1	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT CHAMPAIGN COUNTY, ILLINOIS		
2	SUBURBAN EXPRESS, INC.		
3	j ,		
4	Plaintiff,)		
5	vs.) No. 13-SC-1653)		
6	ANNE E. MAURO,)		
7	Defendant.)		
8	BENCH TRIAL		
9	REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS of the electronic		
10	recording of the hearing before ASSOCIATE JUDGE CHASE		
11	M. LEONHARD on April 14th, 2014.		
12			
13	APPEARANCES:		
14			
15	MR. MICHAEL POWELL Attorney at Law		
16	for the Plaintiff		
17	MR. THOMAS BETZ		
18	Attorney at Law for the Defendant		
19			
20	Electronically Recorded Proceedings transcribed by:		
21	LAURA B. WORKMAN, CSR, RMR, CRR		
22	Official Court Reporter Champaign County Courthouse		
23	Urbana, Illinois 61801		
2.4			

1	INDEX		
2	WITNESS	PAGE	
3	MS. MAURO		
4	Direct examination by Mr. Powell	9	
5	Cross examination by Mr. Betz	29	
6	Redirect examination by Mr. Powell	34	
7	DENNIS TOEPPEN		
8	Direct examination by Mr. Powell	38	
9	Voir dire examination by Mr. Betz	55	
10	Further direct examination by Mr. Powell	56	
11	Voir dire examination by Mr. Betz	58	
12	Further direct examination by Mr. Powell	64	
13	Voir dire examination by Mr. Betz	69	
14	Further direct examination by Mr. Powell	73	
15	Cross examination by Mr. Betz	80	
16	Redirect examination by Mr. Powell	81	
17	DENNIS TOEPPEN, RECALLED		
18	Direct examination by Mr. Powell	85	
19	ROBIN_MAURO		
20	Direct examination by Mr. Betz	94	
21	Cross examination by Mr. Powell	104	
22	Redirect examination by Mr. Betz	107	
23			
24			

1		EXHIBITS	
2			
3	EXHIBIT NO.	MOVED	ADMITTED
4	Plaintiff's 2	51	51
5	Plaintiff's 3	52	52
6	Plaintiff's 4	52	52
7	Plaintiff's 5	53	54
8	Plaintiff's 7	55, 57	57
9	Plaintiff's 8	59	(In part) 58
10	Plaintiff's 1A - I	73	74
11	Plaintiff's 9	74	75
12	Plaintiff's 12	77	77
13	Plaintiff's 13	78	78
14	Plaintiff's 13B	79	80
15	Plaintiff's 14	83	8 4
16	Plaintiff's 15	83	84
17	Plaintiff's 17	83	84
18	Plaintiff's 19A - C	91	93
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1	(April 14, 2014.)
2	THE COURT: 13-SC-1650 is Suburban
3	Express against Minnis, Cater Minis.
4	MR. BETZ: He's present, Your Honor, and
5	we're prepared for trial today.
6	THE COURT: All right. And the plaintiff
7	appears by Mr. Powell, is it?
8	MR. POWELL: Yes, Judge.
9	THE COURT: All right. Is it in fact set
10	for trial?
11	MR. POWELL: Yes.
12	THE COURT: All right. We'll call it for
13	trial shortly.
14	13-SC-1653 is Suburban Express against Mauro.
15	We'll show the same appearances.
16	Still at issue, gentlemen?
17	MR. BETZ: Still at issue, ready for
18	trial today.
19	THE COURT: All right. We'll call the
20	case for trial in just a few minutes.
21	(Proceedings had as to other cases.)
22	THE COURT: Let's first call 13-SC-1653,
23	which is Suburban Express against Mauro.
24	Ms. Mauro appears personal together with her

attorney, Mr. Betz. Mr. Powell appears on behalf of the plaintiff.

We'll show the cause called for trial on the merits of the amended complaint filed March 26th.

Mr. Powell, you can proceed at your convenience.

MR. POWELL: Does Your Honor like opening statements or do you want to get right to witnesses?

THE COURT: It's entirely up to you, sir.

MR. POWELL: Okay. Judge, I would just like to make an opening statement real quick.

THE COURT: All right. You certainly may.

MR. POWELL: Thank you, Judge.
May it please the court, counsel.

THE COURT: Sir.

MR. POWELL: Your Honor, this is a -this is a case where Ms. Mauro electronically purchased
a bus ticket to -- for a fare to ride on a Suburban
Express bus on a given date and time. She went online.
There was a contract presented to her, several screen
shots, nine, ten, eleven, so forth, warning each step
of the way of the term -- of the contract conditions,
you know, if you don't agree, don't go forward and so
forth. She purchases it. One of those contract terms

is is that you have to have a printed ticket to board the bus. No exceptions.

Ms. Mauro shows up to the bus, which she just got the ticket less than hour before its departure time, trying to convince the bus driver to let her on the bus with her iPhone screen shot. She was denied. Later purchased — that same day purchased another ticket that was leaving an hour and 45 minutes later. She gets on that bus.

Subsequently, she contacts her credit card company to reverse the charges. She reversed the charges on the second ticket which she purchased and did, in fact, ride.

Subsequently, after Suburban Express showed proof of the contract terms, they then funded Suburban Express back the cost of the ticket but, in doing so, Suburban Express was charged a \$16 fee for the chargeback transaction. The way I relate that is if, you know, in our terms, if somebody gives us a check and we deposit it in our account and it's a bad check, we, having the privity of contract with our bank, get charged the transaction fee for reversal of that check. That's what's happened here to Suburban Express.

