

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

2 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

3 JEFFREY STROBEL, )  
4 )  
5 Petitioner, ) FC2012-001202  
6 )  
7 vs. )  
8 )  
9 GAIL F. ROSIER, )  
10 )  
11 Respondent. )  
12 \_\_\_\_\_ )

13  
14 Phoenix, Arizona  
15 February 23, 2016

16 BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAUL M. MCMURDIE

17 APPEARANCES:

18 For the Petitioner:  
19 Mr. David E. Wood

20 For the Respondent:  
21 Mr. Mark W. Horne

22 SQUAW PEAK REPORTERS, INC.

23 *Certified Reporters*

P.O. Box 26158

Phoenix, Arizona 85068

602/956-7618

Fax 602/956-0732

24 Transcribed By:  
25 Tammy Gillett  
Certified Reporter  
No. 50430

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

INDEX

**EXAMINATION**

<b>Witness Name</b>	<b>Page</b>
JEFFREY STROBEL	
Cross By Mr. Horne .....	3
Direct By Mr. Wood .....	22
Re-Cross By Mr. Horne .....	24

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Mr. Horne, are you going to call your  
3 next witness?

4 MR. HORNE: Yes, I would like to call Jeffrey Strobел,  
5 please, Your Honor.

6 JUDGE STROBEL: Are you still there, Mr. Strobел? Mr.  
7 Strobел?

8 MR. STROBEL: Yes.

9 JUDGE MCMURDIE: All Right.

10 JEFFREY STROBEL,  
11 having previously been duly sworn to speak the whole truth and  
12 nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

13 CROSS EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. HORNE:

15 Q. Could you please state your name for the record,  
16 Mr. Strobел?

17 A. Yes, Jeffrey Strobел.

18 Q. And you had an agreement with Ms. Gail Rosier whereby  
19 she would not have to pay child support; is that correct?

20 A. It was an agreement to defer the payment of child  
21 support, but that is what that agreement is.

22 Q. Okay. Now, isn't it true that the agreement was that  
23 she would save money for the payment of Connor's child -- for  
24 Connor's college expenses?

25 A. For the college -- yeah, yeah.

1 Q. Okay. So instead of paying child support, she was  
2 going to pay -- save money to pay for Connor's college expenses;  
3 is that correct?

4 A. She was going to save money -- in a sense, I suspect,  
5 yes, saving the child support payments, yes, yes.

6 Q. Okay. So how much have you paid towards Connor's  
7 college expenses?

8 MR. WOOD: Objection. Relevance.

9 JUDGE MCMURDIE: I am not sure what the relevance is.

10 MR. HORNE: Because the Order of Support is supposed  
11 to be for the payment of Connor's college expenses. It goes  
12 towards the amount. He told the Court that --

13 JUDGE MCMURDIE: We are -- Counsel, we are here only  
14 today on whether or not this order should be registered in  
15 Arizona.

16 MR. HORNE: Right, but part of -- part of what is  
17 relevant is whether or not he defrauded the Court on the amount  
18 of the child support arrearages. So whether or not he  
19 actually --

20 JUDGE MCMURDIE: At the time of the alleged fraud, how  
21 old was the child?

22 MR. HORNE: The child was -- at the time the first  
23 support order was entered, the child was 18.

24 JUDGE MCMURDIE: So there would be no college  
25 expenses. So any amounts of money he may or may not have paid

1 subsequent to that are irrelevant to your claim of fraud.

2 MR. HORNE: Well, we believe it is relevant because if  
3 the order for the payment of college expenses, then the amount  
4 that he actually paid for college expenses should be relevant to  
5 whether or not he overstated the amount in child support  
6 arrearages.

7 JUDGE MCMURDIE: The objection is sustained.

8 MR. WOOD: Your Honor, just quickly for the record,  
9 the New Hampshire Court has already rejected demands to produce  
10 documents related specifically to this area, which were what  
11 were the expenses when, et cetera.

12 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Ask your next question.

13 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Okay. Did you -- did you file in 2009  
14 a motion with the New Hampshire Court for the payment to  
15 liquidate the property and have the monies paid to you as child  
16 support?

