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RALPH GULKO,
    having been duly sworn according
    to law, testified as follows:
EXAMINATION BY MR. STERN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Gulko. My name is Philip Stern and I'm representing Natalie Williams, formerly known as Natalie Freeman, and Alan Setneska with respect to a complaint that's been filed against Pressler \& Pressler. Have you read the complaint or the amended complaint?
A. No
Q. Do you have any understanding as to
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``` what the nature of the lawsuit is about?
A. No.
Q. What's your understanding of the reason why you're appearing this morning?
A. I don't know. You haven't asked me any questions yet.
Q. You have no idea what this is about? Is that what you're saying?
A. I've never reviewed the file, no.
Q. Do you have any understanding about what this proceeding is about?
A. No.
(The question is read by the reporter.)
A. I don't understand your question.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Object to form as well.
Q. Did Mr. Williamson explain to you any reason why you would be appearing today?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection. Answer it to the best of your ability.
A. I don't understand what you mean by "reason." I mean, I'm guessing at what you're asking me and I don't want to guess.
Q. Do you have any understanding about
Q. How did you find out that you would need to be here today?
A. Mr. Williamson notified me.
Q. And without telling me the substance
of it, did you discuss with Mr. Williamson what the
reason for your appearing here today would be?
MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm going to let him answer, but you're real close to attorney-client privilege. I'll let him give a yes or no answer.
A. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

MR. STERN: Can you repeat the
question, please?
well.
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why you're here today?
A. I'm being deposed.
Q. Do you have any idea as to what the
subject matter of the deposition is intended to be?
A. It's my understanding that you are deposing me as a fact witness as to the work \(I\) do on behalf of this law firm.
Q. Are you admitted to practice law?
A. Yes.
Q. In what jurisdictions?
A. New Jersey, New York, and

Pennsylvania.
Q. Where did you graduate law school?
A. Rutgers in Camden.
Q. Do you remember the year?
A. \(\quad 1978\).
Q. Since that time, has your full-time employment been engaged in the private practice of law?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you run through chronologically where you've worked since you graduated law school?
A. I served a one-year clerkship for the Honorable Amos Saunders in Paterson, Superior Court of New Jersey. After the clerkship, I worked for the
law firm of Celentano \& Stadtmauer in Clifton. Then I worked for the law firm of Eichenbaum, Cantowitz and Leff beginning in May of 1980. The firm became Eichenbaum, Kantrowitz, Leff \& Gulko in 1986, and then seven years ago I withdrew from that law firm and associated myself with this law firm.
Q. Just so I'm clear, 2005 is when you started working with Pressler \& Pressler?
A. Yes, August, 2005.
Q. Other than your license to practice law in the three states you mentioned, do you hold any vocational or professional licenses?
A. Other than the practice of law?
Q. Right, for those three states.
A. Well, there are federal court licenses
in those states, but other than that, no.
Q. From the time you began working at Celentano \& Stadtmauer, has your practice been primarily related to the collection of defaulted debts?
A. Yes.
Q. Has that been limited or focussed with respect to consumer debts or both consumer and commercial debts?
A. Both, but primarily consumers.
A. I was hired as an associate attorney for the firm.
Q. Has your position changed since you began working at Pressler \& Pressler?
A. No.
Q. Do you report to any other attorney in the office?
A. I am subject to the partners.
Q. Is there any particular individual who is your immediate supervisor?
A. I don't understand your question as to "immediate supervisor."
Q. Is there any one individual who has primary responsibility for overseeing your work?
A. I don't know about responsibility. I have at times spoken with all the partners. If there's one partner who you ask over the years do I speak with more about my work than other partners, that would be Mr. Felt, Gerald Felt.
Q. Who are the other partners?
A. Mr. McCabe, Mr. McDermott and there's Mr. Pressler.
Q. Please describe the work that you perform currently for Pressler \& Pressler.
A. Currently, my work consists of pleading and document review and approval.
Q. So would it be fair to say that your work is limited to cases that have been pending in court?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, form. MR. STERN: I'll withdraw the
question.
Q. Would it be fair to say that your work focuses on matters that are either being filed in court or have already been filed in court matters?
A. My work consists of whatever work is given to me by the firm to review.
Q. You said pleading and document review and approval. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Pleading and review obviously, by definition, pleading is referring to matters that are pending in court, correct?
A. Or about to be.
Q. Okay. And would document review
were hired when you first came to Pressler \& Pressler?
Q. What was the position for which you

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection to form. include matters that are about to be filed?
A. Yes.
Q. With respect to the courts in which
the matter is filed or about to be filed, are those courts courts of the state of New Jersey?
A. Yes, and Pennsylvania.
Q. And what about New York?
A. I do not presently do New York review.
Q. Can you estimate how much of your time is spent doing your work with respect to matters filed or about to be filed in New Jersey as opposed to matters that are filed or about to be filed in Pennsylvania?
A. The majority of my time is spent on New Jersey.
Q. Mr. Gulko, I'm showing you what's been marked as P-10. Do you know what P-10 is?
A. It appears to be a complaint that was filed by this office through JEFIS with the Hudson County Special Civil Part.
Q. Mr. Gulko, I'm showing you what's been 11
marked as P-11 and I'll represent to you that Mr.
Williamson provided my office with P-11. Do you agree that P-10 and P-11 are substantially the same document?
A. It would appear so.
Q. If you want to, take a moment and
review it, because I want to ask you about this. It appears the only difference that I've been able to see between the two is that there's a typed signature on \(\mathrm{P}-10\) and not on \(\mathrm{P}-11\). So I want to ask you about that in a moment, but I want to give you an opportunity to review it to see if there's any other differences.
A. Well, there are differences to the extent that this would appear -- this appears to me to be our -- P-11 appears to be our file copy and P-10 appears to be a copy of what was filed with the court. Because of the information received on the top and the file date as well as the docket number itself, this document appears to have come from the court and this is the document before it was sent to the court.
Q. And just for purposes of the record,
the document that you said appears to have been recorded is \(\mathrm{P}-10\) ?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 12 & & 14 \\
\hline 1 & A. P-10. & 1 & complaint. \\
\hline 2 & Q. And the document you said is from your & 2 & Q. Based upon the volume of cases that \\
\hline 3 & files as your file copy is \(\mathrm{P}-11\) ? & 3 & your firm brings, Pressler \& Pressler is obligated to \\
\hline 4 & A. Yes. & 4 & file Special Civil Part matters through the JEFIS \\
\hline 5 & Q. Is \(\mathrm{P}-11\) a version of \(\mathrm{P}-10\) which & 5 & system, correct? \\
\hline 6 & existed prior to P-10? I'll withdraw that. & 6 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 7 & Did P-11 come earlier than P-10 in & 7 & Q. To your knowledge, does the Special \\
\hline 8 & time? & 8 & Civil Part accept complaints for filing that are not \\
\hline 9 & A. It would appear so, yes. & 9 & filed through the JEFIS system? \\
\hline 10 & Q. And is the reason why it appears so is & 10 & A. I wouldn't know what the court does. \\
\hline 11 & because P-10 has a signature on it, a typed & 11 & Q. Is there a difference in effect \\
\hline 12 & signature? & 12 & between your handwritten signature on a Law Division \\
\hline 13 & A. No, that's not what makes me say that. & 13 & complaint and your typed signature on a JEFIS-filed \\
\hline 14 & What makes me say that P-10 comes after P-11 is P-11 & 14 & complaint? \\
\hline 15 & looks like what is created in our office, and P-10 & 15 & A. I don't understand what you mean by \\
\hline 16 & looks like what is generated by the court after it's & 16 & "difference." \\
\hline 17 & filed and the docket number is assigned. & 17 & Q. The typewritten signature, is the \(\mathrm{S} /\) \\
\hline 18 & Q. Okay. Is there a point in time after & 18 & signature on P-10 your signature? \\
\hline 19 & P-11 was created when your typed signature was added & 19 & A. I don't understand your question. \\
\hline 20 & to the document? & 20 & Q. Does the S/ typed signature on P-10 \\
\hline 21 & A. Documents such as P-10 are what we & 21 & constitute your signature on that complaint? \\
\hline 22 & call a Special Civil Part complaint. All Special & 22 & A. It is my understanding that the format \\
\hline 23 & Civil Part complaints by court rule are & 23 & of the P-10 document is indicative upon the filing \\
\hline 24 & electronically filed through the JEFIS system. & 24 & through JEFIS of a signed complaint. \\
\hline 25 & Therefore, none of the complaints filed in the court & 25 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Could we go off the \\
\hline & 13 & & 15 \\
\hline 1 & contain an ink signature. They are processed as an & 1 & record for a second? \\
\hline 2 & "S/type name" because it is an electronic download to & 2 & MR. STERN: Are you going to talk \\
\hline 3 & the court pursuant to court regulations. That is why & 3 & about this? \\
\hline 4 & it appears this way from the court. & 4 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes. \\
\hline 5 & Q. Do you know who added the typed & 5 & MR. STERN: Just have him step \\
\hline 6 & signature to \(\mathrm{P}-10\) ? & 6 & outside. \\
\hline 7 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection to form. & 7 & (The witness leaves the room.) \\
\hline 8 & A. I'm presuming our office did during, & 8 & MR. WILLIAMSON: It would appear to me \\
\hline 9 & you know, when it's sent to JEFIS. & 9 & that this is like you and I, we have the right to \\
\hline 10 & Q. I appreciate your explaining it & 10 & file electronically with the District Court. So I \\
\hline 11 & through the JEFIS system that the signatures are & 11 & think we're spending a lot of time -- \\
\hline 12 & typed. To your knowledge, is there a difference in & 12 & MR. STERN: He's fighting with me -- \\
\hline 13 & effect between a typed signature and a handwritten & 13 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, I don't -- \\
\hline 14 & signature with respect to the complaints that are & 14 & MR. STERN: But I'm pretty sure he \\
\hline 15 & filed through JEFIS? & 15 & admitted in the answer that the complaint was signed. \\
\hline 16 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, form. I & 16 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Right, in the same \\
\hline 17 & don't understand it, but if you understand it, & 17 & sense that you and I -- \\
\hline 18 & answer. Read it back, please. & 18 & MR. STERN: It doesn't bother me to \\
\hline 19 & (The question is read by the reporter.) & 19 & forecast this a little bit. What I want to get to is \\
\hline 20 & A. I've already testified to you that all & 20 & the process, how it goes from P-11 to P-10. \\
\hline 21 & complaints filed through JEFIS are electronic. & 21 & MR. WILLIAMSON: That's fine. \\
\hline 22 & Therefore, there are no ink-signed signatures on a & 22 & MR. STERN: We'll get to that, but \\
\hline 23 & JEFIS-filed complaint. Where I would sign in ink a & & first I need him to acknowledge that yes, he signed \\
\hline 24 & complaint would be in a Law Division complaint for & & the document. \\
\hline 25 & matters over 15,000. JEFIS is not used to file a & 25 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, no, you keep \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
asking about signature. I think we're going to be here for another half hour. You need to sign up so that your typewritten -- your S/ constitutes --

