:21 70:12 70:13 70:12 73:21 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 73:21 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 73:21 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 73:21 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 73:21 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 73:21 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 73:21 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:12 70:13 70:13 70:12 70:13						137:6 140:11 219:2
190:17 215:10 accessed 88:16 130:18 153:7 71:17,21 135:19 149:6,8,12,14,22 accessibility 46:25 160:11 174:17 175:14,18 184:20 197:9 219:1 activity 30:23 39:24 71:14 169:11 activity 30:23 39:24 73:3 76:25 78:20 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 88:17 83:10,11,14 99:19 99:20 135:16 136:12 162:22 175:6 176:22 affiliated 80:20 affirmative 45:24 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:2 28:7 36:17 41:23 45:18 46:11 49:10 67:2 68:13 70:12 78:51 70:21 178:51 70:21 178:51 70:21 178:51 70:21 185:5 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:10 70:21 178:11 70:21 178:12 70:21 178:12 70:21 178:12 70:21 178:12 70:21 178:12 70:21 178:12 70:21 178:						
accessed 88:16 accessibility 46:25 accessible 10:25 11:4 12:25 14:9,12 16:25 17:11 27:1 30:2 43:10 46:17,20 61:14,21 69:9,16 88:17 accessing 187:12 222:11 accommodated 114:17 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 130:18 153:7 160:11 174:17 149:68,12,14,22 advised 43:8 45:4 149:68,12,14,22 advised 43:8 45:4 149:68,12,14,22 advised 43:8 45:4 77:14 169:11 52:8 65:4,5,18 advised 45:8 46:11 49:10 67:2 68:13 70:12 advised 45:8 45:4 15:10 20:14,16 29:23 30:25 32: 32: 35:1 38:10,20 44:12 20:19 13:20 14:15 33:6 35:18 36:22 15:8 65:4,5,18 67:12 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 93:15,19,25 94:6 33:10 34:17 43:20 92:6,12 93:9 98:12 102:4 104:105:23 55:12 56:7 57:6,7 126:12 127:12,11 30:10 106:8,11 107:13,17 57:11,15,24 58:3,12 160:12 127:12,1 106:8,11 107:13,17 57:11,15,24 58:3,12 160:12 127:12,1 106:8,11 107:13,17 57:11,15,24 58:3,12 106:10,12 175:15 82:4 89:15,21,23 advised 43:8 45:4 40:14 47:24 48:3 102:6,14 40:22 178:11 accommodation 52:4 accommodate 62:10		86:18 100:2 111:25	39:17,18 43:9,10	34:8 41:21 52:23	224:23	alright 11:5 12:8 13:6
accessibility 46:25 accessible 10:25 11:4 160:11 174:17 149:6,8,12,14,22 agree 23:5,11 34:3 4:3 1:5,10 2:14,16 29:23 30:25 32: accessible 10:25 11:4 12:25 14:9,12 16:25 175:14,18 184:20 197:9 219:1 activity 30:23 39:24 71:14 169:11 187:19:4,12 21:11 38:12 39:5 43:1 43:10 46:17,20 43:10 46:17,20 61:14,21 69:9,16 48:17 79:14 80:17,22 AFEs 221:8 93:15,19,25 94:6 33:10 34:17 43:20 81:15 83:25 91: 48:17 99:20 135:16 136:12 162:22 198:11 136:12 162:22 198:11 102:6,14 105:23 55:12 56:7 57:6,7 126:12 127:12,1 accommodated 114:17 178:11 actual 18:8,11 92:4 46:14 47:24 48:3 106:8,11 107:13,17 57:11,15,24 58:3,12 158:3 165:1 168 149:8 46:14 47:24 48:3 15:18 120:12 68:8 71:1,7,10 68:8 71:1,7,10 200:20 201:22 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 4ccording 108:9 219:5 28:7 36:17 41:23 186:8 28:7 36:17 41:23 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:14 47:24 48:3 107:12 114:17 101:13 106:8 117:52 12:16 117:52 12:4		130:18 153:7	71:17,21 135:19	54:1 162:6 181:11	Alexander 2:5,9 3:3,5	15:20 25:18,20 27:8
accessible 10:25 11:4 175:14,18 184:20 advised 43:8 45:4 35:1 38:10,20 44:12 2:19 13:20 14:15 33:6 35:18 36:2 12:25 14:9,12 16:25 197:9 219:1 activity 30:23 39:24 71:14 169:11 52:8 65:4,5,18 18:7 19:4,12 21:11 18:7 19:4,12 21:11 38:12 39:5 43:12 43:10 46:17,20 79:14 80:17,22 AFEs 21:8 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 25:20 32:19,20 33:1 81:15 83:25 91: 88:17 83:10,11,14 99:19 affairs 131:3 98:21,22 99:1,23 53:20 54:16 55:5,9 98:12 102:4 104 accommodated 114:17 136:12 162:22 175:6 176:22 198:11 106:8,11 107:13,17 57:11,15,24 58:3,12 158:3 165:1 58:3 165:1 58:2 59: accommodating 141:18 14:18 93:14 97:3 123:22 46:14 47:24 48:3 156:10,12 175:15 85:24 89:15,21,23 200:20 20:122 219:8 164:4 193:23 actually 3:1 14:16 28:7 36:17 41:23 186:8 28:7 36:17 41:23 186:8 28:7 36:17 41:23 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:11 49:10 45:18 46:11 49:10 185:5 118:17 119:22 97:15,20,23 101:10 117:5 122:4 117:5 122:4 accommodation 5:2 45:18 46:11 49:10<		160:11 174:17		agree 23:5,11 34:3	4:3 1:5,10 2:14,16	29:23 30:25 32:24
12:25 14:9,12 16:25 17:11 27:1 30:2 43:10 46:17,20 61:14,21 69:9,16 88:17 accessing 187:12 222:11 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 197:9 219:1 71:14 169:11 advisors 105:22 157:18 77:23 83:8,11 92:6 77:2,3 83:8,11 92:6 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 80:10 77:3,1 8				•	2:19 13:20 14:15	33:6 35:18 36:23
17:11 27:1 30:2				, ,		
79:14 80:17,22 83:10,11,14 99:19 accessing 187:12 222:11 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 79:14 80:17,22 83:10,11,14 99:19 99:20 135:16 136:12 162:22 175:6 176:22 178:11 actual 18:8,11 92:4 63:18 67:14 186:8 178:10 178:11 178:12 178:12 178:13 178:14 178:14 178:14 178:14 178:14 178:14 179:14 178:19 178:10 178:11 178:11 178:11 178:11 178:11 178:11 178:11 178:12 178:18 178:1						44:19 62:6 67:7,13
88:17 accessing 187:12 222:11 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4	43:10 46:17,20					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
accessing 187:12 222:11 99:20 135:16 136:12 162:22 affected 86:20 134:3 198:11 102:6,14 105:23 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 106:8,11 107:13,17 108:16,17 111:21 106:8,11 107:13,17 108:16,17 111:21 108:18,17 119:22 108:16,17 111:21 108:18,17 119:22 108:18,17,19 108:18,17 119:22 108:18,17,19 108:18,17 119:22 108:18,17,19 108:18,17 119:22 108:18,17,19 108:18,17 119:22 108:18,17 119:22 108:18,17,19 108:18,17 119:22 108:18,17 118:18 1	61:14,21 69:9,16					
136:12 162:22 198:11 106:8,11 107:13,17 57:11,15,24 58:3,12 158:3 165:1 168 170:12 193:5 198 114:17 accommodating						
222:11 accommodated 114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 accomding 108:9 219:5 219:8 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 156:12 162:22 175:6 176:22 affiliated 80:20 affirmative 45:24 46:14 47:24 48:3 63:18 67:14 15:18 120:12 158:18 120:12 168:8,71 107:13 130:10 182:17,19 84:14 200:20 201:22 207:17 208:22 207:17 208:22 207:17 208:22 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:18,20 59:14,16 200:20 201:22 207:17 208:22 207:17 208:22 208:2,8 208:13 20:2 208:2,8 208:2,8 208:13 10:10 200:20 201:21 200:20 201:22 200:20 201:22 200:20 201:21 200:20 201:22 200:20 201:21 200:20 201:2						
178:11 actual 18:8,11 92:4 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:18 47:19 47:3 46:18 48:19 2:4 accommodation 52:4 according 108:9 219:5 219:8 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 4 accounting 5:2 4 45:18 46:11 49:10 47:18 75: 20:20 20:20 201:22 201:22 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:14 47:24 48:3 46:18 47:14 47:3 48:3 46:18 47:14 47:3 48:3 46:18 47:14 47:3 48:3 46:18 47:14 47:3 48:3 46:18 47:14 47:3 48:3 46:18 47:19 69:3 45:18 46:11 49:10 47:18 75: 20:20 201:22 201	222:11			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
114:17 accommodating 141:18 accommodation 52:4 accommodation 52:4 according 108:9 219:5 219:8 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 accum 46:14 47:24 48:3 63:18 67:14 156:10,12 175:15 204:8 206:18 208:1 204:8 206:18 208:1 204:8 206:18 208:1 208:2,8 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 46:14 47:24 48:3 63:18 67:14 156:10,12 175:15 204:8 206:18 208:1 208:2,8 affirmatively 47:3 affirmed 47:19 69:3 185:5 170:12 114:17 117:5 122:4 affirmed 47:19 69:3 accounting 5:2 125:17,21 130:10 156:10,12 175:15 204:8 206:18 208:1 208:1 208:2,8 affirmed 47:19 69:3 185:5 170:12 114:17 117:5 122:4 alternative 27:2,5 115:23 116:10 117:5 122:4 alternative 27:2,5 115:23 116:10 117:5 122:4 alternative 116:3 alternative 27:2,5 117:2 114:17 117:2 121:16 alternative 27:2,5 116:10 117:5 122:4 117:2					, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
32:14 97:3 123:22 63:18 67:14 156:10,12 175:15 85:24 89:15,21,23 alter 65:15 accommodation 52:4 according 108:9 219:5 219:8 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 63:18 67:14 156:10,12 175:15 204:8 206:18 208:1 90:6,12,25 91:1,3 alter 65:15 alternative 27:2,5 208:2,8						
164:4 193:23 accommodation 52:4 according 108:9 219:5 219:8 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 accounting 5:2 164:4 193:23 affirmatively 47:3 204:8 206:18 208:1 90:6,12,25 91:1,3 94:15 95:5,13 96:12 115:23 116:10 117:5 122:4 affirmed 47:19 69:3 agreed 74:18 75:20,22 97:15,20,23 101:10 117:5 122:4 alternative 27:2,5 115:23 116:10 117:5 122:4 accounting 5:2 107:12 114:17 101:13 106:8 alternative 47:1 87:10 117:22 121:16 although 47:1 87:10 117:22 121:16 117:23 13:35 6 21:101:16 117:23 13:35 6 20:101:16					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
according 108:9 219:5 219:8 account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 4 5:18 46:11 49:10 67:2 68:13 70:12 accounting 5:2 62:13 70:26 68:23 73:14 70:26 68:24 73:14 70:26 68:13 70:12 affirmed 47:18 75:20,22 75:26 7						
account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 28:7 36:17 41:23 affirmed 47:19 69:3 agreed 74:18 75:20,22 97:15,20,23 101:10 117:5 122:4 alternatives 116:3 afforementioned 92:16 118:17 119:22 117:22 121:16 although 47:1 87: 125:3 6 21 101:16 123:3 5 0 20 120:5 116:13 178:11						
account 51:5 170:6 accounting 5:2 45:18 46:11 49:10 185:5 170:12 114:17 101:13 106:8 alternatives 116:3 accounting 5:2 173:21 70:3 6 82:13 170:12 aforementioned 92:16 118:17 119:22 117:22 121:16 although 47:1 87:11 116:13 178:11	0			, -	•	
accounting 5:2 67:2 68:13 70:12 aforementioned 92:16 118:17 119:22 117:22 121:16 although 47:1 87:						alternatives 116:3
accounting 5:2 72:21 70:2 6 92:12 of rotd 04:19 125:2 6 21 101:16 122:2 5 0 20 120:5 116:12 179:11						although 47:1 87:19
	accounting 5:2 accurate 102:4 120:8					C
155:20 208:16 83:21 115:6 119:10 after 5:1,13 7:2 25:23 191:24 192:6 148:25 152:18,20 always 103:18 139				1 1		always 103:18 139:17
ACKLAM 2:15 125:18 129:12 26:22 29:23 30:12 agreeing 148:25 152:21 154:11 139:19 148:12		125:18 129:12			T	139:19 148:12
acknowledge 133:16 131:2,18 132:6 34:19 36:20 38:4 222:20 158:14 176:18 168:3 213:22,22		131:2,18 132:6				168:3 213:22,22,23
acknowledged 220:11 133:18 136:23 46:12,12,13 47:16 agreement 8:13 75:11 179:3,5,8 181:25 214:2 220:1	O			0	1 1	
acouire 7:6 8:14 115:7 138:4,9 140:20 48:1 58:9 61:13 91:9 96:5 102:11 183:25 184:4,10 ambiguity 47:9	O	T			-	0 0
115:8 143:3 144:4 148:14 63:25 79:14 85:9 109:21 110:15,23 191:4 199:12,15 amendment 177:1	•				-	amendment 177:14
acquired 36:9 152:9 157:4 158:13 86:23 87:11 104:19 111:5,9,20 118:14 208:22 210:14 amenity 198:5		152:9 157:4 158:13	86:23 87:11 104:19	111:5,9,20 118:14	208:22 210:14	amenity 198:5

America 3:23
among 84:6
amongst 21:19 151:1
amount 72:22 135:17
161:16 174:13,16
amounts 108:16
analogy 168:4
analysis 22:12,17 25:2
anchor 37:21
Andrea 193:12,12
Andrejco 200:8
and/or 43:5
anger 143:9
angry 195:18
Anne-Marie 1:24
annoyed 32:6
another 3:23 12:8
32:20 34:17 45:12
67:22 76:15 82:25
85:15 87:15 135:2
137:16 140:14
141:20 150:12
169:17 170:7 175:2
183:2 204:24 205:4
222:16 224:8
answer 3:20 11:14
13:4 18:4,13 24:10
47:14 53:15,24 74:4
74:5 94:17,21,22
95:1 96:17,21 97:3
109:11 123:6
127:25 145:8
148:14 152:17
185:16,20 195:17
199:19 205:3,7
220:21
answered 148:22
149:21
answering 13:5 18:6
181:12
answers 94:19 191:2
197:20 201:15
anticipated 161:3
163:15 227:18
ANWAY 2:8 59:2,5
ANWAY 2:8 59:2,5
anxious 76:20
anybody 77:24 100:9
195:12 205:13
anybody's 95:7
anymore 76:4 117:6
205:25
anyone 17:7 55:19
106:2 134:14
144:18 183:14
209:13 227:3
anything 13:1 34:8
39:17 47:2 100:4,8
125:24 132:12
140:5,19 142:11
164:4,17 171:2
174:5 179:20,22
205:6,19 212:10
214:16 217:20
225:24 227:21
anyway 59:5 93:13
159:13 160:4,18
163:9 184:9 223:25

```
anyways 212:19
anywhere 192:19
   196:18 202:7
AOG 6:10 14:25 16:1
   28:12 29:17,23,24
   30:19 34:21,25
  35:12,16 36:24 37:6
  37:14 44:4,11 45:9
  45:23 46:6,7,14
  47:24 51:18 59:22
  62:19 63:2,6,17,21
  64:1,9,14,16,22,23
  65:1,6,6,7,8,10,20
  65:21 66:6,11,16,24
  67:2,7,10,12,14,21
  67:23 69:6,20 70:1
  70:4.18.21.22 72:2
  74:15,21 77:14,21
  78:1 79:7 81:6
  82:22,25 84:18
  85:17 86:4,24 94:13
  94:14 96:17 98:17
  108:3 109:3 114:13
   115:7 118:5,19
   119:1 120:15
   139:13 157:1
  166:11 170:18
   175:9 179:8 185:13
   185:24 186:6,12
  208:4
AOG's 29:7 32:15
  62:14 65:23 68:2
  83:9 88:9 99:12
   111:2
apart 144:19
apologies 14:14 17:24
  211.23
apologise 56:24 68:8
   88:25 89:16 117:22
  122:5 208:25
appalled 134:12
apparent 93:17
apparently 107:8
   111:3 133:1 166:4
   166:13
appeal 46:9 49:21
  60:14,15,16 85:19
   134:20,23 204:2
appealed 36:24 63:6
Appeals 47:18,19 50:6
  59:18 85:16 185:6
appear 26:3 31:16
   92:7 125:24 135:12
   135:21 183:7
APPEARANCES 2:1
appearing 183:18
appears 15:23,23 16:6
   44:1 96:7 97:5
   98:23,25 186:24
appetite 120:17 208:7
application 21:23
   36:20 37:1 50:10
  59:19 140:25
applications 141:8
   186:14
applied 28:23 68:14
   134:24 176:2 203:2
```

```
apportioned 137:10
appreciate 30:9 57:1
   101:10 199:18
appreciated 147:24
  178:3
appreciation 178:19
approach 27:3,5,6
   31:13 138:7 139:22
   149:16 163:21
   190:2
appropriate 32:22
  57:18 187:11 211:6
approve 201:18,20
approved 185:21
  214:13
approximately 41:20
  109:24
April 18:25 19:2
arbitrary 147:15
arbitration 1:1,1 1:22
  34:5 85:11 120:16
   142:12 150:1 182:8
  208:6
ARB/21/51 1:3
area 15:5 81:21 82:2,4
   126:6 132:20 157:7
   167:6 174:4 180:5
   180:14,15,25
areas 6:7 137:19
  180:20 222:15
arguably 217:16
argue 67:16 87:25
   126:13
argument 33:15 63:15
arguments 63:18
  99:24
arisen 26:22
arms 212:10
around 15:6 106:21
   171:6 174:14
   178:23,24 181:19
  187:5 226:3
arrange 121:23
arranged 200:7
arrangement 107:25
  110:21 158:24
arrearage 108:12
  114:6
arrearages 108:19
  109:4
arrears 108:8
arrested 47:6
arrived 144:12 175:20
Article 6:11,12,14,18
articulated 132:23
ascribe 197:1
asked 2:5 10:16 13:15
   13:16 14:8 17:22,25
   18:11 24:8 38:7
  42:19 46:8 48:7
  49:25 59:17 84:23
  84:24 92:14 122:20
   123:3 129:4,18
   142:23 159:25
   181:1.11 182:18
   183:1,11 187:22
```

```
211:4 215:18,24
  217:13
asking 2:19 9:3 14:6.8
   14:20 21:24 31:21
  32:3,5 58:6 63:10
  145:9,10 152:21
  175:24 178:19
                           164:1
  180:7 184:3 188:11
  197:11 211:2
  222:10
asks 172:2
aspect 133:14 174:11
  187:6 197:8 214:15
aspects 7:21 130:16
  174:1 222:1
assembly 177:16
assert 10:22 33:12
  71:16 75:17
asserted 185:24
assertion 25:4 31:11
assessment 121:3
  178:9 204:11
  205:15,20 206:5,22
  207:22
asset 134:13,17
  165:16
assets 64:18 128:4
  217:11 218:3
                           214:2
assistance 39:18 150:9
assistant 1:23 203:24
assists 126:8 209:6
associated 83:22
  174:23
Associates 2:14,15,15
  17:19
assume 4:17 5:9 16:5
  19:19 94:12.20
  101:23 114:3
   168:21 175:7 178:6
  187:21 188:13
  189:17 227:11
assumed 5:15 16:10
  40:9,10 113:10
  188:4
assurance 39:25
assure 79:11
assured 54:10
atmosphere 133:17
  134:4,4
attached 23:20 91:19
attachment 16:8
  20:17,19,21,23
  22:12 24:7,9,13,15
  24:16,20 25:5,6,16
  56:9 90:19 91:15
  92:3,24 93:1,10
  96:8,10,19 149:1,8
attachments 92:5
attempt 186:1
attempted 70:13 78:9
attempting 70:9
attend 201:3
attended 101:19,20
  193:13
attention 30:25 52:9
  54:17 102:10
  162:16 167:15
```

```
175:21 207:5
attorney 15:24 31:6
  98:17 99:12 193:18
attorney-client 32:11
attract 187:8
attractive 163:24
attributions 137:9
August 123:9 156:6
authorisation 70:10
   78:6 147:9
authorisations 67:5
authorise 37:24
authorised 33:25 38:7
   70:12 147:8 205:9
authorities 47:11 88:2
  146:21 148:3
authority 40:11,23
  62:20 69:15 77:10
   78:8 102:25 146:20
authorized 49:4,12
automobile 100:20
availability 10:13 12:4
available 10:15 91:13
   114:22 117:6 182:9
   182:18 203:10
  210:21 211:10
avoid 116:21 117:12
aware 6:12 7:3,4,5,7
   7:11 8:10 14:24
   15:2.10.11.11 16:13
   16:16,19,22 17:7
   28:19 33:21 36:13
   36:16,18,21 39:21
   53:17 61:25 63:3
   77:10 78:8 9 83:5
  86:15 96:3 100:7,22
   101:1,6 103:25
   105:9,16 112:17,18
   112:21.22 113:4.9
   113:14 136:14
   170:19 175:1
   180:12 184:12,15
   184:18,24,25 185:4
   185:6.7.8.24 186:2
   186:11,15 189:18
  202:5,13 205:5,12
  205:16 206:23
awareness 181:13
away 34:7 78:17 145:4
   174:4 197:2 224:10
back 5:21 13:9 16:12
   17:1 41:14 69:5,24
  73:3 74:18 75:20
   76:20 81:15 84:1,25
  96:3 97:7 109:10
   117:4 119:24 122:1
   131:22 137:21
   139:7 150:18
   161:15 162:1 168:4
   169:13 196:15,17
backdrop 85:15 156:6
background 131:19
   133:2 135:7 168:15
```

```
190:19
Bacová 193:12
bag 159:16
Bakken 172:10
balance 47:21 108:15
  114:23 115:4 187:3
balanced 143:7
ballpark 154:18
  163:13
bank 214:1
bans 175:2
Bar 3:8
Baran 93:1
Baran's 93:14
Barnett 172:12
barred 3:6
Barthus 200:5
based 30:15 45:12
  58:12 80:4 86:19
basic 157:5
basically 169:22
basis 4:11,12,14 9:25
  29:14,16 39:14 40:4
  40:9 42:3 69:2,10
  70:9,24 74:2 88:16
  182:11 186:1 196:6
  203:16 205:8
battle 116:22,23
  120:16 208:5
BCC 95:24
bear 98:8,11
beard 195:10
bearing 69:17 92:6
became 4:15,21 5:10
  6:12 7:11 16:19
  36:16.18.21 40:13
  73:21 133:17
  146:25 156:7,12
  159:20 163:23,24
  163:25 175:5
become 7:3 19:20
  36:13 115:19 161:4
  202:12
becoming 85:3
bee 195:23
before 1:10 8:9 14:25
  16:12 17:1 21:14
  23:3 24:3 25:1 33:7
  34:4 39:6 46:7 48:6
  48:13,15 49:10
  52:19 55:3.7 56:1
  62:7,9,13 67:20
  69:8,25 70:20 76:25
  79:23 80:21 81:9
  82:24 90:3,7 92:4,5
  93:9 113:5 129:23
  135:3 136:21
  138:13 140:24
  142:7,8,11,12
  164:25 166:23
  175:9 179:8 180:3
  180:17,24 185:1
  186:21 187:20
  190:22 199:21
  203:12 226:10
```