17 A. Yes. The money should have liquidated to pay towards  
18 the child support, yes, that was the motion, I believe.

19 Q. Okay. Now, did the Court when it issued its order --  
20 sorry. How much did you ask for, from the Court, for child  
21 support?

22 A. I actually don't recall the order at the time. So I  
23 don't know that amount.

24 Q. Okay. Do you know the current amount of arrearages  
25 that you have obtained?

1           A.     The current amount -- the current is based on the most  
2     recent of the 2010 order was 2,000 -- \$202,500.

3           Q.     Okay. So the first time an amount was established was  
4     in 2010; is that correct?

5           A.     It was ordered specifically by a Court. It was the  
6     first Uniform Support Order, but that is the most up-to-date  
7     amount given that my son had reached the age of maturity or  
8     finished high school, yes.

9           Q.     When was a Uniform Support Order entered prior to  
10    that?

11          A.     You know, when her attorney entered the first Uniform  
12    Support Order in -- I forget the month -- it was either June or  
13    July of 2006.

14          Q.     So there was a Uniform Support Order entered in July  
15    of 2006 that was entered by the Court?

16          A.     Yes, they accepted her Uniform Support Order when she  
17    first took me to court in, I believe it was -- I forget the  
18    exact month, but in or about June or July 2006.

19          Q.     So you are saying that the Court actually entered a  
20    Uniform Support Order signed by the Court in 2006?

21          A.     Yes. To the best of my knowledge, yes.

22          Q.     Isn't it correct that in 2009, March of 2009, the  
23    Court specifically found that no Uniform Support Order had ever  
24    been entered by the Court?

25          A.     I would have to go back and read the Court Orders, but

1 if you go back and look at 2006, there was one entered. So  
2 there may be an error on the part of the Court. I am not a  
3 Judge. So I can't speak to what they did or didn't do.

4 Q. Okay. So what is the arrearages amount of \$202,500  
5 based on?

6 A. It is based on the amount prior to my offer be saved  
7 that the child support paying one hundred -- someone is on the  
8 line there, sorry -- \$132 a week, so -- and there was an amount,  
9 almost a year's worth -- I forget the exact number of weeks --  
10 that weren't paid. So it was based on the unpaid amount, plus  
11 \$132 a week that I applied, basically, the cost of living is  
12 based on, I think, by the U.S. Social Security, and the accepted  
13 interest rate at the time for each year, if you will,  
14 compounding up until the point my son graduated from high  
15 school.

16 And that is how the two hundred -- or it would have  
17 been when he graduated from high school since I did it from  
18 March and he graduated in May. So there were subsequent months,  
19 but that is how the amount was arrived at.

20 Q. So is \$132 a week from when to when?

21 A. Well, it was from -- there was a prior owed amount of  
22 \$3300 starting, and then the amount would have been from March  
23 of 1997 through May of 2010.

24 Q. And at what percent interest?

25 A. It varied by year. Obviously, as everybody knows, our

1 interest rates back in the nineties were then lower, similar  
2 with cost of living. For example, I don't think there was much  
3 cost of living in 2009 or '10, but, of course, I did not account  
4 for something like a CD, or, you know, a U fund that might have  
5 yielded a higher amount. We basically looked at either a  
6 savings account, or, you know, jumbo savings accounts where it  
7 might be liquid, but certainly something that, you know, would  
8 yield -- a jumbo would yield an extra percent or percent and a  
9 half over a standard savings account. So I tried to be  
10 conservative.

11 Q. Mr. Strobel, you came to exactly an amount of  
12 \$105,000; correct?

13 A. 105?

14 Q. \$105,000, isn't that what is stated in the Support  
15 Order that you obtained in March of 2010?

16 A. No. The 105 was the number that was originally back  
17 in 2006 which Gail's estimate of the house was -- the house  
18 value was an asset of \$150,000, and she reduced to 105. But I  
19 don't believe there was an order in 2010 of \$105,000. And I  
20 believe the 2010 order was for 202 -- or \$202,500.