On top of that, Suburban Express then, as the

evidence will show, sent Ms. Mauro a collections letter explaining to her that she owes a \$16 chargeback fee plus \$10 for the internal process of the attempts to collect that, so the collection letter that went out, and warning Ms. Mauro that if the terms are -- or if the payments aren't made, then, you know, she's also, pursuant to the contract, would be responsible for attorney's fees, costs, et cetera. So we have filed this complaint, Your Honor, to recoup the \$16 chargeback fee, plus the \$10 collections fee, but this case is much bigger than \$26, Your Honor and you'll, you'll hear testimony of why it is important for Suburban Express to move forward with this case. This isn't just one single \$26 case, it's a much bigger picture.

At the evidence end of the evidence, Your Honor, of this trial, we're quite confident that you will find in favor of Plaintiff Suburban Express and against Defendant Mauro for her breach of contract and the damages that resulted therefrom.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Betz, did you care to make any opening statement on behalf of Ms. Mauro whether at this or

other any other juncture?

MR. BETZ:

MR. BETZ: We would reserve, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We'll note that reservation and, before we proceed, let me inquire of counsel in 14-LM-137, Price against Mannen, are you ready to proceed or are we waiting the arrival of Ms. Lyons now?

(Proceedings had as to another case.)

THE COURT: All right. Let's revisit

13-SC-1653, Suburban Express versus Mauro.

Mr. Powell, you may proceed.

MR. POWELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

We would call Defendant Mauro as an adverse witness.

THE COURT: All right. Ma'am, this is a civil case in which one party can call the other as a witness. I think you can remain seated wherever you're most comfortable. If you care to take the witness stand, you may. If you'd care to remain seated at table -- the table, you may. The audio system will pick you up either way.

And while you're doing that, Ms. VanDeventer, have you resolved the other cases?

(Proceedings had as to other cases.)

1	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Powell.
2	MR. POWELL: Thank you, Judge.
3	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
4	MS. MAURO
5	called as a witness, was examined and testified as
6	follows:
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION:
8	BY MR. POWELL
9	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Mauro.
10	A. Good afternoon.
11	Q. Am I pronouncing your name correctly?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Okay. If you can't hear me, just let me
14	know and I'll repeat the question for you, okay?
15	On February 22nd, 2013, isn't it true that you
16	went online to purchase a Suburban Express ticket?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And where were your plans? Where were you
19	going to leave from, where were you going to go?
20	A. I'm sorry. I couldn't hear with you the
21	door.
22	Q. Where were you leaving from and where were
23	you where was it taking you to?
24	A. The ticket that I purchased was leaving from

1	Champaign to Woodfield Mall.
2	Q. All right. And you went online to your
3	Smartphone to purchase this ticket?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And do you remember that there was a
6	process, by process I mean several screens that you had
7	to go through before you could actually pay for that
8	ticket and receive a copy of that ticket; is that
9	correct?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. All right. Let me show you
12	MR. POWELL: Your Honor, may I approach?
13	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
14	BY MR. POWELL: Show you what's been
15	marked as Exhibit 1A through I.
16	MR. POWELL: Here you go, Judge.
17	You printed this?
18	MR. BETZ: Yes.
19	BY MR. POWELL: So when did you determine
20	that or or when did you go online to try to purchase
21	this, Ms. Mauro?
22	A. Like what time that day?
23	Q. Yeah.
24	A. It must have been somewhere between 1 and

1	1:30.	
2	Q. Okay. And you chose a bus that left at 2	
3	p.m.; correct?	
4	A. Correct.	
5	Q. And when you said between 1 and 1:30, that	
6	is p.m.; right?	
7	A. Correct.	
8	Q. So it left you less than an hour	
9	A. Yes.	
10	Q to purchase a ticket, follow the, the	
11	contract terms and board the bus; correct?	
12	A. Yes.	
13	Q. And the packet that I had put in front of	
14	you, for example, Exhibit 1A, does that look familiar	
15	as to the first page that you went on the site to begin	
16	purchasing this ticket?	
17	A. I don't	
18	MR. BETZ: Your Honor, objection. This	
19	is dated 2014, not 2013.	
20	MR. POWELL: May I respond, Judge?	
21	THE COURT: Well, there's a foundation	
22	objection I take this as, and the objection will be	
23	sustained. You can establish an adequate foundation	
24	for the document, the Exhibit 1, if you will, sir.	

MR. POWELL: Sure, Judge.

Actually, my client and I on Friday, April 18, went online, because to show each and every step that must take place to purchase a ticket, you have to go online and go through those steps. So you can see Exhibit 1A is the first page. We picked from Champaign-Urbana to Chicago area and we picked the date that we did this on.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel --

MR. BETZ: Objection.

THE COURT: -- I realize it's a small claim case, but there's been no request that we invoke Rule 286(b) and you're making a proffer, which essentially is testifying. Now you've got one of two choices. You can appear as an advocate or you can appear as a witness. Rule 3.7 of the Rules of Professional Conduct don't permit you to do both, so your proffer's stricken. The objection to the foundation remains sustained. You may otherwise continue.

MR. POWELL: Judge, could I ask then that the rules be relaxed? I'm going to be offering my witness as far as foundation for the documents.