227:21

beg 60:22

began 89:8	Benada's 110:6	119:14 155:6	175:13 183:13	Centre 1:2,5	chief 4:17,19,24 130:7
begin 124:10 164:20	136:10	168:15 207:12	186:13	CEO 102:7 103:12	131:5
210:13	benefit 93:10 136:4	217:3,10	calling 29:8 102:10	185:14	choice 26:6 191:17
beginning 22:25 31:4	216:17	bound 64:7,9	162:15	CEO's 137:9	192:1,8 203:4 204:6
44:22 51:13 86:1,8	best 4:3 78:2,19	brag 172:2	calls 72:25 108:12	certain 25:10 58:22	chose 103:12
86:19 109:1 116:2	112:16 149:15	Bratislava 5:12,19	114:7,16 172:3	118:3 125:7 165:6	CHRIS 2:13
123:12 139:24	203:10 222:1	19:6 129:1 133:19	calm 147:23	169:10 190:8	CHRISTINA 2:11
173:18 214:19	227:15,19	133:24 193:11	came 5:18 7:2 9:23	certainly 33:4 54:25	Christmas 41:9
begins 36:3 61:3 86:3	better 26:21 68:9	breach 66:4,21 185:14	16:9 17:12 27:23	83:21 96:3 99:2,22	chronology 54:17,24
119:15 152:11	113:19 138:7	break 55:3,8,18,23	75:2 77:10 83:13	106:22 115:1	55:7 62:8 88:13
160:23 203:15	148:23 157:8 179:6	56:9 58:9,10 89:16	88:14 89:2,4 96:3	130:13 158:25,25	church 165:5
begun 84:18	184:7 220:2,3	89:25,25 90:3,16	104:25 106:1,24	174:9 176:20	Cicvara 103:8
behalf 97:17 146:7	between 12:19 20:8	121:20 150:11,13	113:22 144:20	177:10 181:18	Cierne 141:13,15
152:22 186:12	22:24 23:5,12 31:22	150:16 209:2,18	145:3 154:13	189:5,5 190:20	circulated 9:25 54:17
210:24	35:18 54:1,4 68:24	breakdown 171:8	159:19 164:9,15	193:14 203:9	55:9,11 62:9
behaved 146:1	73:10 94:21 97:8	brewing 116:24,25	167:20,22,24 168:2	206:10 219:2	circumstances 52:21
behind 52:2 106:20	99:3 113:21 129:9	brick 133:11	169:23 205:24	225:25	143:13,23 144:1
139:11 147:6	137:10 138:14	briefly 193:9	217:24 218:24	Cesty 46:6 63:9,20,21	145:13 185:22
185:17,19	139:13 146:6	bring 52:9 76:14 77:6	224:22	63:24 64:7,14 65:2	circumventing 64:5
being 7:5 10:5 28:1	224:10	158:6 164:3 165:7	capacity 160:10	65:4 66:2,6,23 67:5	65:25
32:11 45:4 49:6	beyond 13:5 29:12	bringing 67:3 164:17	capital 109:3 115:24	67:9,15,22,24 68:13	citizens 68:15 80:23
56:10 61:25 63:2	47:22 62:24 64:12	213:20	156:8,13	68:21 70:10,21	178:3,14
72:22 73:21 78:13	70:2 130:4 137:6	brings 227:6	captured 146:3	71:10,12 77:16,17	civil 45:15
		C C	captured 146.5 car 29:25 31:10 33:11		
82:11 83:22 84:21	156:4 169:5 185:9	broad 159:24 174:24		77:23 78:7 79:7	claim 28:12,15,20,21
85:1 95:19,20 96:20	biased 147:15	broke 62:7	33:19,21,24 34:1,2	87:16,25 89:2,14	28:23 44:14 67:22
100:10,13 103:25	big 42:9 116:22	brother 144:20	34:20 35:5 37:24	98:18 149:16	71:20,21 84:19
112:25 113:14	131:10 159:16	brought 20:2 77:8	47:9 133:9 142:20	186:13,16	86:24 87:3,6 88:7,7
114:11 126:20	202:1 223:24	113:22 144:21	198:16 225:22	cetera 213:23 222:22	135:1,1
128:17 131:16	224:18	159:1 212:6 213:14	care 195:16	CFO 1:14 108:18	claimant 1:16 2:2 2:5
132:21 136:15	bigger 54:14 158:8	bruising 142:20,22	career 153:1,4 156:16	115:15 131:11	48:22,23 49:5,11,12
140:13,16 141:18	bills 77:22 213:22,24	brunt 178:11	172:20 174:3,7,10	132:23 137:7	49:21 90:23 121:23
144:8 157:15 171:4	214:13	budget 221:2	careful 132:21	159:24	154:3
172:11 176:20	binding 82:20	build 146:21 223:3	carefully 22:4	chains 37:21	Claimants 90:20
186:17 202:20	bit 6:4 61:20 129:20	224:7	cares 195:11,12	challenge 46:3	claimant's 49:4
212:1	131:6 139:12,16	built 127:6 156:21	Carpathians 162:24	challenges 108:3	claimed 29:20
believe 15:4 17:15	140:16 197:20	223:1	163:1 173:25	109:3 111:25 112:4	claims 52:11 74:17
33:25 42:6 43:3	bits 149:14	built-up 126:5	carried 121:13	115:5	117:12,14,16
50:20 51:12 65:22	blessing 53:17 77:10	bull 190:3,4	carry 49:12 52:16	challenging 113:2	118:16
71:22 74:3 78:16,25	block 34:2 52:5 206:7	bundle 149:25	66:3 86:9	chance 6:19 25:24	CLAIRE 2:13
			cars 38:7		
79:17 88:20 92:5	226:7	burden 52:16 154:7		91:22 97:24 199:9	clarification 101:10
95:2,10 96:2,2,5	blockage 53:1 205:5	business 4:2 76:7	case 1:3 50:23 71:6	199:22	clarify 7:4 72:17 95:8
100:17 101:2 102:4	224:21	86:18 154:24,24	82:19 84:16,23	change 139:21 140:19	clarifying 179:1
105:17 107:18,21	blockages 26:23 46:12	155:2 159:11 161:3	85:13 88:7 97:5	140:21 224:22	214:22
109:1 113:17 115:4	blocked 19:22 27:24	166:5 168:6 170:7	169:7 170:2 178:2,6	changed 63:12,15	classic 45:15
117:14 131:14	28:2,7 31:17 205:7	178:7 181:19	187:21 188:4	67:17,17,18 141:16	classify 138:17
148:5 149:16,17,19	blocking 37:20 49:15	188:14 190:1	195:22 202:24	219:6,7	clear 6:14 33:23 34:3
153:23 162:25	78:14 186:18	198:21	204:15 213:14	changing 62:14 68:2	40:13 43:14 46:20
163:4 164:9 165:5	225:22 226:6	businesses 167:18	214:16 224:20	88:9	47:1 48:10 54:11
165:15 166:9,20	blockings 186:8	businessman 224:13	cases 88:3 186:14	channels 141:10,11	66:23 76:3,10 82:19
170:25 171:2	board 4:10 7:2 20:2	bust 153:19	cash 72:25 108:12	chap 140:6	97:14 103:7 116:23
172:23 173:18	159:20 160:17	butting 129:9	114:6,16 115:5	characterisation	118:1 119:4 125:22
174:25 176:21	212:7	button 216:21	169:23 212:4,14	131:23 132:1 133:3	138:13 159:19,25
179:19 180:22	Boggs 2:8,8,9,9,10,10	buy 28:3	213:10,21 215:17	133:7 136:3 154:16	160:2 175:23,25
193:11 201:7 216:6	2:11		222:4 223:22	characterise 130:19	180:2 184:2 198:4
believed 42:22 43:8,8	bona 86:22	C	cast 142:16,16,21	132:3 154:21 159:7	204:10 205:21
43:15 69:15 191:11	bonnet 195:23		catch 126:15	159:22 167:11	clearer 206:1
bell 153:22 157:24	boom 153:8	C 126:4 127:3	caught 112:25	194:13	clearly 93:7 207:15
164:8 187:1	bore 178:11	cadastral 126:24	cause 138:24 195:21	characterises 143:11	Clermont 157:24,25
bells 6:11 179:17	borrow 166:7 168:4	call 20:7,8,11 23:9	caused 64:14 204:15	characteristics 195:8	158:17,23 162:1
below 153:24,25	both 35:23 44:5 50:5	26:20 30:25 48:14	206:15 224:21	charge 131:3 137:12	164:3,9,12,15 212:8
		53:7 97:8 143:10		0	
BEN 2:5	54:22 73:13 91:20	146:11 172:23	causes 180:11	Charles 2:14 15 15	212:13
Benada 7:24 10:12	96:6,7 98:17 111:2	189:8,11 207:5	causing 109:4 204:20	Charles 2:14,15,15	close 85:23 86:17
11:21 12:20 19:15	119:4 123:24 134:1	226:11	caution 86:14	charts 166:2	135:1 173:21 197:2
19:16 84:3,4 92:9	158:20 174:12	called 3:3 4:1 1:5	CC 95:21	check 225:15	215:3 224:4 227:9
92:14 139:10	182:21 186:12,14	17:18 63:14 110:22	CCs 193:20	checked 56:9	227:21
183:13,16,20,25	222:3	132:2 141:13 145:3	cease 219:1	chemicals 141:4	closer 113:18
184:8 193:20	bottom 111:14 114:8	150:20 174:7	Central 217:19	chemistry 197:22	club 41:8

ap 26:12	214:5	gangarning 6:2.10	considered 14:25	convenient 132:15	11.0 50.1 56.0 50.2
co 36:12 coach 145:3	communications 18:8	concerning 6:2,10 27:13 84:15 98:3	considered 14:25 27:25 134:19	146:10	44:9 52:1 56:8 58:3 92:8 96:18 102:7
coal 145:15	communications	100:8 131:24	181:18 200:25	conventional 173:8	126:13,19 127:15
coalition 146:4	133:15	concerns 54:9 107:15	211:16 225:3	174:7,8	131:20 132:24
coffee 209:14	communities 199:6	181:16 196:21	considering 222:17	conversation 11:22	134:6 148:11
coffin 225:4,5	community 53:18	197:19 198:1	consistent 33:3 88:19	12:3 13:23 15:8,11	155:18 161:14
coherence 40:14	54:5 78:24 79:2	200:15 202:11	111:16 121:2	23:4 26:5 32:22	177:15 178:7
COLIN 2:4	85:18 143:14 145:6	concession 180:21	consistently 87:12	41:25 59:1 84:23	184:10 194:5 197:4
collaboration 65:7	145:7 146:11	181:17	consortium 113:9	85:12 97:10 102:5	197:11 198:12
colleague 102:1,2 131:3 140:14	178:23 181:16 199:8 203:25	concessions 140:24 180:15	Constitution 61:6 constitutional 60:4	103:3 106:4 122:25 129:9 184:8	209:4,11,14 court 28:9,11 35:23
217:13	205:13 226:17	conciliatory 141:18	61:2 178:20	conversations 3:16	37:2 38:16,17 39:7
colleagues 13:23	companies 129:19	conclude 61:5	construct 86:9	10:25 11:17,19	44:23 45:1 46:8
41:24 80:13 124:8	company 4:14 8:7	concluded 4:16	construction 31:7	12:11 15:12,13,17	47:17,18,18 49:14
129:10 140:13	9:11,14 12:22 25:11	208:19	51:15 168:5	26:8 30:7 41:23	49:25 50:4,5,6,14
144:17 182:6,9	31:7 41:14 53:5	concludes 116:2	construed 62:2 206:4	48:6 112:16 131:20	51:12 52:15 53:21
183:11 199:12	84:7 97:17 119:11	121:17 208:22	consultant 193:24	139:13	59:18 62:1,19 63:25
209:25 Combustible 81:22	130:24 133:22	conclusion 60:7 95:18	consultation 137:15	convince 43:16 coordinates 125:7	67:14 69:1,19,20,22
come 27:21 39:10	136:20 137:8,13 143:19 149:9	120:22 218:24 condensed 227:12	Consulting 2:13,13,14 contact 3:21	126:24	70:7,16,18 85:16 87:4 88:18,24,25
40:19 42:6,11 46:5	157:22 167:12,12	condition 51:16,16	contacted 50:18	copied 19:19 95:19,20	103:10 112:10
52:6 67:3,5 73:3	168:22,23 169:1,3	70:2 115:16	contacts 105:10	123:9 199:21	133:2 134:10 185:5
76:6 104:17 113:11	169:17 171:13	conditions 53:8,22	156:21,23	copies 1:21	208:25
113:12 137:18	202:20 213:21,23	140:7 153:3	contained 141:3	copy 54:21 55:7 84:5	courts 48:4,11 133:10
143:7,19 157:13,16	214:12 215:8	conduct 35:1,4 56:15	contemplated 110:20	154:6	134:3,9 145:20,20
159:8,16 160:3	221:25	85:17 86:13,21	111:10 166:18	corporation 165:17	148:5,5,8,17 189:19
165:4 167:1 172:24 181:5 182:10,17,21	company's 53:16 comparable 28:18	87:20 127:19 128:8 218:25	181:15 contemplating 162:2	correcting 126:23 correction 90:21	189:20 190:16 court's 38:15 60:1,3,7
183:12,14 192:13	177:20	conducted 187:10	162:3,18	152:1,7	63:11,11,15,17 89:3
196:15 197:9,12	comparison 97:5	conducting 112:19	contemporaneous	corrections 2:10	cover 18:11 36:25
201:6 218:2 225:2	155:1	confer 21:19	101:24,25	152:14	covered 23:24 31:23
comfort 40:23 136:9	compensation 60:10	conference 173:16,24	contend 66:10	correctly 43:1 59:11	87:16,18
comfortable 139:6	60:11 61:16 62:3	176:9	content 22:11 23:23	133:6 210:15	covering 149:18
177:25 180:1	competent 44:23 45:1	confess 28:16	57:8 104:1	correspondence	co-fund 76:6
215:15	competing 131:25	confessed 67:21	contents 25:6	199:22 225:9	co-investor 113:21,22
coming 73:7 76:24 93:6 132:19 193:17	132:5 complains 220:2	confession 28:17 confident 7:14	contesting 28:15 context 56:5	corroborate 105:8 Corrupt 74:14 118:10	co-investors 113:12 co-owned 35:15,16
commence 40:19	complaint 44:4,11,15	confirm 1:9,24 57:16	continuation 116:11	cost 160:11,14 161:2	47:6
comment 23:14 31:22	45:5,10,19 46:21	150:21 151:13	continue 47:5 73:24	161:20 162:23	co-owner 29:17,21
32:3 33:10 43:23	47:25 147:15	209:22	107:16 120:16	costs 155:11,13 157:9	30:3,5,16 34:21
84:22 91:10 140:25	complaints 44:5,7	confirmation 135:23	121:22 156:19	163:11,15 183:18	36:11 38:20 39:1
177:9,24 178:16	184:19 219:17,18	confirmed 192:6	160:14 161:7	couch 140:17	44:15 45:12,13 46:6
200:23 207:25	220:1	confirms 90:9	163:16,21 204:22	couched 103:2	46:22
213:15	complete 111:9	conflicted 182:24	208:5	council 40:7,8,9 41:1	co-owners 36:14
commenters 206:19 commenting 204:3	128:17 199:7 219:5 completely 35:7 190:2	conformable 61:6 confrontations 138:8	continued 18:17 73:1 77:6 141:10 155:9	41:3,4,5 42:23 43:4 79:16,18 80:24 81:2	38:15,18 71:11 co-ownership 86:11
comments 57:9	compliance 112:19	confusion 111:13	160:8	81:10,12,25	86:16
commit 206:7	complicating 53:24	connect 224:9	continuing 54:19	counsel 17:23 18:1	cratered 154:24,24,25
commitment 72:13,18	complied 7:21 118:9	connected 139:25	154:4 219:11	62:10 91:9 96:5	crazy 226:1
72:19 73:16 76:15	comply 201:11	connection 71:10	contract 27:13 28:6,8	125:22 135:22	create 140:7 141:15
109:19 195:21	compromise 117:2	172:5 182:8	36:10,15 222:15	148:22,25 151:20	166:21
206:21	122:6	ConocoPhillips	contracting 222:23,23	151:21 183:22	created 59:20 63:25
committed 108:7 109:21 144:9	compulsory 7:6 computer 216:18	173:14 conscience 2:1 151:17	contractor 77:9,19,20 77:22 78:5	186:4 211:2,3,5,7 212:22	115:6 creating 133:17
219:10	concede 28:20,20,23	conscientious 7:20	contractors 10:4	counted 134:7	creation 64:14
committee 80:18	67:9 134:25	conscious 39:16	104:15,17	counted 134.7	criminal 44:4,10,14
207:2 219:16 220:5	conceded 28:21 87:6	consciousness 145:24	contrary 70:6	75:16,17,20	45:9 46:13
common 32:14 36:8	88:6	consent 38:25 61:7,8	contrast 45:23	country 3:2 5:13 7:17	critical 115:12,16,19
36:12 76:8 191:7	concept 25:3 27:3	consents 79:6	contributed 65:24	8:7 136:16 137:16	115:21
192:3 198:25	215:16 222:5	consequences 81:23	contributing 119:5	147:4	criticism 11:10
202:11	concern 39:7 42:9	119:25	contribution 167:23	couple 3:12,16 127:16	cross-examination 3:5
communicate 61:10 209:13	82:21 83:9 85:1,4 198:6 202:14	consider 49:25 84:19 101:8 147:23	171:23 controlled 65:2,10	138:21 144:16 161:18 183:7,17	4:3 2:16 56:7 121:18 152:20
communicated 24:24	concerned 22:12	197:16	67:23	210:3,8	cross-purposes 96:10
111:23 208:8	75:18 109:6 133:10	consideration 37:1	controlling 65:8	course 7:8 11:11	Crow 3:10,18 8:24
communication 14:18	141:3 166:15 193:2	considerations 147:2	controversy 174:13,23	14:18 21:15,18 24:4	9:12 11:20 12:3,23
84:6 86:20 103:19	193:4	148:9	174:24 178:1	32:8,13 35:12 39:12	12:24 19:16 80:12

178:15 183:2

duties 4:23,25 5:15

159:25

154:13,20 156:11

175:3 178:7 198:23

214:24 220:6

222:22 226:15

227:2

100:4,8,10,18,19	December 17:1 27:22	depending 18:10	217:25 222:12,13	45:15,15 47:17	door 172:21
136:8 141:22	27:25 28:25 46:11	165:19	difficulty 72:2	69:18 70:17 95:25	doubt 90:9,9 103:8
182:14,17 210:14	46:14 47:3 48:1,11	depends 90:4 223:7	diligence 5:20 135:13	131:21,24	202:2
210:20,24 217:5	48:22 106:24,25	225:12	135:23 136:21	Disputes 1:2	doubtful 204:19
cumbersome 31:13	113:3,8,13 114:3	depths 220:18	166:10,11 187:11	disrupt 133:24 145:5	doubts 201:2
Cumbria 145:15	139:15 151:4 167:3	describe 27:5,6 100:8	213:13 214:15	205:22 206:7	DOUGLAS 2:10
curious 20:14 39:14	186:6,11	129:20 139:25	215:16	disrupted 192:15	down 3:2 5:4 24:5
153:5	decide 44:24 46:8	215:6	diminish 200:21	206:15	29:12 31:5 35:8,10
cut 37:21 185:18	47:17 69:19 145:22	described 24:23 30:16	dinner 217:24	disrupting 205:23	36:3 37:3 44:19
226:8	222:1	70:20 100:11	dip 154:12	disruption 204:15	61:3,12 79:5 91:25
cuts 39:11 cut-and-dried 185:20	decided 27:2 28:14	105:13 113:14 141:14	Direct 3:4 4:2 2:9 151:23	disruptive 200:19 disseminated 170:15	93:12 127:23
Czarna 173:19	104:3 128:25 decidedly 120:12	describes 38:17 156:4	directed 70:22 88:23	dissimilar 153:15	147:13 153:17 155:10 160:22
Czech 7:17 8:1,4,6	decision 59:18 60:1,13	describing 15:13	direction 64:22,23	distant 131:4 133:22	162:14 163:9
41:24 136:12	105:18 145:16	26:12 98:3 147:3	65:5 96:25	distinct 54:8	168:15 191:15,23
Czechoslovak 8:5	173:3 211:2	153:2 173:9	directions 44:6	distinction 138:14	203:15 210:20
136:11	decisions 134:10,11	description 58:13,21	directly 52:10 93:24	211:23	220:19 221:15
C-105 27:11	145:21	58:25 84:22 130:4	directors 65:11	distinguish 54:4	224:22
C-120 30:20	declaration 1:25 14:8	130:18 131:11	disagree 81:20 144:3	distracted 122:5	draft 92:25 93:1,3,3
C-125 34:18	14:10 87:4 151:14	desirable 144:4	153:5	District 44:2,3	93:18 96:7 97:9
C-139 126:9,25	declare 2:1 151:16	desired 120:20	disagreements 111:13	divest 128:10 217:21	108:21 203:17
C-142 168:10	declared 28:9	desires 43:4	disapproval 82:1	doable 201:13 224:11	drafted 94:5,13,13
C-161 98:10	decline 153:21 154:20	despite 36:10 70:16,18	disbursed 72:22	document 20:22 24:22	96:17 102:8
C-166 203:8,12,18	156:3	72:12 88:2 111:2	disclosed 21:7 56:12	27:12,14 29:6,11	drain 160:8
C-171 203:22 C-185 127:22 216:15	deed 126:8 default 74:7,9 75:10	112:24 114:13 141:17 159:4	179:19 disclosure 56:19 113:3	32:13,17 34:4,17 44:9 48:15,17 55:14	dramatically 155:10 dress 199:2
C-280 125:10 126:2	75:14 106:23 107:4	226:16	113:5	55:15 56:17 57:4,8	dressing 132:14
127:10	107:12 115:22	detail 23:20 52:6	discovered 56:11	57:10 58:21 68:4	dried 185:18
C-281 123:8	116:4,9,19 117:15	54:13 112:9 117:25	Discovery 1:15 1:14	71:5 82:16 84:15	drill 15:18 72:4
C-282 165:7	118:5,6 168:12	detailed 135:13,23	2:25 4:14 114:16,21	88:8,18 91:11,12	144:22 157:16
C-340 101:14	defaulted 75:10	details 44:6 45:6	115:6,12,15,23	92:9 94:10 101:8	181:7 199:6 212:4
C-382 119:13 206:24	108:15	184:3,5 186:19	116:8,14 118:15	105:5 107:3 110:24	215:5 221:23 222:7
C-41 154:1,11 186:20	defence 213:14	deteriorate 156:11	129:19 130:20	118:1 123:8 126:2	222:20
	defence's 214:16	deteriorated 156:9	132:24 150:24	126:11,25 202:11	drilled 136:8 220:25
D	defendant 35:12 36:9	determination 88:4	170:14,14,18 171:7 218:24	205:12 206:3	221:10 222:9
Dakota 172:11	37:5 86:3,5,6,8,12 86:14,14,18,21	determine 40:5 157:4 determined 144:7	discriminated 148:6	documentary 38:9 documentation	drilling 9:5 112:23 123:23 141:2,3
Dallas 172:24	defending 198:21	devastating 154:23	discuss 146:19 179:15	166:21,23 175:16	161:5 162:23
damage 142:20 data 157:8 215:9,10	defer 110:1	155:9	196:2	documented 27:9	163:14,16 173:8
219:19 220:11	deferred 110:6 114:24	develop 157:17	discussed 10:4 12:21	165:24 166:19	174:1,8 178:24
date 22:25 30:21	defines 133:13	developed 63:14 68:22	15:4 23:2 37:3	documents 14:25	187:12,14 197:22
48:17 171:20	definitional 131:9	161:8 163:11 171:4	68:10 69:1 70:11	16:14,16 46:19	215:23 219:21,23
204:23	defray 157:9	172:16	84:21 88:21 106:16	54:20,23 56:14,16	220:8 222:17
dated 1:17 25:22	degree 132:7 147:11	development 159:12	137:6 166:16	62:10 79:23 91:19	drop 105:13,19
27:22 30:22 123:9	delay 109:4 204:15	162:10 172:8	discusses 99:24	92:2 97:1 100:7,15	153:13,15 171:16
164:22 193:8	delayed 111:6,7 delays 109:6,12 111:7	DG 114:16 118:3 DG's 168:17	discussing 54:1 89:13 105:12 135:10	100:22 109:7,8 171:2 206:14	171:17 dropped 85:13 88:7
203:18	111:24 114:1	DG 8 108:17 DG/Alpine 118:9	196:4 203:14	219:16 221:17	104:23 105:4,16
David 2:9 2:19 152:21	delinquent 117:5	dialogue 41:16 52:2	discussion 3:13 13:8,9	222:22	104:23 103:4,10
day 1:8 1:4 58:2 98:25 99:5 105:17 137:22	demand 29:7,13,14,16	112:14 113:19	13:12 17:2,4 27:22	doing 1:4 2:25 13:14	dry 226:8
140:18 141:7	30:4,6 114:11 116:5	140:7 141:10	33:13 52:25 60:3,12	59:5 117:11 132:19	Drymer's 131:18
140:18 141.7	demanded 115:4	dichotomy 53:25	61:2 62:21,25 68:23	155:12 160:15,17	DUARTE-SILVA
227:9,21 228:2	democratic 143:18	difference 141:19	84:15 89:8 96:1	172:12,14 181:21	2:14
days 29:13 45:18,18	145:24 147:10	221:9 224:12	101:21 104:1 106:1	188:3 191:11	due 5:20 111:25 114:1
67:20 89:3 98:21	177:4,6	different 43:7 51:21	108:1 119:15,16	196:14 197:18	126:13,18 127:15
143:18 157:14	demonstrate 41:15	132:13,20,24	123:25 127:18	198:10 214:3	135:13,23 136:21
159:14 183:7,17	demonstration 83:17	139:22 140:11	148:24 149:5	215:15 226:1	187:11 213:12
day-to-day 7:16	83:23 demonstrations 83:14	145:9 170:21 190:2 192:19 204:17	171:22 178:13	dollars 212:23 213:25	214:14 215:16
deal 5:22 110:20	174:25 181:23	differentiate 113:21	191:6 201:4 discussions 10:12 17:6	done 5:23 26:9,10 37:24 38:5 59:9	218:24 during 15:3,16,16
126:18 157:23	demonstrative 54:18	difficult 106:8 156:7	52:22 53:6 104:25	78:13 108:20	16:19 56:8 58:10
165:13,24 166:25	55:16 62:11 68:1	156:12 159:13,15	107:14 139:10	113:16 135:8	72:23,24 73:7 101:2
171:12 188:5 193:22 205:18	69:25 185:1	163:23 165:25	159:2 164:20	157:14 170:12	121:22 153:16
dealing 176:4	denied 50:4 51:2 69:2	211:18.25 212:12	204:13	175:3 178:7 198:23	154:13.20 156:11