MR. STERN: Right, is your signature. MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, as a JEFIS
filer, your S/ constitutes --
MR. STERN: Okay.
MR. WILLIAMSON: Just to cut to the
chase.
MR. STERN: Right, I don't want to belabor the point.
(The witness re-enters the room.)
Q. Mr. Gulko, are you a JEFIS filer?
A. The law firm is a JEFIS filer.
Q. So are you saying you are not a JEFIS filer?
A. I don't understand your question.
Q. All right. Do you have authority to file complaints through the JEFIS system?
A. I have authority to approve or disapprove complaints that are presented to me, which, if approved, are JEFISed, yes.
Q. Do you have an understanding as to what effect the typewritten S / has on the complaint?
A. I don't understand your question.
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Q. Do complaints which you file require you to sign it?
A. In the computer, yes.
Q. What do you mean by in the computer?
A. I either approve it or don't approve it upon my review of the proposed complaint that's presented to me in my work. After I have reviewed it and if \(I\) am satisfied that the complaint should be filed in the manner that it's presented to me, I imprint GD for good in the computer and hit enter.

If for any reason I don't want the complaint filed, I enter NG in the computer and hit enter and then the complaint is kicked back to wherever I want it to go for further action.
Q. Do complaints filed with the courts of the state of New Jersey require a signature of the attorney filing the complaint?
A. Could you repeat that question?
Q. Yes. Do complaints filed with the courts of the state of New Jersey require a signature of the attorney filing the complaint?
A. What do you mean by "signature"? I've already testified that in Law Division matters I sign the complaint in ink and that in Special Civil Part matters I approve the complaints which are
transmitted electronically through the JEFIS system, and that is why it appears as it does.
Q. Is your approval of a complaint
different from your signing the complaint?
A. On the JEFIS matters? Is that your question?
Q. Yes, I'm asking with respect to the JEFIS matters.
A. When I approve a matter for Special Civil Part, once it is approved by me in the computer, it is JEFISed to whichever court I want it to be filed.
Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as \(\mathrm{P}-14\). Do you recognize \(\mathrm{P}-14\) ?
A. I see it.
Q. Do you recognize it?
A. It looks like a Law Division complaint prepared by this office.
Q. And does your signature appear on that complaint?
A. As an S slash.
Q. And to your knowledge, was that complaint filed in that form with the Superior Court of New Jersey?
A. Law Division complaints are filed in
19
multiple. There is what I would call the original complaint, which has my signature in ink, and then there's at least one copy filed with it which has the S/F to allow the court upon receipt of the complaint and the filing fee to stamp the court receipt date and the docket number. And then the \(S /\) copy is returned to us and we use that copy to issue out a summons to the sheriff for service.
Q. Based upon the explanations you just gave about your practice, are you able to say with respect to \(\mathrm{P}-14\) that \(\mathrm{P}-14\) is the copy that you received back from the Superior Court?
A. Oh, I don't know that, because there's no court received date or docket number. If you're asking me what \(I\) think this is looking at the four corners of \(\mathbf{P - 1 4 , ~ I ~ w o u l d ~ s a y ~ m u c h ~ a s ~ I ~ s a i d ~ i n ~ P - 1 1 , ~}\) that this is our file copy of the complaint as it was prepared. Looking at P-14, I couldn't testify whether this document has been or ever was filed, because there's no file stamp and no docket number.
Q. Was there an original of the complaint represented by \(\mathrm{P}-14\) which contained your wet ink signature?
A. I've already testified to that, sir. Would you like me to repeat my testimony to you?

a compromise, I'm going to have him review the files to the point that the complaint was filed, no further. That's it, he's not going to look at anything else and he's not going to testify about anything else.

MR. STERN: But the fact that he's not able to testify as to whether the Setneska complaint, for example, was filed --

MR. WILLIAMSON: Fair enough. I'll
have him review the notes, the files, to the extent to the time when these two were filed.

MR. STERN: Okay.
MR. WILLIAMSON: And not beyond.
MR. STERN: Okay. I assume we'll take a break at some point.
(A discussion is held off the record.)
BY MR. STERN:
Q. Mr. Gulko, referring back again to
\(\mathrm{P}-14\), is the inclusion of the typed signature with the \(S\) / intended to represent that you had signed the complaint.
A. It is intended or was intended by me to be an additional copy to the original complaint that was signed by me. That would have been submitted to the court for filing and the assignment
of a docket number.
Q. Mr. Gulko, I'm showing you what's been marked as P-9. Do you recognize P-9?
A. It says it's an affidavit of Ralph

Gulko, and on the second page it bears a signature that I recognize to be mine.
Q. Would you take a moment and read to yourself the affidavit? Let me know when you're done?

Do you see on the second page there is
a jurat?
A. Yes.
Q. That indicates that it was signed on the 2nd day of April, 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall signing this affidavit
on or about April 2nd, 2012?
A. I have no present recollection.
Q. Is there anything stated in the
affidavit which you believe to be inaccurate?
A. No.
Q. Is there anything stated in the affidavit which you believe to be untrue?
A. No.
Q. Is there anything stated in the
affidavit which you would like to change today?
A. No.
Q. Refer, if you will, please, to paragraph number two in P-9.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that that refers to describing a first step with respect to new retail consumer collection claims?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe from the point in time that the initial notice letter goes out until the time that you would approve a complaint for filing, what happens with respect to the claim?
A. I don't see the file until the complaint is presented to me for approval or disapproval as stated in paragraph three, that step. The presentation of the proposed complaint is not presented to me until at least 35 days after the mailing of the initial notice letter.
Q. So you have no involvement with respect to the claim until a complaint is presented to you for approval?
A. That's correct.
Q. When a complaint is presented to you, it's already been prepared? Someone has drafted the 27 complaint, correct?
A. It's been prepared for my review, yes.
Q. Do you know who prepares the complaint?
A. Not personally, no.
Q. Are there individuals with designated job titles or job functions who have responsibility for preparing the complaints that are presented to you?
A. I don't know who the individuals are. There are departments that prepare this pursuant to forms that are within our computer system.
Q. Do you know if the complaints are prepared by an attorney at Pressler \& Pressler?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, form.
A. I don't understand your question.
Q. How do you find out that a complaint has been prepared for your approval?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection to form.
You keep using the word "prepared." I'm not clear what that word means. I think that's the problem.
Q. A complaint is presented to you for approval.
A. For review.
Q. For review. And either approval or
disapproval, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. How is the complaint created?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection to form. I
want to cut to the chase. Are you asking him how it gets drafted?

