## **EXHIBIT 14**

		Page 1
1	CONFIDENTIAL - MATTHEW GREENBLATT	
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
4		-x
5	In re:	SIPA LIQUIDATION
6	BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,	No. 08-01789(BRL)
7		(Substantively Consolidated)
8	Debtor.	
9	IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee of the Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff	Α
10	Investment Securities LLC,	
11	Plaintiff,	
		Adv. Pro. No.
12	vs.	09-01182(BRL)
13	J. EZRA MERKIN, GABRIEL CAPITAL, L.P., ARIEL FUND LTD.,	
14	ASCOT PARTNERS, L.P., GABRIEL CAPITAL CORPORATION,	
15	,	
	Defendants.	
16		x
17	***CONFIDENTIAL***	
18	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MATTHEW	GREENBLATT
19	New York, New York	
20	August 17, 2015	
21		
22		
23	Reported by:	
24	KATHY S. KLEPFER, RMR, RPR, CRR,	CLR
25	JOB NO. 96625	

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- the IRS were necessitated by fictitious activity
- 3 in the accounts?
- 4 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- $^5$  A. I would say yes.
- Q. And those tax payments were not made
- <sup>7</sup> at the request of account holders, correct?
- 8 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- <sup>9</sup> A. I don't know whether or not they ever
- said, "Pay them on my behalf or not." The
- calculation, though, goes to the books and
- 12 records and a reconstruction of the items on the
- books and records as to what transactions
- 14 actually transpired with respect to cash and
- principal. So those payments were made on
- behalf of account holders by BLMIS and,
- therefore, have been concluded were reductions
- of their principal.
- Q. And you're not offering an opinion as
- to the appropriateness of deductions of the tax
- payments from the net equity; that was
- determined by counsel, right?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- $^{24}$  A. As I said before, the net equity
- determinations are essentially a legal

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- conclusion, and from the very beginning, I was
- 3 asked by counsel to the trustee to identify cash
- 4 and principal transactions and to apply this
- methodology of inflows and outflows.
- Q. You're not offering an opinion as to
- <sup>7</sup> the appropriateness of that methodology,
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- Q. Was there any other analysis that you
- 11 had done that was altered before -- before
- issuing your final reports?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. I don't think -- I can't think of any,
- 15 no.
- Q. Are you being compensated for your
- time spent on the Merkin and Madoff cases?
- $^{18}$  A. Yes.
- 19 Q. How are you being compensated?
- A. Me, personally, or my firm?
- Q. How are you personally being
- compensated?
- $^{23}$  A. I draw a salary and bonus over time.
- Q. How is the amount of your bonus
- <sup>25</sup> determined?

1 BRUCE G. DUBINSKY 2 the fraud; it's going in and objectively looking at the facts and circumstances of a situation and then determining whether or not fraud existed; or if there's evidence to show that it's not fraud, to conclude that there wasn't fraud. And -- and in every instance it starts with the premise that you have to 10 believe that there's a fraud; is that right? 11 And I think that from the Α. Yes. 12 standpoint it makes sense because if there's 13 not evidence or -- or some sort of allegation 14 of fraud inquiry, why would I be doing an 15 investigation. I think the ACFE, when they 16 put that in their ethics, wanted to make sure 17 its members weren't on just a fishing 18 expedition, but were doing work that was 19 focused on there was some allegation of fraud. 20 So you don't, for example, pull Ο. 21 some random sampling of situations and say, 22 let me see whether there's fraud in any of 23 them or what percentage of cases there's

of fraud and see if you can prove it?

24

fraud, you start from there's some allegation

- BRUCE G. DUBINSKY
- MS. KOSACK: Object to form.
- A. Yeah, I didn't understand your
- 4 question. It sounded like you were talking
- <sup>5</sup> about sampling or some sort of research.
- 6 Q. Sure. I take it you never start
- <sup>7</sup> from the kind of neutral hypothesis of I'm
- going to take ten companies or ten investment
- <sup>9</sup> advisers and investigate whether there's any
- fraud at any of them; you start -- you always
- start from the premise of I believe that
- there's fraud at this particular one, let me
- see what I can prove?
- A. As to me, I've never been hired in
- $^{15}$  the -- the former example you gave; I've
- always been hired when a client believes there
- was some problem and then I'm hired.
- O. And I take it it is your belief
- that most fraud is uncovered as a result of
- some confession or some whistleblower and
- not -- well, strike.
- That -- that most fraud is
- uncovered as a result of either a confession
- by the perpetrator or some whistleblower; is
- that right?