204:13

display 143:9

disingenuous 201:7

dispute 1:4 35:18

211:18,25 212:12

difficulties 73:4,6,25

181:6 206:15

212:13

debate 52:13,21 147:5

dealing 176:4

dealings 10:3

dealt 221:12

denied 50:4 51:2 69:2

department 37:17

dependent 121:4,6

44:3 45:5

duty 1:23 151:12	elsewhere 108:5
dying 42:10	email 15:23 16:3,7
Dáša 193:11	19:20 20:12 24:2
	25:16 56:2 95:14
E	95:20,23 96:11,1
each 57:17 58:2 98:25	97:7 102:7,8 105
99:5 138:21 193:10	123:8 127:24
214:10	169:24 193:7
earlier 19:13 59:17	200:22 217:4,24 emails 105:10,11
62:18 69:1,18 83:1	emerged 94:22
83:4 88:15 89:8	Emma 1:25
91:15 106:17 114:3 114:5 129:13	employed 2:21,23,
135:10 136:5 138:6	37:14 69:6
147:20 162:2	employee 37:5,7,10
171:21 217:14	employees 64:20
early 16:20 51:20	employment 130:2
68:13 73:9 74:8	enable 66:3
76:12,14 112:11	encompass 130:2
122:21 138:1	encompassed 137:
139:11 152:25	end 62:24 64:12 66
153:3 154:19	72:15 73:2,6,7,1
157:14 159:14	73:19,23 74:8 12
161:11 162:22	137:22 140:18
176:18,20 211:13	141:7 145:19,20
211:20	171:14 184:22 185:9 191:4 196
easier 54:23 158:13	219:22 220:24
222:6	223:8 225:2,16,1
eastern 5:13 easy 146:21 157:10	225:20 227:1,19
215:14	ended 172:11
echo 147:22	ending 152:9
EC4M 1:6	Energy 157:24 158
edges 143:15	162:1 172:10
educate 160:18	enforce 116:8 226:
effect 67:19 87:3	engage 138:7 139:
135:22 203:25	157:20
225:21	engaged 17:20 18:
effective 133:15	22:23 77:20,24 7
effectively 143:24	104:16,17 157:1 157:22
213:9	engagement 18:9,1
effects 155:9	22:25 138:5,9
effort 108:23 126:19	226:11,13
159:7,13 160:15 192:21 211:19	engagements 42:4
212:1,2 226:17	172:19
efforts 72:12 107:21	engaging 138:2
109:2 111:2 159:4	engineer 194:2,6
ego 65:15	221:14
EIA 140:25 141:8	engineering 127:6
192:25 193:3	English 3:7 18:18
206:11 218:20	56:20 58:25 71:5
224:22 225:1,3,6,7	English-speaking
225:10,13,19	58:23
EIAs 140:22	enjoined 34:25 35:
eight 46:7	35:23,24 63:8 64
either 2:10 3:10 50:12	187:12
59:5 94:4 115:9	enough 40:11 54:6
125:14 152:15	73:21 93:7 150:5
190:2,25 197:10	168:6 191:1 227 ensure 116:14
201:16	ensure 116:14 ensuring 8:18 116:
elaborate 211:24	enter 8:13 70:9
elections 146:12	enter 8.13 70.9 entered 14:25 17:2
element 195:6 201:10	41:2 63:7,9,19,2
elementary 86:14 elements 213:13	69:10 70:1 78:5
elephant 223:24	157:5
скриант 223.2 4	

```
where 108:5
il 15:23 16:3,7
9.20 20.12 24.20
5:16 56:2 95:14,19
5:20,23 96:11,19
7:7 102:7,8 105:8
23:8 127:24
69:24 193:7
00:22 217:4.24
ils 105:10,11
rged 94:22
na 1:25
loyed 2:21,23,25
7:14 69:6
loyee 37:5,7,10
loyees 64:20
loyment 130:21
ole 66:3
ompass 130:2
ompassed 137:8
62:24 64:12 66:17
2:15 73:2.6.7.15
3:19.23 74:8 125:8
37:22 140:18
41:7 145:19,20
71:14 184:22
85:9 191:4 196:8
19:22 220:24
23:8 225:2,16,17
25:20 227:1,19
ed 172:11
ing 152:9
rgy 157:24 158:23
52:1 172:10
rce 116:8 226:5
ge 138:7 139:19
57.20
aged 17:20 18:20
2:23 77:20,24 78:1
04:16,17 157:18
gement 18:9,11
2:25 138:5,9
26:11,13
agements 42:4
72:19
aging 138:2
neer 194:2,6
21:14
neering 127:6
lish 3:7 18:18 42:1
6:20 58:25 71:5
lish-speaking
ined 34:25 35:2
5:23,24 63:8 64:1
87:12
11 154:6 11 154:6
3:21 93:7 150:5
68:6 191:1 227:2
re 116:14
ıring 8:18 116:11
r 8:13 70:9
red 14:25 17:2
1:2 63:7,9,19,20
```

```
entering 8:9 185:13
enthusiasm 157:6
entire 57:23 106:9,9
  221:25
entirely 64:22 199:14
entirety 28:21 93:12
entities 54:8
entitled 70:15
entitlement 70:5
  187:19
entitlements 44:25
entity 49:12 132:9
  170:23
entrance 104:8
environment 6:3,5 8:3
  81:23 82:5 133:13
  138:25 139:4
  145:23 146:14.16
  146:24 148:15
  155:14 179:12
  195:11,13,14
  220:17
environmental 139:3
   174:14,16 178:9
  179:16 180:5,11,11
  180:20 181:17
  196:21 197:25
  198:5,6 200:10
  201:1,12 204:11
  205:15,20 206:20
  207:22
envisioned 158:17
equipment 66:7 67:3
equity 156:7,13
error 56:17,24
especially 222:17
espouse 195:21
essentially 82:11
   102:13 103:23
  108:15 139:2
  157:23 169:1
Essex 2:3
establish 29:2 47:25
established 61:15
  87:13
establishing 187:19
establishment 52:16
estate 154:24 166:3,4
  168:4,6
estimate 57:22
estimated 57:17
estimates 162:23,25
  163:3
estimating 161:20
et 213:23 222:22
EU 175:1 177:7,20
  178:7,8,13
Europe 156:19 172:22
  173:1,7 174:11,13
  175:6
European 217:19
evaluate 215:9
even 19:15 21:13
  29:24 40:13 70:21
  119:8 139:12
  155:16 165:24
  173:18 177:8
```

```
182:16 190:11
                         exclusively 108:7
  212:7 226:24
evening 199:16 227:25
event 60:9 82:20
                            105:18 150:2
  85:15 154:22
  156:25
                            201:20 211:5
events 27:9 62:8 72:1
  85:16 87:11 98:3
                         execute 168:23
  99:16 160:8 181:25
                         executed 28:25
  182:10 226:18
                         exercise 56:19
eventually 130:1
                         exercising 177:23
                         exhibit 24:2 54:18
  213:10
ever 46:7 69:20,22
   77:24 94:1 132:9
  163:20 166:14
  170:20 193:1,24
  196:3 202:6 206:20
every 69:24 70:1,3
                         exhibits 154:3.8
  130:2 135:16 147:4
  155:15 170:2
                            190:21
  175:25 189:5
                         existence 45:2 61:9
  204:15 225:8,9
                           112:21
everybody 78:1
                         existing 28:4
  117:21 122:14
                         exit 192:12
  150:18 209:20
  214:1
                           217:16
everyone 1:3,3 220:2
                         expanded 130:20
  227:25
                         expect 23:23 76:16
everything 67:17
                            104:25 112:7
  118:18 160:12
  218:5,7 222:6
                            190:7 215:13
                         expectation 155:15
  224:23
evidence 38:9 60:10
   74:1 77:23 79:9
                            189:5 190:22
   170:17,23 184:7
                         expectations 212:4
  187:20 202:24
  211.1 17
evident 86:18
evolved 129:20 130:1
  160:8
EWAN 2:14
exacerbate 225:25
                            156:17 165:2
exactly 23:1 65:11
   126:22 130:15,23
                         experienced 7:18
  135:13 142:18
  146:13 147:25
  227.18
                         expert 178:12,17
examination 3:4,20
                         expertise 174:4
  4:2 2:9 90:2 121:21
                         explain 56:4 91:14
  122:17 129:17
  150:8 151:23
                           224:18
  208:22 209:2
examinations 227:11
example 6:6,8 30:7
                         explaining 57:7
  41:8 47:8 105:12
                           -
179:11
  119:12 136:16
  137:1,14 174:14
                           56:12,25 57:1
   176:23 183:11
   196:21
                         exploration 8:10
exceeded 163:12
excellent 1:21 227:20
except 155:2
                           86:10 143:15
exception 72:13
                            158:20 160:5
exchange 109:7
  118:13
                            162:11
exclusive 107:25
  108:4
```

```
explored 183:16
excuse 13:4 15:8 25:19
                         exploring 130:25
  30:9 53:23 101:2
                         exposure 174:16
                         expounded 217:24
  161:24 197:15
                         expounding 196:24
                         express 23:16 64:5
  214:21 216:24
                            82:1 103:13 132:22
                            181:16
                         expressed 202:14
                            208:16
                         expressing 39:7
                         expression 82:21
  56:8 60:24 90:22
                            143:17 196:9,16,18
  91:8,8,15 96:6
                         expressions 178:23
  125:10 127:21
                         expressly 46:15
  154:6 185:1 186:22
                         extended 163:17
  193:6 214:4 216:15
                         extension 163:19
                         extensively 220:13
existed 166:23 186:16
                         extent 53:19 72:18,19
                            72:21 120:19
                            137:13 180:1
                            198:12 201:23,24
                         extenuating 185:22
                         external 72:10 74:24
exiting 4:13 128:7,12
                            75:25 76:1 108:5
                            119:2 121:10,14
                           157:2 163:22 187:8
                         extra 160:14
                         extract 127:2
  120:10 128:17
                         extreme 74:21 153:20
                         extremely 114:15
                         eyes 80:6,8 158:9
  160:23 161:19
                         e-mail 20:18
  214:25 215:3,4
                         face 118:1 140:8 144:2
expected 86:8 177:7
                            145:25
  212:14 221:14
                         Facebook 133:25
experience 4:5,7 8:2,4
                         facet 130:2
  10:20 18:20 131:4
                         facing 73:25 108:3
   136:10 154:19
                            109:3 112:17
                         fact 6:15 36:10 46:2
  171:22 179:23,24
                           46:11,19 49:11,23
                            52:14 57:2 61:25
  111:24 130:21
                            70:16,18 87:18 88:2
  143:21 153:3.16
                            114:13 115:21
                            118:5.21 128:9
                            137:6 159:14
                            177:22 178:24
  126:9 152:7 198:2
                            181:4 187:17 200:8
                           202:18 206:13
explained 17:15 23:1
                           211:18,20 215:22
  147:25 197:6 203:6
                           222.13
                         factor 111:8
                         facts 128:9 185:17
explanation 10:21,24
                            197:21
                         factually 66:14,22
explanations 127:15
                         fail 86:12
explicitly 30:4 164:12
                         failed 51:5 64:2
                         failing 74:7 146:1
  42:12 81:21 82:2.4
                         failure 52:15 114:16
                         fair 6:15 13:7 20:12
  154:20 155:5,12
                            20:13 22:6 47:13,14
                            52:9 54:6 58:21
                            90:6 91:20 99:17,18
explore 40:21 97:12
                            102:4 131:23 136:3
   155:9 183:6,8 219:3
                            150:5 154:16 157:2
```

		ı			1
161:11 171:24	226:20	94:11 97:2,22	Formalizing 111:20	fully 118:9,14 157:3	43:9 54:21 199:9
174:13,16 182:6	fiction 132:15	107:11 109:10	formed 9:25	219:18	215:12
191:1 203:5	fide 85:17,21 86:19,22	119:21 128:2,19	forth 135:11 140:2	full-time 4:15 5:10	general 18:14 156:14
fairly 106:8 176:18	field 26:17 35:14	137:24 147:22	forthright 147:23	182:24 183:4	180:10 212:9
fairness 60:19	49:22,23 92:16	151:3,9,19 152:1,3	179:11	fulsome 125:13	221:19
faith 70:24 71:16	172:11	152:4 154:21 156:4	fortune 171:9	fun 172:20	generally 4:23 181:25
86:13	fields 215:10	158:5,14 160:20	forward 28:5,7 59:22	functions 131:12	184:13
faked 142:4	fight 139:1 226:25	161:2,17,21 162:7,8	112:9 127:14	fund 72:13,19 73:1,16	generate 171:10
fallout 155:6	file 37:16 45:23	166:8,18,19 168:14	149:15 166:22	73:24 74:7 75:4,12	generated 161:3
familiar 16:17 78:20	148:25	170:14 173:10	181:5 205:22,25	76:4,5,7,10 107:16	gentleman 217:22
145:14 177:10	filed 34:21 36:20	177:14 186:24	forwarded 93:2 114:3	159:17 160:3 161:7	gentleman's 124:20
178:8 181:25 220:6	38:16 44:4 45:9,19	189:6,12,24 192:23	found 10:17 20:14	161:9 162:10	gentlemen 12:8
famous 133:18,20,23	46:4,14,21 47:25	199:25 200:4	67:20 69:20 85:16	165:14 167:19	genuine 195:21
fantastic 224:1	48:13 90:21 141:7	203:13,13 213:8	87:20 134:21 139:5	213:2,11,17 214:9	geographic 180:25
far 53:16 75:18 77:9	186:11	216:4,9 218:16,19	211:14,14 222:16	214:18	geological 49:13 82:3
90:5 105:15 132:10	filing 204:1	218:24 221:7	foundation 87:15	fundamental 220:16	86:10 168:18
133:10 158:16	filings 46:13	223:10	four 35:10 41:22	funded 72:20,21 73:17	geologist 172:7 183:2
166:15,25 173:20	final 116:2,6 208:13	Firstly 219:25	59:20 80:17 81:11	74:19 76:16 167:12	194:6
176:6 203:10	218:21,22	first-hand 182:11	82:6 84:6 135:1	202:20	geology 6:6,7 160:16
221:10 224:10	finally 87:10 135:4	211:1	160:22 175:23	funder 106:16	215:2
farm 3:2 11:1,18	finance 2:11,12,12	five 41:22 59:20	176:4,8	funders 107:7	geophysical 168:18
12:21 15:6 105:1,4	73:10,13 121:14	fix 188:6	fourth 69:8 191:5	funding 72:15,25 73:5	Germany 42:8
105:11,12 106:4	130:13 160:1	fixer 140:1	fracking 147:5 156:16	73:20 74:24,24	gestures 41:13
137:3	161:16,17	Flammable 82:2	171:22 172:5,9	107:24 108:5,8	getting 47:10 94:20
farmed 11:1	financial 4:17,19,24	flexibility 58:4	173:9 174:2,10,14	109:18 110:21,22	106:15 134:24
farmout 166:17,17	41:3,5 112:15	floor 2:13 21:16	175:2,12	113:25 116:10,19	135:18 136:1 163:9
fault 199:14	119:25 130:3 131:5	flow 212:5,14 222:4	fracks 173:11	117:5 118:15 119:1	165:23 191:10
favour 69:20 81:12	157:18 188:18,20	223:22	France 135:16	120:15,24 121:7	202:10 209:1
82:7	188:23 218:1,8	focus 71:25 98:15	frankly 142:4	159:13 160:5,14	221:10,12 222:24
favourite 166:7	financially 72:5	focused 51:22 62:5 175:21	Fraser 2:5 3:3 1:5,6,7 1:10,11,15,19 2:1	161:4 164:5 167:24	gist 118:6
February 1:8 1:1 36:18 62:20,21	financing 72:10 75:25 76:1 119:2 121:10	focusing 174:6	2:10,18 11:6 15:8	168:1 202:18,21 208:5 211:19,21	give 8:12 10:19 21:16 22:6 31:1 41:14
185:8 189:17 193:8	121:11 127:18	folks 133:6 172:21	15:20 19:13 20:3	212:1,2,3 214:6,7	91:20 133:2 140:11
203:18 221:1	157:2 159:21 162:2	173:22 179:9	22:10 25:21 27:12	215:17	165:9 201:5
fed 191:10 208:21	163:22,24,25	follow 42:17 58:1	29:19 30:9 33:1	fundraising 4:25	given 32:1,15 38:25
Federal 74:14	165:19	147:11 196:14	34:19 43:20 44:13	funds 72:22 75:2,23	56:22 57:18 67:13
fee 121:1 208:15	find 53:22 56:22 60:19	214:10	47:12 50:21 51:18	113:4,10,21 114:15	97:3 115:5 163:19
feel 120:25 129:8	84:24 112:23	following 7:9 43:20	52:7,8,20 54:16	115:17 117:3,7	169:22 197:24
132:12 145:18	126:16 155:24	123:14 131:18	55:18 58:8,10 59:17	118:21 119:6	204:14
146:13 148:17	159:21 191:7 192:2	137:5 147:13	64:25 66:1 67:9	169:17 170:5,18,20	gives 96:20,23
177:25 193:16	202:10 222:3	210:13 228:2	71:10,25 73:9 78:14	170:24 214:12	giving 97:16
198:7 208:14	finding 86:23 135:18	follow-on 199:22	78:20 79:14,24 81:5	further 25:9 26:5 32:5	glad 91:5 124:16
215:15 226:14	221:11	follow-up 14:4 20:7	82:19 87:14 88:8	32:21 33:13 44:19	201:4
feeling 40:16	finds 116:8	143:3,5 147:19	90:2,7,13 91:7,14	61:12 75:5,13 76:10	Global 1:15 1:14 2:25
feels 120:6 207:8,19	fine 1:4 54:25 55:5	148:19	92:2 95:13 98:2,10	118:11 119:6	150:24
feet 220:19	58:15 59:3,13 86:7	foot 49:22	101:13 107:3	123:20 124:6,7	go 13:5 15:7 17:1
felt 40:18,22 105:22	90:22 122:13	football 41:8	109:11 118:25	127:14 150:7 161:5	32:19 38:12,24 39:5
105:23,23 120:7	149:20 150:14,18	forced 62:2 147:16	121:16,22 122:9,14	161:8 166:16 201:9	42:20 43:16 59:1
135:4 139:18,19	158:16 199:4 209:3	foreign 42:10 118:10	122:19 150:8,10	202:2 227:3	69:24 76:20,21
146:22 192:20	209:7,24 220:19	146:7	159:19 175:11	future 75:2,22	78:10 81:15 90:5
196:23 197:5	227:3	foreigner 129:9	183:11,23 184:11		97:6 102:23 109:10
204:17,18 207:9,20	finger 42:19 131:9	Forestry 222:14	187:23 189:9,12	- G	114:13 124:21
215:19 225:1,19	finish 97:24 199:16	forfeited 205:14	191:16,24 193:7	GABRIELLE 1:11	133:18,23 140:9
fence 104:3,17,20,22	227:19	forfeiture 206:4	199:25 201:9,18	game 121:11,15	146:18 149:15
106:9	finished 104:19	forget 119:10 130:7	202:6,9 211:1 217:4	gas 3:1,25 4:5,8 8:5,6	158:1 159:17
fencing 104:13,19	fire 19:9	forgive 31:13 55:13	Fraser's 97:20 155:19	8:7 81:22 82:3	161:15 164:7
105:14,16 106:2	firm 17:17,18 98:24	71:3 96:13 158:10	free 177:16	132:10 136:12,17	165:20 167:16
Ferko 140:5 194:7,8	118:20	forgot 147:20 148:20	Friday 1:8 1:1	145:16 155:10	171:14 172:25
200:7	first 1:17 2:21 4:21	220:9 forgotten 129:12	friend 157:21 165:5 217:13	156:8 162:11 166:5	194:1 196:4,24
few 2:5 3:16 13:15	7:11 20:5 21:4,11	163:2	front 88:10 151:3	171:13,17 173:11	199:9 202:16 204:6
21:13 24:7 45:18,18 45:20 62:12 83:15	22:19,20,22 24:7 30:22 35:12 36:9,13	form 15:14 42:4 58:24	216:6	190:1 215:8 223:10	204:19 206:25 212:3 213:19 215:9
91:23 122:18	37:5 39:13 40:1	formal 4:21 107:12	fruitful 226:15	223:14,16,18,19,24	216:19,22 217:2
132:25 139:16	46:13 49:25 50:5	110:15,21 111:9	frustrated 105:25	223:25 224:2	220:7 221:17,25
157:11,12 165:14	52:7 54:4 60:13,21	225:19	frustrating 226:4	gate 104:8 117:7	223:22 225:18
173:17 199:19	62:12 70:3 74:4	formalising 111:4	full 72:21 166:17	gather 20:19 149:20	227:2
209:9 220:12	88:14 89:3 94:4,7	formalities 169:2	176:14 225:7,10	gathered 201:15 gave 39:25 40:11,22	goal 199:18
				gave 37.43 40.11,44	
	•	•	•	•	