THE COURT: Okay. You're almost asking

the court to make Anglo-American legal history by applying Rule 286(b) in a small claims case in which both parties are represented by counsel.

Mr. Betz, what's your position with regard to the court applying Rule 286(b)?

MR. BETZ: I object, Your Honor, quite frankly. I'd assumed we were having two attorneys following the rules of evidence and rules of procedure on this matter. I would have brought in -- since this has happened so quickly from the date of filing to the date of trial, I assumed normal rules and so I do object.

THE COURT: All right. Well, the court's mindful that it is a matter of discretion, however, Rule 286(b) was enacted by the supreme court to be an aid to pro se litigants in small claims cases so that pro se litigants don't have to be subjected to the rigors of procedure and evidence that lawyers are called upon to and expected to follow. And, again, the court thinks it would be contrary to the purpose of Rule 286(b) to apply it in a case over objection whereas here both parties are represented by able counsel, so the objection's sustained, the foundation objection remains sustained and the case will proceed.

Sir, you may continue your examination of Ms. Mauro.

BY MR. POWELL: So, Ms. Mauro, you do recall that there was several screens that you had to go through which finally led you to inputting your credit card information and purchasing a ticket; correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And you remember that confirmation page was then sent to you saying that here's the information, here's the terms and conditions of the contract which you agree to?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. POWELL: May I approach, Judge?
THE COURT: Yes, sir.

BY MR. POWELL: I'm going to hand you what's been marked as Exhibit 4 and can you take a look at that document and tell me if that looks like a copy — or if that is a copy of the confirmation that you received after you purchased the ticket online with your Smartphone?

- A. No.
- Q. What's not (inaudible) about it?

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

2

Α,	This was not the first	ticket that I
purchased.	This was the second.	I, I printed this
one.		

- Q. Okay. Did you purchase that ticket?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And you purchased this ticket to ride the 3:45 bus?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Again, from Champaign to where?
- A. To Woodridge Jewel, which is a different location.
- Q. Okay. And when you, you purchased this ticket, you looked down at the bottom, three lines up from the bottom it says reservation number 945688; is that correct?
 - A. I assume so.
- Q. Okay. We'll go ahead and turn to page two. That says that you were -- on February 22nd, 2013, you were departing UIUC in Champaign and you were going to be taken to Armory -- or the UIU -- UIUC Armory in Champaign and they are taking you to Woodridge Jewel; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And is that, in fact, the trip that you took

1	on February 22nd
2	A. Yes.
3	Q 2013?
4	Boarding at 3:45 p.m.?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And you arrived at 6:15 p.m.?
7	A. Somewhere around there.
8	Q. And did you if you continue down there,
9	that again reminds you, does it not, of the terms of
10	the contract that you agreed to in order to purchase
11	this ticket?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And, in fact, in order to purchase the
14	ticket, you had to read through the terms and
15	conditions and check the box that says you agreed with
16	those terms, the contract terms; correct?
17	A. Yes.
18	MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?
19	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
20	BY MR. POWELL: I'm now showing you
21	what's marked as Exhibit 5. Ms. Mauro, is this a copy
22	of the ticket that you actually printed off?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And handed to the driver or someone

1	accepting the tickets to get on the bus?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And again that's ticket number 945688.1;
4	correct?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And it says that you paid \$27.95 on that day
7	at 2:19 p.m.?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. So am I correct then that the first ticket
10	that you had purchased, you did not have a printed
11	ticket to get on board; correct?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. And when you were denied, then you went in
14	and you purchased a ticket so that you could print one
15	off and get on the next bus; correct?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. On the terms and conditions for this ticket
18	
19	MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?
20	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
21	BY MR. POWELL: This has previously been
22	marked as Exhibit 3, and please feel free, but go ahead
23	and look the terms and conditions, the contract
24	terms on Exhibit 3, and go ahead and compare that to

a

Exhibit 4 and those are one and the same; correct? In other words, each paragraph is the same on those two documents?

- A. Yeah. Yes, sir.
- Q. Look at the fourth paragraph on Exhibit 3 or you can use the confirmation ticket. It says you must, in all caps, print out your ticket and present it to the bus driver to board. You will not be permitted to board without a printed ticket. Is that correct?
 - A. Yep.
- Q. And on this occasion, you actually again presented this ticket to the bus driver and they, as you -- as they agreed when you purchased this ticket, they took you from that location in Champaign and dropped you off to the location up north; correct?
 - A. In Woodridge, yes.
- Q. Did you at any time contact your credit card company telling them that you were charged for -- or wrongfully charged for a ticket you were not able to use?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. How did -- how -- are you aware that the price of the ticket for the 2:00 bus was reversed and charged back to your account out of Suburban

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Express's account?

- A. No.
- Q. Were you aware that the 3:45 ticket was reversed out of the Suburban Express account and back into your account?
 - A. I'm a little confused.
- Q. Okay. Let me ask it this way. Did you have any communication with your credit card company regarding the ticket that you purchased or a ticket that you purchased on February 22nd, 2013 to take that trip on Suburban Express from Champaign up north?
 - A. No.

interruption.

Q. Are you aware --

MR. BETZ: Asked and answered.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know whether it's been asked or answered yet. It hasn't been asked the second time, so let him ask the question.

But before you get to that, let me inquire of counsel in the LM case, counsel, have you resolved your scheduling issue?