1 CONFIDENTIAL - MATTHEW GREENBLATT

- We have identified all of those line
- items where funds were attempted to be
- transferred from one to the other, and then we
- 5 look at how much principal was available in the
- 6 account at the time of that transfer and move
- over only those funds up to the balance of
- 8 principal available in the transferor's account
- <sup>9</sup> at the time.
- 10 Q. What about the transfer of securities
- between BLMIS accounts, did you factor that into
- the principal balance calculation?
- 13 A. Those have all been reviewed and
- considered, but as the fictitious trading has
- been identified within Madoff, the securities
- were not actually purchased, no securities
- actually existed, so the securities could not be
- moved from one account to another because they
- didn't exist. So those have all been considered
- and excluded from the calculation.
- O. And did you make the determination to
- 22 exclude the transfer of securities between BLMIS
- <sup>23</sup> accounts?
- $^{24}$  A. It was not my decision to be made. It
- was part of the methodology that the trustee and

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- his team had determined was the appropriate
- method with which to calculate the net equity
- 4 balances.
- 5 So I identified all of those instances
- of inter-account transfers of funds and
- <sup>7</sup> identified principal available in everybody's
- 8 account, and I identified all the instances of
- <sup>9</sup> transfers of reportedly held but fictitious
- securities; and the decision was made that the
- 11 fictitious trading activity and the fictitious
- securities, any fictitious gains generated, all
- of the fictitious activity couldn't be moved
- from one account to another, and only funds in
- the form of principal could be moved in the
- inter-account transfers.
- 0. And you're not offering any opinion as
- to the appropriateness of excluding the transfer
- of securities between BLMIS accounts, correct?
- A. It calls for a legal conclusion, so
- 21 all I'm offering is the calculation of the
- methodology that accounts only for principal.
- Q. Did you ever discuss factoring in the
- transfer of securities between BLMIS accounts
- into your principal balance calculation?

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 A. I performed the calculation where it
- was determined that the appropriate method to
- 4 calculate net equity or determine net equity was
- 5 to account for all actual cash and principal
- transactions on the face of the BLMIS documents
- on the books and records that we were
- 8 reconstructing in an effort to calculate the
- 9 reality of the Madoff situation and to disallow
- any of the fictitious trading activity.
- 11 Q. You're the expert who signed these
- 12 reports, correct?
- $^{13}$  A. Yes.
- Q. And as the expert, you made the
- determination to exclude those transactions from
- the principal balance calculation, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form. Asked
- and answered.
- A. I don't agree with that, no.
- Q. Where in your report do you say that
- 21 you're excluding the transfer of securities
- between BLMIS accounts from your principal
- 23 balance calculation?
- A. It's captured in paragraph 18, where
- it says, "The principal balance calculation does

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 not include trading activity reflected on
- 3 customer statements. At the direction of
- 4 Trustee's counsel, no credit is given or removed
- 5 for gains or losses resulting from trades
- 6 reflected on customer statements."
- 7 Q. Is the transfer of securities from one
- 8 BLMIS account to another a trade?
- 9 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 10 A. No, I wouldn't call it a trade.
- 11 Q. So where in your report do you say
- that you're excluding the transfers of
- securities between BLMIS accounts from your
- principal balance calculation?
- 15 A. It's implied in that sentence. It
- doesn't use the words, but the principal balance
- calculation doesn't include the trading
- 18 activity. The direction I was provided was to
- prepare a calculation based on the inflows and
- the outflows that are in paragraph 17 and to not
- 21 give any credit to any of the fictitiously
- 22 purchased securities or any of the fictitious
- 23 gains from fictitious sales of securities or any
- of that related trading activity.
- So, in situations where securities

1 CONFIDENTIAL - MATTHEW GREENBLATT

- that don't exist are attempted to be moved from
- $^3$  Account A to Account B, the principal that
- 4 exists in an account is not ignored; it's left
- 5 in the transfer -- the principal is left in the
- transferor's account because the securities
- <sup>7</sup> can't be moved.
- 8 Q. Paragraph 17 says you considered
- 9 non-cash deposits, correct?
- 10 A. It says that, yes.
- 11 Q. Is a security that's being transferred
- from one BLMIS to another a non-cash deposit of
- 13 principal?
- 14 A. In certain cases, yes. There are
- instances where BLMIS customers deposited real
- bonds or real securities from other brokerage
- accounts, and those were granted as principal to
- those account holders because they represented
- real non-cash deposits.
- The fictitiously reported purchases of
- securities are treated differently because the
- fictitious trading never took place, so the
- securities listed on the vast majority of
- 24 customer statements that were falsely reported
- as purchased, those securities never existed,