MR. STERN: Drafted, prepared, created, whatever. How does it get to him in that form? He's presented with something he calls a complaint.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I don't mean to speak for him, but I think he testified he's presented with a draft complaint.
Q. Mr. Gulko, are you presented with a draft complaint?
A. Here is how my work is presented to me. Complaints are either Special Civil Part for purposes of being JEFISed upon approval or they're Law Division complaints for purposes of being signed and filed with the court manually.

The Special Civil Part complaint, the daily work for my review comes in a computer printout of file number and case name. When \(I\) work it on my computer, the file is brought up on a double-screen computer. On the right side of the screen is the

\section*{29}
collection program that contains all the information on the case that is pertinent for me to review, and on the left side of the screen is the actual document itself.

For instance, \(\mathrm{P}-11\) is what I would actually see on the left side of \(m y\) screen.
Likewise, \(\mathbf{P - 1 4}\) is what I would -- well, P - 14 comes up, but since it's physically presented to me for signing, my eyes are on the paper document, but it does also come up because the computer pulls it up.
Q. Okay. So the left side is the
document that you're reviewing.
A. Yes.
Q. The complaint. Do you know how that document is created?
A. At a point in time, a department responsible for creating that work creates it. The computer pulls the information, the variable information in what is, for the lack of a better form, a template computer complaint document. It merges it. The work then comes to me on a daily basis and I review it as to all aspects for approval or disapproval.
Q. In the course of what you do, you approve complaints that are prepared on behalf of New

\section*{Century Financial Services?}
A. New Century Financial Services is a client that \(I\) recognize to be a client of this firm's, yes.
Q. On the right screen, you said there is information about the file?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know how that information is entered into your system?
A. It is my understanding that we receive files both electronically and manually depending on the client. For New Century it would be electronic. The information is received electronically by the computer. It's set up. If it's a manual client, as would be typical in our medical and veterinary claims, we have a setup department where they take the information and they input it into the collection program that we use.
Q. We can limit ourselves to what happens with respect to New Century.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. Okay?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. I need a verbal response.
A. Yes.
Q. Please correct me if I'm wrong. I believe you testified that you look at the document on the left screen and you look at pertinent information or relevant information for purposes of the complaint on the right screen. Is that a fair statement as to what you do?
A. Yes.
Q. When you're reviewing a complaint that's prepared for New Century, what information on that right screen are you looking for?
A. The initial screen, which is the computer program that I'm looking at, has the Pressler file number, the claim name of both the debtor and the plaintiff, the debtor's address, the debtor's Social Security number, the debtor's date of birth, the account number, the date of referral, the referral balance, the amount referred.

There will be on the lower half of the screen what's called the note set, which will have information and a default pops up to the most recent. So therefore the note set information can vary as to what was last done on the case, last communications, whatever.

The screen has the date of the initial demand letter. It will also have any payments that
had come in after referral. That will show on the screen. It will flash if there was any bankruptcy filed or any claim of death. I mean, there's a lot of information and it's all on the screen in designated areas, the same information in the same place on the screen.
Q. You referred -- I want to make sure I say it right. Was it the collection software, is that what you said or the firm's software? How did you describe what system you're using that's on the right-hand side?
A. It's the firm's computer. I'm an attorney, I'm not an IT wonk, so I don't know what anybody else would call it. I call it our collection software, whatever it is that we use to receive claims and process them.
Q. Okay. Do you know if that collection software is something that's proprietary to the firm or is it something that's provided by some vendor?
A. I'm not really sure.
Q. Do you know how information regarding
-- again, limiting ourselves to New Century
matters -- do you know how the information that's populated into the collection software gets into the software?
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A. Through electronic download transfer.
Q. From New Century to Pressler \&

Pressler?
MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm going to object because he already testified he's not a computer guy. So now you're asking him how the computer works. I think it's inappropriate.

MR. STERN: I asked him if he knows.
I asked him if he knows how it gets there and he said from a download.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, part of the problem, he's not a computer expert. So he can say anything and I don't want that to become -- based on the fact that he doesn't really know what he's talking about.

MR. STERN: You can handle that on cross or if it's not the firm's policy, there's ways to correct that, but I can ask him what his understanding is. That's his understanding. That may or may not be binding on the firm.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, it certainly
isn't binding on the firm. He's here as an individual, not as a representative of the firm.
Q. Do you know the term "placement information"?
A. In what regard?
Q. In regard to the collection of consumer debts.
A. Generally or in regard to New Century?
Q. Well, let's talk about New Century.
A. I'm not understanding your question.

What do you want me to --
Q. I want to know if you understand the term. Do you know what's meant by "placement information"?
A. My understanding of the term "placement information" is the information that the client provides the law firm.
Q. When you review a complaint for New Century and you look at the information that's populated into the collection software, is that either all or part of the placement information from New Century?
A. It's my understanding that's where that information comes from, yes.
Q. Do you have an understanding as to how New Century obtained that information?
A. No, I do not know. I mean, they're a client. I'm not an employee of New Century, so I don't know.
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Q. With respect to medical claims, you
talked about that there's a department that takes the information obtained from the clients and enters that into your computers, correct?
A. Sent, by way of example, in manual submissions.
Q. You say manual submissions. You mean submissions on paper?
A. Yes.
Q. Does New Century submit anything manually to Pressler \& Pressler for collection?
A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I'm not involved in the receipt aspect of New Century claims.
Q. So then you don't know with respect to the information that you see on your screen whether the information comes either electronically or manually from New Century?
A. I don't know. It was my understanding it was electronic.
Q. What's the basis of your understanding that it comes in electronically?
A. From general knowledge and practice within the firm over the seven years. Also, a lot of manual files, that paper is scanned into a separate
screen, so you can determine if a file is manual or electronic depending on the existence of scanned documents.
Q. Do you recall any instance where you reviewed a New Century complaint where there were scanned documents?
A. Some are, some aren't.
Q. With respect to New Century, when
there are scanned documents, do you recall what those documents were? Either categorically or specifically?
A. It depends. It depends on the particular file that we get. Sometimes we get what's called the chain of ownership, because New Century is a debt buyer. So the documents that link back to the original creditor on the claim that we are now collecting on behalf of New Century, again, depending on the claim, there may be a monthly statement, there may be an application. After the initial demand letter there may be a letter response from the debtor, correspondence. It depends on the file.
Q. After you review a complaint and approve it, is there anything else that you do with respect to that claim?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection.

MR. STERN: I'll withdraw the question.
Q. Do you do anything with respect to a claim after you have approved the complaint?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection. Do you want me to expand?

MR. STERN: Go ahead.
MR. WILLIAMSON: I think Mr. Gulko
reviews multiple complaints on any given day. So
what he might do, I mean, it's pretty broad. Some
accounts he may look at at a later date, some he may
not. So you're asking --
MR. STERN: Well, you're testifying
for him.
MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, I'm just pointing out that this is kind of like where are we going?

MR. STERN: I just want to find out what his functions are beyond approving the complaint.

MR. WILLIAMSON: If you ask him generally, I'm not going to object. If you're asking on a complaint, if you ask him in general.

MR. STERN: In general what?
MR. WILLIAMSON: Does he come to see
accounts after he approves an account --
MR. STERN: What is the difference if
you do anything after you've approved the complaint?
He's testified --
MR. WILLIAMSON: Any complaint, not a complaint.

