18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

have it towed from Mr. Smith's home?

- A. I'm sorry. What?
- Q. Did you have it towed from Mr. Smith's home?
- A. No. I took the truck to CarMax. It was not towed.
- Q. During direct examination there was a mention of -- or excuse me -- the recording.

 Mr. Smith -- I believe, it was Mr. Smith who mentioned Mr. Humphrey's will. Have you presented a will as part of this case?

MR. SAATHOFF: Objection: Relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Go ahead and answer, if you can, ma'am.

THE WITNESS: We had a will and trust.

BY MR. SAATHOFF:

- Q. Okay. Have you presented the will as part of this case?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. You mentioned that the account with you and Mr. Humphrey was a joint account. And so at times when directed to, for example, with respect to the truck and the \$10,000 check, you would write the check out -- the checks out per Mr. Humphrey's wishes, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. I note there's been mention of the

Exhibit 2



1

 $\mathbf{2}$

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

According to your attorneys, Ms. Humphrey, when Okay. you filed this affidavit, okay, you said that you was entitled to my property per the will. And for a year and a half I've sought access to that will. You've seen your own affidavit. I've even filed compelled information from you, and I can't get it. you're sitting here telling me that Don had a will, a signed will, and yet I have a tape recording here every time I've asked for that will because I know my property is not in this will per the will as you claim on this document. I haven't seen it. Your property is not in the will. Α. Q. I know it's not in the will. Α. That's correct. We don't want it in the will. On here you said you was entitled to my Q.

property, Ms. Humphrey, per the will.

MR. SMITH: Do you have that affidavit up there, ma'am?

> THE WITNESS: Well, upon the April --Hold on, ma'am. MR. SMITH:

> > (Discussion had off the record.)

(Exhibit No. 163

marked for identification.)

MR. SMITH: I'd like to submit this, Your

Honor.

 22

21

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

23

24

25

Q.	Okay.	Would	you f	lip to	the	first	page,	
please.	Okay.	Look at	No.	5. Do	you	see th	at?	And
you have	two opt	ions th	ere.	I see	a ch	eckmar	k and	then
a second	option.	Would	you 1	read th	nat a	loud t	o the	
Court, ma	a'am?							

- I am entitled to real property per the will of the deceased, and I have made an investigation and have been unable to determine any subsequent will.
- Thank you. Now, you're sitting here telling me or telling the Court -- may I have that? You're sitting here telling the Court that Donald Humphrey had a will; am I correct?
 - Α. He had a will.
 - Q. A signed will; is that correct?
 - That house was not in the will. Α.
 - Answer my questions, Ms. Humphrey. Q.
 - I thought it was a signed will.
- Right now you're pushing yourself up against a \mathbf{Q} . wall on two occasions. Okay? You're saying the house was not in the will. Okay?

MR. SAATHOFF: Your Honor --

BY MR. SMITH: 22

> At the same time, you're telling the Court. okay, through this affidavit that you're entitled to the house per the will. Think about what you're saying.

MR. SAATHOFF: Your Honor, I'm going to object based on argumentative and badgering the witness. The document speaks for itself.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Answer, if you understand it,

ma'am.

1

2

3

4

BY MR. SMITH:

Q. So let me see if I can clarify you. If Don had a signed will, and the will -- I mean, my house was not in that will, Ms. Humphrey, was there any reason that can explain why you put No. 5, the second option, that you was entitled to my property per the will?

MR. SAATHOFF: Objection: Misstates the testimony, and she didn't draft this document.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Go ahead and answer if you understand, ma'am. BY MR. SMITH:

Q. Again, why did you claim you was entitled to my property per the will?

MR. SAATHOFF: Misstates the testimony. The evidence already supports this is real estate held in joint tenancy.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Overruled.

22 23

24

25

	1	MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.							
	2	THE WITNESS: I'm entitled to the house,							
	3	half of the house, because of joint tenancy. I'm the							
	4	wife of the deceased. And in Nebraska							
	5	MR. SMITH: I could care less.							
~	6	THE WITNESS: But I do.							
+2	7	BY MR. SMITH:							
2	8	Q. You're the wife of the deceased that forgave							
Trial Part	9	the loan before he was deceased.							
15	10	MR. SAATHOFF: Your Honor, I'm going to							
23	11	move to strike because he's not testifying.							
202	12	THE COURT: Stricken.							
from May 23,2023	13	(Exhibit No. 165							
7	14	marked for identification.)							
M	15	MR. SMITH: Do you recognize this? I'm							
Š	16	showing you what's been marked as							
	1 1	MR. SAATHOFF: Sir, do you have a copy							
pts	18 19	for me?							
6	19	MR. SMITH: Exhibit 165. Look it over							
X	20	and tell me if you recognize it.							
7	21	MR. SAATHOFF: Sir, did you give any of							
	22	these to me before							
	23	THE COURT: Mr. Saathoff, don't be asking							
	24	any questions.							
	25	MR. SAATHOFF: I'm just wondering if							

1 foundation, relevance, asked and answered. 2 THE COURT: Overruled. The Court does not have a will though, sir, so the contents of the will 3 are not going to be considered by the Court because I 4 don't have one. 5 2023 Trial Agraph 10 11 That's the point. MR. SMITH: THE COURT: I'm just telling you where I'm at. BY MR. SMITH: But he should consider this, what you said on here? On this affidavit? Excepts for May 33, 16 12 18 19 19 19 Same objection of what the MR. SAATHOFF: Court should consider. That's the ultimate call of the Court and its rulings. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. SMITH: Should the Court, Ms. Humphrey, consider the fact -- for purposes of Your Honor's ruling, should Your Honor consider that Don gave me the \$25,000, and once I 20 paid it down, even though he did forgive the remainder, 21 according to you it was \$16,000. Should the Court 22 consider the fact that Don gave me an additional $\mathbf{23}$ \$10,000 -- no matter what for. Should the Court consider the fact that he added that \$10,000 to what you 24 25 claim was still owed, \$16,000, which was to take it up