21 MR. HORNE: Your Honor, I have the order that was  
22 entered in March of 2010.

23 JUDGE MCMURDIE: The document speaks for itself.

24 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Okay. So if I told you that the order  
25 that you obtained in March of 2010 states arrearages of \$105,000



1 as of March 2010, that would be based on the value of the  
2 Hopkinton property as set forth by Gail Rosier; isn't that  
3 correct?

4 A. No, it is absolutely incorrect.

5 Q. So what would the \$105,000 be based off of?

6 A. The 105 was still based on the -- was an older number,  
7 again, from 2006, as I mentioned. When you look at \$132 I get a  
8 week, but again, that was only up to -- with a rough estimate of  
9 interest in Ocola (phonetic) back in 2006.

10 Q. At what interest rate do you get to \$105,000?

11 A. Well, you can the pick year anywhere from -- if I had  
12 it here somewhere -- anywhere from six percent in the late  
13 nineties down to four percent and three and a half percent.

14 Q. Mr. Strobel, isn't it true that if there is \$105,000  
15 of arrearages as of March 1st, 2010, you have no idea how that  
16 amount is calculated?

17 A. I just told you how it was calculated, sir.

18 Q. Okay. How was it calculated, Mr. Strobel?

19 A. Okay. You took, again, \$132 a month -- a week.

20 Q. Right. At what interest rate?

21 A. What year would you like, sir? Anywhere from five and  
22 a half percent --

23 Q. As of March -- as of March 1st, 2010.

24 A. March 1st, 2010, was -- the rate for that year would  
25 have been three and a half percent. But you have -- it would --

1 if you compound it like any bank, it would be for each year. It  
2 is not that rate for every year. It varies. It goes up and  
3 down.

4 Q. So can you tell me exactly how \$105,000 of arrearages  
5 of as of March 1st, 2010, can you tell me how that was  
6 calculated?

7 A. There was two -- there were \$202,500, I am not --

8 Q. Okay. So how did you calculate the \$202,500. How was  
9 that calculated?

10 A. By taking the \$3300 that was owed before, the  
11 agreement that she would defer the payments, then taking \$132 a  
12 week from March of 1997 forward and each year applying the  
13 interest rate and then whatever these, whether it is Social  
14 Security, whatever the federal government uses for a cost of  
15 living adjustment, so the interest compounds monthly for the  
16 outstanding balance and carry it forward until my son graduated  
17 from high school in May of 2010. And that is how I arrived at  
18 the two-hundred-two-thousand-five-hundred-dollar amount.

19 Q. Okay. So why does your filing with the Court in March  
20 of 2010 state back child support of a \$105,000 as of March 1st,  
21 2010? Your filing that your attorney, Ms. Shanellaris, handed  
22 the Court in March of 2010 says back child support of \$105,000  
23 as of March 1st, 2010.

24 MR. WOOD: Objection. That is testimony.

25 JUDGE MCMURDIE: I am assuming he is reading from the

1 document.

2 MR. HORNE: I am reading from the document.

3 MR. WOOD: A document that Mr. Strobel doesn't have.

4 JUDGE MCMURDIE: That is why he is asking the  
5 question. Otherwise I would tell him to read the document  
6 himself.

7 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Right. Mr. Strobel?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. I am reading your document that was handed to the  
10 Court in March of 2010 by your attorney, Catherine Shanelaris.  
11 Do you remember that hearing?

12 A. Yes, I do, sir.

13 Q. Okay. That document says that the arrearages as of  
14 March 1st, 2010, are \$105,000. I am reading from the document  
15 right now.

16 A. I believe you, sir.

17 Q. Okay. Do you know how that \$105,000 was calculated?

18 A. That would have been derived, as I mentioned --

19 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Hold on. It calls for a yes or no  
20 answer.

21 Q. BY MR. HORNE: It calls for a yes or no answer, sir.

22 A. Yes, it does, sir. Yes, I do, sir.

23 Q. Okay. How was that amount calculated?

24 A. By the same basis of \$132 a week. Unfortunately, that  
25 would have been up through about 2006, which is why I believe

1 there is a confusion, but you want a yes or no answer, so I  
2 won't --

3 Q. So the \$105,000, is it just a coincidence that that's  
4 exactly the same amount as what Ms. Rosier had listed as the  
5 value of the Hopkinton property?