Day 2 Hearing on
goals 181:22 goes 53:23,25 115:11
124:2 147:8 going 9:2 15:18 21:5 24:15,22 31:13
33:12 34:17 35:2 39:17,22 42:8 43:16
43:17 44:5,11 47:16 52:6 55:1,3,18
58:20 59:22 67:15 76:10 77:1 87:12
91:11,12 96:24 102:10 113:24
117:18,22,24 119:5 120:23 124:16
126:12 127:12 128:1 136:20 139:3
139:7 143:20 145:20 146:8 152:21 166:22
172:22 181:10 184:15 187:23
188:2 191:5 198:1 199:13,15 200:23
202:7 204:10,13,16 205:19,22,25
206:24 208:20,24 209:8 212:18
213:25 214:8,8 215:2 217:9 222:25
225:2,10,25 227:18 gone 30:12 147:6 199:3
good 1:3 13:21 18:18 18:18,19 19:11
34:16 40:11 42:1 55:2,21 59:6,13
63:23 69:15 70:14 70:23 71:16 86:13
90:24 95:12 112:5 122:14 128:15
129:5,11 133:16,17 146:21 160:18 166:13 171:9
172:20 189:4 198:3 209:7,24 211:12
216:2 220:7 222:14 227:12,13,20,24,25
gotten 162:22 181:6
government 134:1
137:14,20,22 146:4
177:17 219:4
governmental 88:2 205:13 206:18
222:21 224:21
226:3
government's 145:16
go-to 7:19
gradually 156:7
granted 45:21 148:13

```
green 147:7
grievance 148:1
grim 106:17
ground 80:5 130:9
   169:22 181:3 182:6
   184:12 191:7 192:3
  193:21 202:11
grounds 28:1 90:10
group 107:8 114:16
   114:21 115:12
   132:19 138:20
   145:4 146:4 169:14
   187:23 200:11
groups 54:8 174:14,17
   179:16 180:5,6,10
   180:20 181:13
grudging 198:18
guaranteed 206:5
guess 22:5 95:24
   153:21 166:17
   195:3 205:7 217:6
guessing 24:1
Gulf 164:7,9,14,17
   212:6
guy 146:9 166:3
   172:24 188:13
  190:3 194:19.21
guys 8:23 160:18
   168:4 190:3
         Н
half 39:19 55:1 145:2
halfway 37:3
hall 176:7
hand 7:20 33:18,19
  54:23 94:22 146:7
   154:5 213:9
handed 154:9.10
handle 185:10
handled 7:16 8:23
  19:14
hands 123:21
handy 154:7
hang 140:18
happen 31:17 69:22
   76:19 87:8 110:24
   188:5.8
happened 67:4 76:18
   78:3 103:13,17
   105:25 110:25
   142:1,24 146:13
   155:1 185:11
  189.17
happening 87:14
```

172:13

happens 104:22

143:23 147:4

154:20 155:5

happy 78:12 117:2

Harakal 128:24

hard 16:10

hardest 153:8

hardly 155:1

having 53:8 62:19

harm 139:4

hate 223:3

155:23 199:7 222:9

```
95:6 97:4 131:20
  154:8 156:25
  163.12 178.7
  184:11 191:5 201:2
  201:3 216:18
  217:25
heading 119:24
headway 191:11
hear 21:21 43:1 82:10
  134:23 150:13
  176:4,25 187:24
heard 1:22 6:22 22:20
  28:19 80:9 133:20
  135:22 142:17
  147:22 151:11
  172:25 178:4,15
  201:3
hearing 1:9 1:4 46:9
  57:23 129:14
  140:12 176:24
  177:14 228:2
heart 50:23 52:11
  131:24 132:3
heavy 66:7
held 7:20 57:22,22
  132:24 176:9 202:2
Hello 131:16 210:6,7
help 126:19 127:20
   157:9,16 160:3
  164:22 199:5 226:3
  227:4
helped 108:18 116:7
  140:1,12 193:22
  226:14
helpful 14:16 27:3,10
  45:8 54:15,21 154:9
  210:25 211:15
  218:6
helping 139:23
helps 126:16
her 29:8,8,25 30:15
  31:10 32:1 33:11
  34:20 36:20 37:25
  47:18 48:1 60:8
  141:9 144:20
  195:24 196:3,4,7,9
  197:1,4,9 198:9,12
  198:16,19,21
hesitate 210:16
high 155:11 162:23,25
  163:5,7 167:4
higher 5:11 146:25
  147:9
highlight 162:8
highlighted 203:23,24
him 3:15,21 12:11
  13:17 18:15.20.22
  20:2,24 21:24 24:11
  26:12 31:21 32:3
  82:10 94:5 99:5,17
  100:13 103:10
  108:18 137:15.19
   137:21,23 139:25
  140:3 142:23
  149:14 154:7
  159:25 160:1
  166:11 167:2 170:4
```

```
170:4 176:25
  182:18 183:4 189:8
  189.11 192.21
  194:13 207:21
  208:12 211:3
  217:23 219:9
himself 119:17 183:23
hindsight 129:5 136:4
   179.14
historic 42:12
historical 13:10,13
  26:13
historically 155:2
hit 153:8 216:21
Hm 169:19
holding 145:7
home 196:4,24 209:8
honest 23:22 33:23
  81:3
honestly 24:25 148:10
  148:11,12 198:23
  226:20
honour 2:1 151:16
hope 1:3 59:8 122:14
   128:20 167:4 190:6
  191:2 201:5 226:9
hoped 94:21 221:8
hoped-for 96:21
hopefully 161:9
horizontal 172:9
  173:11 174:1,2,9
horsepower 120:17
  208:7
hospital 142:15 143:1
hostile 139:17,18
hostility 140:20
hothed 175:5
hotel 144:16
hour 55:1 145:4
hours 57:17 98:25
  99:2.5
huge 51:18
human 56:17 138:25
Hungary 128:4,12
  136:9 217:11
hungry 117:21,25
hurdles 192:12
hurt 197:9
idea 11:12 104:23,24
   105:14,16 129:11
  149:5 212:9
identified 8:9 201:9
identify 7:23 157:15
  193:10
identifying 11:7 61:18
IDRC 1:5
Igor 140:14
ii 92:18
illegitimate 196:10
imagine 26:10 126:24
  150:3
Imelus 194:2
immediate 23:9 75:3
immediately 116:9
   157:2
```

```
immodesty 172:3
impact 81:23 82:5
   .
153:7 178:9 187:15
  188:22 198:10
  201:1 204:11
  205:15,20 207:22
impacted 160:9
  187:25 197:5
impacting 187:7
impairment 60:8,8
  61:2
implied 206:10
imply 58:9
important 8:16 42:19
  44:13 54:16 137:17
  169:2 174:10,11
  187:6 200:22
  201:10
importantly 222:4
impose 143:19
imposed 175:2
impression 96:20,23
  130:6 134:5
impressive 134:21
improved 70:2
improvement 154:13
  187:3
incident 100:5,8,10
  141:21 142:13
inclined 21:14
include 123:23
included 10:1 22:17
  53:14 83:6 93:11
  220:5
includes 37:19 99:19
  152:12
including 7:17,22 49:2
  74:13 105:1 118:10
  118:16 119:8
  139:14 149:15
  156:22 202:4
incorporated 64:4
incur 163:12
indeed 218:3
independence 67:10
INDEX 3:1
indicate 44:10 116:7
indicated 58:1 103:10
  215:20
indicating 200:3
indication 105:5
  215:24,25 225:8,9
indications 70:14
individual 44:7
  165:25
individuals 65:14
  132:19,25 145:12
indulge 147:21
indulgence 57:15
industries 154:25
industry 3:25 76:8
  136:11 156:22
infer 22:10
inference 214:9
influence 146:5
  148:16
influenced 148:8
                         intends 116:9
```

```
inform 136:5
informal 4:20 169:25
information 20:16
  55:15 99:11 112:15
  128:4 182:5 217:11
informed 120:24
  216:12
infrastructure 223:20
infringed 44:14
infringement 44:16
inhabitants 78:24
inherited 3:3
initial 110:22 163:13
  173:7 212:7 215:23
  223:1
initially 5:12 46:18
  69:10
initiative 41:7
injunction 35:6 36:17
  36:17,20 45:20,21
  45:24 46:3,4,10,15
  47:18,19,21 48:1
  49:1,6,20 50:4 51:2
  59:19 60:14 62:19
  62:23 63:3,5,7 64:6
  64:8,10 65:25 66:4
  66:21 68:14 69:2
  70:7,17,19 76:21
  77:1,12 78:3 85:19
  87:7,8,13 88:5
  112:7,20,22,24,25
  133:11,12 134:11
  134:17,22,25 135:3
  185:4,7,14,21
  186:14 202:25
  203:2
injunctions 187:18,25
inkling 197:24
input 130:11 131:6
inquire 21:6 22:6
  179:22
inquired 179:23
inquiring 18:9
inquiry 85:12 180:24
insert 224:25
Inside 180:13,14
insight 215:12
insist 223:14
inspected 77:11
instance 50:5 138:18
  189:19 212:6
  220:24
instead 204:21
institutional 206:19
instructed 66:6,24
  67:23 70:22 104:20
instruction 17:22.25
instructions 97:16
insufficient 213:12
  214:14
insurmountable 50:22
  59:21 190:9,10
intend 184:12
intended 82:20 110:23
  157:3
intending 18:8
```

graph 154:2 186:21

great 146:15 157:6

GRASSI 2:4

gravel 53:10

193:22

GRECH 2:4

greater 145:24

intensive 191.2
intensive 181:3
intent 110:19 202:15
intention 29:1 127:19
176:1 214:12
216:12
intentions 181:22
intents 132:8
interactions 184:18
interest 19:23 29:1
32:14 42:13 82:21
32:14 42:13 62:21
86:12,16 120:19
152:25 163:25
171:22 178:4
180:11.21 183:21
,
192:16 208:11
interested 69:17 105:2
179:3 182:15 188:7
188:9,14,17 189:1
195:15 197:21
203:14 218:3
interesting 153:2
211:15
Interestingly 154:11
interests 48:21 128:14
155:23 198:21
200:22 203:3
217:19
interference 30:15
interim 49:20 87:7
88:5 134:17
internal 9:24 11:24
12:16,18 13:8 14:23
74:13 103:19
122:24 123:17
international 1:2,4
178:21
interpretation 61:6
219:8 220:7
interpreted 147:14
214:11 219:18
interpreter 102:3
interpreters 56:15
interrupt 47:13
181:10
interrupting 13:14,22
53:24 71:3 158:11
interruption 25:19
intervene 82:4
intervention 99:9
intrigued 23:4 192:9
introducing 98:14
introduction 23:8
164:16 192:25
193:2 218:20
introductory 2:5
invalid 86:11
invest 113:11 117:6
136:21 160:10
161:2 219:11
invested 113:4 178:21
180:4,17 214:21
investigate 157:3
investigated 118:11
investigating 186:17
investigation 8:20
37:16 74:13
investigations 8:17

```
investing 135:25
  169:3 180:25
investment 1:2 5:21
   42:6 113:15 116:16
   135:21 159:9
   167:10 169:12
   171:3.19
investments 128:7
investor 42:10 76:15
  85:9 113:20 146:7
   156:8,22,23 159:4
   169:14 188:2 190:8
  212:12
investors 113:9
   115:25 119:3 147:6
   159:1,9 187:8,10,15
   187:22 188:1.6.13
   188:17 190:6.14
investor-friendly
  136:16
invited 156:19 172:25
  173:16
invoices 110:11
invoked 32:8,11
involve 40:2
involved 6:8 11:15
   19:19.21 22:22 89:5
   102:12 105:18
   112:15 120:19
   130:13 131:5 136:1
   137:13 143:22
  157:23 165:1
  174:22 177:1
   189:22 204:25
  208:12 226:18
involving 19:14 39:21
  66.2
in-place 120:15 208:5
irrelevant 212:18
irreplaceable 61:9
issuance 34:24
issue 8:21 15:1 17:9
   19:24 20:1 42:19
  43:23 52:10 53:20
  58:11 76:23 78:11
  80:11 105:24 125:3
  132:4 145:16.24
   190:20 198:14
  200:25 214:14
  225:23
issued 36:17.18 62:19
  67:5 135:2
issues 22:22 31:1
   39:21,23 59:22
   112:17 135:14,24
   136:14.18.22 141:5
  146:19 181:17
  221:12
item 119:21
```

Jackiewicz 183:2

JAKUB 2:10

Janova 146:17

Jackiewicz's 37:19

January 19:23 30:22

36:16 167:8 168:12

```
168:16 186:12
January/February
  22:23 107:23
JARA 1:22
Jean-Michel 157:21
JESKO 1:23
JEŠKOVÁ 2:12
JKX 127:20,24 128:4
   128:6,16 207:17
  216:12 217:4,8,11
  217:16
JKX's 127:19
job 4:15,15 182:24
   183:4
jockeying 146:5
join 224:7
joint 5:2 14:3 32:13,15
   108:23 119:25
  202:12
JORDAN 2:13
judgment 28:11,17
  51:8 67:21 135:2
judicial 51:22 62:5
JULIÁN 2:11
July 5:16 11:25 14:2
  122:25
June 11:25 13:25 14:2
   25:22 28:23,24 47:8
   70:9,13 76:20 84:1
  84:2 85:7,16 122:25
iurisdictions 217:17
justice 134:18
justification 220:8
justifications 62:15
  68:3 88:9
justified 49:11
justify 69:21 186:1
just-as-important
  8:21
JV 9:25 119:5 207:3
  208:8
          K
KAMENICKÝ 2:10
```

Karabin 8:25,25 12:9

80:14 84:5 182:14

12:10,20 19:17

182:19

1:11

Katarina 193:13

KAUFMANN-KO...

keen 39:24 40:19,20

76:24 116:21

41:11,15 42:6,14

keep 39:17,22 117:19

120:24 153:10

194:22

keeping 185:11

222:10,25

key 191:7 192:2

kilometres 197:2

kind 39:22 106:3

129:8 155:5 180:24

kick 214:7

224:10

kept 119:18,19,20

181:23 215:2 kinds 135:13,24 136.14 Kingdom 3:6 147:5 knew 40:9 42:11,12,13 43:12 69:14 123:3 139:16 140:2 144:17 172:13 173:23 181:9 183:3 185:11 186:16 200:10 213:22 knocked 142:18 172:21 knowing 20:3 189:20 189:22 knowledge 4:3 78:2 78:19 112:16 135:8 174:5 180:6 known 79:1 112:6 140:3 146:16,17 185:13 knows 13:17 135:15 **KUPKA** 2:11 L 1:11 label 98:20 labelled 107:3 lack 26:6 163:19 166:21,23 213:12 lacked 86:14 lacks 86:21 ladies 146:17 land 11:2 20:19 45:1 45:15,15 47:6 61:7 61:11,15,16 63:7,9 69:18 86:10.20 87:12 127:3.6 131:25 132:1,6,14 136:18 198:21 222:15,16 landowner 8:12,14 landowners 35:18 60:5 landscape 198:5 Lane 1:5 LANGER 1:23 language 20:1,5,15 23:3 35:8 36:3 81:15,18 82:17 103:2,18,21 169:10 203:20,23,25 large 8:6 24:21 42:20 143:25 176:12 227:10 largely 80:4 larger 136:18 223:5 last 3:4,10,12,14,16,18 3:22 4:15 49:15 106:14 120:4 127:23 128:2 131:18 192:13 202:16 209:8,20 214:4 217:10

```
late 4:20 6:13 98:14
  106:25 112:12
  167:2 176:21 209:1
later 5:9 28:22 40:2
  45:18,20 57:10
  68:13 69:2 73:20
  82:10 87:25 88:4
  138:6 142:24
  150:12 172:22
  175:3 179:19
  196:15 221:1
latter 73:5 203:1
law 3:4 8:11 51:24
  52:1 54:1 66:13
  120:1 178:21
  185:23 206:6 207:6
  219:5 226:2,6
lawful 70:5
laws 118:9 190:10
lawsuit 34:21,24 52:2
  83:7
lawyer 14:6 18:16
  27:25 29:7 43:11
  69:14 103:5 178:20
  193:14,19
lawvers 17:18 137:1
  210:23
lawyer's 149:3
layer 166:18
lead 108:24 192:19
leader 172:7
leadership 9:14
leading 49:3
learn 17:12,14 200:4
learned 38:4 179:19
  182:5 187:11 202:2
lease 8:14 45:2
leasing 136:25
least 58:21 103:5
  131:9 138:23 142:5
  197:6,20 218:13
  221-22 225-11
leave 1:13 43:18
   127:12 148:18
  183:6 223:4
leaving 42:8 214:12
led 34:24 111:10
  148:25
left 68:2 89:19 211:2,8
leg 142:16
legal 5:7,11,19 19:15
  31:10,20,25 32:8
  33:11 36:11 39:16
  43:6,9 56:10 66:12
  71:21 83:7 86:9
  105:1.21 111:25
  112:4 116:14,22,23
  118:22 119:24
  130:3,13 131:3,4,6
  132:15 135:7,19
  136:5.21 148:7
  177:20 178:8,14,18
  186:7 187:19
  213:12 215:16,21
legality 177:12
legally 82:20 116:13
legitimacy 44:24
```

```
legitimise 67:15 69:6
lender 168:5
lengthy 107:6 168:11
Leon 179:9 215:20
less 51:21 130:10
let 6:19 7:4 9:9 15:19
  23:7 32:20 54:11
  60:19 71:6 91:22
  97:24 101:14
  124:21 125:12
  140:18 147:12,22
  155:25 158:15
  185:10 191:18
  196:14 201:18
  210:13 213:6
  216:23
letter 14:20,24 16:13
  22:11 25:24 29:7
  43:22 89:9 91:16
  92:7,14,25 93:3,13
  96:3 107:6 108:10
  108:21 110:19
  113:6 118:17,22
  149:3,8 168:11,12
  168:14
letters 118:13
let's 13:9 16:12 17:1
  27:8 30:19 35:8
  44:8 53:17 58:15
  65:7 73:15 76:20
  79:22 81:4,9,15
  84:14 85:15.22
  90:11 107:1 109:18
  158:5 161:15 170:8
  180:2 187:21 193:5
  206:1 209:16 222:8
  222.9 223.2 227.2
level 138:11 139:3
  146:16,22 148:3
  187:7 189:20
levels 190:16
lever 37:21
Lewis 4:1 3:18 4:10
  5:1 9:11 12:6,14
  76:3 82:25 84:5
  102:23 103:12
  107:6,11,19,24
  108:9,14,25 110:3
  111:3,22 115:11,19
  119:4,17,22 120:11
  121:3,5,6,8,11
  123:9 137:11,12
  139:14 150:13,20
  150:22,23,25 151:6
  151:10,16,25 152:3
  152:6,25 158:11
  177:2 187:17 191:4
  199:12 204:23
  208:4 209:12,15,25
  210:6 227:4,5
LEŠOVÁ 2:12
licence 76:23 119:8
  121:1 175:16
  218:21 219:7,7
licences 76:23 85:1,4
  85:14 119:11
  145:16
```

218:18 220:9,21,23

221:22

lasted 154:12

	ı	T	ı	T	
license 208:15	lived 144:15	212:15,22 214:1	108:13 114:10	material 6:9 22:16	53:23 54:4 64:25
licensing 6:8	lives 195:24 196:1	216:8,23 218:2,4	115:6,21 118:3	92:4	66:2,12 77:21 95:7
lifted 87:7,9 88:5	living 39:20 177:3	looked 5:13 42:15	119:4 140:23 144:8	materialise 221:4	96:20 99:13 100:24
135:4 215:8	190:18 213:9	46:19 79:5 82:6	153:17 159:25	materials 6:2 77:6,8	102:25 112:13
light 147:7	LLC 1:15 113:12	94:10 95:13 97:4	170:13 171:17,21	80:7 211:24	115:1 119:18 121:4
like 4:20 10:1 11:6	loan 167:10 169:4,10	125:23 142:4	171:23 175:25	matter 1:1 22:11	128:11 131:10
13:14 14:8 15:7	169:13	164:11 167:13	176:3 203:7 205:21	59:25 71:20 144:13	132:3,6 134:5 135:7
16:9 17:6 20:16,21	loaned 167:7 168:16	177:12	206:20 210:9,10	199:2	135:15 137:17
21:3,6,11,12 23:16	168:22 169:7	looking 6:1 25:7 73:10	212:12,13 224:12	matters 3:13 4:5,7 5:7	138:22 142:4,4,6,23
23:24 24:1 25:7	170:11	73:12 112:23	226:9	5:12,18,19 10:1,3	143:17 144:3,6,18
29:4 32:6 40:12	loaning 169:1	136:23 143:13	MAGNUS 1:23	19:14,15 98:14	145:14 146:11
41:10 43:3 48:13	lobby 133:24	159:8 179:20 212:8	main 11:2 105:2 172:7	178:4 210:25	150:2 166:15
57:12 62:11 84:1	lobbying 141:15	219:15 224:1	mainstream 220:10	Mat'ová 146:17	168:23 172:5
98:10,11 101:13	local 5:14 8:23 19:14	looks 20:21 21:3 25:7	maintain 63:9 106:10	may 6:22 14:5,18,24	174:24 176:15
117:9 120:18	31:7 53:18 54:5	186:24 187:2	maintained 112:14	15:16 16:13,17 18:7	185:17 194:15
127:13 132:20	77:9 85:18 127:7	216:18 217:16	maintaining 53:14	18:11,12 22:8 24:3	195:12,13 196:5
135:4 136:16	133:1 138:15	loop 95:25 96:2	54:13	25:9 27:2,9 32:21	197:1,24 198:6
137:19 138:11,24	139:24 140:1	loosely 173:9	maintenance 92:21	34:1 38:20 42:17	200:21 211:25
140:1,15,16 145:21	142:15 143:10,14	lose 140:6	major 159:20,23	50:1 52:19 54:19	212:9 214:1 220:2
149:11 152:10,11	146:11 189:19	losing 42:7	221:24	57:17 58:7,19 59:14	meaning 104:5 148:7
154:5 155:14,25	194:11 198:20	lot 5:25 42:11 47:9	majority 40:18 78:23	59:17 61:15 68:23	means 65:16 112:23
159:9 161:10,18	201:1 203:25	51:21 83:12 133:13	79:1,3	71:1 83:20,20 84:11	196:7 198:14 214:7
164:11 167:18	226:13	136:13,21 137:8,21	make 2:10 7:20 10:19	85:23,24 86:12	meant 35:4 88:15 94:7
175:8 176:7,21	locally 134:15 139:25	138:9 140:23	46:19 55:4 57:9	88:23 93:7 95:13,23	128:2 166:1
179:22 186:24	locals 78:12	144:15,17 145:19	97:6 99:6 117:2	96:14 97:12 100:17	measure 34:25 85:8
188:5,7 190:3 192:9	located 19:7	146:19,19 160:17	119:10 139:5	103:3 106:19	mechanics 169:16
193:16 194:19,21	location 8:16,18,19	175:20 181:4	141:19 145:19	108:23 109:11,12	mechanisms 66:23
201:21 203:12	10:2,3,5 15:3 70:13	184:11 187:16	151:25 152:7,14	110:18 118:24	meet 2:18 41:17
212:15,25 213:2	99:19 100:2 104:18	189:4 194:19,21	155:16 158:8	124:15 126:9,18	114:16 152:23
216:16,18 217:16	104:19 112:23	199:6 211:14 220:6	159:19 170:8 177:7	127:16,25,25 132:2	173:22 203:5
219:16 220:17	123:13,25 124:1	222:15 224:12	178:2 180:3,24	139:7 143:3,24	meeting 12:18 41:6
221:13,18 223:3,5	126:4 136:25	226:16,17	181:20 191:11	144:3 150:12 158:7	88:20 101:17,19
224:25	138:21 141:12	loud 124:24	195:17 206:11	158:10 163:8	102:11 103:13
liked 139:18	145:1 178:23 189:3	love 195:13	makes 195:9 197:7	169:10 175:10	105:20 113:2,13
limited 46:22 47:12	220:8 221:11	Lovell 1:25	204:4 222:5	178:18 183:1,22	119:18,23 120:9
130:4	222:11,17 223:1,3,4	lovely 167:6	making 72:25 116:4	189:11 190:9,15	125:1,9 129:6,24
line 18:3 61:12 66:17	locations 136:24	low 186:25 188:21	138:14 141:17	196:14,21,22 203:9	133:18 137:17,17
85:11 92:8 95:21	179:13 200:18	202:18	163:20 184:19	209:9 210:3 214:17	140:8 192:23
106:14 107:4	lodging 197:4	lower 155:13 157:9	204:9,21	214:17,19 225:19	193:13 194:7 200:1
128:23 191:15	London 1:6 172:23	Lukacs 200:5,24	mala 85:17,21 86:19	maybe 6:15 21:15	200:7 201:3 205:1
212:21 215:1	long 23:25 41:21	lunch 58:9,10 89:24	man 201:7	25:4,5 60:2 61:12	207:3 208:9,17
lined 116:1	120:6 140:3 148:24	89:25 90:3,7 121:20	manage 137:20	95:8 125:15 138:6	221:1
lines 31:5 35:10 36:3	150:8,11 154:12	121:22,24 122:14	management 65:19,21	150:12 163:2	meetings 15:2 129:13
49:10 61:3,13	155:13 158:23	LUO 2:11 55:17	66:16 84:6 92:20	173:21 176:8	133:25 137:14
160:22 162:14	170:15 174:7 180:2	Lyco 172:9,17	193:20	217:17	140:2 176:7 192:15
191:23 203:15	193:8 194:3 207:8		manager 7:18 8:7	mayor 11:1,3,17,19,23	197:21 202:2,6
list 79:5 193:8	207:19 208:24	M	managers 64:24	11:25 12:19,19 13:2	203:1 219:17
listen 202:11	longer 2:25 28:14 52:5	machinery 199:1	manner 86:19	14:6,21 15:3,9,12	Melus 140:14
listening 129:24	163:17 221:7,13	Maciej 8:25,25 11:20	many 39:12,20 41:20	15:18 16:3 20:9	Member 175:1
226:12	LONGMAN 2:13	12:20 19:17 80:14	83:17 88:4 141:5	21:1 23:5,12 24:25	members 7:17 80:17
listing 38:15	long-winded 215:7	182:14,23 194:5	159:9 162:3,18	26:6,8 30:7 33:25	181:15
litigated 187:13	look 5:1,22,25 6:20	Madam 2:17 14:15,20	198:24 200:18	38:8 39:14,18,21,23	memoranda 17:8
litigation 2:3,4,4,5	15:5 27:8 29:5,12	18:7 19:4,12 21:5	201:8 221:22 222:7	39:24 40:2,4,22	memorandum 23:21
52:3 102:18,24	30:19 43:25 44:8,20	31:12 54:19 55:5,6	224:24	41:1,2,4,16,18 42:4	23:23,25 24:23 84:2
103:1,4,8,16 117:12	51:11 60:20 68:1	56:6 57:11 58:12,18	map 156:18 172:4	42:21 68:24 82:1,7	84:21 88:20
174:17 184:15,23	69:5 81:4,9 88:8	59:16 68:8 71:1	March 4:22 5:21 19:2	88:21 89:8,9 91:17	memory 25:22 103:20
184:24 186:11	89:17 93:9 98:10	84:11 89:15 90:25	19:3 48:18 62:4	92:7 93:2,14,17	153:13 169:9,20
little 16:11 23:7 31:14	106:2 108:13	91:4,9,12 95:12	157:1	96:4 97:4,8,12	mention 50:10 100:4
32:5 37:3 61:20	109:18 117:18	98:9 117:19 118:24	Marek 183:1	122:25 137:3	103:1 125:2 128:15
131:6 145:4 146:9	126:8,14 127:14	121:17 122:3,18	mark 2:3 129:3	ma'am 151:6,10	mentioned 9:13 12:8
166:11 170:21	128:6 144:22	131:14 150:6	marked 88:8	209:15 220:12,20	23:3 26:17 39:11
171:16 191:17	154:11 155:22	151:24 154:2 209:4	market 153:3,12,14	221:6 223:16 224:9	62:7 93:23 103:4
192:1,8 202:21	158:7 163:22 165:8	madame 218:18	154:19,22 155:10	224:16 225:5	134:9 162:21,25
204:17 206:1	165:10 168:10	made 10:5 43:13 50:9	156:25	mean 6:5 15:15 19:22	224:14
220:25	186:20,23 189:23	52:15 61:25 67:22	Matej 17:16,17 18:18	23:14 30:1 33:8	merit 188:9,15,18,23
live 129:14,15 135:15	193:5 199:3,20,23	69:19 76:3,5,10	18:23 20:1 22:23	38:6 39:15 40:6	Merits 1:9
197:17 226:2	203:8,12 206:24	79:24 86:23 99:25	193:18	41:1,21 46:24 47:8	mess 134:25