(Proceedings had as to another case.)

THE COURT: All right. Apologies for the

There was an asked and answered objection that

1 wasn't justiciable just yet. 2 Continue asking the question, Mr. Powell. 3 MR. POWELL: And, Judge, I apologize. Ι forget what I was even going to ask. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Well, the objection's withdrawn. 6 MR. BETZ: I'll withdraw it --7 THE COURT: You may proceed. 8 9 MR. BETZ: -- because I forget the basis. BY MR. POWELL: Let me -- let me start 10 11 There's no transcript here, Ms. Mauro, so let me think -- let me draw you back to my train of thought. 12 13 I think you told me that you were not aware -- or no. 14 I'm sorry. You told us that you did not call your credit card company to reverse any charges for the 15 purchase of a ticket on Suburban Express on February 16 22nd, 2013; is that correct? 17 I did not. 18 Right. And were you aware that the credit card 19 charge had been reversed? 20 21 Α. Yes. When did you become aware of that? 22 Α. It, it must have been March. We waited 30 23 24 days.

1	Q. Okay. So you, you do admit that Exhibit 5
2	is a copy of the ticket that you used to get on the
3	bus; correct?
4	A. Yes.
5	MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?
6	THE COURT: Yes.
7	BY MR. POWELL: Let me show you Exhibit
8	7. Have you ever seen this document before?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And that's a chargeback debit advice from
11	your credit card company to Suburban Express; correct?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Okay. And could you tell me the original
14	reference? Can you read that number? Do you see it
15	there? It's on the left-hand column, typed, go to the
16	bottom, original reference?
17	A. 945688.
18	Q. Okay. And how did you get a copy of this
19	document?
20	A. When I received my summons in December or
21	January.
22	Q. Okay. And if you look at Exhibit 5 again,
23	the ticket that you just agreed and testified under
24	oath that you purchased, printed and boarded and took

1	the ride, what is that ticket number?
2	A. 945688.
3	Q. Same as what's on the chargeback?
4	A. Correct.
5	MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?
6	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
7	BY MR. POWELL: I'm going to hand you
8	what we've marked as Exhibit 6. Are you familiar with
9	this document, Ms. Mauro?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. What is it?
12	A. This is the refund request form that I
13	filled out five days after I purchased both of those
14	tickets in a request to get a refund for the first
15	ticket that I didn't get to ride. That received no
16	response until June or July.
17	Q. Okay. And here you were admitting that you,
18	in fact, purchased a ticket and did not print off the
19	first trip; correct?
20	A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?
21	Q. Sure. You said you had to buy tickets from
22	your phone. There was no opportunity for you to print
23	the ticket before you had to be at the bus stop?
24	A. Correct.

1	Q. This is your typing?
2	A, Yes.
3	Q. And you dated it February 27, 2013, which is
4	five days after you bought it; correct?
5	A. Yep.
6	Q. And you instruct that the bus driver would
7	not let you on the bus; correct?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. And have you read the terms and conditions
10	of the ticket that you purchased?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And, and right there it says you must
13	present a printed ticket?
14	A. Am I allowed to ask a question?
15	Q. No.
16	A. Okay. Sorry.
17	Q. So you're not surprised by the fact that you
18	couldn't get on without a ticket, printed ticket;
19	correct?
20	A. I was surprised.
21	Q. Even though the contract conditions that you
22	agreed to before being able to purchase the ticket said
23	you had to have a printed ticket?
24	A. Yes.

Q. Correct?

And does that language mean to you that I have to present a printed ticket to get on the bus?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. But yet you were surprised that you couldn't get on without one, is that what you're telling us to believe?

A. Yes.

Q. And you also said that you recalled getting a confirmation from the 2:00 ticket that you had purchased less than an hour before that; correct?

A. Yes.

MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. POWELL: Show you what's been marked as Exhibit 18A through C, if you will look at Exhibit 18B for me, please. Eighteen A I will use later on. And 18B, is this a confirmation or does this look like an accurate copy of the confirmation that you had received from the ticket that you purchased online with a credit card payment for the 2:00 fare?

A. Yes.

Q. And as you can see here, and this was sent to you at 1:27:07 p.m on February 22nd, 2013; correct?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

70	V
м.	res.

- Q. And, again, if you turn to the second page, again it has a date, the trip, departure location, arrival location and the times for those; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And, again, it gives you another reminder of your terms -- or I should say the contract terms that you agreed to to purchase this; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And on the fourth paragraph, again, just like the second ticket you purchased, it says you must print out your ticket and present it to the bus driver to board, you will not be permitted to board without a printed ticket; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And, again, you understood that to mean for me to get on the bus, I have to present a printed ticket; correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Were you at -- in school at this time?
 - A. Yep.
 - Q. What, what year?
 - A. Freshman.
 - Q. Okay. If you'd look at the last paragraph,

part of the contract terms for checking the box, 1 printing off the ticket and paying it and for Suburban 2 Express to provide you with a seat on that bus, you 3 also had agreed to pay any all collection costs, including attorney's fees, should collection or other legal action become necessary for that; correct? 6 7 Α. Correct. 8 Have you since learned how your credit card was contacted to reverse the payment for the 2:00 9 ticket? 10 Yes. 11 12 Q. How? 13 My mother. Okay. Again, looking at the ticket, you 14 personally contracted, right, you and your -- your name 15 is Anne Mauro; correct? 16 Yes. 17 Α. On Exhibit 5, the ticket is in your name, 18 19 Anne Mauro; correct? 20 Yes. The e-mail confirmation from Exhibit 18B was 21 to Anne Mauro; correct? 22 Α. Yes. 23 You checked the box on the contract terms as 24 0.