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 BLMIS never had custody of those shares, and
- therefore, those shares couldn't be moved from
- <sup>4</sup> Account A to Account B.
- <sup>5</sup> Q. When cash was transferred from one
- 6 BLMIS account to another, was there actual cash
- <sup>7</sup> being transferred?
- A. And I never used the word "cash" being
- 9 transferred because, no, cash was not
- transferred in inter-account transfers. It was
- a book entry, where liquid --
- 12 liquidly-available-looking funds were moved, but
- 13 no cash ever changed hands.
- 14 Q. So it was just a book entry that you
- included in your principal balance calculation?
- A. For the inter-account transfers?
- 17 Ouestion mark.
- 18 O. Yes, for the inter-account transfers,
- it was just a book entry that you included in
- your principal balance calculation, correct?
- 21 A. Those inter-account transfers that are
- reflected in the principal balance calculation
- are book entries made to move funds from one
- account to another, and then the analysis that I
- described earlier was put on each one of those.

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- O. And did the cash reflected in those
- 3 book entries actually exist?
- 4 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- $^5$  A. They weren't cash transactions.
- Q. What do you mean by that?
- <sup>7</sup> A. No cash changed hands. If he
- 8 transferred funds from Account A to Account B,
- <sup>9</sup> there was never any cash that changed hands.
- Only movements in a customer's account related
- to those funds, and for that we looked to see
- whether or not actual principal existed, not
- 13 cash.
- Q. And when securities were traded
- between BLMIS accounts, those were just book
- entries too, right?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 18 A. I don't understand what you mean by
- "when securities were traded between accounts."
- Q. I apologize.
- When the customer statements showed
- securities being transferred from one BLMIS
- account to another, do you know whether there
- were -- those securities actually existed?
- A. Well, I'll first say that, in most of

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- those transactions, they didn't show that they
- were being transferred. The customer statements
- 4 usually reflected delivery on one end and
- <sup>5</sup> receipt on the other end, and those securities
- did not exist. So delivery could not have
- <sup>7</sup> happened and, therefore, receipt could not have
- 8 happened.
- 9 Q. Just like the cash transferred between
- 10 BLMIS accounts didn't actually exist, correct?
- 11 A. But it's not reported as cash.
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- Q. So the book entries are just a symbol
- of the cash -- of cash being transferred from
- one BLMIS account to another, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. I don't use the word "cash" in that
- description in any way. It's -- it's value or
- 19 funds available in an account, but no cash ever
- changes hands on these inter-account transfers.
- Q. Did the transferor of securities from
- one BLMIS account to another believe that they
- have transfer value?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. I don't know in those situations the

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 calcu- -- my report and the calculation that I
- 3 prepared doesn't factor in what the account
- 4 holders knew or should have known.
- <sup>5</sup> Q. If the owner of one BLMIS account had
- transferred all of the securities in that
- account to another BLMIS account, could the
- 8 owner then have withdrawn anything from that
- 9 account, assuming there was no cash in the
- 10 account?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 12 A. Yeah, I'm going to need you to do that
- again. When you say the "owner," are you still
- 14 referring to the transferor?
- <sup>15</sup> Q. Yes.
- A. So could you repeat that? So if the
- 17 transferor?
- 18 Q. Let's say someone owns a BLMIS
- 19 account, it has some securities and no cash, and
- that person transfers all of the securities to
- 21 another BLMIS account. After that transfer
- occurs, can that person then withdraw value from
- his or her BLMIS account?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. It's a more complicated question

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 2 the transferor of those securities now claim
- 3 that he or she has a principal balance in that
- 4 account?
- $^5$  A. In that same situation, we have to --
- for there's multiple factors. Did they have valid
- <sup>7</sup> principal in the account? Because the
- 8 securities held is not directly --
- 9 O. Assume they had -- sorry.
- 10 A. -- reconcilable to the principal
- 11 available in an account, so we need a few more
- variables filled in.
- 13 Q. Assuming they had principal balance
- 14 equivalent to the securities transferred outside
- of the account, can that transferor then claim a
- principal balance?
- 17 A. The transferor, in that situation,
- yes, because the principal stays with the
- transferor's account. If a fictitious security
- is moved from A to B, and that security never
- existed, can't be delivered and can't be
- received by the transferee, the principal
- remains in the transferor's account and can be
- <sup>24</sup> drawn down.
- Q. And it's your expert opinion that