messages 47:10	minutes 13:15 24:8	months 3:22 46:7 88:4	municipal 81:10,25	214:3,11 225:2	33:7 38:15 40:17
met 11:24 133:11	89:21 90:11 119:18	135:1,3 221:9	municipal 61.10,23	227:1	44:5 51:2 56:14
144:18 166:12	119:20 120:10	223:14,15	81:24	nevertheless 71:20	62:11 70:1 77:2
172:21 179:8	126:10,20 127:10	more 5:14 6:4 13:1	must 44:7 51:6,15	192:20	79:6,7 83:22 98:6
method 222:17	207:1 209:16	19:23 23:7,20 25:4	53:21 55:10 86:8	new 23:4 55:13 63:14	105:21 107:2,14
Michael 4:1 119:22	minutiae 117:4	25:5 33:4 36:25	110:13 162:13	63:18 90:18,22 91:8	110:10 123:11
150:20,22	misapplication 147:16	37:3 59:12 72:9	167:3	96:6 140:8,9 141:12	127:3,21 128:7
microphone 1:12	mischaracterised	83:21 85:12 91:23	myself 20:14 26:8	145:16 165:16	136:8 143:25,25
mid 6:13 73:15	196:11	110:23 113:25	58:6 137:19,21	180:25 218:20	144:25,25 145:2,18
middle 27:24 73:8	missed 35:9 56:18	119:11 120:12	195:15 197:6	newco 165:16	163:6,7 169:19
191:15	148:21 211:23	125:13,23,24	222:10	NEWING 2:3	176:12 184:22,24
mid-June 72:1	missing 149:1	130:10 132:17,17	MÍNGUEZ 1:22	newly 153:8	204:12 217:16
mid-2015 7:2	mistake 35:9	132:18 133:1		news 113:2,24 133:21	227:10
mid-2016 112:12	mistaken 14:5 74:6	134:14 138:11	N	187:25	numbered 127:4
might 27:3 54:23 58:8	95:8 225:19	146:10,18 153:19	nail 225:4,5	next 30:19,20 31:9	numbers 166:2 167:13
58:23 63:14 85:2,4	misunderstanding	156:7,12 158:14	name 2:19 7:23 15:22	36:2 38:12 104:2,13	numerous 192:16
85:11 89:15,17,19	24:6 misunderstood 96:13	163:23,24,25 166:4	16:6 19:20 37:12	105:17 111:4	196:2 204:14
89:24 102:20 113:11,12 128:7	96:14,15 101:9	188:9 189:18,19 190:19 201:1	95:14,21 124:20	115:11 124:3 129:3 141:13 152:9 164:7	
136:2,4 137:15	109:11	202:23 204:17	152:21 156:18	165:8 167:21	0
154:3 168:11 169:8	mix 170:5	206:13 216:3 222:4	157:22 164:7 172:4	196:25 197:17	obey 185:23
173:18 178:22	mixed 47:10 133:8	226:13	179:17,18,18	207:17 212:17	object 18:3 22:1 31:24
180:21 181:16	Miškovcík 193:16	Moreover 45:1	names 79:5 83:12 national 133:21	NICOLE 2:15	211:5 objected 141:8 206:14
190:9 199:16 201:5	mm 34:11 42:25 43:8	morning 1:3 39:12	Natural 81:22 82:2	NIMBY 196:17	226:21
212:16 213:16	45:11,17 54:3,3	62:18 68:23 69:1	nature 18:9,10 20:17	nobody's 178:19	objection 21:24 38:4
221:25	66:9,15 93:24 95:15	129:18 130:5	25:12 40:25 44:2	noise 145:19 181:19	53:12 204:1 211:6
Mike 5:1 9:11 76:16	101:4 138:3 141:25	most 41:22 112:14	132:5 147:10 190:6	195:17	objective 88:5
112:13 113:17,18	143:12 149:10	156:23 182:2,4	near 100:19 173:18	noises 141:17	objectives 67:12
116:21 117:2 121:5	Mm-hm 7:10 11:13	187:6 188:6,17	nearer 136:23	none 206:18,23	obligation 75:3,4,12
121:6,8,10 136:7	16:2 23:19 27:18	190:11 196:16	necessarily 113:11	non-public 92:17	116:15 118:23
137:12,18 139:14	29:9 35:20 38:14	201:10 218:5	necessary 61:9 71:15	non-rational 206:16	obligations 108:8
208:4	48:9,24 53:2 65:17	mostly 174:1	71:19 155:24 188:3	North 172:11	116:19 118:15
mike@discovery	69:4 81:19 82:9,23	motivated 42:5 197:15	necessity 61:10	northern 163:4	119:1
217:6	89:10 91:18,21	motivation 197:1	need 13:5 41:14 44:12	173:12 175:3	obliged 35:13 116:8
mildly 72:2	95:22 98:13 103:14	motivations 197:18	44:17 58:6 62:1	notation 61:13	116:13
miles 173:21,21	113:1 123:10	motor 38:21 39:1	65:1,5 67:8 72:17	note 20:4,11 57:6	observe 136:2
million 73:11,11,18	153:21 164:17	49:23	87:1 89:20 112:8	107:24 118:2	observed 99:16 147:4
109:22,24 116:16	225:6,21	mouth 95:7 210:17	114:23 120:23	119:17 125:20	182:10
118:18 158:18	MND 8:6	213:9	124:23 135:17	208:13	observer 129:7
161:18,22,22 162:3	model 161:1,3,6,11	move 29:8,13 34:17	147:11 158:14	noted 17:13 26:15	obstacles 50:25
163:7,13 167:7,13	modern 147:10	44:11 52:18 54:19	170:3 223:19	49:14 111:13	obstruction 215:21
168:16 170:10 171:7 213:25	modest 172:1 modified 62:24	66:7 97:14 121:21	needed 22:1 27:7	114:22 115:23 120:22 162:2	obtain 8:11 72:9
millions 145:17	moment 9:2 14:19	154:4 171:11 188:6 200:23 222:9	118:11 125:6	171:21 210:19	134:22
million-two 161:22	21:19,23 31:2,19	moved 30:1 37:21	167:12,17 168:2	notes 37:2 110:10	obtained 83:13 119:1
mind 69:17 92:6 98:11	52:23 54:1 55:2	52:13,21,21 206:25	170:15 182:18,22	168:23	185:4
103:9 130:8 153:10	71:1 72:1 73:4 84:9	moving 29:24 35:5	202:20,21 210:21	nothing 2:3 30:5	obtaining 56:21
161:1,17 163:21	84:11 91:20 98:8	MT 219:17,25 220:4	211:11 212:24	48:10 53:3 85:12	obvious 66:1
169:12 199:18	101:14 117:17	220:11	215:19	139:5 140:6 141:16	obviously 21:7 22:7 46:3 56:9 57:25
224:22	118:24 124:23	much 5:23 7:18 21:18	needs 169:23 188:19 negotiations 114:5	151:18 175:15	67:11 103:2 117:1
mine 168:2 190:1	158:7 165:7,9	28:21 32:6,23 42:16	205:23	206:3 217:18 218:1	142:15 143:21
minibus 145:3	181:11	43:19 89:20 90:12	NEIL 2:3	218:8 223:25	155:7 156:15
mining 77:10 78:8	momentarily 91:7,13	131:10,15,16	neither 172:13 210:25	227:23	163:17 185:23
145:15 146:20	93:6	134:14 136:17	net 67:19 75:25	notice 6:23 7:12 8:12	222:11 224:15
222:22	money 41:12 74:19	137:4,12 138:16	118:13 161:24	15:22 74:7,9 106:22	227:17
minister 137:17	75:1,21 109:5	146:10 147:4,18,24	network 156:21,22,23	107:4,12,15 114:25	occasions 41:20
193:13	114:10,18 115:3	148:22 150:9,10	neutral 82:12	115:22 116:4	192:16 196:2,12
ministerial 133:25	116:18 136:21	153:19 154:7 156:7	never 16:21 28:7 36:4	117:15 127:19,20	occur 60:9 138:6
ministries 50:18	153:11 159:17	156:12 160:14	36:8 50:12,18 63:11	168:12	occurred 49:15 56:25
133:19	167:11,15,17	163:17 167:19	63:15 67:14 70:4	notwithstanding	70:4 78:21 88:12
Ministry 2:11,12,12	168:22 169:7	171:3 179:5 182:7	76:18 87:9 88:3	76:21 77:1 116:18	129:22 166:24
146:14,14,15,24	202:22 212:24	195:14 198:11	106:5 110:25 111:3	November 49:16	October 108:14,14
179:24	214:2,8 223:5	199:13 200:25	119:1 166:16,19,24	145:2	119:13 164:22
minority 80:1 83:1	monitoring 5:6	213:2,17 214:18	177:12 179:25	nowhere 85:13	207:2
minuscule 86:15	Montana 172:10	219:13 223:2,7,8	181:14 186:7	no-brainer 215:1 null 28:9,11 87:5	odd 41:7
minute 34:8 46:5 125:9,12,18 162:6	month 134:22,22 166:25	226:15,19 227:1,4 mud 141:2,3 197:22	197:24 199:9	nun 28:9,11 87:3 number 15:12 30:1	off 16:9 37:22 167:1
123.7,12,10 102.0	100.43	muu 141.2,3 177.22	204:24 205:4,18	number 13.12 30.1	offer 36:15 87:18,22

	ı				
117:2	133:1,4 135:8,15	opinions 197:10	ought 6:16	84:14 85:22 91:25	124:14 132:4
offered 36:4,8 43:22	137:25 138:20	opponents 21:16	ourselves 21:20	94:11,12,24 99:21	153:12,19 157:12
60:11 71:12 140:21	140:2,13 142:21	opportune 89:17	134:25	108:13 109:10,23	165:25 203:13
225:7	143:3,11 146:6	opportunities 130:22	out 49:12 56:22 75:10	111:18,19,22 114:8	207:6 211:21 212:1
		204:14			
offering 117:7,9	147:19 149:15		77:11 84:24 86:9	114:14 116:3 118:3	particularly 53:4
offhand 10:11 77:21	150:12 151:3,25	opportunity 5:19,22	91:5 96:21 97:1	119:14,14,21,24	113:2 177:7 195:23
office 19:5 44:2	153:19 154:3,9	92:12 202:17	117:7 124:23	120:21 123:11	203:14 210:9
160:12	155:7,8 160:15	opposed 47:17 80:1	134:25 135:18	128:22,22 137:25	parties 29:1 49:3
officer 4:18,20,24	162:13 166:7	81:6 83:3 133:15	140:18 144:23	151:3,4,9 152:5,9	59:20 113:15,16
131:5	169:21 170:3 175:1	144:19 170:18	147:16 149:7 153:8	162:15 165:8	119:16 125:9 146:5
officers 65:11 103:3	184:25 189:19,19	opposition 46:4 83:9	164:9,15 170:4	168:14 191:12,15	partners 10:1 14:4,4
105:21	202:9 203:10	85:2 141:11,16	172:15 193:11	191:21 206:25	30:20 32:14,16
official 129:10 225:9	204:12 207:23	143:24 144:1,3,6	197:23 201:6 204:4	207:6,12,13 208:12	119:5 120:20,24
officials 137:14	211:3 213:10	oppressive 134:19	204:9 214:3,8	212:21	207:4 208:9 221:8
offloading 218:4	214:15 215:11	optimism 207:25	217:23 223:8	pages 182:4	222:19
off-mic 147:23	220:20 221:3	optimistic 204:18	outcome 128:25 129:2	paid 60:10 62:3 73:22	party 2:5 17:6 41:9
often 11:11 172:24	225:16,17	option 165:19,20	144:2 161:12 204:1	77:21 134:14,15,16	65:23 86:10 105:2
oh 24:17 36:24 96:9	ones 134:7 172:14	166:19 186:17	225:12	213:22,23,23	119:3
133:19 195:1	one's 131:12 158:13	203:9	outflanked 146:8	painful 10:18	part-time 4:11,12,14
200:12 207:14	only 17:2 18:9 44:22	options 183:8	outlined 23:20	Pakostov 145:4	pass 49:22
216:25 217:5	44:23 45:1 47:5,17	orally 210:11	outset 129:17 138:10	pandemic 154:12	passage 33:18 131:22
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		outside 3:1 21:8 65:22	186:24	1 0
oil 3:1,25 4:5,8 8:5,6,7	47:24 58:11 60:9	order 29:2 56:15			passed 79:18
41:14 42:12 76:8	61:6,16 67:20 69:19	63:11,11,15,17 87:6	65:23 144:21	paragraph 9:2 31:1	past 42:14 130:21,22
81:21 82:2 132:10	73:17 78:11,17 83:3	124:14 162:10	163:24,25 198:8	35:10 37:2,8 38:13	131:4 141:6
136:11,12,17	83:5 93:18,24 97:6	177:20 178:14	over 3:16 5:10 8:14	44:21 48:20 49:10	Paternoster 1:5
143:15 145:16	98:2,4,11,24 105:15	ordering 49:1	44:20 57:23 66:18	49:18 51:11 60:20	path 54:11
153:7,9,18 154:20	110:8 114:22 115:2	order's 178:8	67:3 71:20 77:6	71:24 85:25 86:3	Patton 2:8,8,9,9,10,10
154:23 155:2,5,16	121:7 132:9 134:24	ordinarily 180:24	79:14 88:12 117:23	97:21 100:11 104:2	2:11
156:8 162:11 166:5	144:24 154:23	organisation 139:11	118:3 120:21	107:20 109:1	pause 6:20 9:9 19:9
171:13,16 178:25	167:24 172:14	organise 178:4	121:11,15 129:21	110:10 111:15,19	22:3 29:14 31:2
181:19 187:5	175:23 176:1	organised 58:2 179:16	131:20 132:1	115:11,22 116:2,6	44:17 71:2,9 79:21
188:13,21 189:4	184:25 197:7,11	180:4,6	137:18 182:3	123:14,24 124:3,18	84:13 91:11,24,25
190:1 198:8 215:8	198:2 201:24 203:9	original 5:21 51:12	184:10 197:20,23	124:22 127:17,23	93:8 97:23 98:9
223:11,15,17,19,22	217:17 220:12	56:20 96:15 110:14	overall 6:2 112:6	128:2,20,22 137:25	118:24 123:15
oilfield 199:1	226:20	110:19	171:19	152:1,2,6,8 160:19	124:24 126:14
okay 6:21 13:21 17:17	onto 67:6 78:5	originally 4:11 46:21	overcome 155:15	162:7 191:12,19	133:3 160:24
34:7 53:3 60:25	onward 175:8	56:12,14,24 88:16	190:7,11 216:19	203:13,14 207:5,12	162:13 165:11
62:17 67:2 92:1	onwards 139:11 156:6	171:12 227:17	overdue 108:16	216:8 217:10	210:3 216:25
97:19 98:1,16	on-site 125:1	other 3:1 7:16 10:3	overhead 163:15	218:15	paved 107:22 109:2
101:16 109:17	Opcom 219:16,17	14:23,24 20:11 23:9	173:15	parcel 126:4,9 127:9	Pavol 18:17,21 19:25
124:25 125:22	open 128:16	23:9 29:20 33:19	overturned 147:9	parcels 45:1	pay 54:17 74:18 75:20
128:18 137:4 141:8	opened 16:8	47:7 53:9 54:20	own 17:18 37:25 40:9	pardon 13:14 60:22	120:25 167:15
148:18 151:11	opening 68:7 101:3		64:18 65:11 68:10	park 31:10 32:1 33:11	168:17 169:5
	1 0	58:15 59:4,20,25	76:7 80:6,7 113:4	33:22 34:1 38:21	
158:9,17 160:21	openness 128:14	60:4 65:8 66:17,24	-		208:14 214:13
165:11,12 168:2,9	operate 8:19 154:8	68:1,15,19 75:24	121:24 128:10	parked 39:1	payment 114:6 115:4
170:1,22 171:9	operating 119:25	78:14 88:13 90:10	147:12,13 155:18	Parking 198:16	170:4
180:8 188:21,25	130:7,8 207:1	94:8,23 97:2 100:7	169:1,3,18 171:16	part 5:13 15:5 37:1	payments 106:20
189:23 190:23	219:24 220:5	100:15,16 105:8,10	172:17 203:3	41:16 73:5 76:15	116:5 119:8,11
204:7 207:12,16	operation 66:24 131:2	115:25 116:3,3	217:21	87:19 93:1 101:5	peaked 153:21
212:16 217:2 218:6	181:5 221:5	117:5 119:4 127:16	owned 47:7 66:6 67:7	107:8 111:2 116:15	pejorative 194:20
227:2,7	operational 111:24	133:6 141:10,11	70:21 197:2 198:20	129:14 133:22	195:6
old 158:8	130:3 146:23	144:20 146:20	owner 26:16 61:7,8,17	159:20,22 162:15	Pekar 2:8 57:7 90:21
once 5:10 19:22 33:5	operations 5:3 40:19	148:5 151:1 152:14	92:18 93:20,22	164:12 172:20	pending 21:23 70:6
75:14 114:16 211:8	66:4 80:2 81:6	154:25 159:25	owners 86:20 143:11	174:10 176:1	people 14:10 28:19
224:11 225:10	107:22 109:6,13	167:24 169:8,21	ownership 60:9 61:8	198:20 199:8 203:1	42:11,14 54:8 65:10
one 1:17,18 7:15 24:3	111:8 112:19 114:2	172:14 174:5	86:17 126:5 135:24	225:22	67:2,5 78:25 79:6,8
25:9 27:25 28:1	116:11 145:5	175:16 183:10	136:18	partial 114:6	79:15 83:17 84:6
31:22 33:18 36:25	165:14 196:11	197:8,12 198:24	owner's 61:15	participant 129:7	98:6 132:19 133:14
51:2 55:6 56:21	197:5 205:22	206:18 207:24		participate 8:20	139:16 141:15
59:25 62:10 65:22	206:13 213:8	215:11 220:20	P	159:12 204:11,14	143:25,25 144:3,17
66:17 68:19 76:23	215:23 221:20	222:23 226:7,23	pace 57:18	205:15 206:4,21	144:20 145:18,21
78:9 80:13 81:12	226:21	others 9:12 78:16	package 212:12	participating 83:16	145:22 146:23
82:7 92:8 93:20,24	operator 188:3 190:7	132:12,24 223:10	page 3:2 9:3 15:22	participation 178:9	147:7 155:9 157:11
94:10,22 97:2 98:8	190:12 216:20	224:24,24	24:1 30:20,22 36:2	particular 7:6,15 15:3	157:12 160:12,16
103:5 106:12 107:7	opinion 23:16 196:8	otherwise 62:24	36:25 37:4 38:12	19:18,21 20:5 26:15	165:1 169:22 176:6
108:3 118:2 119:15	197:11,18 198:2	125:16 205:14	44:20,20 49:9,17	27:21 31:1 40:5	176:12,16 177:23
128:21 131:24	219:5	226:16	60:20,21,23 68:7	53:7 71:25 85:25	180:10 181:4
	==		00.20,21,23 08:7		
	<u> </u>				