1	Description of the second of t
1	Anne Mauro; correct?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And you used a credit card?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. What credit card did you use?
6	A. It's my mother card's that I'm an authorized
7	user on.
8	Q. Okay. So you personally have signature
9	authorization on that credit card?
10	A. Yes.
11	MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?
12	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
13	BY MR. POWELL: Let me show you what's
14	been marked as Exhibit 9. Do you recognize this as
15	correspondence from Suburban Express dated October 5
16	A. Yes.
17	Q 2013?
18	And in this letter, they're Suburban Express
19	is informing you, are they not, of the \$16 fee incurred
20	by them due to your actions as well as a \$10 collection
21	expense to date totaling \$26?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And they told you that, if they did not
24	receive this and they had to file suit to collect this

1	debt, you'd be responsible for filing fees, cost of
2	serving you with a lawsuit, attorney's fees, et cetera;
3	correct?
;	
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And those fees can add up to 200 or more;
6	correct?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. So you had an appreciation, did you not,
9	after receipt of this letter that, if legal proceedings
10	had to be filed and that you were found in breach of
11	contract, you'd be responsible for those costs?
12	A. Yes.
13	MR. POWELL: That's all I have at this
14	time, Judge.
15	Thank you.
16	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Betz, did you
17	wish to make any inquiry of Ms. Mauro at this point or,
18	or reserve?
19	MR. BETZ: Yes, Your Honor, I think I
20	will.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Betz, do you wish to
22	reserve or do you wish to inquire?
23	MR. BETZ: No. I wish to ask her.
24	THE COURT: All right. You may.

CROSS EXAMINATION:

BY MR. BETZ

- Q. Have you ridden Suburban Express a number of times before this incident?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Did you subsequently use Suburban Express after this incident?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. On the day in which the two tickets were purchased, when you went and you testified that you went to try to catch the bus on the first ticket, what happened?
 - A. Well, we --
 - Q. Who's we?
- A. Sorry. My brother and I share a car on campus and the car wasn't starting. That's what we were both going to use to take home. And since it wasn't starting, we had to make other arrangements. He was able to get a ride with a friend and then I was going to purchase a bus ticket on my phone. And I said to my brother, well, I don't have any time to print this out. I don't think I can take it at this time. And he says no. I've done it before. I've ridden the bus without printing my ticket before.

1 MR. POWELL: Objection, Your Honor. 2 Hearsay. 3 THE COURT: It appears to be -- well, the inquiry would be this, counsel. Is the statement of the brother being offered to establish that that's, in 5 fact, the policy of Suburban Express or is it being 6 offered for a so-called nonhearsay purpose to establish Ms. Mauro's reasons for proceeding with the purchase of R 9 the ticket? MR. BETZ: It's to establish her 10 11 rationale for proceeding with the ticket. THE COURT: That would be a nonhearsay 12 13 purpose and, accordingly, the hearsay objection's overruled. The answer, to the extent it's been made, 14 will stand. 15 Did you wish to augment the answer at all? 16 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what that 17 18 means. THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think -- I 19 20 think the lady answered the question so that the answer 21 will stand and you may further inquire. 22 Thank you. THE WITNESS: 23 Okay.

24

BY MR. BETZ: Did you go to the bus stop

1	location and try to board the bus?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And what did you show, if anything, to the
4	bus driver?
5	A. I walked up to him with tears already
6	rolling down my face with my phone in my hand with the
7	e-mail confirmation, the ticket on there, and I told
8	him that I could provide a photo ID. I had my I-card.
9	I was willing to provide any information to prove that
10	this was the ticket that I had purchased.
11	Q. Okay. And were you denied the ability to
12	take the bus?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Okay. So subsequently you purchased another
15	ticket?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Because you needed to get back to Greater
18	Chicago?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. Okay. There came a time in which you,
21	according to Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, filed a written
22	complaint; is that true?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. What, what date was did you file that?

1	A. February 27th, 2013.
2	Q. And at the very bottom of this complaint,
3	what does it state?
4	A. Typical turnaround time is 30 days from when
5	you receive request.
6	Q. Did you receive any information or response
7	within 30 days?
8	A. No.
9	Q. When did you to the best of your
10	recollection, when did you receive a response?
11	A. June or July.
12	Q. Okay. It says on that contract on that
13	terms and conditions that it's irrevocable, the, the
14	agreement. Did you understand that?
15	A. Yes, but I was confused because there's a
16	refund request form online.
17	Q. Okay. Why, why is that confusing?
18	A. Because if a ticket is irrevocable, then why
19	is there an opportunity to revoke the ticket?
20	Q. Okay. You personally did not dispute the
21	credit card charge?
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. Have you ever had occasion to dispute a
24	credit card charge?