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- <sup>2</sup> Account A to Account B.
- Q. And you think even though the result
- of that is that someone who believes they have
- 5 transferred all of the securities out of their
- 6 account then has a principal balance left in the
- <sup>7</sup> account?
- 8 MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 9 A. If I understood the question correct,
- 10 I would say yes, because the transferor
- shouldn't be punished by a transfer that didn't
- exist and couldn't have taken place. So the
- principal still exists within the four walls of
- the BLMIS estate, but it still belongs to the
- 15 transferor.
- 16 Q. But what about the transferee; is it
- appropriate that, although the transferor
- intended to transfer everything in their account
- to the transferee, the transferee then has no
- 20 principal balance as a result?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 22 A. The calculation itself doesn't factor
- in any account holder's intent in any
- transaction. So I don't think that that is any
- 25 different than those situations where funds are

BRUCE G. DUBINSKY

- representing to me on the record and for
- $^3$  purposes of your questions, I'll assume it is,
- $^4$  but I don't know.
- <sup>5</sup> Q. And do you have appendices in your
- binders that are in front of you somewhere?
- A. I don't think the appendices -- let
- me see. Let me check one other place. No,
- <sup>9</sup> these don't have the appendix. They would
- have been attached as part of the report.
- 11 Q. Well, I will represent to you that
- this, to the best of my knowledge, is
- Exhibit B that was from the report produced by
- the -- or sent to us by the trustee, but
- attached to your report that's Exhibit 1.
- <sup>16</sup> A. Okay.
- Q. And is this -- you said that you
- had provided a detailed list of the documents
- 19 that you considered. Assuming this is in fact
- the Exhibit B that was attached to the report
- in this case, would this be that list?
- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And it has a long list. For
- example, it starts with some articles and
- books, and it goes to a list of pleadings; is

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- L.P. were each net losers as of December 2008,
- 3 correct?
- A. And I want to say "yes" to that, but
- $^{5}$  the term "net loser" I guess is a term of art in
- that situation. So when you say "net loser,"
- 7 what do you mean?
- 8 O. What do you think I mean?
- 9 A. I think you mean that they had
- deposited more than they had withdrawn when the
- 11 Ponzi scheme came to an end.
- 12 O. And do you agree that Ascot Partners,
- 13 Ariel Fund Limited, Gabriel Capital, L.P. had
- all deposited more than they had withdrawn?
- 15 A. I'm just going to confirm that answer,
- but "yes" is my answer. When you say Ariel
- Fund, Ariel -- did you say Ariel Fund or Ariel
- 18 Capital?
- 19 Q. Ariel Fund Limited.
- <sup>20</sup> A. Yes.
- Q. And turning to Exhibit 3D in your
- March 20 report.
- $^{23}$  A. Yes.
- $^{24}$  O. You found that Ascot Partners had over
- <sup>25</sup> \$226 million of principal left in its account in

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- December 11, 2008, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. And turning to Exhibit 3E, you
- 5 determined that Ariel Fund had more than \$175
- 6 million of principal left in its account on
- December 11, 2008, correct?
- 8 A. The -- and there were several Ariel
- <sup>9</sup> funds, some of which ended previously with zero
- balances, but Ariel Fund Account 1FR070, yes.
- Q. And turning to Exhibit 3F, you
- determined that Gabriel Capital, L.P. had more
- than \$163 million of principal left in its
- account on December 11, 2008, correct?
- <sup>15</sup> A. Correct.
- Q. And so, as you defined it, all three
- of these accounts were net losers, correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
- Q. And turning to paragraph 96 of your
- report, your March 20 report, you also
- determined that of the more than \$974 million in
- total principal invested in Ascot Partners'
- account, only about \$490 million was ever
- withdrawn, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- Q. But you only credited just over \$221
- million to the Ascot Partners' account principal
- 4 balance because that was the available principal
- balance that you had calculated to be in Ascot
- Fund's account as of January 8, 2003, correct?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Okay. Please turn to Exhibit 40 of
- <sup>9</sup> your March 20 report.
- 10 A. Okay.
- 11 Q. And do you see that on the last page
- of that exhibit, there is the other side of that
- transaction, where Ascot Partners is
- transferring funds -- I mean where Ascot Fund is
- transferring funds to Ascot Partners, correct?
- A. I see it, yes.
- 17 O. And columns 7 and 8 show the total
- principal balance that you had calculated Ascot
- 19 Fund to have on January 8, 2003, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- A. Yes, column 8 shows the principal
- 22 available. Column 7 shows the principal then
- that was transferred to the transferee.
- 0. Okav. And one of the transfers that
- you factored into that total of \$221 million in