	T	ı	I	I	I
184:19 190:18	23:9 66:17,18	193:5 203:8 208:13	polluting 196:7	prepare 108:18 116:7	146:6 166:11 172:1
193:10 195:3,5,16	172:23	210:15 215:6 216:5	pool 197:3	prepared 116:18	182:23 194:14
195:18 196:6,16	photograph 100:17	216:17,21	population 79:3	117:6 134:8 212:3,5	199:5 201:16
197:16 199:7 212:8	144:23	pleasure 2:18 20:3	226:13	214:25 221:2,2	206:25
220:13 224:25	photographs 100:18	152:22 177:2	portion 92:24 115:2	preparing 59:2 199:23	problem 18:5 51:18
226:19	phrase 16:15,17,19,22	plot 127:3,4 131:25		1 1 0	_
	-		position 4:21 28:3	presence 19:20 180:10	58:5 179:25 181:8
per 161:25 171:8	22:20,21 26:2 28:19	132:1,6	32:21 56:23 70:5,20	present 98:24 103:5	189:6,12 195:18,24
193:25	35:4 94:1 192:8	plugged 157:7	70:23 82:11,25	105:22 109:8	198:24 216:1,18,19
perceived 136:15	194:23,24	pm 90:15,17 122:10	97:13 106:10 111:3	presentation 16:11	226:1
percentage 153:13,15	phrases 166:7	122:11,12 124:12	115:12,16,19 133:7	68:7 80:21	problematic 136:15
perception 132:8	pick 66:7	150:15,17 151:22	134:3 145:25	presented 41:5,6 70:3	144:5 200:19
141:17 179:12	picked 56:18	152:19 209:17,19	159:23 165:20	79:16 80:24 101:5	problems 26:23 40:2
188:22	picks 66:16	210:4 228:1	198:13	204:20	50:22 59:21 72:24
perfectly 78:12 159:17	picture 54:14 106:17	point 14:9 20:6 22:24	positions 178:23	President's 91:9	73:20 146:24
perform 22:8	112:6 158:23	28:22 29:24 32:22	positive 143:8,9	President/CEO	165:23 166:21,23
performance 215:4	188:15 202:1	32:24 33:13 36:25	200:13,17 201:6	150:24	181:2,7 190:7,8
perhaps 21:13 63:23	224:19	44:9,13 51:20 54:12	possession 56:11	press 176:9,14 202:12	206:12 215:21
89:18 101:9 106:20	piece 76:16 132:14	58:19 61:1,18 66:13	possibility 103:1,4	203:18 205:9	218:8
148:21	PIETRO 2:4	69:12,19 73:17	181:15,18 183:17	pressure 74:21 148:17	procedural 3:13
period 23:11 48:2	PILAWA 2:10	75:19,22 76:17	191:6 192:13	Presumably 34:12	procedure 201:12
72:1 76:9 108:13,14	pile 213:25	79:23 84:9,18 85:7	202:10	pretext 196:22 204:16	proceed 39:15 58:15
	-	85:10 86:21 97:6	possible 11:6,9 15:6	pretext 196:22 204:16 pretty 14:3 136:18	59:14 91:2 111:4
109:14,15 121:13	pin 24:5			1 0	
154:23 156:11	pioneer 156:16	103:23 105:23	16:7 20:24 24:11,23	147:4 160:2 161:12	146:2
163:16,18 186:20	pipeline 223:20 224:4	106:23 109:12,19	59:9 74:14 90:4	164:15 166:13	proceeded 87:25
186:23 212:7	224:7,8,9	109:20,23 113:15	95:23 97:9 104:4,7	167:21 170:2	215:22
permission 6:22 7:12	placated 53:12	115:17 116:22	141:18 178:22	185:18 191:10	proceeding 68:17
8:11 9:17 10:8,22	place 13:24 40:1 47:21	117:13 118:2 121:5	221:24 222:2,8	226:8	100:25 112:10
154:5 220:5	48:2 62:23 63:3,5	121:11,14 124:15	possibly 18:25 73:6	prevail 120:7 207:9,20	153:5
permissions 135:17	63:17 75:25 78:3	146:23 153:19	posted 117:19	prevailing 148:15	proceedings 10:13
221:13	97:8 115:24 129:14	157:15 158:5	posts 133:25	prevented 183:4	78:18 101:1 145:11
permitted 57:16	141:13 185:8	167:19 174:3	potential 75:16,17,20	previous 4:13,15	213:8
permitting 5:12 7:16	187:18 190:10	191:10 192:11	84:19 116:23 157:6	94:10 118:22	proceeds 23:15
7:19,21 10:2 19:14	205:24 221:23	200:10 202:9,18	159:1 173:25	130:18,24 139:8	process 10:17 50:15
persistent 116:19	222:2,3,20,24	208:19 210:23	187:25 212:14	previously 38:7 45:18	51:22 120:7 128:25
person 3:11 7:19,23	placed 35:24 62:9	212:11,20,20 218:5	PR 130:13,14,15	87:20 201:2	178:10,12,15
9:18 10:8 78:11,17	places 198:25 212:4	218:23,23 219:10	131:7 133:14	pre-cleared 102:22	187:11 204:12
83:3,5 140:10	plaintiff 35:25 36:4	220:11 222:8,19	193:11	pre-emption 86:16	205:20 206:5,20,22
153:10 154:8	38:20	227:2	practical 58:19	pre-emptive 36:11	207:9,20,22 221:11
165:25 166:4,13	plan 78:10 105:13	pointed 53:20	practice 167:18	Prešov 83:18 176:10	221:15 225:1
172:8 193:11	175:22 219:24	points 125:15,21	Practices 74:14	price 153:7 155:16	processes 4:8 62:5
personal 42:3 170:6	227:12	129:22	118:10	187:5,7 188:22	222:21
171:3	planned 179:13 221:5	Poland 4:9 5:2,3	practise 3:4	189:4 223:25	procure 113:10
		73:13 130:25 136:7	_		_
personally 26:5 41:17	planning 219:21		preaching 224:20	prices 156:4 171:17	produced 1:24 21:7
43:12 53:5 63:2	plans 175:12,13	136:9,16 158:20	precautionary 85:8	primary 174:4	producing 171:10
160:5 161:16	180:21	160:6,9 162:4,11,19	preceded 5:20	principals 107:7	production 21:10,11
163:12 183:1	play 157:17 172:10,13	162:22 163:4 171:9	precise 6:4 11:9 23:7	printed 16:8	56:13 171:11 223:8
226:17	173:11	173:12,17 175:3	35:1,4 108:22	prior 3:14 4:5 8:2	productive 138:4
personnel 66:23	pleadings 196:19	214:24	154:18 166:1,4	16:13,13,17,21	200:2 226:12
persons 9:13 11:15	pleasantly 192:22	police 30:12,17 31:7	214:22	31:17 33:1 113:13	professional 102:3
44:25 49:4 62:20	please 1:24 6:4,17	33:25 37:16 44:2,3	precisely 83:19 223:15	135:12 154:22	professionals 177:3
65:8	7:23 19:11 27:11	45:5 46:21 47:8,16	precluded 175:17	165:2 201:15	professor 1:11,12
perspective 132:23	29:5 30:20 34:18	48:6 50:12,14 67:16	precondition 61:10	prioritise 223:14,17	39:10 40:4,13,25
135:6	36:25 44:20,21	69:17 70:12 78:9	predict 215:12	priority 88:6 204:13	41:17,20 42:3,16,18
perversion 134:18	49:19 51:11 55:13	88:1 100:2 103:3	preemption 36:14	private 61:11 132:14	82:14,18 94:9,16,19
per-well 161:20	55:19 59:15 71:3,24	105:21 133:1,8	87:19,23	privilege 18:2 21:8	95:4 96:16,20,25
pessimistic 120:12	79:20 81:8,18 84:10	134:5 184:19,19	prefer 160:2	31:11,24 32:8,11	131:16 132:21
Peter 140:13 194:3,4	84:14 86:1 92:10	225:24 226:5	preference 76:5	33:12 34:8 71:20	134:9 135:6 137:4
petition 78:20,23 79:5	93:5 99:21 107:1	policeman 134:6	prejudiced 148:6	150:3	143:3,5,13 145:9
79:8,14,15 80:7,17	109:10 113:6 123:7	Polish 8:24 41:24	prejudicial 147:14	privileged 18:12 57:3	146:12 147:3,18
80:22 81:5,8,16,18	123:11 124:9,11	73:13 136:17	preliminary 21:13,21	57:4	148:1 178:20
82:17 83:10,11,11	125:25 127:22	160:11,15 171:4,13	21:25 34:25 58:13	proactive 181:21	194:15,18,20,22,25
83:12 144:10	128:19 129:25	215:7	140:22,24 141:8	probably 3:12 5:24	195:6,8,11,20 196:1
176:22 177:17	150:21 151:13,14	political 130:15	164:13 201:11	6:13 19:3 36:2,16	196:9,13,22 198:4
PETRA 2:12	152:2,6,10,17 154:1	146:25 147:1 148:2	218:20 225:6,10,13	59:21 80:14 105:1,3	198:16,18 199:10
PHAROAH 2:5					210:1
	154:10 158:8,10	148:9,15 198:1	prematurely 89:16	129:15 132:7	proffered 69:21
PHILIPPE 1:12	165:7 170:1,16,16	204:20,21 224:25	premised 46:15 149:5	134:16 136:20	_
phone 3:11 20:7,8,11	180:16,23 191:20	politics 54:1 201:1	preparation 135:10	138:21 144:12	profile 18:18
L	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	Г	ı	Г	ı	
profitable 155:16	protesters 47:6 112:3	purposes 22:5 31:12	3:11,12,14,15,16,17	25:24 31:2,3 44:21	recognised 67:21
profoundly 222:6	144:23 145:2	70:22 132:8 169:4	3:18,19,21,22 4:4,5	49:18 51:13 54:23	recognition 28:12
programme 161:8	186:18	178:13	4:6,7,8,9 2:5,20	57:12 81:17 86:1	86:24 87:3
192:12	protests 46:13 177:11	pursuant 28:5 36:15	18:11 21:9,12,13,21	91:20 92:12 98:23	recollection 39:6 73:8
progress 10:4 163:20	181:14 184:13	51:6	21:25 23:24 25:9	117:25 120:11	78:5 83:20 89:12
168:19	provide 17:23 18:1	pursued 67:11,11	43:21 55:3 58:8,14	123:15 124:22,23	92:3 111:17 121:2
project 3:23 4:4 42:5	222:3	106:5	58:16,22 59:18	125:16,24 151:15	159:3 160:4 206:8
120:19 130:2,8,20	provided 1:16 13:1	pursuing 56:7	62:12 90:5 91:2,23	152:25 155:19,25	recommended 20:1
136:1 153:16	22:16 31:21 61:16	pushed 224:3	92:15,22 93:19 94:5	158:15 160:23	reconsider 163:20,23
155:16 157:4,5	90:20 99:11 151:2	pushing 96:25 222:7	94:8,20 96:7,22	162:5,9 171:21	record 1:9,25 10:10
159:10 160:3,13	185:22	put 6:16 15:19 41:11	107:2 121:21	196:18 201:9	13:17,19 16:14,16
161:9,13 167:9	provides 214:7	42:18 48:13 54:24	122:19,21 123:20	216:21 217:15	20:20 22:5 24:6
168:19 169:23	providing 108:15	58:22 64:4 68:17,19	124:6,7,8,13 127:16	218:7 222:15	31:4,12 38:10 44:22
171:8,13,16 172:16	provision 6:15,23 7:5	69:25 72:2 74:21	129:18 131:15	224:14	48:10 51:13 60:11
179:21 181:20	7:9,12 17:13	95:7 102:25 104:8	141:1 143:6 150:6,8	reading 1:24 10:7	68:17,20 74:1 77:23
188:7,10,16 196:3	pry 39:16	107:11 118:18	151:19 152:18,22	13:16 20:4 97:2,25	79:9 81:17 88:20
211:21 214:20	PSPR 26:20 43:23	131:8 133:4 139:2	154:4 175:24 181:1	129:23	98:12,15,15 99:9
215:13,20 216:13	46:6,16 50:23 51:4	142:16,18,21 146:7	183:23 199:19	reads 128:3 207:7	100:7,9,15,23,24
220:15,20 221:25	51:6 52:10,17 53:21	147:20 148:17	209:10,22,25 210:5	217:10	101:8 120:8 123:4
223:24	88:1	154:7 156:17 158:5	210:8 215:18,25	ready 1:4,6 91:1	126:1 141:24
projected 6:10	psychiatrist's 140:17	165:16 167:7 172:4	216:3 227:3	122:13 150:19	142:10 149:23,24
projects 130:22	public 9:17 10:24	183:22 185:14	quick 5:25 24:3 39:11	157:15 165:9 181:6	151:15 170:17,23
158:20 159:12	16:15,18,22 17:3,4	196:22 210:14,16	222:18	209:20	184:2
162:11,17 171:4,7	17:9,14 22:12,13,21	213:6 216:5,16	quickest 223:22	real 35:13,14 108:3	recorded 125:17
171:11 174:22 179:13 220:15	23:2,17 25:3 26:2,7 26:20 27:3 41:6	217:15 putting 148:7 198:7	quickly 200:23 207:1 220:7 221:24	154:24 166:3,3 168:4,6 226:7,23	recourse 39:13 85:11 redacted 31:21,23,25
221:22	43:23 44:16 46:6,25	putting 148:7 198:7	quite 9:21 22:19 25:20	realise 42:1 90:8 195:1	32:10,17 33:14
PROKOPOVÁ 2:9	49:24 61:11,14,21	0	30:4,11 54:7 106:17	realities 132:16	34:10,13,13
promised 205:21	68:25 69:12 89:7,13	qualified 3:7,8	135:9 138:4,9	really 9:13 22:5 30:9	reduce 120:18 208:11
promissory 168:23	92:16 94:1 106:10	quality 222:3	139:12,16,24 140:3	30:11 33:17 58:11	refer 9:9 16:14 68:24
promote 138:24	122:22 124:4 134:4	quanty 222:3 quarrel 96:24	140:6 164:12	64:25 83:21 129:8,8	97:7 125:10
promoting 201:10	137:19,20 178:4,8	quarter 4:21 186:25	169:25 172:24	130:11 135:23	reference 26:7 29:20
pronounce 43:6	185:25 186:3	191:5	176:12 181:3	136:1 139:4 140:19	44:16 105:15
proof 52:16 222:4	192:18 226:6	question 3:20 9:21	211:16 217:23	141:16 142:1	106:16 125:1,14
proper 53:19	publicity 197:8	11:14,16 13:4,5	227:10	147:15 157:3,7,15	126:16,23 210:19
properly 31:15	publicly 10:25 11:4	14:7 17:24 18:5	quote 114:14	158:4 159:11	212:21
property 29:17 34:20	12:24 14:9,11 16:24	21:5,20 22:2,14	quoted 163:4,6	160:13 166:14,16	referencing 155:7
35:13,14,19,25 36:9	17:10 26:25 30:2	23:17 24:3,7,17,20	Q1 219:22 221:3	167:11 174:3 176:8	referred 6:22 12:17
36:12 37:25 38:16	43:10 46:17,20	25:23 31:24 32:20		181:8 185:10	13:9,10 14:24 28:16
38:21 44:24 143:11	61:14,21 69:9,16	33:17 39:11,19	R	188:14 195:16	56:10 122:24
proposal 115:2,6,9	88:17	42:21 46:5,8 47:14	race 158:15	197:25 201:8	126:20 127:9
Proposals 113:8 proposed 92:25 162:7	pull 6:17 25:21 27:11 48:21 60:1 84:1	47:15,16 48:7 52:19	rails 167:1	202:16 203:4 219:23,23 224:2	216:15 referring 7:8 9:4
162:14 202:9	93:8 97:20 107:1	53:3,7,25 55:6	raise 57:12 58:19	225:4 226:12	13:20 17:9 26:21
208:11	124:19 138:1 154:1	57:13 58:6 64:9	82:24 121:14 156:7	reason 19:19 68:19	46:9,11 85:25
proposes 93:2	155:23	65:2 66:12 74:4	156:13	99:8 117:11 156:15	105:10,11 123:17
proposing 51:5	pulled 34:18 127:21	88:23 94:7,17 95:1	raised 50:21,25 59:25	204:16 222:25	125:12 167:23
proposition 217:15	156:1	96:15,16,18 100:13 115:18 125:13	107:15 227:21 raising 157:1 158:17	224:17 226:7	168:1
propositions 140:23	purchase 27:13,15	100 1 100 0 101 10	100 4	reasonable 143:8	refers 31:25 48:19
213:6	35:2 36:10,12,15,15	128:1 129:3 131:19 139:8 141:20	ran 198:6 ransom 145:8	144:3	104:6 123:22,24
prosecuted 88:3	86:11,15 153:22	144:11 145:10	rather 66:1 129:7	reasoning 13:1	126:3,21
prosecutor 88:1 99:10	purchased 156:25	147:19 148:20	138:8 188:18	reasons 28:1 106:12	reflect 125:7 132:15
99:25	179:8	149:13,21 155:4	194:20 197:2	128:8,10 217:18,21	reflected 97:10
Prosecutor's 44:2	purely 197:10	161:15 166:14	203:23 204:8	222:12 226:22	reflects 91:9
prospect 163:24	purported 29:16	170:21 171:1 172:2	211:21 212:1	rebound 155:17	refrain 35:13 49:2
188:15	purportedly 35:15	175:21 179:2	rationale 67:17 69:8	recalled 95:19	refresh 92:2 206:8
prospective 187:10	purports 98:20 99:24	180:16 181:11,12	69:11	receive 59:7	refund 114:17,22
prospects 157:15	purpose 16:15,18,23	182:20,25 183:22	rationales 69:6	received 56:1 58:13	118:17,20
212:4	17:5,9,14 22:13,21	183:24 185:20,25	RD-1 55:17 62:11	73:16 80:13 98:6	refunding 115:2
protect 177:8 195:14	23:2,17 25:3 26:2,7	188:12 189:2 191:2	70:1	106:22 116:15	refusal 133:12
protected 18:2 134:17 protection 138:24	49:6,24 61:14,21	192:24 197:14	re 3:13	149:6,12,14 171:24	refused 73:24 186:14 regard 5:15 61:4,5
protection 138:24 protections 177:20	64:5 65:25 68:25 69:12 89:7,13 92:17	198:5 210:13 211:5	reach 52:4	receiving 25:11,12 71:4 80:11	113:20 214:3
protections 177:20 protest 174:17 177:8	92:19,21 93:23 94:2	212:17,18 217:13	reached 117:1	recently 25:24	215:20 224:3,12
187:23 204:24	102:10,12 105:24	218:18 220:9,21,23	react 153:11	receptive 140:12	regarding 107:4
protester 99:19	142:6 167:11	223:12 questioning 18:3	reaction 106:4 134:10 143:14	reclaim 223:4	127:18 148:1
111:25 186:8	185:25 221:18	questioning 18:3 questions 3:6,7,8,9,10	read 11:22,24 20:14	recognise 27:12 29:6	181:13
		questions 3.0,7,0,2,10	10au 11.22,24 20.14		
	•		•		

region 18:19 19:6 42:7	remarkable 156:21	representations 118:4	111:14 137:7	129:20 130:1,20	90:14 103:18
42:8,10	remedy 188:3	representative 2:5	responsibility 5:6,11	131:10 137:5,6	141:14 145:1,2
regional 62:18 69:1	remember 10:7 14:18	12:20 145:6	57:19 82:12 137:23	193:21	146:20 148:4
register 126:24	20:23 24:9,13,15	representatives	145:10	roles 193:10	152:24 154:25
Registry 127:3	45:4,6,7,9 51:7,8	139:14	responsible 92:20	Romgaz 214:4	170:8 171:1,5
regularly 111:23	60:17 80:15,16	representing 16:1	153:9 176:24	Romgaz 214.4 Romgaz's 127:18	172:12 182:20
regulations 118:10	83:22 110:16	represents 40:6,7,7	rest 40:24 226:23	Ron 8:24 9:11 11:20	186:20 190:21
190:10	149:19 153:18	Republic 1:17 2:11,12	restaurant 226:19	12:22 136:8 141:22	206:13 215:2,3
regulatory 4:5,7 5:7	157:21,23 162:19	2:12 128:9 136:13	restriction 49:3 61:7	142:15 182:14,23	217:15 219:20
6:2,5 8:2 136:5		152:22 213:7	62:3	211:10	222:13
reimbursement	163:5 165:21 167:2	218:25			San 179:9 215:20
183:18	168:11,24,24 169:21 171:6,8		result 12:25 74:17 105:4 111:15	room 101:2 176:14	sand 220:17
reinforces 90:10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Republic's 151:21	118:13 171:24	177:3,8 196:16 215:9 220:1	
	175:7 176:9,24	request 21:6 41:6	172:18	ROSTISLAV 2:8	Sands 1:12 39:10 40:4
rejected 134:23 relate 100:15 181:4	177:14 191:4,9	48:22 49:11,20 50:4	resulted 28:11 149:16	rough 153:13	40:13,25 41:17,20
	193:23 194:4,5	56:13 69:2 81:25		0	42:3,16,18 82:14,18
212:17 213:16	204:3 219:25	94:12	213:11	roughly 5:16 25:23	94:9,16,19 95:4
214:17 216:3	220:22 221:16	requested 94:14	results 161:12 192:22	138:21 153:15	96:16,20,25 131:16
related 81:21 82:4	223:2 225:8,17	101:17	resume 122:13 150:19	161:22	132:21 134:9 135:6
108:12 124:15	remembers 13:16	requesting 99:8	209:16	round 11:2	137:4 143:3,5,13
128:9 181:16 210:9	remind 70:11 79:20	required 9:18 10:8,23	retain 18:13,22	route 7:5	145:9 146:12 147:3
210:10 211:10	189:8	53:14,19 87:24	retained 18:15,15	rule 51:5 55:11 156:14	147:18 148:1
215:17	reminded 129:22	136:25 168:18	return 19:13 71:23	rules 1:1 147:12,13,17	194:15,18,20,22,25
relates 31:17 37:16	199:12	225:11	114:11 116:16,18	ruling 34:24,25 50:10	195:6,8,11,20 196:1
56:6	removal 34:20	requirement 8:11	117:7,9 171:19	50:19,21 52:9,15	196:9,13,22 198:4
relation 56:8 94:9,19	remove 31:8 33:21,24	192:25 193:3	revenues 161:3	89:3	198:16,18 199:10
134:11 135:24	34:1 37:24 38:7	218:21	reversed 134:20	rulings 184:23	210:1
145:15	39:1 70:12 133:9	requiring 6:15 159:10	revert 58:16	run 3:2 5:2 181:7	satisfactorily 19:25
relations 137:20,20,22	140:20	reservations 38:19	review 5:20 56:16,19	214:8	save 130:10 223:7
relationship 31:22	removed 33:2,4,19	reservoir 176:2	101:14 109:7	running 108:15	savvy 190:11 216:20
39:22 41:1 44:24	removing 35:24 53:1	reservoirs 215:13	206:20	179:24 214:3	saw 7:15 32:5 69:18
85:18 94:21 108:4	renewal 76:24,25	resident 138:19	reviewed 99:16	221:19	80:6 89:7 92:3
111:11,15 112:13	renewed 85:2,4,5,6,14	198:20	revised 91:8	run-up 107:14	101:5 132:12
128:16,17 146:15	repay 75:1,3,23	residents 40:15,17	revisited 105:3	rushing 202:1	137:19
146:21 164:10	repeat 11:16 47:16	47:7 79:1 81:20	rewards 171:24	R-015 81:4	saying 15:10 28:20
166:22 222:14	155:3	83:15 138:15	re-adjust 57:19	R-036 29:5	32:10 50:25 100:13
relationships 156:24	repeated 34:20 111:2	143:10	re-commence 107:22	R-059 48:14	105:9 133:5 163:5
relative 119:25	repeatedly 29:23,24	resolution 1:5 79:18	re-direct 3:20 90:4	R-107 81:16	170:16 181:14
relatively 97:14	31:7 33:2 42:20	79:20 80:24	121:21 122:17	R-109 79:22	196:25 204:3
227:12	63:6,19 79:24	resolve 44:23 53:7,20	209:22,23	R-117 193:6 199:20	says 11:11 24:16,16
relaxed 198:7	rephrase 170:16	resolved 117:1 189:6	re-examination	R-122 84:2,15 85:23	29:18,22 30:6 35:6
relay 211:9 212:13	replaced 110:23	resort 197:2,3,10	122:19 123:21	R-123 158:6 162:1	36:1 49:9 116:17,20
relayed 211:7,8 214:5	replough 184:12	198:7,8	209:5	R-142 107:1 168:10	118:22 119:19,21
relaying 211:3	reply 117:15,17	resourcefulness 144:8	RICHARD 2:15	R-143 117:17	123:24 125:18
release 75:24 118:25	report 10:7,10,22	resources 169:18	ride 190:3	R-150 43:25	127:5 151:3,4,8
202:12 203:18	11:24 12:16,18 13:8	respect 42:21 53:22	ridiculous 134:13	R-155 15:19 24:20	156:4,5
205:9,9	13:16,17,18,20 14:4	64:25 127:3 148:2,4	163:7,8	56:8 90:19	scale 169:5 174:25
released 75:4,12,14,16	14:23 30:19,21,22	183:25 196:5	riding 190:4	R-155A 90:22 91:8	scene 142:6
118:14,15	37:20 44:1,3 98:2,4	210:14,25	rig 198:8 222:23	94:11,11	scenery 198:11
relevance 56:16 154:4	98:17,20 99:6,8	respectfully 50:22	rigged 135:5	R-156 24:2 25:21 93:5	scheme 64:1 68:22,25
relevant 44:23 52:12	100:16 115:11	respecting 86:16	rights 8:18 28:4 29:2,4	93:8	69:9,13 71:11 87:5
87:11 153:4	120:11 122:24	respectively 110:4	29:16 60:4,8,9	R-37 141:24	87:15,19,25 88:1,14
reliably 86:13	123:3,17 135:10	respond 115:9	86:17 131:25	R-42 6:17	89:2,3,7
reliance 71:16	208:16	responded 43:22	135:25 138:25	R-59 60:2,24	schemes 88:12
reliant 30:4	reported 12:22,24	93:18,24 114:25	177:23 221:12	R-63 85:22	scholar 178:20
relied 43:11 46:17	14:2,3 15:14 26:11	115:2	right-hand 162:15	2. 00 03.22	scope 180:13
	114:21 120:4	Respondent 1:18 2:7	ring 6:11 153:22	S	screen 6:16 60:24 91:7
137:2.186:5			157:24 164:7		126:25 158:11
137:2 186:5 relief 45:24 46:14	142.13	1 7.6 90.71	131.47 104.1	Sabo 200:5	
relief 45:24 46:14	142:13 reporter 208:25	2:6 90:21 respondents 49:2		1 1 47 1	
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1	reporter 208:25	respondents 49:2	179:17 186:25	sacrificed 147:1	216:16 217:1 scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15	salaries 213:22	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12	seroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19 relying 30:3 50:1	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4 11:22 17:8 80:4,11	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3 26:11 45:4,6 56:13	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22 224:24	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12 same 8:17 10:20 14:6	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12 se 193:25
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19 relying 30:3 50:1 51:24 52:1 219:8	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4 11:22 17:8 80:4,11 80:13 98:6 99:19	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3 26:11 45:4,6 56:13 72:25 79:18 93:3,14	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22 224:24 River 2:14,15,15	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12 same 8:17 10:20 14:6 16:10 43:13 54:7	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12 se 193:25 search 73:10
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19 relying 30:3 50:1 51:24 52:1 219:8 remain 82:12	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4 11:22 17:8 80:4,11 80:13 98:6 99:19 110:3 119:16 182:4	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3 26:11 45:4,6 56:13 72:25 79:18 93:3,14 93:17 94:2,4,8,14	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22 224:24 River 2:14,15,15 roads 51:17	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12 same 8:17 10:20 14:6 16:10 43:13 54:7 64:23,24 65:10,13	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12 se 193:25 search 73:10 sec 128:21
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19 relying 30:3 50:1 51:24 52:1 219:8 remain 82:12 remained 47:21 63:3	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4 11:22 17:8 80:4,11 80:13 98:6 99:19 110:3 119:16 182:4 represent 48:20	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3 26:11 45:4,6 56:13 72:25 79:18 93:3,14 93:17 94:2,4,8,14 96:8 114:5,24 118:4	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22 224:24 River 2:14,15,15 roads 51:17 rodeo 166:8 174:18	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12 same 8:17 10:20 14:6 16:10 43:13 54:7 64:23,24 65:10,13 65:13,19,19 67:11	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12 se 193:25 search 73:10 sec 128:21 second 1:18 16:12
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19 relying 30:3 50:1 51:24 52:1 219:8 remain 82:12 remained 47:21 63:3 78:3 110:11 159:5	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4 11:22 17:8 80:4,11 80:13 98:6 99:19 110:3 119:16 182:4 represent 48:20 202:24 203:3,17	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3 26:11 45:4,6 56:13 72:25 79:18 93:3,14 93:17 94:2,4,8,14 96:8 114:5,24 118:4 143:5 155:3	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22 224:24 River 2:14,15,15 roads 51:17 rodeo 166:8 174:18 189:24	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12 same 8:17 10:20 14:6 16:10 43:13 54:7 64:23,24 65:10,13 65:13,19,19 67:11 68:19,21 69:11	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12 se 193:25 search 73:10 sec 128:21 second 1:18 16:12 39:13 92:24 93:18
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19 relying 30:3 50:1 51:24 52:1 219:8 remain 82:12 remained 47:21 63:3	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4 11:22 17:8 80:4,11 80:13 98:6 99:19 110:3 119:16 182:4 represent 48:20	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3 26:11 45:4,6 56:13 72:25 79:18 93:3,14 93:17 94:2,4,8,14 96:8 114:5,24 118:4	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22 224:24 River 2:14,15,15 roads 51:17 rodeo 166:8 174:18	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12 same 8:17 10:20 14:6 16:10 43:13 54:7 64:23,24 65:10,13 65:13,19,19 67:11	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12 se 193:25 search 73:10 sec 128:21 second 1:18 16:12
relief 45:24 46:14 relocate 39:1 reluctance 111:9 reluctant 192:9,10 rely 46:20 188:19 relying 30:3 50:1 51:24 52:1 219:8 remain 82:12 remained 47:21 63:3 78:3 110:11 159:5	reporter 208:25 reporting 107:19 137:21 182:5 reports 9:24 10:4 11:22 17:8 80:4,11 80:13 98:6 99:19 110:3 119:16 182:4 represent 48:20 202:24 203:3,17	respondents 49:2 Respondent's 62:11 68:7 69:25 142:9 response 24:2,6 26:3 26:11 45:4,6 56:13 72:25 79:18 93:3,14 93:17 94:2,4,8,14 96:8 114:5,24 118:4 143:5 155:3	179:17 186:25 risk 202:15 risks 157:10 Ritchie 217:22,22 224:24 River 2:14,15,15 roads 51:17 rodeo 166:8 174:18 189:24	salaries 213:22 salary 110:1,6 sale 128:5 217:12 same 8:17 10:20 14:6 16:10 43:13 54:7 64:23,24 65:10,13 65:13,19,19 67:11 68:19,21 69:11	scroll 6:17 29:12 35:8 92:10 93:11 127:23 208:12 se 193:25 search 73:10 sec 128:21 second 1:18 16:12 39:13 92:24 93:18