MR. STERN: As a general matter, yes.
A. It depends on the history of the file. Some cases \(I\) see again, some \(I\) don't.
Q. What would be the basis why you would see a complaint in a case again versus not seeing it again?
A. I approve a complaint, such as P-10.
Q. Okay.
A. I approve a compliant for filing. The court serves it upon the debtor. The debtor goes to a licensed attorney such as yourself and says defend me. You'll pick up the phone, because my name is on the complaint, you'll phone me, you'll introduce yourself, you'll tell me what you want to do with the file, whether you had a meritorious defense, the defendant is in a financial problem, whether you want to do a settlement, whether you want to do a consent order, whatever, that's me seeing the case a second time because you were obtained by the debtor to call
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me.
Q. For you to perform the functions that you've described, is it important that you have an understanding of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it important that you stay current with respect to any changes in that act or any court decisions concerning that act?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you do to stay current with respect to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act?
A. This firm has regular attorney meetings at which changes are discussed and appellate Supreme Court cases are distributed and discussed.
Q. Anything else that you do with respect to staying current with the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act?
A. Well, if it should be one of the cases or one of the courses that I take, although by no means required, my professional continuing legal education can be satisfied through a course on that topic.
Q. Do you review periodicals with respect to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act? On a
regular basis.
A. I don't know what you mean by periodicals.
Q. Magazines, newspapers, newsletters.
A. If I see them or if they're
distributed within the office.
Q. So it's fair to say that your
information is going to come from either taking
continuing education or from information that gets circulated in the office?
A. Yes, which is done on a regular basis.
Q. Okay. Do you feel for your job it's
important that you have an understanding of the New Jersey court rules?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's important that you stay
current with respect to any changes with respect to the New Jersey court rules?
A. Yes.
Q. And also with respect to the court
rules in Pennsylvania?
A. Yes.
Q. What do you do to stay current with
respect to the court rules in those states?
A. Every year I receive a copy -- and
it's in my office as we speak -- of the current New Jersey court rules and the current Pennsylvania court rules.
Q. And you review them after they come
in?
A. As I need them.
Q. And to do your job properly it's
important that you have an understanding of the rules of evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it important that you stay
current with respect to any changes or
interpretations with respect to New Jersey Rules of Evidence?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, form, relevance.

MR. STERN: We'll get there. I think it's clearly relevant or likely to lead. Are you instructing him not to answer?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Whether he needs to know the rules of evidence relating to the review of the complaint?

MR. STERN: No, that's not what I asked him, I asked him for him to do his job properly here, which could include whatever that is. He
talked about a lot of things.
MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, if his job was to take a case to trial, I would agree with you.
However, this case is not about whether he takes a case to trial. This case is limited to what he does in reviewing complaints. It's not about what he does otherwise. It's not about when he does discovery issues, if he does that. It's not about whether he does any other types of things subsequent on any other accounts. That's not what it's about. We're going overboard.

MR. STERN: I don't think it's overboard. I think it's clearly within the scope of it and I think I can ask him whether he feels that he needs to know the rules of evidence.

MR. WILLIAMSON: He answered that.
MR. STERN: I don't know, I think you
objected before he answered. You're not letting him answer that question?

MR. WILLIAMSON: I think it's
irrelevant.
You know what? For the sake of moving
on, if you want to tell him what you think briefly, tell him.

Please reread just that question.
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(The question is read by the reporter.)
A. Yes.
Q. And can you describe what you do to stay current?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Now I'm going to object and direct him not to answer because I think we're going -- it's just ridiculous.

MR. STERN: Okay.
MR. WILLIAMSON: Is this a good time
to take a break?
MR. STERN: Yes.
(A one-hour recess is taken at 12:42 p.m.)
(Exhibit P-15, Rule 1:4-5, is marked for identification by the reporter.)
(Exhibit P-16, Rule 1:4-8, is marked for identification by the reporter.)

BY MR. STERN:
Q. Mr. Gulko, during the break did you
get an opportunity to look at your firm's files with respect to the two complaints that we looked at earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to make sure we're using the
same terms. So I want to be clear. You approved the complaint in the Setneska matter?
A. For filing, yes, I did.
Q. And the other matter, we'll refer to that as the Freeman matter.
A. If you wish.
Q. You approved the complaint for filing in the Freeman matter?
Q. Was it the responsibility of any other attorney to approve the complaint for filing in
Q. Is your recollection refreshed with respect to \(\mathrm{P}-14\) as to whether there was an original of that complaint that was filed with your original signature?
A. I wouldn't use the phrase "recollection refreshed." When I looked at the file during the break, I saw in what we call the V screen, which are scanned documents, \(I\) saw that this document, P-14, was scanned in with a court filed stamp and a docket number. That one also had the S/Ralph Gulko, which would comport with my earlier testimony that when a Law Division matter complaint is filed by this office, since it is a manual filing, I sign the first copy, the original copy and we send at least one more copy in for filing carrying the \(S /\) Ralph Gulko, so that the court will return to us a filed copy. The court always keeps the original signature copy of the complaint, and if you want to obtain a copy of that, I suggest you contact the clerk of the court.
Q. Okay. P-14 refers to a particular case, correct?
A. Claim I would call it, a particular claim.
Q. All right. And your review of the
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file reflects that a civil action was commenced with respect to that claim, correct?
A. I reviewed the file up until the point of \(\mathbf{m y}\) involvement in it, and then I did another review to see if \(I\) had ever viewed this file or done anything on it after my involvement, which was approval of suit, and I did not have any involvement after the filing of the complaint.
Q. Okay. Are you okay if we refer to that matter as the Setneska matter? Is that a term you're okay with?
A. Yes. You can refer to it however you

\section*{A. Yes, I did.} mind
either the Setneska matter or the Freeman matter?
A. I already testified that I did it.
Q. To your knowledge, no one else also approved it. Is that correct?
A. For the complaint?
Q. For the complaint.
A. No.
Q. Is it common practice that complaints
that you approve for filing are not approved by anyone else?
A. I don't understand that question.
Q. Does someone else approve the same complaints that you approve?
A. Twice you mean?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. So once you approve them, then the standard practice is that they're sent in for filing?
A. Yes.
Q. Either through the JEFIS or in a manual form if it's a Law Division matter?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm showing you what I've marked as \(\mathrm{P}-15\), and I'll represent to you that \(\mathrm{P}-15\) is a copy of one court rule which I obtained from West's, but
take a moment and tell me if you're familiar with that rule.
A. It appears to be a copy of New Jersey Court Rule 1:4-5.
Q. Referring your attention to the last sentence, do you see there it says, "Every paper to be filed should bear the date on which it was signed"?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware as to whether the filed complaint in either the Setneska matter or the Freeman matter bears a date on which it was signed?
A. A view of P-14 and P-11 does not indicate a date.
Q. To your knowledge, is it your practice with respect to complaints that you approve that they bear a date on which they're signed?
A. I don't understand your question.
Q. It appears that these complaints do not bear a date on which it was signed. What I'm trying to find out is, is that common practice with respect to complaints filed or is this perhaps an aberration?
A. I would have no recollection.
Q. I have in my possession -- and I can
mark them -- a bunch of complaints, I don't know how many exactly, that appear to have your signature. And I represent to you that none of them are dated, and I can go through showing them to you --

MR. WILLIAMSON: Phil, is there any point to that?

MR. STERN: Yes.
MR. WILLIAMSON: What's the point, that you're going to allege that there was a violation of the court rule that it was signed, that there's no date on it?

MR. STERN: Is there an allegation? No, I'm just trying to find out --

MR. WILLIAMSON: No, when you say you're just trying to find out, I think you're just going to waste time. If you have documents that you want to know if -- and as to their authenticity, the document is the document. If there's a date on it, there's a date on it. If there's not, there's not.
Q. Mr. Gulko, do you know what date you approved the Freeman complaint?
A. I could if \(I\) went into the computer screen, yes.
Q. Do you know the date on which you signed the Setneska complaint?
A. If I were to go into the computer screen, yes.
Q. When you sign complaints, handwritten signatures for Law Division matters, is it your practice to include the date on which you signed it on the complaint?
A. I don't prepare the complaint. I review the complaint.
Q. In Law Division cases?
A. In all cases.
Q. But you personally sign your name to Law Division complaints.
A. That are approved, yes.
Q. That you approve?
A. Yes, that I approve.
Q. In those situations where it's a Law

Division complaint that you approve that you are signing, is it your practice to include the date on which you signed the complaint and include that date on the complaint?
A. It's not something I would have recalled.
Q. And do you recall when you review complaints to be filed with JEFIS that they include the date on which you either approve or that your
typed signature is added to the complaint?
A. It's not something that I would recall having looked for.
Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as \(\mathrm{P}-16\). Do you know what \(\mathrm{P}-16\) is?