6 A. The coincidence is that when it was presented  
7 originally in 2006, she presented the house at \$150,000 and then  
8 reduced it to 105 to coincide with what I had submitted.

9 Q. Okay. And when did you submit the document saying  
10 \$105,000?

11 A. That was back in 2006, I believe. I don't know if I  
12 submitted it or if it was discussed in the Court Minutes. I  
13 would have to go back to the documentation.

14 Q. Okay. Because I actually have the document you  
15 submitted back in July of 2006. That would have been about the  
16 time you are talking about; correct, sir?

17 A. That would be correct.

18 Q. Okay. Now, it says on that document, without accrued  
19 interest, that would total \$78,848 through July of 2006.  
20 Assuming three percent interest compounded monthly, an amount  
21 would be 95,208. I am reading your document --

22 A. Okay.

23 Q. -- right now, sir. Would that be correct that you  
24 said that?

25 A. Yes. Yes, if it is on the document, yes, I would have

1 said that.

2 Q. Okay. So how did you get from that amount to  
3 \$105,000?

4 A. I do not recall the discussion in the Court, how it  
5 went from 95 to 105, to be honest, from years ago.

6 Q. Okay. So is it correct that you have no idea how you  
7 got -- how you calculated the amount of arrearages for the  
8 current support order that you have against Ms. Rosier?

9 A. That is absolutely incorrect, sir.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. I went over how I calculated it numerous times on this  
12 phone.

13 Q. Okay. So I am also -- I am now looking at the support  
14 order you obtained in March of 2010 against Ms. Rosier, and it  
15 says there's -- you add \$10,000 to the \$105,000 each year from  
16 March of 2010 to March of 2020. Do you recall that?

17 A. Yes, and -- yes, I do, yes.

18 Q. Okay. So you added \$10,000 each year through 2020 to  
19 get to the total amount of a \$205,000; is that correct?

20 A. No, that table is incorrect in its presentation. It  
21 shows what it might if it was paid off at a ten-thousand-dollar  
22 clip. So it, unfortunately, mixes apples and oranges.

23 Q. I am sorry, could you please clarify, sir, why the  
24 order adds \$10,000 to the \$105,000 each year through 2020?

25 A. The order does not add \$10,000 a year. That was a

1 table that was added that showed from the base of 105 back in  
2 2006, if, in fact, everything was paid off by 2020 without  
3 asking for statutory interest after the fact when it might be  
4 paid off. So, unfortunately, that table, it adds confusion, not  
5 clarity.

6 Q. Okay. So this \$205,000 would be the amount owed in  
7 2020 with interest?

8 A. No, that was an estimate if it was paid off at 10,000  
9 a month when it would be paid off. So it is not a clear  
10 document in any -- a clear table in any form.

11 Q. I am still not understanding, sir.

12 A. Unfortunately, if I can -- it is not a clear table  
13 because the amount should be, as I mentioned before, 202 -- two  
14 hundred and two thousand -- \$202,500. \$10,000 a month, which  
15 later showed up as a monthly amount in, I believe, the June  
16 order, was to demonstrate when it might be paid off, which  
17 brought us to 2020. So, unfortunately, including that document  
18 in the Court Order makes it appear as though it is future  
19 payments which it is not. It is an arrearage.

20 Q. So what you are -- are you saying that if Gail paid  
21 \$10,000 a month, it would take her ten years to pay off  
22 \$202,000?

23 A. That was a brief estimate at that time, yes. It  
24 probably actually will take longer.

25 Q. Longer than ten years at \$10,000 a month?

1 A. Well, ten years at \$10,000 a month is only \$120,000;  
2 right?

3 Q. Isn't it correct that at \$10,000 a month, you would  
4 pay \$120,000 in 12 months?

5 A. At 10,000 a month, yes. Okay. The math is off.  
6 Okay. Yes, it would have been less. It would have been what,  
7 eight years or something.