1	A. Not me personally.
2	Q. Okay. The person who did so was
3	A. My mother.
4	Q your mother?
5	During the time of, of these transactions, let's
6	say from June until August, were you living on campus
7	or were you living at home?
8	A. I moved back to campus mid August.
9	Q. Mid August. Did you at your campus address
10	ever, ever receive any mail from Suburban Express?
11	A. No.
12	Q. Did you personally are you personally
13	aware of mail that you had received in your home
14	address?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And that would be the information that the
17	plaintiff alluded to regarding the Exhibit 9; is that
18	correct?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And did you read that?
21	A. No.
22	Q. Who, who received it?
23	A. My mother.
24	Q. So did your mother share it with you?

1	A. She didn't share the exact letter, but she
2	told me that we did receive a letter.
3	Q. Okay. Is it fair to say your mother is kind
4	of in charge of your finances?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Okay. On Exhibit 4
7	MR. BETZ: It's Plaintiff's Exhibit 4,
8	Your Honor.
9	BY MR. BETZ: Second page, one, two,
10	second paragraph from the bottom, could you read that
11	into the record?
12	A. You agree to all direct to direct all
13	questions and concerns pertaining to credit card
14	charges or credits to Suburban Express/Illini Shuttle
15	in writing at P.O. Box 2400, Champaign, Illinois,
16	61825.
17	Q. Did you direct the issue to in writing?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Did you get a response?
20	A. No.
21	MR. BET2: Nothing further, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Any redirect, counsel?
23	MR. POWELL: Yes, Judge.
24	REDIRECT EXAMINATION.

1	
1	BY MR. POWELL
2	Q. Didn't you already tell us that you did get
3	a response for that inquiry from the credit card
4	company?
5	A. From the credit card company
6	Q. Yes.
7	A or Suburban Express?
8	Q. From the credit card company?
9	A. I'm sorry. I'm a little confused.
10	Q. So Suburban Express did respond to you,
11	correct, in July or August?
12	A. Not in the 30-day turnaround time.
13	Q. But did they respond to you?
14	A. In several months later.
15	Q. Okay. And you said you had mentioned
16	that when you went to the bus to try to board, you were
17	already in tears. Why were you already in tears?
18	Q. Because I thought I wasn't going to be able
19	to get home that weekend.
20	Q. So you were crying like as you were
21	purchasing the ticket?
22	A. No. When our car wasn't starting.
23	Q. Oh, okay. So before that.
24	All right. So your mother contacted you and

<u> </u>
told you that Suburban Express was seeking to collect
what they were saying they were owed pursuant to this
transaction; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understand at that point in time
that you, as an adult, contracted for the purchase of
that ticket using a credit card that you had authority,
signage authority for; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you tell your mother I'm on the hook for
this, mom, not you?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever have that discussion with her
at all?
A. No.
Q. What did your mother tell you about that?
A. She didn't she's the card holder
Q. Okay.
A so she was taking care of it
Q. Okay.
A and teaching me how to dispute a credit
card charge and teaching me that I have a right to do
that.
Q. Okay. And after you got the collection

1	letter, did she tell you that you should ignore that?
2	A. We didn't ignore it.
3	Q. No. When you get the letter on October 5,
4	2013, did you just ignore that or did you do anything
5	further?
6	A. I, I ignored it because I wasn't handling
7	it.
8	Q. Thank you.
9	MR. POWELL: Nothing further.
10	THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Betz?
11	MR. BETZ: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: All right. Further evidence,
13	Mr. Powell?
14	You may step down.
15	Thank you.
16	(Witness excused.)
17	MR. POWELL: Yes, Judge. At this time,
18	we'd call Dennis Toeppen to the stand.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	(Witness sworn.)
21	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
22	Mr. Powell, you may proceed.
23	MR. POWELL: Judge, if I may?
24	DENNIS TOEPPEN

called as a witness, after having been duly sworn, was 1 examined and testified as follows: 2 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION: BY MR. POWELL Dennis, could you please state your name for 5 ο. 6 the record? 7 Α. Dennis Toeppen. 8 Ο. And who are you employed by or with? 9 I am the owner of Suburban Express. 10 Q. And how long have you owned Suburban 11 Express? Since November of 1983. 12 Α. 13 And as the owner of Suburban Express, what are your job duties and responsibilities? 14 I have a wide variety of responsibilities. 15 I do programming. I do marketing. I do everything 16 from washing buses to filing tax returns, the whole 17 gamut. 18 So the company lives and dies by your sword; 19 is that correct? 20 Sure, yes. 21 Α. All right. I had told the court in opening 22 statement that this was not a case about \$26. 23 agree with that? 24

A. Yes.

Q. In today's social media, the social media that's available (inaudible) today, can you explain to the court why this is more than just a \$26 collection case against Ms. Mauro?

A. Yes. Social media has the power to communicate everything from important information to trivial trash quickly and efficiently through a large number of people. And when, when somebody discovers a way to defraud my company, that information tends to get disseminated. When it becomes known that we --

MR. BETZ: Objection. There is no allegation of fraud in these pleadings.

THE COURT: There seems to be no evidence of that factual premise, counsel.

MR. POWELL: If you'll just give me a little leniency, Judge, we're just --

THE COURT: Pardon me?

MR. POWELL: If you'll just give us a little leniency, this isn't a fraud --

THE COURT: Well, the objection is to the adumbration by Mr. Toeppen that Ms. Mauro perpetrated a fraud in the case and there's no evidence of that.

That's the objection. What's your position on the

objection?

MR. POWELL: We'll rephrase.

THE COURT: The objection's sustained.

The answer's stricken.

You may continue.