\section*{A. It purports to be New Jersey Court}

\section*{Rule 1:4-8.}
Q. Do you recall ever reviewing rule 1:4-8 prior to today?
A. I've read it in my lifetime, yes.
Q. Referring to paragraph \(A\) and the first sentence, it says, "The signature of an attorney or pro se party constitutes a certificate that the signatory has read the pleading, written motion or other paper."

Is it your understanding that by signing a complaint that you have certified that you read the complaint?
A. Yes, and I have.
Q. Going to the next sentence, which we can go through but I'd have to break it down because it's a rather lengthy sentence, it says, "By signing, filing or advocating a pleading, written motion or other paper, an attorney or pro se party certifies to the best of his or her knowledge information and
belief formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances," and then there are four numbered items and I'd like you to focus on number three.
"The factual allegations have evidentiary support or as to specifically identify the allegations, they're either likely to have evidentiary support or they will be withdrawn or corrected if reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery indicates insufficient evidentiary support."

Have you read the provisions that I just read out loud prior to today?

\section*{A. Yes, I previously testified that I} have read this rule before.
Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that -- let's go back. I want to get this very clear for the record.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm also going to get clear that this is what it's been alleged that you haven't done in the filing of this complaint, because you're now sitting here trying to find out if there is any evidentiary support. You filed the complaint without any evidentiary support other than your own personal supposition.

MR. STERN: Is there an objection?
object depending where we go with this. He's
admitted that he's read it. The rule is the rule.
MR. STERN: You are free to make any application for sanctions against --

MR. WILLIAMSON: You're badgering him.
MR. STERN: I'm not badgering him.
There's no objection being stated. There's actually
no question pending for you to object to and there shouldn't be speaking objections.
Q. With respect to complaints filed through JEFIS which bears the typewritten signature of S/Ralph Gulko, does the typewritten signature get included before or after you have approved the complaint?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, asked and answered. You can answer.
A. It's my understanding that after I approve a complaint and the document is JEFISed, the document is JEFISed in the form that is reflected in P-10, which has the S/Ralph Gulko.
Q. Do you personally type in the S/Ralph

Gulko on those approved complaints?
A. No.
Q. Do you know whether a typist does it
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or whether the system automatically includes it?
A. I have no personal knowledge. I can hazard a guess.

MR. WILLIAMSON: You're not here to guess.
Q. Is it your intent that when you
approve a complaint for filing via JEFIS that the typed signature be added to the complaint?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Could you read that back, please?
(The question is read by the reporter.)
A. I don't understand your question.
Q. Does your approval of the complaint include your authorization that your typed signature be added to the complaint?
A. I'm unclear what you mean by the use of the word "authorization."
Q. Permission.
A. I don't even know what you mean by that. I've previously testified this morning that when a complaint is presented to me for approval, since it is a computer-generated document to be electronically transferred to the court by JEFIS, that if \(I\) approve it, I enter GD for good and hit enter, and then the JEFIS department JEFISes the
document in the manner that it does.
I don't know what you want me to say, what my entry of GD enter button, what that represents to you beyond approving of the complaint for filing with the court.
Q. You know that once you approve the complaint for filing that the typed signature will be added to the complaint, correct?
A. I have an awareness of that, yes.
Q. Do you have an objection to Pressler \& Pressler typing your name as the signature after you have approved a complaint for filing via JEFIS?
A. I have no objection.
Q. Does Pressler \& Pressler have your permission to type that signature on the complaint?
A. I don't know what you mean by permission.
Q. Is it okay with you that Pressler \& Pressler adds your typed signature to the complaints you have approved for JEFIS filing?
A. If I have approved the complaint within the computer by the entry of the characters GD and the enter button, then \(I\) have done so with the intent and purpose that the complaint be filed, and if it's in Special Civil Part that it be JEFISed.
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Since, in my prior testimony, an electronic transfer of a complaint by JEFIS does not have an inked signature, it is \(\mathbf{m y}\) understanding that as in P-14, that the S/Ralph Gulko is tantamount to signing the complaint at the time of filing with the court.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't know what else you're trying to ask me.
Q. So the typed signature is tantamount to your having signed the complaint, correct?
A. After I have approved it, yes.
Q. Understood, it's after you have approved it.

So would you agree that your
understanding of Court Rule 1:4-8 applies to the complaints that you have approved for filing via JEFIS?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, asked and answered I think three times now.
A. I don't understand your question.
Q. Do you understand that Rule 1:4-8A applies to complaints signed by attorneys and filed with the court?
A. That is my understanding.
A. As to whether any of the items of the court rule have been violated.
Q. I'm not asking whether it's been violated. My question is, is it your understanding that the rule applies to the filing of the complaint that you have approved and that contains either your handwritten signature or the typewritten signature which you said is tantamount to your signature?
A. The entire rules of court apply to the documents that are filed with the court.
Q. Okay.
A. Rule 1:4-8 is just one.
Q. When you approved the complaint in the Freeman matter, did you have an understanding as to whether the factual allegations in the complaint had evidentiary support?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection. You've got to read the whole rule. I don't see how reading
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half the rule or a word at a time is relevant.
MR. STERN: I'm not reading from the rule. I asked him a question. I didn't ask him a question about the rule.

Can you read the question back, please?
(The question is read by the reporter.)
MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection. What
time? If you're going to parse the rule, you're asking him specifically one aspect of that rule, of that paragraph.

MR. STERN: You said when?
MR. WILLIAMSON: You're asking him as to one aspect of that paragraph.

MR. STERN: I didn't ask him anything about the rule.

MR. WILLIAMSON: You did. It says here, "Factual allegations have evidentiary support." You asked him if the factual allegations had evidentiary support. You didn't ask him the rest as it goes on "or they're likely to have evidentiary support."

MR. STERN: Okay.
MR. WILLIAMSON: The rule is much more broad than what you're making it out to be.

MR. STERN: Fine.
Q. Mr. Gulko, do you understand what your counsel is arguing?
A. Yes.
Q. In other words, that paragraph A-3 has a disjunctive?

\section*{A. I've read the rule.}
Q. Okay. Well, your point, the point from counsel is that it has a disjunctive, it's the factual allegation or, and then it goes on.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Ask him if what he did complies with the rule as it's written.

MR. STERN: No.
MR. WILLIAMSON: You want to ask him something totally different.

MR. STERN: No. I'm asking you, I think your point is that Rule A-3 has two different components written in the disjunctive.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Two different components and it also allows for subsequent action, as I understand it, subsequent to the filing.

MR. STERN: A-3?
MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes, A-3.
MR. STERN: As to the disjunctive, there's two parts.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Correct.
MR. STERN: Fine, I'm asking him is
that his understanding that it has two parts.
Q. Mr. Gulko, do you agree with your counsel's description of paragraph A-3 in Rule 1:4-8 that it has two parts in the disjunctive?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we agree that one part says the factual allegations have evidentiary support? Correct?
A. The rule is what the rule says. You're reading it. You don't need me to say that's what it says.
Q. I'm trying to find out what your understanding is.

MR. WILLIAMSON: He's not here to give a legal conclusion.

MR. STERN: I'm not asking for a legal conclusion, I'm asking for his understanding.

MR. WILLIAMSON: His understanding as to what? As a layman, as a lawyer, as what? If you're asking for his understanding as a lawyer, then he is giving you -- you're asking him for a legal interpretation.

MR. STERN: No, I'm not asking for a
statement. factual. rule -you're asking -question back. support.
legal interpretation, I'm asking for his
understanding. He may have an understanding based on
the fact that he's a lawyer, but he's here to testify
about what he does. He's already testified that
certain information he takes into account when he performs his duties.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Right, that's

MR. STERN: So I'm asking him about -MR. WILLIAMSON: And he's testified that he's read the rule, he understands the rule and he complies with the rule.

MR. STERN: Fine. Now I want to ask him specifics about that.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Now we're into argument. What he understands the rule to mean.