8 Q. Okay. So why -- you can't tell me why it says  
9 \$105,000 in arrearages as of March 1st, 2010?

10 A. That was the basis -- no. If you want a no answer,  
11 no.

12 Q. Yes or no?

13 JUDGE MCMURDIE: He answered it. No.

14 THE WITNESS: No.

15 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Okay. And you can't tell me why this  
16 order adds \$10,000 to that amount each year through 2020?

17 A. The order doesn't. The order -- that's a document in  
18 the order. The order was for \$202,500.

19 Q. Okay. But you can't tell me how that amount was  
20 arrived at?

21 A. The 202,500?

22 Q. Correct.

23 A. Sir, I have gone through that a number of times on  
24 this call.

25 Q. Okay.

1           A.    I would be happy to go over it again, if you would  
2 like.

3           Q.    Right.  Okay.  But you have had -- you have had a lot  
4 of time to prepare for this hearing, have you not?

5           A.    To prepare for this hearing?

6           Q.    Correct.

7           A.    Well, yeah, I have been chasing this for a number of  
8 years, sir, so --

9           Q.    Right.  And as of today, you still cannot tell me how  
10 this amount -- precisely, how you calculated this amount?

11               MR. WOOD:  Objection.  He answered that question.

12               JUDGE MCMURDIE:  Sustained.

13               THE WITNESS:  I have, Your Honor, I have.

14               JUDGE MCMURDIE:  It has been asked and answered.

15           Q.    BY MR. HORNE:  Okay.  Now, you also put -- do you  
16 remember obtaining an order in March of 2010 for Gail Rosier to  
17 obtain a loan to pay off the arrearages?

18           A.    Yes.

19           Q.    Okay.  Was it your -- did you think that Gail Rosier  
20 could obtain a loan to pay off the arrearages amount?

21           A.    I had no knowledge of her financials, and it was a  
22 request.  I mean, she could certainly argue it and -- but I  
23 never heard from her one way or the other.  So it was simply a  
24 request.

25           Q.    But you are aware that she was recently incarcerated;



1 correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And you are aware that that had something to do with  
4 obtaining a loan; correct?

5 A. With obtaining a loan? I had some information on what  
6 it had -- I do, yes.

7 Q. And, then, you obtained an order for her to get a loan  
8 in the amount of over \$200,000 to pay off the child support  
9 arrearages; correct?

10 A. Yes, I requested that.

11 Q. Did you realistically expect that Gail would be able  
12 to obtain a loan to pay off those arrearages?

13 A. No, but she had been avoiding all Court Orders,  
14 including the one this past November. So I was attempting to  
15 get some sort of answer or funds to support my son's college  
16 education.

17 Q. But you obtained an order that you knew that she  
18 wouldn't be able to comply with, didn't you?

19 A. I did not know specifically. I don't know her  
20 financials. Yes, I knew she was in jail, but I don't know what  
21 other means she might have, whether it is family or otherwise.

22 Q. But you knew that you had obtained an order for her to  
23 obtain a loan --

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. -- to pay off the amount? Okay.

1 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Counsel, you have 25 minutes  
2 remaining.

3 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Okay. Then you obtained an order for  
4 her to pay \$10,000 a month; correct?

5 A. That is correct.

6 Q. Did you have any basis for thinking that she could pay  
7 \$10,000 a month?

8 A. I had no basis to know whether she could or she  
9 couldn't.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. Even \$200 a month, you have got to start somewhere.

12 Q. Now, do you remember -- do you recall a hearing in  
13 December of 2012?

14 A. 2012?

15 Q. December of -- I am sorry, December of 2009. Do you  
16 recall meeting with a Judge with your attorney, Catherine  
17 Shanelaris, in December of 2009?

18 A. Yes, I do.

19 Q. Okay. And that was just the three of you, you, your  
20 attorney, and the Judge; correct?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q. Do you recall what was said at that time?

23 A. I don't recall a conversation, no, I don't, sir.

24 Q. Okay. Do you ever remember your attorney telling the  
25 Judge that Gail Rosier sold the Hopkinton property and took the

1 money?

2 A. I believe -- I recall the property was sold, but I  
3 don't recall that she said specifically that she had sold it and  
4 had taken the property.

