

**Jon Wilson**

---

**From:** Ryan Shaffer <ryan@mss-lawfirm.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 5, 2022 3:24 PM  
**To:** Brett Jensen  
**Cc:** Gerry Fagan; 'Christopher Sweeney'; Jordan W. FitzGerald; Jon Wilson; Sylvia Basnett; Barbara Bessey  
**Subject:** RE: Caekaert and Rowland Cases

Brett,

Yes, understood on the electronic correspondence, that was our fault. Sorry about that.

Thanks for your email.

As it pertains to Breaux, Shuster, and Smalley, these gentleman have been a part of the Jehovah's Witness organization in New York during the time period relevant to this case and have knowledge relevant to issues in this case. My understanding is that Plaintiffs get to choose the sequence of their discovery; let me know if you understand otherwise. While Plaintiffs have been attempting to arrange a Rule 30b6 deposition, that does not preclude us from deposing other people with knowledge relevant to issues in this case, including Breaux, Shuster and Smalley. The fact that Mr. Smalley is 82 only increases the urgency of getting his testimony preserved sooner than later. In the interest of moving things along, we intend to file a Motion to Compel these depositions.

It appears that WTNY is not agreeing to a staggered Rule 30b6 deposition. Thanks for clarifying WTNY's position on that.

I look forward to hearing from Gerry and Chris on Brumley and the Plaintiffs' depositions.

Best,

Ryan R. Shaffer



*Montana Office:*

430 Ryman St.  
Missoula, MT 59802  
Tel: 406-543-6929  
Fax: 406-721-1799

*Wyoming Office:*

3490 Clubhouse Drive, Suite 104  
Wilson, WY 83014  
Tel: 307-734-9544  
Fax: 307-733-3449

The information contained in this email is confidential and privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please ignore and delete this message and inform the sender of the mistake. This email may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient, please ignore and delete this message and inform the sender of the mistake.

**From:** Brett Jensen <BJensen@brownfirm.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 5, 2022 2:05 PM  
**To:** Ryan Shaffer <ryan@mss-lawfirm.com>; Rob Stepans <rob@mss-lawfirm.com>; James Murnion <james@mss-lawfirm.com>  
**Cc:** Gerry Fagan <Gerry.Fagan@moultonbellingham.com>; 'Christopher Sweeney' <Christopher.Sweeney@moultonbellingham.com>; Jordan W. FitzGerald <Jordan.FitzGerald@moultonbellingham.com>; Jon Wilson <jwilson@brownfirm.com>; Sylvia Basnett <SBasnett@brownfirm.com>; Barbara Bessey <BBessey@brownfirm.com>  
**Subject:** Caekaert and Rowland Cases

Hi Ryan:

We are writing in response to your October 4, 2022 letter addressed to all defense counsel that references your September 29, 2022 letter. To be clear, no one at the Brown Law Firm or Miller McNamara & Taylor received your September letter until yesterday when we received it in the U.S. Mail. It appears the only electronic recipients of the letter were at Moulton Bellingham.

First, as to the Brumley deposition and the deposition of your clients, Moulton Bellingham will coordinate the response on behalf of WTNY and WTPA.

Second, as to the proposed depositions of Messrs. Breaux, Shuster, and Smalley, we are concerned that the requests may be inappropriate, premature, or ultimately unnecessary. None of them have any direct knowledge of any of the claims, none of them have ever met your clients or co-defendant Mr. Mapley, and none of them were executive officers or members of the boards of directors of either corporation during the relevant time period. Moreover, because of their important roles in connection with the religion, they may be subject to protection under the apex doctrine. In addition, Mr. Smalley is over 82 years old. Can you provide the basis for the necessity of these depositions, especially since there has yet to be a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of the defendants? Thereafter, we will decide whether to seek the Court's assistance with protective orders.

Third and finally, we would like to respond to the Rule 30(b)(6) issues raised in your September letter. We have been unable to locate any authority for the staggering of the corporate deponent(s). It appears you want us to agree in advance to multiple depositions on topics yet to be determined. Absent some authority to the contrary, it would seem prudent to schedule the deposition when you deem appropriate, take it, and then if you feel there is a legitimate need to reopen the deposition, that you then seek leave of Court to obtain permission. At that point, your arguments and our response will be concrete rather than hypothetical.

I think I have covered everything here, but let me know if there is anything else currently pending that we need to discuss.

Sincerely,

Brett C. Jensen  
Brown Law Firm, P.C.  
315 North 24<sup>th</sup> Street  
P.O. Drawer 849  
Billings, MT 59103-0849

Telephone: (406) 248-2611

Fax: (406) 248-3128

**Confidentiality Notice:** *The information contained in this e-mail communication and any attached documentation may be privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure and is intended only for the use of the designated recipient(s). This information, along with any attachments, constitutes attorney-client and/or attorney work product and is confidential in nature. This information is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized person. The use, distribution, transmittal or re-transmittal by an unintended recipient of this communication is strictly prohibited without our express approval in writing or by e-mail. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please delete it from your system without copying it and notify the above sender so that our e-mail address may be corrected. Receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient is not a waiver of any attorney-client or work-product privilege.*