MR. STERN: I can say, for example, that, you know what, that I'm a really ey man as an example, all right? But that doesn't bar you, if the issue is am I a wealthy man into going into specifics as to what assets I have and what they're worth, all right? So the same thing applies here. Him saying a flat statement of "I comply with the rules" does not bar me -- excuse me I'm not done -- does not bar me from asking specifics to inquire as to his general

MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes, and he's testified what he does. If you want to argue at a later date that what he does does not comply with the

MR. STERN: I don't know that I've covered everything so I --

MR. WILLIAMSON: Knock yourself out, that's fine. I'm saying that's the factual. If

MR. STERN: I want to end the argument because I want to ask the question. Read the last
(The question is read by the reporter.)
Q. Is your understanding different than that one part of A-3 deals with factual allegations that have evidentiary support?
A. It's what the rule says.
Q. Okay. And the other part of the rule says as to specifically identified allegations and then it has requirements as to those specifically identified allegations.
A. It says likely to have evidentiary
Q. As to specifically identified
allegations, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So it requires that there be specifically identified allegations which will likely have evidentiary support, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So if you would, turn to any version of the complaint that you may have, whether it's here or whether you need to get it from your file, of the Freeman complaint.
A. I have \(\mathbf{P - 1 0}\) in front of \(\mathbf{m e}\).
Q. Can you tell me where in \(\mathrm{P}-10\) there are any specifically identified allegations where you asserted that they were likely to have evidentiary support?
A. Paragraph one.
Q. What does it say?
A. It says that "The Plaintiff is the owner of Defendant's GE Capital Regular Walmart Account number C77W0342324478, which is now in default. There is due the plaintiff from the Defendant Natalie Freeman the sum of \(\mathbf{\$ 7 2 0 . 1 1}\) plus interest from October 27, 2010 to December 15, 2010 in the amount of \(\mathbf{\$ 1 . 4 5}\) for a total of \(\mathbf{\$ 7 2 1 . 5 6 . " ~}\)
Q. Are you testifying that that is a specifically identified --

MR. WILLIAMSON: No, no, stop.
Because what you're reading of the rule is totally incorrect. If you're asking him if he specifically identified allegations, if he parsed them back and forth, whether they might? Or whether you -- are you now pointing to a specific allegation?

You're trying to imply -- you're trying to revamp this rule in your interpretation of it and I don't think that's appropriate in a deposition. Ask him a factual question. Ask him a simple factual question, but don't ask him to try to interpret based on your interpretation, which is what you're doing. You're asking him to interpret an interpretation, which I think is incorrect.

MR. STERN: You may be right, you may be wrong as to the interpretation issue, but it doesn't matter. That's what a judge will decide, whose interpretation is right or wrong. Let me finish. It's not an argument. I can ask him facts based upon my interpretation of the rule, whether it's wrong or right, and as to facts.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Well, ask him facts.
MR. STERN: If you want to argue that it doesn't matter --
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 64 & & 66 \\
\hline 1 & quiet. MR. WILLIAMSON: If you ask facts, I'm & & determination as to whether I am to approve or disapprove the complaint. \\
\hline 3 & MR. STERN: It is a fact. I'm asking & 3 & Q. I think I asked you with respect to \\
\hline 4 & him as to where in the complaint it specifically & 4 & the Freeman complaint. Is there anything that you \\
\hline 5 & identifies an allegation that it's either likely to & 5 & looked at beyond what was on the right screen with \\
\hline 6 & have evidentiary support or will be withdrawn or & 6 & respect to approving the Freeman complaint? \\
\hline 7 & corrected if reasonable opportunity for further & 7 & A. No. \\
\hline 8 & investigation or discovery indicates insufficient & 8 & Q. Is there anything you looked at beyond \\
\hline 9 & evidentiary support. & 9 & the right screen in approving the Setneska complaint? \\
\hline 10 & MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm going to direct & 10 & A. No. \\
\hline 11 & him not to answer, because I don't see anywhere in & 11 & Q. Is there anything that you ask to see \\
\hline 12 & the rule where each individual line needs to be under & 12 & in the process of approving a complaint? \\
\hline 13 & that rubric. & 13 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, form. \\
\hline 14 & Q. Is there anywhere that there is any & 14 & You've already asked that, come on. \\
\hline 15 & allegation that is specifically identified? & 15 & A. I don't understand your question. \\
\hline 16 & MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm going to direct & 16 & Q. You only look at what's on the right \\
\hline 17 & him not to answer because that makes no sense. By & 17 & screen or the V screen I think you talked about, \\
\hline 18 & who? & 18 & correct? \\
\hline 19 & Q. Mr. Gulko, we've just identified in & 19 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection. You \\
\hline 20 & paragraph A-3 that there are two parts, correct? & 20 & ischaracterized his prior testimony. \\
\hline 21 & MR. WILLIAMSON: If you want to & 21 & MR. STERN: I asked him if it was \\
\hline 22 & specifically identify an allegation -- & 22 & correct, I'm not mischaracterizing. He can either \\
\hline 23 & MR. STERN: Excuse me, I asked him a & 23 & say it is correct or it's not correct. \\
\hline 24 & question. & 24 & A. I said the right screen contained the \\
\hline 25 & MR. WILLIAMSON: He's not going to & 25 & computer collection software program that we use. I \\
\hline & 65 & & 67 \\
\hline 1 & explain the rule to you. & 1 & look at that. There is an initial screen. There are \\
\hline 2 & MR. STERN: I'm not asking him to & 2 & things on it that may cause me to bounce to \\
\hline 3 & explain the rule. I'm asking his understan & 3 & additional screens within the collection program, so \\
\hline 4 & the rule. The rule has two parts. & 4 & that by the time I'm done, I have looked at more than \\
\hline 5 & MR. WILLIAMSON: The rule is a whole & 5 & one screen in the collection program. \\
\hline 6 & and he's already testified to it. & 6 & Q. With respect to New Century Financial, \\
\hline 7 & MR. STERN: I'm not going to argue. & 7 & you stated that they are a debt buyer, correct? \\
\hline 8 & You want to interpret it your way, but I'm going to & 8 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 9 & ask my questions. Let's get the judge on the phone. & 9 & Q. So that every claim that you have with \\
\hline 10 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Okay. & 10 & respect to them is a claim that was purchased from \\
\hline 11 & (A brief recess is taken.) & 11 & someone else who held the account. \\
\hline 12 & BY MR. STERN: & 12 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 13 & Q. Mr. Gulko, did you conduct any inquiry & 13 & Q. And that could either be the issuer of \\
\hline 14 & about anything prior to approving the Freeman & 14 & the account, correct, or someone who has purchased \\
\hline 15 & complaint? & 15 & from the issuer, correct? \\
\hline 16 & A. I reviewed the file in its entirety. & 16 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 17 & Q. That's the items that you described as & 17 & MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection. I don't \\
\hline 18 & being on the right screen previously? & 18 & know whether he's competent to testify to that, but \\
\hline 19 & A. Yes. & 19 & keep going. \\
\hline 20 & Q. Anything else beyond what was on the & 20 & Q. Do you review the chain of assignment \\
\hline 21 & right screen? & 21 & in every New Century complaint? \\
\hline 22 & A. If anything on the right screen & 22 & A. I don't know what you mean by review. \\
\hline 23 & appears unusual or incomplete or in any way peaks my & 23 & I mean, it's there in the placement information. \\
\hline 24 & interest or makes me question what it is, there are & 24 & It's either there to be seen or it isn't. \\
\hline 25 & other things I can look to to further my & 25 & Q. The placement information is the data \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
or the copies of the documents?
MR. WILLIAMSON: Could you read back
his question? Because your second question was
totally different. I don't know if he responded to
your question. You're asking one thing and he's answering another.
(The record is read by the reporter.)
A. I view what's there.
Q. And sometimes it includes copies of the chain of assignment documents?
A. Sometimes it will.
Q. And sometimes it does not?
A. That's correct.
Q. What happens more often?
A. It's hard to say.
Q. Can you tell me with respect to the

Freeman complaint whether you reviewed the credit
card agreement as part of your process of approving the complaint?
A. What do you mean by the credit card agreement review?
Q. Is it your understanding that with
respect to bank-issued credit cards that there is a
document which contains the written terms of the
agreement between the account issuer and the account
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debtor?
A. In my capacity as a lawyer, it's my understanding that original bank creditors do provide that upon the issuance of the plastic credit card, yes.
Q. Is that document something that you
with respect to reviewing and approving the review with respect to reviewing and approving the complaint in the Freeman matter?
A. No.
Q. Is that something that you looked at in connection with your review of the file and your approval of the Setneska complaint?
A. No.
Q. Did you review any copies of any
billing statements in connection with your review and approval of the Freeman complaint?
A. No.
Q. Did you review any copies of any
billing statements with respect to your review and approval of the Setneska complaint?
A. No.
Q. In connection with your approval of either the Setneska complaint or the Freeman complaint, did you draw a conclusion as to whether the factual allegations had evidentiary support?
Q. What information did you look at with respect to the Freeman complaint that you evaluated would be admissible into evidence?
A. My client has provided us information that it is the owner of a GE Capital Regular Walmart account, and it gave an account number and that it belonged to the Defendant Natalie Freeman. And it provided us information that the account is in default and it provided us information as to the amount that was in default and gave us the date from which we then calculated accruing interest to arrive at a total demand in the complaint.
Q. And your evaluation was that that information that was supplied to you by your client was admissible in evidence?
A. That it would be, yes.
Q. Where did your client obtain that
information?
MR. WILLIAMSON: What information?
MR. STERN: The information that he's
identified as the client supplied information on which he relied in terms of approving the complaint.