5 Q. Okay. As of March 2010, was it your understanding  
6 that Gail Rosier sold the Hopkinton property and took the money?

7 A. It was my understanding that the property had been  
8 sold, but --

9 Q. And you knew the funds from that account were -- you  
10 knew funds were sitting in an account that was being litigated  
11 in Probate Court, didn't you?

12 A. Eventually, yes, but therefore, it wasn't her asset to  
13 sell which makes it kind of convoluted.

14 Q. Okay. And you told -- in fact, you wrote a letter to  
15 the Court in Gail's criminal case telling the Court that there  
16 was \$60,000 sitting in an account from the sale of this  
17 property; isn't that correct?

18 A. I believe, I would have to relook at my letter, but I  
19 know I wrote to the Court, and the value of whatever asset it  
20 was, was down to \$60,000 per the information I had been able to  
21 obtain.

22 Q. Correct. And that -- and you told the Court that that  
23 money was sitting in an account, didn't you?

24 A. I don't have the letter in front of me, but I may well  
25 have, yes.

1 Q. Okay. Well, I do have the letter in front of me. If  
2 I told you that it said that, would it be a correct statement?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Would you -- would you agree with that?

5 A. Yes, I do.

6 Q. Okay. So why did your attorney tell the Court in  
7 March of 2010 when it obtained the order against Gail Rosier  
8 that the property was worth \$150,000 and that Gail sold it and  
9 took the money?

10 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Are you calling for speculation? How  
11 would he know that, why the attorney --

12 MR. HORNE: Because it is his attorney.

13 JUDGE MCMURDIE: -- why the attorney said it?

14 MR. HORNE: Well --

15 JUDGE MCMURDIE: He is speculating. Isn't it a better  
16 question to ask the attorney why she said it?

17 MR. HORNE: Well, he would have -- maybe he would have  
18 told his attorney that. I mean, the attorney --

19 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Well, you asked him and he said he  
20 didn't know.

21 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Did you tell your attorney that Gail  
22 Rosier sold the Hopkinton property and took the money?

23 MR. WOOD: Objection. Privileged.

24 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Sustained.

25 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Okay. As of March 2010, was it your

1 understanding that Gail Rosier sold the Hopkinton property and  
2 took the money?

3 A. It was my understanding that the property had been  
4 sold.

5 Q. Okay. And you told the Criminal Court that there was  
6 \$60,000 sitting in an account in Probate Court, didn't you?

7 A. That was the information I had, yes.

8 Q. Okay. And it was not your understanding that the  
9 Hopkinton property was sold for \$150,000, was it?

10 A. I -- I don't know what it was sold for. I don't know  
11 what the outstanding mortgage might have been. I don't know if  
12 it was in Gail's name or if she was entitled to it, just how she  
13 represented it to the Court subsequently.

14 Q. Okay. But would you have any reason to tell the New  
15 Hampshire Court that Gail Rosier sold the property and took the  
16 money?

17 A. I don't understand your question. I am sorry.

18 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Counsel, you have 20 minutes  
19 remaining.

20 Q. BY MR. HORNE: Okay. Did you have any basis for  
21 telling the Court, the New Hampshire Court, in March of 2010  
22 that Gail Rosier sold the Hopkinton property and took the money?

23 A. I -- I honestly don't know or recall, I mean, whether  
24 I said it was sold. It, in fact, was sold in 2008, but I  
25 wouldn't -- whether she -- whether she took the money or it was

1 sitting in probate or it had been liquidated or the resolution  
2 of a probate fund or I don't -- I did not have the detailed  
3 knowledge of an IRA or anything else to know.

4 MR. Horne: Okay. I have no further questions.

5 JUDGE MCMURDIE: All right. Thank you. Counsel, do  
6 you have questions for your witness?

7 DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. WOOD:

9 Q. Yes, and I will keep it brief, Your Honor.

10 Hello, Mr. Strobel. This is Mr. Wood.

11 A. Good afternoon.

12 Q. Good afternoon. Could you give the Judge just a rough  
13 estimate of how long you have been trying to receive these  
14 monies and these arrearages?