BY MR. POWELL: Dennis, can you tell the court, I'm sure fraud isn't a component, but are there reasons why you have contractual terms that you require your passengers to abide by?

A. We handled 119,000 some passengers last year. We have high volume work flows and we are concerned with providing speedy, reliable service at a reasonable price. To provide speedy, reliable transportation at a reasonable price with a high work — or a high volume like that, we have to have consistent procedures and policies. And one of the very important components of our system is that, in order to board a bus, you must have a printed ticket. A printed ticket is something that has been used I would imagine for centuries in many different venues, theaters, sporting events, all kind of things. It's a wildly accepted means of, you know — for a person — a person who has purchased a performance or transportation to prove to the person that is admitting

people to that venue that they have -- that they have the, the right to do that.

Q. Okay.

- A. Now --
- Q. Well, let me -- so hold on. So you, you heard Ms. Mauro state that she understood on both tickets that she purchased on, on that same day that part of those contract terms was is that she had to have a printed ticket?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Why -- what's the importance to your business of why that printed ticket is necessary?
- A. Well, one, one reason it's important is so that the person can be admitted to the bus rapidly without having to evaluate different types of proof of admission. If everybody showed up at the bus with a different kind of -- kind of proof of admission, then the boarding process would slow way down.

It's very important to us that we have something that we can take possession of, a hard copy, so that we have an audit trail. And what happens when a bus departs is the driver collects the tickets, he numbers the tickets as he takes them, he puts the ticket into a ticket envelope and then the ticket envelope gets

returned to our office.

Now if we were just glancing at iPhones and confirmation e-mails and scribbles on matchbooks and things like that, we would have no audit trail because the driver would be the final arbiter of everything happening at the bus and, if the driver made a mistake, we wouldn't be able to detect that. And so we have an audit trail. And the printed ticket is a very important part of that audit trail.

But, you know, the more important thing here is that we want to be able to board passengers rapidly and we can do that with printed tickets. Other systems of boarding people are not satisfactory to us. We communicate our system to the passengers prior to them making payment to us. The passenger has the option of declining our offer to sell them transportation on our terms. If somebody doesn't like that you have to have a printed ticket, they have the option of hitting cancel and not making the purchase.

- Q. Okay.
- A. So I, I'm aware that other carriers do things differently. And I, I'm accustomed to people saying that they've been allowed to board the bus with an iPhone ticket before. And when I hear that, I just

1	assume that they're talking about another carrier
2	because we never do that.
3	Q. So let me ask this question then.
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q. How long has Suburban Express, your company,
6	been offering electronic tickets to be purchased on the
7	over the Internet?
8	A. Since spring of 2008.
9	Q. And since spring of 2008, have you always
10	required a paperless ticket?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Ever changed?
13	A. No.
14	Q. So when you hear Ms. Mauro testify that her
15	brother told her that it's no problem, you can just use
16	your iPhone
17	A. I would you assume that she's talking about
18	one of the two other carriers that go to Woodridge and
19	Woodfield and accept iPhone tickets.
20	Q. Okay. But under no circumstance would
21	Suburban Express
22	A. Absolutely
23	Q accept those tickets?
24	A not.

Q. I would like you to look at Exhibit 1A through I, and can you tell us why this document was created?

- A. This document is a printout of the different steps. It's the ordering process. We made this to demonstrate to the court the steps that you must take to order a ticket. And I, I designed these pages. I, I made (inaudible). I made the CSS. And this the design here has not changed except that in about 2008— no, sorry, not 2008— in about 2010 we added a link on 1A that offers people the ability to use the Java Script free version of the site. Other than that, this is unchanged since it was started in 2000— 2008 with the exception of the terms and conditions, which have changed a couple of times over the years.
 - Q. I was going to ask you, why is that?
- A. The, the -- well, we've, we've made some modifications to the terms and conditions in response to market feedback.

Let me point out that the terms and conditions exist in one text file on the server that sells the tickets. The text file is used by both the website and by the, the program that sends the confirmation e-mail. So whenever you see terms and conditions in a

confirmation e-mail, those are the terms and conditions that were displayed on the website at time that the ticket was purchased.

Q. Okay.

- A. And then that would also mean that the terms and conditions that are displayed on this particular exhibit are not necessarily the exact terms and conditions that were displayed once she made her purchase, but we have those in the form of the other exhibits.
- Q. That's correct. And we'll get to that here in a second, so let's just start on the first page. Since it's origination in 2008, you have testified and you've always required that there be tickets to board; right?
 - A. Right.
- Q. And Exhibit 1A, right there in blue it says you must print out your tickets at the end of the order process and you must have a working e-mail address.

 Please note that tickets cannot be refunded, exchanged or used at a different time. Did that -- was that on the website at the time Ms. Mauro purchased her ticket?
 - A. Absolutely.
 - Q. Looking at page two, once you select your

origin, once you select the area and the date, is page two then the options of the -- of those things to choose?

- A. Page two is the, the schedules that you can choose from, which is kind of a macro view of everything that's available on that day.
- Q. Okay. And then if you look at C, that's confirming where they're --
- A. C is where they're -- where they're -- the purchaser is picking their specific point of origin and their specific destination.
 - Q. Okay. And then look at Exhibit 1D.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. That is the first time that they're asking or the site is asking the, the customer to confirm their selection; is it not?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And, again, in red, warning, in all caps, you must print out your tickets after paying. Do not proceed if you are not able to print your tickets right now. This ticket is nonrefundable or exchangeable and it cannot be used at a different date or time. Is that what that says?
 - A. Yes.