MR. WILLIAMSON: You're talking about the Freeman complaint?

MR. STERN: We're talking about the
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Freeman complaint. He's identified the information.
A. That's the business records.
Q. Whose business records?
A. My client's business records.
Q. Could we go back to the question? If

I understand, because there was some interruption
between the question and the answer, are you saying
that your client obtained the information from its own business records?
A. No. My client's business records is this account. It claims it is the owner of it. It provided me the name of the debtor. It provided us the address, it provided us the account number, the amount of the debt, the date of the debt. It provides us all this information.
Q. Okay. And I'm asking you, you
concluded that that information was admissible evidence, correct?

MR. WILLIAMSON: You're now getting to a point where you're just arguing with him over what is or is not admissible.

MR. STERN: No, I asked him what he
concluded. That's all I asked him was what he concluded.
A. I don't conclude anything. My client
provided us with this information. If you're asking me in my review as an attorney did I consider this information sufficient to form the basis of a lawsuit for filing, yes.

If you're asking me would I consider this information sufficient in the event of no answer to the complaint and the submission of a certification of proof and nonmilitary service for filing with the court to obtain a money judgement, the answer to that is yes.
Q. Are there any of the factual allegations in the Freeman complaint which you concluded to have evidentiary support at the time you approved the complaint?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, form.
You're asking him for a legal conclusion. When you
say evidentiary support, that's a legal determination.

MR. STERN: Can you read back the question.
(The question is read by the reporter.)
MR. WILLIAMSON: And the question is what's the difference whether he does or he doesn't? What he concludes?

MR. STERN: It's not an objection,
it's not a speaking objection --
MR. WILLIAMSON: But we're going on
and on and on about it, that's why I'm asking the question. What is the point? Is there any point to what he concludes?

MR. STERN: I asked him the question.
I'd like an answer to the question. It's a factual question.
Q. Answer the question.

MR. WILLIAMSON: We're going to spend an hour on what he thinks is evidential and what he doesn't think is evidential? Again, what is the point? If there's a point to it, I wouldn't argue, I wouldn't complain. Is there a point?

MR. STERN: Mr. Williamson, I don't
have to --
MR. WILLIAMSON: You do have to have a point.

MR. STERN: Excuse me. I don't have to explain where I'm going with every question that I'm asking so that you understand where I'm going.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm not asking you to, but it's not open-ended. Let's talk about anything. It's not open-ended.

MR. STERN: This is not an open-ended
question. Can we read back the question, please?
(The question is read by the reporter.)
A. Yes, the placement information that my client provided me.
Q. I don't think your answer was
responsive and I'll explain why. The question I
asked you was about allegations, not about what was
provided to you. So if we can read back the question and you can answer.
(The question is read by the reporter.)
Q. The question was, are there allegations?

MR. WILLIAMSON: And he's testified to what that placement information was.

MR. STERN: I didn't ask him about
placement information. I asked him about allegations. I didn't ask him about placement information.
Q. Mr. Gulko, I asked you whether there were any allegations --
A. I don't understand your question, counselor. My client alleges that it is owed money because it owns an account and it identified the account by name, it identified the account holder, it identified the account number, it identified the
amount due, it identified the date due. That's the allegation, that's the information that my client provided me. That's what I reviewed. Anything else, I'm just not following you.
Q. Okay. Mr. Gulko, I know from our initial discussion this morning that you knew very little about this case, so I'll give you a little bit of background and hopefully that will assist in your ability to answer questions.
A. Excuse me, counselor. What I had said was I hadn't reviewed the file before. Okay? You're now saying that \(I\) never knew anything about this case.
Q. I apologize if I mischaracterized what you had said.

MR. WILLIAMSON: This is three years ago or two years ago.
Q. Mr. Gulko, you indicated that you had some familiarity and that it was important for you to have familiarity with the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever heard of the term in connection with the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act of meaningful attorney involvement?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have an understanding as to what that means?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your understanding?
A. It means that the attorney is involved in a review of the information provided by the client to make a determination whether there is a good faith belief that what is alleged by the client is supportable.
Q. And do you understand also that there is a provision of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act that deals with debt collectors not stating false information?
A. I'm aware that there is some provision to that effect.
Q. Do you understand that in connection with your work in connection with the collection of consumer debts that the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act applies to you?