15 MR. HORNE: Objection. Relevance.

16 JUDGE MCMURDIE: It is irrelevant.

17 THE WITNESS: 2009 or before, so seven years.

18 MR. WOOD: And I am going to address the Judge real  
19 fast.

20 THE WITNESS: Okay.

21 MR. WOOD: Your Honor, what I just wanted to go to,  
22 which maybe is just reflected in the record, is any questioning  
23 of Mr. Strobel has to be taken into the context of how long this  
24 has been going on.

25 JUDGE MCMURDIE: I certainly understand he was asking

1 about events that were six, seven -- five, six years ago.

2 MR. WOOD: Okay. And I appreciate that. So just two  
3 to three more questions, Your Honor.

4 JUDGE MCMURDIE: All right.

5 Q. BY MR. WOOD: And, Mr. Strobel, throughout these many  
6 years, has it been a struggle for you to obtain information?

7 MR. HORNE: Objection. Form.

8 THE WITNESS: Yes.

9 JUDGE MCMURDIE: I do need some clarification. What  
10 information are you referring to?

11 Q. BY MR. WOOD: Okay. You were asked, Mr. Strobel --  
12 and I will withdraw that.

13 Mr. Strobel, you were asked questions about where you  
14 obtained certain amounts and certain concepts of sales of  
15 property. Were those pieces of information difficult to obtain?

16 A. Yes, they were.

17 Q. Were you able to obtain information from Ms. Rosier at  
18 all?

19 A. No information from her, sir.

20 Q. Did you have to obtain information largely through  
21 self help?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And through that process, did you sometimes receive  
24 conflicting information?

25 A. Yes, I did.

1 MR. WOOD: Okay. No further questions.

2 JUDGE MCMURDIE: All right. Thank you. Counsel?

3 Hold on.

4 Any additional questions for this witness?

5 MR. HORNE: No, Your Honor.

6 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Do you have any additional witnesses  
7 you would like to call?

8 MR. HORNE: Your Honor, I just have one more question  
9 for Mr. Strobel.

10 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Okay.

11 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. HORNE:

13 Q. You just said -- did you just testify that you tried  
14 to obtain information from Gail Rosier with regard to the  
15 Hopkinton property?

16 A. No, I said I did not -- to clarify, what I meant was I  
17 never received information from her. I did not ask her about  
18 the Hopkinton property, but the only information I ever had  
19 about the Hopkinton property that she provided was her initial  
20 filing back in 2006. So I never requested anything from her --

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. -- and nor did she supply it to me or the Court.

23 Q. Now, just one more question. As far as, you said \$132  
24 per week in child support. Is that what your understanding Gail  
25 Rosier was supposed to pay?



1 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Mr. Strobел? I think we lost him.

2 MR. HORNE: Okay. I think that we are good.

3 JUDGE MCMURDIE: Do you have any other additional  
4 witnesses you are going to call?

5 MR. HORNE: No, Your Honor. I don't believe that we  
6 need to call additional witnesses.

7 JUDGE MCMURDIE: You have a lawyer sitting out in the  
8 hall. Are you going to release him?

9 MR. HORNE: Oh, do you want to call him?

10 MS. ROSIER: Yeah.

11 MR. HORNE: Okay. We will actually call him, Your  
12 Honor.

13 JUDGE MCMURDIE: You only have 18 minutes total, and  
14 that includes any Cross, I am just letting you know.

15 MR. HORNE: Okay. We will just be brief with him.

16 \* \* \*

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 CERTIFICATE

2 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing audiotaped proceedings  
3 were transcribed by me, Tammy Gillett, that I was then and there  
4 a Certified Reporter in and for the County of Maricopa, State of  
5 Arizona, that the audiotaped proceedings were taken down by me  
6 in shorthand and thereafter transcribed, and that the foregoing  
7 pages contain a full, true, and accurate transcript of all  
8 proceedings, all to the best of my skill and ability.

9 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to nor employed by  
10 any of the parties hereto, and have no interest in the outcome.

11 DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 3rd day of May, 2016.

12 TAMMY GILLETT  
13 Certified Reporter  
14 No. 50430  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25