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- <sup>2</sup> principal available in January of 2003 appears
- on page 2 of Exhibit 40 at the top; it's a
- 4 transfer from account number 1FN0430 dated
- January 4, 1993, correct?
- A. It was -- I think you missed one zero.
- <sup>7</sup> 1FN00430, yes.
- Q. Okay. And was this a transfer from
- 9 Ariel Fund to Ascot Fund?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And this transfer, according to the
- customer statements, was in the amount of \$35
- million, correct?
- 14 A. And change, yes.
- Q. And but you only credited about \$13.6
- million to Ascot Fund's principal balance,
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. And you only attributed that amount
- because you had calculated that, as of January
- $^{21}$  4, 1993, Ariel Fund only had \$13 --
- 22 approximately \$13.6 million in principal balance
- on that date, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Let's turn to Exhibit 4A of

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- your March 20 report, and on page 3, toward the
- bottom, is that transfer from Ariel Fund of
- 4 about \$35 million to Ascot Fund on January 4,
- <sup>5</sup> 1993, correct?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And then in column 8 is your
- 8 calculation of the principal balance available
- 9 in Ariel Fund in January of 1993, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- Q. Please turn to page 2 of Exhibit A,
- 4A, of your March 20 report.
- 13 A. Okay.
- 14 Q. You credit a number of inter-account
- transfers to Ariel Fund in calculating its
- principal balance, correct?
- A. A number of transfers into?
- 0. You calculate -- yes. In
- 19 calculating -- in calculating the principal
- $^{20}$  balance available in Ariel Fund in January 1993,
- there are two transfers of principal credited to
- 22 Ariel Fund, correct?
- A. There are two transfers of principal
- in, yes.
- Q. One of these transfers is a March 31,

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- 1992 transfer from BLMIS Account 1FN033?
- A. Correct, which you will see from that
- $^4$  line item at the time had the Account Number
- $5 \quad 105121 3 0$ .
- 6 O. And that's a Shalvah account, correct?
- <sup>7</sup> A. That is correct.
- 8 O. And did you credit any other transfers
- 9 from Shalvah Fund to Ariel Fund --
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. -- in calculating the principal
- 12 balance?
- $^{13}$  A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Where is that?
- 15 A. The last line item, on May 29, 1992,
- the last line item on page 2.
- 0. Were there any other transfers from
- 18 Shalvah to Ariel Fund included in your principal
- balance calculation to Ariel Fund?
- A. Those were the only two transfers of
- $^{21}$  funds from Shalvah to Ariel Fund. There was, as
- we've been talking about for a while, there was
- <sup>23</sup> a transfer or a delivery of fictitiously
- reported securities from Shalvah to Ariel, but
- $^{25}$  the securities didn't exist and, therefore,

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- <sup>2</sup> aren't included on this calculation.
- O. Did the funds exist?
- 4 A. The column 8 will tell you how much
- <sup>5</sup> principal was available in the account at the
- time of each of those transfers. So, yes, there
- 7 were -- they were in a positive principal
- balance at the time, but, as we discussed
- 9 earlier, because the fictitious securities
- didn't exist, they couldn't be delivered.
- 11 Q. And you understand that Shalvah's
- account was closed in about 1992, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- 14 A. I know that the account activity
- ceased, and I'm not sure whether or not it was
- closed officially within Madoff's system or not,
- but I know the account activity ceased and that
- 18 this was the account holder's final -- final set
- of transactions within that account.
- Q. And as BLMIS operated, there was
- 21 nothing left in the account as of 1992, correct?
- MR. SONG: Object to the form.
- $^{23}$  A. I believe that's the case, yes. I'm
- $^{24}$  not sure when in 1992. I believe in October or
- November of 1992, yes.

- 1 CONFIDENTIAL MATTHEW GREENBLATT
- Q. But you calculated that Shalvah had a
- principal balance of 9. -- about \$9.7 million in
- 4 October of 1992, correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. And based on your calculations, you
- yould credit a principal balance of \$9.7 million
- 8 to Shalvah as of December 11, 2008, correct?
- 9 A. Correct, that's their principal
- balance from October of 1992 continuing through
- 11 to December 11 of 2008.
- 12 O. And that's because you didn't reduce
- that balance based on the securities transferred
- out of the Shalvah account, correct?
- 15 A. Because the fictitious securities
- didn't exist, correct.
- 0. And you did not give Ariel Fund credit
- for the transfer of those securities, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- MS. BRONEN: Let's take a five-minute
- $^{21}$  break.
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off
- the record. The time is 1:19 p.m.
- 24 (Recess.)
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:33