\section*{A. Yes.}
Q. Are you aware that by virtue of either signing a complaint or approving a complaint so that your typewritten signature is placed upon it, that there is a certain certification that you have made
as set forth in Court Rule 1:4-8?
MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection, he's
already answered this repeatedly. And it does become badgering when you ask the same question over and over and over again. Answer it one more time, please.
(The question is read by the reporter.)
A. Yes.
Q. And do you understand that that certification includes making a statement with regard to the factual allegations contained in the complaint?
A. Yes.
Q. And you approved factual allegations in the Setneska and the Freeman complaints, which asserted factual allegations, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That was a circular question. And you're aware that you certified that to the best of your knowledge, information, and belief, which was formed after a reasonable inquiry under the circumstances, you made, among other things, certification as to those factual allegations?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've also testified that as part
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objections.
objections.

```

MR. STERN: There's no speaking

MR. WILLIAMSON: Come on. We're just
wasting time.
MR. STERN: I'm not wasting time.
MR. WILLIAMSON: Yeah, you are,
because you're going in an area that has nothing to
do with the allegations in the complaint.
Answer the question, please.
(The question is read by the reporter.)
A. No.
Q. The answer is no, you were not aware
of that?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Gulko, are you able to state the
amount of time you spend reviewing a complaint on behalf of New Century?
A. It depends on the particular account.
Q. Can you give an approximation of sort
of the least amount of time and the most amount of time you generally spend?
A. The least amount of time would be less
than a minute. The most amount of time could be two,
three, four, five minutes.
Q. You testified earlier that when you
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start your day you're provided a computer printout,
which is a list of the files in which you need to review the complaints?
A. Yes.
Q. With respect to when you're reviewing

New Century accounts, generally your list only
includes New Century?
A. No.
Q. So your list will be mixed in terms of
who the clients are?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who generates that list?
A. The department in the firm that is responsible for generating the complaint list.
Q. Is there a name for that department?
A. We call it the SAC department for
summons and complaint.
Q. In connection with your reviewing and approving complaints for New Century, do you review the agreement between New Century and the entity from whom it acquired the accounts?
A. No, especially since I may not have that. There may not be anything to review as to that particular question.
Q. Would it be relevant in your review of

\footnotetext{
5
}
complaints on behalf of New Century as to whether there was a choice of law provision in the credit card agreement?
A. That could be relevant.
Q. Would it be relevant as to whether or not there was an arbitration agreement in the credit card agreement?
A. That could be relevant also.
Q. In connection with your review and
approval of complaints on behalf of New Century, do you make a determination as to whether a default has occurred?

MR. WILLIAMSON: Excuse me. Could you read that again?
(The question is read by the reporter.)
A. Well, part of the placement information is that the client is alleging that there's a default. I can determine from the placement information when the last payment was. So merely by the passage of time, it can confirm to me the client's position, the client's allegation that there is a default.
Q. I understand that you're relying upon
the information that the client is giving you. I'm asking you whether you make any independent
evaluation as to whether the account is in default.
MR. WILLIAMSON: I'm going to object
to the word "evaluation." Do you mean investigation?
That makes sense, the other way doesn't. Because he's answered that already.

MR. STERN: I'll withdraw the
question.
Q. Do you make an inquiry into any information beyond what the client has given you as to whether a default has occurred?
A. I'm unclear about your question. Let me repeat my prior answer. The client places a claim with us because of claims that the account is in default. It gives me a date of last payment. So I'm able to -- if they were to send me a claim today and it said that a hundred dollars was last paid yesterday, I'm going to kick that back saying what's going on here. But if they send me a claim and they claim it's in default and in the placement information it says that a hundred dollars was last paid June 20th, 2010, then there's nothing in there for me to disbelieve that this account is not in default as my client advises me.
Q. So you rely upon your client advising you that the claim is in default?
A. And my viewing the information that the client provides me.
Q. And the connection with New Century, that's information that New Century obtains from other parties, correct?
A. In part or in whole. And if you want to know what that means, when New Century buys a claim, they own it. They can work it. It could be, for all I know, that the last payment was a payment that was made to New Century at a time that it already owned it. So the information that it provides me could be a combination of its own information and the information as it bought the account.
Q. Okay, I understand. The information you would have that comes from New Century is information they would have of any activity once New Century owned the account?
A. Yes. And the information --
Q. And the information that they obtained from whoever they purchased from.
A. Yes.
Q. With respect to the Freeman complaint, were you able to determine the date default occurred?
A. I don't recall. It did have -- yes,
it did have a date. Without being able to pull up the computer, I couldn't give it to you.
Q. And the same answer applies with respect to the Setneska matter?
A. Sure.
Q. In connection with your review and approval of claims on behalf of New Century, do you review a credit report of the defendant?
A. Yes, I can. I often do. In the case of the Freeman file, before a complaint could be prepared for review, the claim came in without a Social Security number. It's required that we not file consumer claims without a Social Security number. A review of the file prior to suit indicated that an accurate credit report was obtained for the purposes of determining the Social Security number and that's how the Social Security number was obtained.

In the Setneska file, the Social
Security number was provided at the time of placement.
Q. Was the --
A. That \(I\) remember from just lunchtime when I was asked to review the file.
Q. So is that a situation where,
referring to the Freeman matter, you had reviewed it, there was no Social Security number and you rejected it, and that came back --
A. No.
Q. Or that was already taken care of before it came to you?
A. That's correct. I reviewed to see that there was a social, and by looking at the collections software screen, I was able to pick up how it was obtained.
Q. Got it. Are you involved in the creation of the template that was used for creating the complaints?
Q. Are you aware that the template that
your office is using has recently changed?
MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection,
foundation.
Q. Are you aware that the court rules changed effective September 1st of 2012 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and that those rules required a
change in the template with respect to the complaints?
A. Yes.
Q.
Q. Were you involved in drafting any part of the change in the template?
A. My only involvement, not directly, my only involvement was there was a Law Division complaint that was presented to me for approval, and while the body of the complaint complied with the new rule, for whatever reason on that one case the plaintiff's name did not include the prior original creditor's name. I killed that complaint and notified I believe it was Mr. Felt. And a change to the template was put in and it was fixed on that case and it was fixed thereafter. I've never killed a complaint since for that reason.
Q. \(\quad\) So is it fair to say you found a
glitch and it was corrected?
A. Exactly, and that was the Law Division only. The template for the Special Civil Part was fully compliant.
Q. Did the scope of your review of complaints change as a result of the recent change in the court rules?
A. Only to the extent, as I just
testified, that I began to look to make sure that the form of the complaint was compliant under the requirements of the new rule. Once all the glitches
were worked out, then it's fairly easy to give it a quick look and know that you're okay in regard to those changes.
Q. Okay.
A. Looking at new matters, I am reviewing
in totality, as I do on every case, as I did on every case. I'm looking for all the information for, as you said earlier, meaningful attorney review.
Q. Is there anyone else at Pressler \&

Pressler who performs the same function as you do with respect to reviewing and approving complaints?
A. For New York, yes. Mitchell Zipkin approves New York complaints.
Q. So it would be fair to say that all or virtually all of the complaints filed in New Jersey or Pennsylvania are reviewed and approved by you?
A. Yes, while I'm here. When I am on vacation, Mr. Felt switches the work, because you can't let it sit a week or more. He switches the work over to another attorney who is also trained to do complaint review, and those complaints go out under that attorney's name. Then when I come back, it's switched over again.
Q. To your knowledge, are there records contained of the number of complaints that you review
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on a daily basis?
A. Well, I'm given the feed list and I go through it in a day, so of course I know how many I go through in a day.
Q. Are the feed lists generally the same length in terms of number of complaints?
A. No, they very from day to day.
Q. What do they very from?
A. Well, the variance can go from as
little as a hundred or less to as much as hundreds a day. If you're asking what my average is, how much do I see mostly? I would say between three and four hundred a day.
Q. Does it ever get as high as a thousand in a day?
A. Yes.
Q. Two thousand?
A. I don't recall that high, no.
Q. And you generally get through your
list every day? If you're working the full day,
you're getting through your list?
A. Yes. The new list is given to me in
the afternoon. So I'll work a little in the afternoon and \(I\) finish it up the next day. So if the list is given to me first thing in the morning, then

I can get it all done in a day. So I don't want to mislead you. Sometimes on a clock, I'm doing it into the next day, but that's not a problem for me. I don't in any way feel stressed or behind the eight ball by that.
Q. I understand. Talking only about JEFIS-filed complaints, do you know how much time expires after you approve a complaint until when it gets filed?
A. No, but it's easy enough to find out. If I know the date that \(I\) approve a complaint, then \(I\) can go to another screen called the BDF screen and it gives me the date that it was JEFISed. So even though I don't have personal knowledge as we speak, it's not something that's hidden from me. I can find that out.
Q. And to your knowledge, once you approve it there's a department that handles then the JEFIS filing?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that it's more than several days from the time that you approve it until the time that it's filed?
A. No, they're pretty quick about it. (A brief recess is taken.)
Q. Mr. Gulko, I apologize, I know there have been comments about me going over stuff that's been gone over, but I want to wrap up on a couple of things.

If systems are working correctly, the information contained in the complaint should be identical to the information that's in your placement information.
A. Unless it's been reviewed and vetted for corrections and also for changes, additional information that has come in after the date of placement to the date of presentation to me for approval.
Q. I understand your answer, and I may not have been clear with my question.
A. Okay.
Q. What I'm talking about is, the
complaint gets prepared and it contains information about the defendant and about the claim.
A. Yes.
Q. That information about the debtor and
about the claim should be identical to the information that you have as the placement information.
A. If we have not determined it to be

\section*{erroneous otherwise, yes.}
Q. You may have other information in I think it was the right side of your screen, your computer software?
A. Yes.
Q. That may cause you to question whether the complaint should be filed.
A. Yes.
Q. But if the systems are working
correctly, the complaint should have the information that matches the information that you have in the placement information.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Objection.
Q. I guess what I'm asking -- let me withdraw it, because looking at your face, I see that you're not quite comfortable with the question I had asked.

\section*{A. I don't want to go into a big long} narrative.
Q. We described earlier that you use a template and there's a merge of information. To your understanding, does the information that gets merged into the complaint have its source as the placement information that you have on the right side of the screen?
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A. Yes.
Q. So that if the right side of the
screen is different from left side of the screen, it means something went wrong.
A. Yes.
Q. And I gather from your answer a few minutes ago is probably something happened, some event happened between when the complaint was prepared and when you're reviewing it.
A. That could be one of multiple reasons.
Q. Okay. But if you're going to approve it, the information is going to match up and there's going to be nothing in the placement information that's going to cause you to question whether the complaint should be filed.
A. I'm sorry. You're losing me on that, you are really are.
Q. What I'm asking you about is, and I realize that there's more information that's required in your complaints now that the rules have recently changed, but if we go back to P-10, because that's the complaint that was filed with JEFIS, it identifies your file number. I assume on all your complaints, the initial information about the name of the firm and its address and phone number is going to
be the same.

\section*{A. Sure.}
Q. That should not be something where there's a mistake.
A. Right.
Q. It's going to have the file number, the plaintiff's name, your client, correct?
A. As of this date.
Q. Right, I understand.
A. Since September it now appears
different.
Q. I understand.
A. Prior to the rule, it did not
constitute a mistake.
Q. I'm not suggesting that.
A. Okay.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Just focus on that
complaint.
Q. Let's assume the rule didn't change in September or that we're back to before the rule changed. So it contains the plaintiff information, the defendant information in the caption.
A. Yes.
Q. The venue?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's in Special Civil Part.
A. Yes.
Q. P-10 obviously has the docket number but that's because it's after it was filed and when you approve it, it does not have a docket number.
A. Yes.
Q. And then in the introductory sentence it's got to have the address of the plaintiff?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in the paragraph one there's two sentences and it's going to include the name of the original creditor?
A. Yes.
Q. The account number that the original creditor signed?
A. Yes.
Q. And just for purposes of the record, I'm running through sequentially what's in the complaint. It will have the defendant's name?
A. Yes. But before then it includes the allegation that the account is in default.
Q. Correct, but that would be the same in all of the complaints. The complaints would all be the same.
A. Yes.
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