99:21 107:19	sequence 58:1	195:23 227:23	187:12 204:25	83:6,15,15 87:16,25	127:13 130:21,23
110:10 115:22	sequence 38.1 sequestered 58:10	sign 200:13	205:5 206:7 219:24	89:2,14 92:18 93:22	132:20 140:17
117:4 124:18	121:23	signals 133:8	Sitting 207:23	96:8 98:18 102:12	147:3 148:21
127:17 128:2,22,23	Serial 126:5	signature 2:3,4,4,5	situation 19:18 117:1	123:13,25 131:21	149:17 153:9
149:21 151:8 152:4	series 165:18	92:8,25 151:4	121:3 136:6 178:18	137:2 138:19	161:18 168:25
165:20 191:18	serious 59:22 138:11	signatures 80:23	185:17 188:4	141:13 144:15,25	175:8 176:21
213:10 217:10	served 29:7 74:7,9	144:11,12	situations 145:15	149:16 176:23	177:24 178:16
second-stage 110:15	serves 25:22	signed 28:8 75:24	six 3:22 31:4 135:3	182:1 184:15	188:13 192:14,25
secretary 1:22 119:17	service 22:13	78:23,25 79:6 125:9	203:15	186:13,16 190:17	198:1 201:6 211:13
119:22 207:2	services 222:23	151:9 207:3 221:8	SKAF 2:15	197:17 203:1	211:16 212:25
section 111:19 115:22	serving 70:22	significant 23:11	ski 197:2,3,9 198:6,8	222:11,25 223:15	223:3 226:1
120:1,5 123:12	set 31:14 56:18 140:1	72:22 99:17 107:15	skiing 167:3,4	223:16,18 226:17	sometime 7:14 16:20
sections 61:1	140:1	111:10,24 135:20	skirts 215:8	226:24	164:21
sector 3:1 8:5 136:17	sets 96:21	161:12 165:23	Slamka 98:24	Smilno's 70:10	sometimes 31:14
156:8	settlement 1:2 74:21	similar 4:8 95:24	slides 6:10	smilno2001 16:4	133:9,9 170:5,6,6
secured 72:15,17	75:1,3 118:14	130:23 136:19	slightly 51:21 139:22	smoothly 59:1 181:5	somewhat 57:19 89:25
securing 10:2,5	settling 74:17	145:14 148:16	140:9 145:9 146:5	social 226:18	219:15
security 31:6	seven 46:7	153:20 160:16	Slovak 1:17 2:11,12	societies 177:4,6	somewhere 15:5 48:19
seeing 6:9 92:2	several 15:2 78:14	181:11	2:12 7:25 8:2,11	society 143:18 147:10	121:24 172:25
seek 102:11 108:5	129:18 154:25	simple 20:6 226:4	24:24,25 41:23	soft 153:2 154:19,21	soon 56:22 59:7,9,10
116:10,14 120:23	162:19,20 172:16	simply 13:3 17:10	56:15 57:11 69:14	154:22	192:22 205:22
222:5	172:18 175:1 182:4	97:11 113:20	73:13 101:21,22	software 160:12	sophisticated 188:12
seeking 76:14	196:11 218:2,4	190:11	103:21 120:1	solely 44:15	sorry 5:3 11:8,16
seem 130:6 133:5	226:18	since 8:8 50:1 52:10	125:23,24 129:6,10	solemnly 2:1 151:16	12:24 22:13 23:22
seemed 18:19 191:16	severe 73:21	139:23 190:24	129:10,14 133:1	solicitor 3:8	24:17 27:20 28:14
192:1,8,13 203:10	severely 111:16	204:23	146:9,11,12 151:20	solution 190:22,25	30:10,21 31:19 32:2
seems 26:21 42:2	shale 155:10 172:12	Sincerely 148:14	152:22 160:10	some 8:24 20:19,24	35:9 36:24 37:8
53:21 97:13 129:25	220:17	single 131:21 175:25	178:14 189:20	21:12 22:24 24:11	46:3 49:17 50:14,25
130:1 143:16 149:7	share 27:14 28:3 35:3	sir 2:18 9:23 10:20	207:6 213:8 218:25	27:8 40:14 41:12	57:7 60:13 61:19,24
195:22 200:1	36:5,8,12 64:1	26:3 29:6 36:13	Slovakia 4:4,6,8 5:3	52:6 54:20 58:4,14	82:14 84:24 88:7
seen 4:8 7:14 29:11	65:24 67:19,22	48:15 50:13,19,24	6:3 42:9 73:25	58:24 59:17,20 62:8	93:7 95:17 96:9
34:4,13,15 95:3,6	68:21 71:12 87:5,15	51:19 52:19 64:18	111:24 128:9,10,13	65:13,19 72:18	100:13 106:9
95:10 100:18	88:14 89:2,5 115:15	65:12 66:11 69:22	133:18,22 136:6,13	75:22 76:24 78:17	108:22 111:18
141:21 142:7,8,11	120:25 134:15	72:18 74:2 77:2,18	145:13 158:21	85:1 105:23 106:3	113:7,17 124:20
142:12 192:16	168:18 200:13	77:20 78:15 79:12	160:13 162:4,12,20	111:10 112:15,15	126:15,25 148:10
199:20,24 215:4	208:15	86:1 87:8 88:19	163:11 168:19	114:5 119:10	149:25 154:22
sees 221:3	shared 21:1 32:13	94:2 100:5 106:11	171:5 173:20,22	122:20 131:4,6	155:3 158:1,4,10
segue 14:16 seismic 179:24 181:2	shareholder 65:22,23 shears 37:21	124:19,23 131:14 150:21 152:13,23	175:12,17,20,22 176:19 180:14	135:7,16,17 136:12 136:13 142:20	162:5 168:10 176:14,17,17
215:23 219:19,25	sheat 126:5	153:4 155:21 156:2	182:6 193:21	145:21,22 148:16	188:11 189:10
220:2	sheets 80:21	156:20 158:19	214:25 217:17,18	153:2 154:4,13	191:19 194:3,17,21
self-help 39:8	shock 142:24	164:2,2 165:22	218:1,9 219:1,11	156:23 157:5,6,18	194:24 195:25
selling 153:18 217:19	Shores 164:7,9,14,17	167:5 174:19	Slovakian 160:15	159:1 160:8 162:22	197:14 199:4
send 59:8 116:4	212:6	175:15 176:17	Slovakia's 56:13	163:16 164:13	207:11,14 216:25
169:23	short 55:23 90:16	177:5,18 179:1	slow 126:15 221:14	166:6,10,12 169:7	220:9 224:6
sender 128:1	114:15 115:17	180:18 183:9 185:2	slowed 155:10	171:9,10 172:21	sort 16:10 17:8 20:14
sense 22:6 55:4 64:23	122:18 150:16	185:3 189:22 190:5	SLR 2:13,13,14	173:3,22 174:6	20:19 110:19 130:4
130:24 146:3 148:1	155:24 209:2,18	191:14,25 192:5,7	small 39:20 40:16	187:3 190:19	135:17 140:16
188:21 190:14	219:21	195:7 199:11,17	41:13 64:19 79:25	191:11 197:3	153:12 163:6
195:20 197:7 203:7	shorten 89:24	200:12,16 201:25	83:1 131:2,7 132:7	198:12 199:21	164:13 179:20
209:8 226:9	shortfall 115:5	202:3 203:19,21	132:18 133:21	207:25 210:8,10	192:8 198:18 206:8
sent 16:7 56:14,15	shortly 7:2 22:24	204:8 207:11	135:15 136:20	212:20 219:16,18	sorts 136:22 172:19
71:4 95:23 107:6	29:23 36:20 63:25	208:20,21 210:7,12	138:20 143:25	220:11 222:4,8,19	206:15
sentence 31:3,9,16,17	71:4 85:14 89:4	211:22 213:1,3,5,18	144:6,7,24 146:4	223:13 227:2	sought 45:19 46:15
31:22,25 32:7,17	114:10 153:21	214:24 215:18,18	217:1	somebody 20:2 66:16	49:1,7 63:18
33:1 61:3 108:25	164:24 175:9	216:4,7,10,14 217:7	smart 140:6	146:8 163:6 172:2	sound 163:8
120:4 128:2,23	211:24	218:10,12,14,17	Smilno 8:21 9:5 10:5	somehow 32:6 67:16	sounded 120:11 192:9
152:10,11 155:24	show 14:10 41:11 83:9	219:4,12	12:19 15:6,18 19:7	146:1 196:6	sounds 167:14 185:18
160:22 162:8,13	113:6 123:7 140:25	sit 169:6 227:8	26:16 27:24 46:7	someone 76:6 104:25	source 121:7 161:4
200:3 203:15 207:7	showed 82:16 83:17	site 8:13,14,21 9:5	47:7 63:9,20,21,24	137:25 139:23	sources 115:23 116:10
207:18 218:19	200:5,8,14	15:1 17:2 51:25	64:7,14 65:2,4 66:3	157:9,13 159:8,11	117:5 169:19 170:5
sentences 123:12	shown 123:7 125:11	63:19,20 70:1,2	66:6,23 67:5,9,15	159:16 160:3	212:3
sentiment 156:8 159:5	152:2	77:6 123:23 131:21	67:22,24 68:13,21	183:12 195:9 198:7	south 220:15
separate 69:5 144:13	shows 185:1	131:22 132:4	70:21 71:11,13 72:4	198:19	south-oestern 173:17
September 1:17,18 15:17 151:3,8 167:8	side 5:13 7:21 59:4 111:6 130:12,15	187:14 189:13 190:17 197:17	77:16,17,24 78:7 79:7,15 80:23 81:6	something 27:7 28:17 38:16 41:9,9,14	south-eastern 173:17 spa 197:3
168:17 220:24	131:6,7 162:15	sites 8:9,15 181:17	81:24 82:1,1,5 83:4	102:22 110:22	space 133:4
100.17 220.24	131.0,7 102.13	51005 0.7,13 101.17	01.27 02.1,1,3 03.4	102.22 110.22	Space 155.7
	ı	ı			

			1	<u> </u>	
speak 2:2 40:8 42:23	104:12 124:14	202:25 219:10	suffered 184:22	18:15,23 19:18 20:1	172:8 188:9,15,18
43:4,14 55:19 57:11	started 5:10 19:23	stir 192:18 195:18	sufficiently 148:16	20:4,8 22:23 23:5	188:19 213:12
134:6 151:17	89:14 138:1 140:4	196:6	suggest 54:16 109:2	23:12 24:21 25:12	technician 172:8
173:16,24 182:13	142:25 146:24	stop 78:9 177:23	121:20 184:6	26:9 68:24 89:12	216:20
speaker 102:19	163:17 167:1	185:15 186:8	196:16 209:1	91:16 93:2 94:5	technology 176:2
speaking 21:4 146:8	172:10 205:23	191:18,19 202:6	suggested 15:5 44:10	96:19 97:7,9,16	220:4,12
148:10,11,12	206:14	215:6	120:18 130:5 191:9	149:7,9,12 193:18	teetering 219:2
	start-up 161:7	stopped 132:10	204:6 213:7	Sýkora's 22:12 25:2	teeth 204:4,9
	starve 213:21	147:13	suggesting 120:16	43:22 89:9	telephone 97:8
	starved 213:10	stopping 132:19	126:16 208:6		tell 1:23 2:21 4:23
	state 143:17,18,23	straightforward	suggestion 23:8,10	T	9:23 67:2 82:14
23:2,17 25:3 26:2,7	145:11,13,25 146:3	218:19	65:24 90:1 102:14	table 23:11 68:2	125:15 128:21
26:20 49:24 61:14	148:3 177:7,22	strained 111:16	106:1 118:3,8	103:19,21 108:18	141:2 148:21
61:21 68:25 69:12	222:14,16	stranger 178:10	suggests 23:4 104:15	116:6 151:13 159:1	151:12 153:4
	stated 86:13 208:4	strapped 72:5	128:6	164:4,18	155:22 170:1
	statement 9:2 11:11	strategy 51:21	Summary 30:23	take 5:10 6:19 13:23	180:23 183:16
105:24 185:25	50:8 60:21,23 68:11	straw 218:21,22	superiors 129:1	16:3 19:10,11,23	202:6 207:23 209:5
special-purpose 127:7	71:23 79:12,24	streamline 89:18	supervise 4:25	21:19 27:8 29:5	210:24
specific 6:7 7:4 17:12	88:19 97:21,22	streets 145:17	supervising 5:18	30:19 31:19 32:23	telling 128:12 170:3
22:2 44:25,25 45:6	99:13 100:12 102:5	strengthen 28:2	supplied 112:14	44:8,8,12,17,20	217:8
92:14 115:18 116:4	109:8 123:18	stretch 154:13 208:24	support 40:23 41:7		temporary 4:19
136:24 180:6	124:18 127:17	209:21	42:5 121:5 137:23	51:5 65:1 66:18	tempted 172:1
181:13,13 183:23	128:20 130:17	strike 152:10,11	146:10 192:21	81:4 84:25 89:25	ten 61:2
specifically 10:7 11:15	137:24 141:9	striking 135:9	201:22	90:11 103:10	tend 215:7
14:6 16:14 90:19	142:18 151:8 152:2	strong 76:5 118:4	supporting 137:19	117:17,24 121:20	tended 41:23
99:9 149:19 152:5	152:3,4,5 153:1	148:16 159:4	supporting 137.17 supportive 39:24	124:16 134:8	tension 111:11
186:16 212:10	155:18,19 160:20	strongly 145:18	40:17 43:12,15	148:13 150:11	ten-minute 150:12
216:3	160:20 162:21	struck 20:4 100:13	supports 49:21	158:7 165:7 166:6	term 195:4,19
specifics 184:1	168:20 169:7 176:3	142:20	suppose 24:19 139:22	168:10 174:4	terminated 158:24
specified 20:17	182:3 191:13 216:4	structure 66:2 89:14	194:13	177:22 198:14	terms 18:14 136:25
spectre 214:3	216:9 218:16,16	127:6 169:8	supposed 197:19	199:20 202:15	140:8 169:16 219:7
speculating 97:11	223:13	struggled 121:13	sure 7:20 10:19 14:3	206:24 209:1,16	terrible 155:8
	statements 1:17,20	struggling 19:24	15:4 22:19 26:9	216:8 224:18	test 19:9 224:11
speculation 187:16	2:11 39:13 40:10	173:3	32:25 33:15 53:13	taken 81:10 82:25	testified 155:18
speech 177:16	49:21 50:9 79:25	studying 221:25	79:3 84:12 90:3,6	97:8 136:4 186:7	175:11
speed 199:13,15	101:3 129:23 137:3	subeconomic 171:17	102:25 112:5,8	211:17	testify 9:7 10:13,16
spend 5:25 39:19 62:8	151:2 152:15 210:9	subject 22:11 70:16	121:23 126:14	takers 159:5	12:4,12 182:10
135:18 153:11	210:10 216:4	70:18 171:12 194:7	134:14 143:4 145:8	takes 204:4 222:19,21 225:11	183:12 210:21
	states 145:25 156:18	202:25 206:2	150:4 158:24		testimony 7:3 22:10
spent 8:5 144:15	174:12 175:1	submission 96:6	163:23 164:15	taking 89:16 129:13	52:14,20 71:17 83:2
184:11 223:1	177:10	submissions 88:23,25	166:10 167:21	145:20 199:13	122:21 129:13
	stating 38:19	submit 50:21 140:24	170:2,8 178:2 179:2	204:9	162:24 180:3
•	status 20:25 24:12	submitted 50:9 86:24	180:3,13 181:12,20	talk 63:23 85:15 192:2	199:23 210:18,24
spoke 3:10,18 42:1,14	30:5,23 43:6,9	87:3 88:18 154:2	184:1 187:9 188:11	197:22,23 200:14	211:13,15
173:25	45:12 46:22 107:16	submitting 57:2	189:16 197:4	talked 62:18 68:22	Texas 166:7 172:13
spoken 3:14 93:7	109:18 135:11	206:14	206:11 209:4	166:13 182:3,16	220:15
103:21	149:13,18	subparagraph 7:7	210:15,17 221:4	197:20 214:4	text 48:19
	statute 22:17 62:1	subsequently 12:22	surely 190:8	224:23	thank 2:4,13,17 3:9
	statutory 16:15,22	subsidiaries 186:7	surface 185:18	talking 23:12 48:3	6:18 14:13,15 19:12
Squire 2:8,8,9,9,10,10	17:13 22:21 26:2	subsidiary 63:21	surfaced 157:11,12	62:8 65:1 66:13,14	21:18 25:18 32:18
2:11	43:23 186:1	64:16 66:7 67:7	surprise 200:9	76:9,12 85:19 96:9	34:16 42:16 43:18
· ·	stay 120:19 208:12	186:13	surprised 134:20	98:11 112:12	43:19 54:15 55:5,21
	stay 120.17 200.12 stayed 62:23	substance 93:13	159:15 177:19,21	135:20 156:3 167:2	57:5 58:12,18 59:6
0	stayed 62.23 staying 34:7	substantial 72:2,24	192:22 200:4,6	170:8,10 176:6,7	59:16 68:8 71:7,8
	steep 154:20	83:8 110:24 171:23	219:15,20	180:13 191:6	82:18 89:23 90:12
	step 84:25 111:4 117:4	171:24	surprisingly 42:18	195:13 207:21	91:4,4,6,13 95:12
	STEPHEN 1:11 2:8	substantially 155:13	200:1	214:19 tonk 150:5	97:15,19 101:11,11
0	stepping 131:22 215:1	163:12	survey 49:13 219:18	tank 159:5	106:7 121:16,19
	steps 77:2 136:4	succeed 164:17	suspect 149:24,24	tasks 137:10	122:9,9,18 123:22
stand 55:20 209:13	165:18	success 187:19 224:15	sustain 70:4	TATIANA 2:9 Tatras 167:4	124:5,20 125:1,11
	stick 57:25	successful 112:4	Svidník 81:21 82:2		128:18 129:12
Ü	stiff 142:25 143:24	156:16 163:9	swamped 172:18	tax 169:4	131:15,16 137:4
_	stiffened 142:25	171:15 173:13,14	switch 1:12	team 5:14 7:17 8:25	147:18 150:6,7,9,10
	still 22:1 51:24 58:7	174:9 215:22	sympathise 198:9	80:4 105:1 131:7	150:14 151:19,24
136:10 139:10,14	67:23 90:13 147:11	224:13	system 135:4	172:7	152:17,24 158:13
146:16 183:13	148:4 155:16	succinct 199:18	Sýkora 14:21 15:23	team's 56:10	164:24 179:1,4,5,7
	185:12 186:21	sued 78:14	17:16,17,18 18:14	technical 130:3,11,12 156:24 166:14	181:24 190:13
Start 30:1 /9:22 An:3					
start 56:1 79:22 86:5	103.12 100.21			130.24 100.14	

Day 2 Hearing on	the Ments	icsib case i	10. / HRB/21/31	11	iday, 2 i cordary 202
191:3,3 196:13	192:14 215:19,24	tone 194:20 207:25	141:12 144:22	61:1 62:10 72:9	93:15 94:15 107:9
198:3 208:23	224:2 226:10	tool 204:21 220:10,16	196:2 197:19 205:6	80:20 94:8 100:17	110:12,14 112:5
211:12 213:20	threat 74:13	top 9:3,14 15:22 16:6	trouble 81:17 93:11	103:6 105:21 110:8	113:19 125:19
214:22 216:2	threaten 102:24	35:11 44:1 61:3	193:9 218:1	125:2 126:17	157:6,13 180:4,19
218:15 219:13,13	threatened 74:11	81:18 84:6 95:14	true 29:19 43:11	134:10 140:13	213:13 214:15
219:14 221:21	102:18 103:7,16	109:23 114:13	45:23,25 46:1 63:8	151:2 165:15 176:8	218:11,13
227:4,5	117:12,14,16	topic 23:10 26:20,22	67:13 70:7 71:11	190:16 213:6 216:3	understood 6:7 17:10
Thanks 127:16	118:16	total 57:22 109:19	73:9 74:18 75:7,9	219:21,22 220:25	25:1 26:25 30:2
their 11:22 38:25 41:6	three 12:1 13:23 15:15	110:4 171:3	77:22 86:23,25 87:2	221:3,9 225:11	40:18 41:13 42:22
42:7 53:1 72:25	25:23 29:13 61:1	totally 34:3 204:4	88:12 118:25	226:23	66:5 67:18 69:15
73:20 81:22 82:1	69:5 92:14 93:18	tourist 197:4	129:12 132:5	type 126:4 143:14	82:22 87:22,23
106:4,20 107:16	96:22 98:21 161:2	toward 215:23	133:10 136:17	155:12	110:18 122:22
109:19 111:25	161:17,21 162:5,10	towards 76:9 119:8,11	142:12 153:18	typical 212:1	133:5 137:7 138:13
112:4 117:7,15	162:14,17 165:15	191:4,15	155:20 159:4	typically 155:14 161:6	206:12 210:15,17
128:10 133:7,25	175:23 176:3,8	towed 47:9	168:20 175:19	212:3,11 221:21	226:5
138:25 144:8	191:23 197:23	town 92:18 93:22 96:8	184:23 188:24		undertaken 176:22
147:13 154:6	204:25 207:3 221:9	145:12 176:7	202:14 204:23	U	unfortunate 199:1
173:15 179:11,23	226:23	197:21	205:4	UK 28:18 145:14	unfortunately 56:17
179:24 188:22	thrill 201:16	toxic 141:3	truly 224:2	ultimately 67:21	121:25 163:14
190:6 196:25	through 5:22 35:2	track 26:17 35:15,23	truncated 30:11	116:15 120:7 164:4	unique 218:8
197:18,19 200:14	44:9 48:3 49:22	93:20 104:3,5,9,13	trust 188:2 192:14	165:16 181:23	United 3:6 147:5
200:18 202:11,14	54:20 59:8 67:4	104:20,22 106:9,10	201:8,10	207:9,20 224:21	156:18 174:12
204:12 205:14	86:10 98:21 117:25	132:2 185:11	truth 1:23 2:2,2,3	Umm 158:2	177:10
206:4 215:8,9,10,23 217:21 218:3 221:8	141:11 154:5 156:17 167:8	trade 197:4 traditional 131:11	151:12,17,17,18 192:17	unaccountable 204:5	unlawful 67:20 87:20 unless 127:13 190:17
themselves 51:15	168:17 170:4 181:2	training 160:17	truthful 198:15	unambiguous 103:7	unofficially 128:24
146:6	185:9 187:3 193:1	trait 86:22	try 10:19 18:13 31:13	unannotated 1:21	unpaid 110:11
theoretically 215:11	194:1 202:1 227:13	tranche 167:21	40:2 47:5 67:15	unconventional	unreasonable 144:2
theories 187:13	throughout 48:2	transaction 27:17,21	68:9 90:2 104:3	175:13	195:3,3,9
theory 46:16 50:1,23	111:23 112:18	27:23 28:5,25 64:4	194:13 199:13,15	undated 97:4	unreasonably 146:1
51:4,6 52:10,17	thumbs 147:7	158:17 162:8,14	206:1 221:23	under 1:1 1:23 8:11 31:1 62:20 75:3	unrecorded 126:5
63:10 69:3,20	TIAGO 2:14	167:20 170:13	227:15,18	90:13 109:21,21,22	unrelated 128:8
they'd 104:19 118:18	ticket 224:3	transactions 41:3,5	trying 22:4 72:4 93:8	111:19 115:21	unsightly 199:2
188:9	timeframe 22:20 84:1	transcript 1:24 68:6	97:1 140:16 159:21	119:21,24 120:1	unsophisticated 189:2
thing 16:10 47:5 129:5	98:3 175:5	210:19 212:21	160:17 179:6	141:24 151:12	unsuccessful 72:12
132:2,22 144:7	timeline 62:14,16,17	transfer 29:1 64:1	202:10 218:22	162:7,14 204:16	unsuccessfully 63:6
145:1 146:20 148:4	69:24 185:2	67:19,22 68:21 69:9	219:3 221:16	206:6 207:6 226:2	187:13 203:2
170:9 197:7 198:25	times 30:1 33:7 39:12	87:5,15 88:14 89:2	222:10 226:1	underlining 51:12	until 8:13 18:16 47:3
199:1,25 205:16	57:25 64:12 201:8	89:5	tune 108:9	underneath 113:7	48:11 73:1 88:4
206:8 215:14 226:5	timing 57:13 58:11 tiny 86:11	transferred 71:12 translated 102:5	turn 2:6,13 9:1 24:2 39:6 44:19 49:9,17	216:22	122:11 157:7
things 3:1 7:19 35:24 43:7 102:23 135:8,9	tired 225:16	translation 56:20 58:7	66:18 84:14 85:22	undersigned 81:20	163:16 186:6,24 219:10 228:2
140:1,10 163:11	title 4:17 25:7 126:8	58:20,25 59:2,7	93:5 101:13 119:14	understand 4:10	unusual 16:11 159:10
165:19 167:1	193:23,25	71:5 89:18 90:19	122:16 123:11	14:19 15:24 22:7,8	161:10
172:19 176:7	titles 130:8 151:1	translations 59:10	128:19 151:20	26:12 32:4,7,21	unwilling 102:14
187:23 188:5,8	today 2:20,22,23 3:24	translator 101:24,25	160:19 191:12	33:4,16,18 35:14,17 37:19 48:7 52:7,20	183:14
195:24 199:6 206:7	10:19 83:2 129:24	transpired 87:11	203:22 208:3	53:6 55:10 59:11	unwillingness 213:11
212:5 221:13	131:21 169:6	91:14	turns 149:7 172:15	63:10 90:18 91:12	213:16 214:17
thinking 40:6 94:13	199:23 207:23	transportation-tech	Tushingham 2:3 3:4	92:25 103:20	update 10:1 30:23
third 37:8 44:21 49:2	210:11 211:14	51:16	3:20 4:2 2:7,9,13	108:25 112:8	updates 9:24,25 15:15
62:19 69:11 85:25	224:14	travel 183:7,17	17:24 21:19,24 22:3	125:13 126:20,21	upgrade 53:18 77:17
86:3,10 94:5 111:15	together 4:2 19:16	treat 169:13	31:19 32:2,12 55:6	127:2 131:8 135:6	upgraded 70:2 77:4,8
111:19 113:15,16	64:5 136:7 202:10	treated 150:3 169:4	55:13 56:3,6 57:4	138:5,23 142:1,6	77:19
119:3 191:15	told 11:3 13:3 14:11	treaty 84:19	59:7 71:3 90:23	147:25 151:25	upgrading 53:14
206:25 207:5	15:17 33:24 38:6	trespasses 31:20	91:5 94:17 95:1	156:17 159:24	uphold 45:2
third-last 123:24	47:8 50:12,14,18	Tribunal 1:22,23 3:6	96:9,13,23 97:6	178:5,22 185:19	upside 157:4
though 70:21 156:24	112:3 128:24	3:7,8,9,10,11,12,14	122:6,16,17 123:20	188:8 190:6,9 193:7	use 9:18 12:21 13:10
167:14 170:21	179:25 181:7 186:3	3:15,16,17,18,19,21	124:7,16 126:2,8,18	196:17 198:12	13:13 38:20 39:7
221:10 thought 16:24 40:23	186:4,6 189:6,12	3:22 4:4,5,6,7,8,9 18:5 21:14 50:9	126:22,25 127:2,9 150:14 151:23	200:6 202:9 206:6	40:1,5 50:22 53:8 54:20 61:11 70:15
54:9 55:13 70:14	190:16,16,21,22 196:24 198:20	52:14 62:10 90:5	150:14 151:25	207:21 211:7 213:7	70:23 79:7 85:21
74:5 95:5 104:18	202:15 205:18	121:21 124:13	209:3,4,11,23	218:22 221:19,21	88:21 94:1 103:18
106:3 133:3 134:12	210:20 225:18	187:21 209:9 210:5	227:15,17,23	understanding 9:8,10	131:24 148:2 161:7
137:9 140:5 153:1,4	tolerance 178:8	Tribunal's 43:21 52:9	Twenty 2:3	9:16,19,20,21,22,23	175:17 186:1,4,18
155:19 157:8	tolerate 177:8	57:15,21 123:21	two 1:16 15:15 24:1	25:2 29:6 32:12,16 33:3 52:3 53:10,11	220:14
172:14 173:14	tomorrow 104:13	tricky 31:14	25:9 35:18 43:6	53:16 64:7 66:20	used 20:5,15 35:4
181:1 190:15	227:10,14,19	tried 140:15,15	50:8,21,25 59:10	70:25 71:18,18	67:24 78:1 132:9
		Pac	re 18		

	1	I		I	
137:1 139:19	views 40:13 131:25	65:21 79:2,12	39:21 52:6 55:18	216:4,9 218:15,16	198:22
159:10 160:13	132:5 196:23	113:24 132:25	56:21,22 59:5 76:9	223:13	wrote 102:17 104:2,7
169:8,19 172:24	208:16	134:20 159:9,14	93:8 96:23 112:12	witnesses 58:2 227:10	111:22 116:7
195:4 198:14	Viktor 193:14	160:13 164:11	117:24 122:13	witness's 216:16	120:14 168:21
220:13	village 26:16 39:20,25	168:25 169:25	143:20 155:7 170:8	wonder 54:21 89:15	217:22
user 11:2 51:5	40:8,15,18,20,24	176:13,25 181:8	170:15 180:13	89:16 134:2 193:9	
Users 51:14,15	41:7,12 42:24 43:4	185:10 201:20	194:1 209:8 217:8	212:16	Y
uses 26:13 38:21	43:5,13,14,15 78:12	202:22 203:9	227:18	wondered 97:3 184:3	yard 196:17
using 35:13,23 37:21	78:16,18,21 79:4,15	219:23 226:2,14	we've 3:16 56:21	wonderful 159:16	yeah 194:17,21
53:13 77:9,12 87:12	79:16 80:1 135:15	waste 222:2 223:5	68:22 70:10,20 71:4	169:14	year 39:20 72:23,24
125:3 127:4 132:10	138:15 143:16	watches 190:3	87:13,16 96:13	wondering 19:5 55:2	73:7,8,20 158:25
161:6 194:22	144:14,19,24 145:3	water 196:7	100:18 131:20	136:2 137:10	184:10 185:9 187:4
196:21	197:1	wave 212:9	133:20 137:5 173:8	192:11 194:22	220:25
usual 60:8,9	villagers 78:14	way 26:12 39:15 48:8	205:6 224:14	word 20:22 31:4 33:1	years 3:17 8:4,5 72:9
usually 137:7 138:23	villages 197:13	62:2 66:3 78:17	226:22 227:2	51:14 148:2 174:24	146:18 172:16,18
	violated 63:6	85:11 97:2 98:14	whatsoever 67:10	209:8	173:17 221:23
V	violation 70:6 86:17	107:22 109:2	175:14	wording 81:8	225:11
v 1:16	87:12 219:5,9	122:19 123:20	wheelchair 100:19	words 26:6 33:14	yesterday 6:10 141:21
vacancy 214:6	violations 74:14	127:4 132:11	whichever 58:23	34:10,13,14 53:9	young 42:7,7
vacated 62:23	185:21	134:24 138:23	while 3:3 4:13 13:22	85:21 88:13 95:7	
validity 45:2	virtually 130:2	147:14 158:8 166:1	47:6 63:5,17 78:3	103:12 128:11	Z
value 89:19	virtue 83:10 211:19	166:12 167:11	155:17 160:15	148:5,8 196:22 197:23 210:16	Zdinak 194:3
Vargaeštok 18:17,21	visiting 226:19 Vladimir 193:16,17	169:4,11,21 192:20 196:20 197:6 198:2	167:3 172:9,16 209:12 227:9	211:19	zero 75:25 81:12
19:25 98:23 99:12	VLK 139:10 179:17	203:6,6 207:23	White 84:16,23 85:13	work 5:20 18:17,20	ZUZANA 2:12
100:16	200:5,10 203:25	214:11 215:17	whole 2:2 10:17 43:15	19:21,25 26:21	
variety 159:24	vocal 54:10 85:3	218:7 219:24 220:7	104:3,5 117:3 149:5	78:13 97:1 104:12	Š
various 79:25 88:2	voice 38:4	221:12 223:22	151:17	104:16 157:1,14	Šarišské 141:13,15
100:2 112:10	void 28:9,11 87:5	226:2,25	wholly 67:7 128:8	159:20 168:18	
139:13 147:7	voluntarily 201:11	Wayland 217:4,23	WHYTE 2:14	171:23 173:7,7,17	\$
149:14 179:12	vote 82:6,8 146:12	224:24	willing 10:16,17 41:11	171.23 173.7,7,17	\$1.95 116:16
217:19 222:1 Variancy 6 20:8 25:15	votes 81:10,11	ways 224:25	111:4 159:17	192:14 194:2 206:7	\$100 153:17,17
Varjanová 29:8 35:15	voting 82:15	week 104:14	182:21 201:22	214:24 220:4,14	\$14,800-and-miscell
44:4 45:19 47:7	, Jung 02.13	weeks 3:12 25:23	202:15 204:19	worked 91:5 136:7,9	114:23
59:19 60:4 68:14 78:11,19 83:2		45:20 144:16	willingness 161:16	183:2 194:5 221:5	\$15 73:11
138:17 139:13,17	wait 75:19 91:11	welcome 48:20 126:12	213:16	working 3:23 4:2 5:1	\$190,000 108:9
141:9 144:19 185:5	waited 46:7	146:23	winding 5:4	8:6 18:16 31:6 72:9	\$2 118:18
195:22 196:20	waived 205:14	wells 136:8 161:2,17	window 216:24	108:7 140:4 146:16	\$2.0 168:16
202:4 226:22	walk 44:8	161:21 162:4,17,18	wiring 114:10	146:22 170:3 171:5	\$25,000 114:7
Varjanová's 225:22	walk 44.8 wall 133:11	165:14 171:10	wisely 153:11	177:3 179:23 181:2	\$30 73:11
vehicle 29:8 31:8 33:2	want 18:4 21:9,9,20	172:9 173:11 174:2	wish 57:9 59:11	187:24 206:11	\$4 109:22
37:20,22 38:21 39:2	30:25 32:23 39:16	178:24 199:7	151:25 152:7,14	works 82:3 220:14,17	\$5.85 153:18
vehicles 49:23 70:12	43:14 52:7 57:15	201:12 219:21	166:12 209:14	220:18	\$50 187:5
venture 5:2 14:3	58:13,21 66:22	220:25 221:3,10	220:3	world 143:22 215:11	
32:14,15	71:23,25 76:4,7	222:7,8,18 223:19	withdraw 127:19	world-class 172:11	1
ventures 160:9,10	86:5 91:19 95:8	went 4:4,10 28:5,7	216:12 217:9	worried 168:25	1 1:5 3:3 62:11 70:1
verbal 125:20	98:15 118:2 122:1	67:14 85:13 107:24	withdrawal 119:15	worry 133:20	86:3,5,6,8,12,14,18
verbatim 33:8	129:8 130:18 140:4	138:10 140:13	withholding 109:5	worth 28:15 52:17	86:21 113:3,13
verbiage 166:2	140:17 141:1	141:12 142:15	witness 1:20,22,24	134:13 205:25	165:19
versa 184:20	143:15 158:7 160:1	143:1 145:5 146:25	2:11 9:1 11:11	wouldn't 27:5 77:3	1(b) 119:21
version 90:18 125:23	165:9 167:15 180:2	157:1 165:19	13:15 39:13 50:8,8	103:2 106:11 129:4	1.2 161:22
203:24	181:10 184:2	167:15 174:11	54:22 55:20 57:17	134:16 140:23	1.35 122:10
vertical 174:8	185:23 196:5,25	181:5,20 189:18	58:23,23,24 60:21	159:7,22 177:19	1.9 73:18
veteran 136:11	199:7,10,11 202:22	217:23	60:23 68:10 71:23	189:1 203:5	1.95 109:24
via 49:2	207:5 210:14,17	weren't 136:14 163:14	79:12,25 82:25	wrap 90:2,7 117:18	1/700th 27:14 36:4,8
vice 184:20	wanted 14:16 36:24	165:24 169:2	93:12 95:2 97:20,22	208:20 209:2	46:22 64:1 87:4
video 101:5,6 141:21	42:10 59:25 62:7	172:15 197:20	100:11 123:18	writ 24:21 42:20	88:14 134:15
142:7,8 183:7,18	69:18 71:5 99:9	202:7 205:19	124:18,19 127:13	writes 14:6 116:12	10 49:10 134:16
view 42:4 46:24 57:21	117:11 146:6	217:14 225:25	127:17 128:20	199:25	146:18
86:21 97:2 115:15	155:24 159:11	West 3:2	129:23 130:17	writing 210:10	10,000 114:22
116:10 132:13,21	166:2 178:2 179:3	western 42:9	137:24 141:9	written 1:16 15:14	100 134:14,14
132:22,23,25 134:8	181:19 189:8	we'll 2:6 14:19 46:5	142:18 147:23	107:6 149:6,8,12,14	100% 33:23 66:6
			151:11,12,14 152:1	151:2 211:17,24	70:21 150:4 161:24
146:23 153:6	190:19 192:17,21	58:16 66:22 73:3		06 01 110 10	
181:21 196:9	190:19 192:17,21 200:14 218:2	82:10 90:5 117:17	152:3,4,4,15 153:1	wrong 96:21 110:18	101 3:18
181:21 196:9 200:13 203:4 204:8	190:19 192:17,21 200:14 218:2 wants 212:22	82:10 90:5 117:17 140:25 150:13	152:3,4,4,15 153:1 154:6 160:19,20	114:4 125:25	101 3:18 105 3:19
181:21 196:9 200:13 203:4 204:8 224:11,19	190:19 192:17,21 200:14 218:2 wants 212:22 wasn't 5:23,24 7:4	82:10 90:5 117:17 140:25 150:13 151:20 199:5	152:3,4,4,15 153:1 154:6 160:19,20 162:21 182:3 184:7	114:4 125:25 129:25 133:6	101 3:18 105 3:19 107 153:22
181:21 196:9 200:13 203:4 204:8	190:19 192:17,21 200:14 218:2 wants 212:22	82:10 90:5 117:17 140:25 150:13	152:3,4,4,15 153:1 154:6 160:19,20	114:4 125:25	101 3:18 105 3:19

Day 2 Hearing on the Wents		Testo case No. ARD/21/31		1 Hday, 2 1 coluary 2024	
11 40.19 00:25 00:25	17.1 07.00 70.15	24 160:10			
11 49:18 98:25 99:2,5	17:1 27:22 72:15	34 160:19			
11.01 55:22	73:16 88:21 122:25	341 80:22			
11.20 55:24	123:9 139:11,15	35 9:2			
12 61:12	164:21,22 167:2,3,8	36 128:22			
12.17 90:15	168:17 176:21	39 3:11			
12.35 90:17	219:22 221:1,2,3				
122 3:20	2016 14:5 16:20,20,21	4			
123 3:21	19:1,2 22:23 25:22	4 38:17 114:14 120:21			
124 3:22	27:2 30:22 36:16				
13 3:6 9:3 51:11 152:5	46:12 47:3,22 48:1	40 173:21			
	· ·	42 127:17			
14 84:2	48:11,22 49:16 50:2	45 71:24			
15 36:2 89:21 90:11	62:9,21,24 64:12				
151:8 209:16	68:23 73:2,5,6,19	5			
224:10	73:23 74:8 76:20	5 108:13,13 123:9			
15,000 220:19	84:2 107:21 109:2	193:8			
15-17 49:16	111:23 112:10,12				
15-30 158:18 162:3	112:18 113:8	5% 120:18 208:11			
15.51 212:22	139:24 182:1	5.02 209:17			
150 4:1	184:10,22 185:9	5.15 209:16			
150 4.1 151 4:2	186:6,23,23,25	5.16 209:19			
		5.17 210:4			
152 4:3	187:7 189:17 191:5	5.45 228:1			
155 91:15	2017 48:18 51:20 62:4	50 83:21 163:7			
156 93:5 97:5	68:13 74:8 76:12,14	50,000 223:2			
16 212:21	87:10 107:23	50/50 165:17			
16th 98:21 151:9	112:11 119:13				
167 212:21	138:1 139:21 171:6	500 161:25			
17 16:17 27:22	186:12 191:5 193:8	52 3:12			
17th 98:24 99:2	203:18 207:2	55 97:21,25 98:4			
171 203:22,24	2018 154:14	100:11			
171 203.22,24 178 4:4	2010 134.14 2022 1:17 151:3,4	56 3:13			
18 3:7 1:18 62:21	2023 1:18 151:8	6			
18th 98:21,24 99:3	2024 1:8 1:1	6 25:22 85:22			
181 4:5	21 30:22	6-point-something			
183 4:6	210 4:9				
185 127:21	210,000 110:4	171:6			
189 4:7	22 127:4				
194 4:8	23 108:14 144:23	7			
1986 153:7 155:7	164:22	7 60:20,21,23			
1993 3:5	230 167:20	7BQ 1:6			
1773 3.3	24 3:8	7.00 99:3			
2	28 60:20	700 79:4			
2 1:8 3:4,5 1:1,4 44:20	29 6:18 7:5 61:20				
48:22 109:1,23	108:14 191:12,21	8			
111:19 118:3	29(3) 6:11,12,14 7:3	8 48:20			
123:11 163:13	7:12,22	8.00 99:3			
167:7,13 168:12	29(4) 7:8	82 3:14			
· ·	. ′	83 191:12			
170:10 197:2	3	89 216:8			
2nd 1:8		07 210.0			
2.15 122:2	3 6:18 36:25 37:2 49:9				
2.20 122:6,8,11	84:14 111:22 114:8	9			
2.24 122:12	119:13,14,24 207:2	9 49:10 124:18 224:10			
2.26 124:12	207:6,12,12	9.30 1:2 228:2			
2.30 122:2	3Legs 173:10	9.32 2:8			
2.5 57:17	3.08 150:15	9.33 2:15			
20 8:5	3.19 150:17	90,000 110:3			
200 83:22	3.21 151:22	92 137:25			
2006 8:8	3.22 152:19				
2007 173:6,19	3.3 38:13	93 218:15			
T		94 3:15			
2013 167:8 168:16	30 1:17 8:4 151:3,4	945 126:5			
175:7	153:24,25 173:21	96 3:16			
2014 4:20 5:21 139:12	300 78:25 79:14	97 3:17			
156:6 157:1 219:22	300,000 110:4	99 128:20,22			
220:24	300-and-something				
2014-2015 156:3	144:11				
2015 4:22 5:16 6:13	31 3:9				
7:14,15 11:25 13:25	32 137:25 152:1,6				
14:1,11 15:3,16	33 3:10 137:25				
1,11 13.3,10	22 3.10 137.23				