1	Q. And was that also on your website since its
2	inception?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Never changed?
5	A. No.
6	Q. Now I want to show you Exhibit 1E. Again,
7	this is another snapshot again warning please do not
8	proceed if you are not able to print out your tickets
9	right now. You must have your printed ticket to board
10	the bus. Please note that this ticket is not
11	refundable or exchangeable. Sorry. No exceptions. Is
12	that what that says?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Has that ever changed since the inception of
15	the site in 2000?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Exhibit 1F, that's where the customer puts
18	in her personal information; is it not?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. They have to put their name, address, e-mail
21	and then a credit card payment; correct?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Once they put that in, what's the next thing
24	to pop up?

- A. Well, before they can proceed, they must check the I agree to all of the -- all of the above terms and conditions, the check box next to that statement. If they do not click that or if they try to proceed with payment without checking that box, you get what you see in Exhibit 1A or Exhibit H, which is you must agree to the terms and conditions to purchase tickets, so it declines the transaction if they don't agree with the terms of the contract.
- Q. Okay. So that's requiring them then to read the terms of the contract, actually check the box that says they agree?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Then they can proceed. If they don't do that, they get a warning and they have to go back and check it before they can proceed?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And that is what is shown on Exhibit 1H; correct?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. Then what's Exhibit H say once they provide that? Is this the next step of the process?
- A. Well, H is -- H was the, the example of the deal being rejected because they did not check the I

agree to all of the above terms and conditions -
Q. Okay.

A. -- check box.

Q. And then, if they do agree to the terms and conditions and check it, then what's the next step of the process?

A. Then the system displays their ticket and they print it out. However, before the display of the

1.7

A. Then the system displays their ticket and they print it out. However, before the display of the ticket completes, it displays an alert that says this is your ticket. You must have it to board the bus. Please print it out now. Please do not hit the back button or leave this page without printing.

- Q. So if I add that up correctly, the fact that you have to print your ticket out to be able to board appears one, two, three, four, five times counting the terms and conditions?
 - A. Yes, because it is very important.
 - Q. I want to show you --

MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes, sir.

BY MR. POWELL: I'm going to show you what we've marked as Exhibit 2. And I've got a couple of them circled there. Can you -- can you tell us what Exhibit 2 is?

1	A. Exhibit 2 is a printout showing all of the
2	tickets purchased in the name Anne Mauro.
3	Q. All right. And when it says reservation
4	945688, which ticket was that for?
5	A. That was the ticket for the 3 p.m. bus.
6	Q. And when it says reservation 945666, what
7	was that one for?
8	A. That was the ticket for the 2 p.m. bus.
9	Q. Take a look at Exhibit 3 and 4.
10	A. Yes, 3.
11	Q. And, first of all, for Exhibit 2, is that a
12	document that's kept on Suburban Express's system?
13	A. I'm sorry. Which exhibit?
14	Q. Is that a document Exhibit 2, is that
15	A. Yes, yes.
16	Q a document is that a document that's
17	kept on Suburban Express's system?
18	A. That is normal business records.
19	Q. Okay. And you and you printed those out
20	and brought those?
21	A. That's correct.
22	Q. Is that a true and accurate copy of the
23	documents kept on the system?
24	A. Yes, it is.

1	MR. POWELL: I would move to enter
2	Exhibit 2 into evidence at this time, Judge.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Betz, on the offer of
4	Exhibit 2?
5	MR. BETZ: Provisionally, no objection.
6	I'm sorry. I, I
7	THE COURT: What's that mean?
8	MR. BETZ: Well, I, I assumed he was
9	going to ask more questions. If he's not, then I
10	accept it.
11	MR. POWELL: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Okay, No objection then?
13	MR. BETZ: No objection, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. Exhibit 2,
15	Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 will be admitted without
16	objection.
17	BY MR. POWELL: Now please take a look at
18	Exhibit 3.
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And what is this?
21	A. These are the terms and conditions that were
22	displayed when Anne Mauro purchased her ticket.
23	Q. Okay. And would this term and condition be
24	the exact same since both of them are purchased on the

1	same day?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. It wasn't changed mid day?
4	A. No, it was not.
5	Q. And looking at Exhibit 4, what is that?
6	A. Exhibit 4 is the confirmation e-mail for
7	945688.
8	Q. Okay. And when you look through those two,
9	those are the exact same contract terms; correct?
10	A. They're the same.
11	Q. Are these documents saved on your system?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Did you print these from your system?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Are they held in the ordinary course of
16	business in your system?
17	A. Yes.
18	MR. POWELL: I would move at this time,
19	Your Honor, to enter Exhibits 3 and 4 into evidence.
20	THE COURT: As to 3 and 4, Mr. Betz?
21	MR. BETZ: No objection.
22	THE COURT: Plaintiff's Exhibits 3 and 4
23	are admitted without objection.
24	BY MR. POWELL: Take a look at Exhibit 5,

1	please.
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. What is this?
4	A. This is a printout of ticket 945688, which
5	is the ticket for the 3 p.m. bus that was subsequently
6	disputed.
7	Q. Now when you say subsequently disputed, so
8	this is the second ticket that was purchased and, and
9	she used, correct, Ms. Mauro used?
10	A. Yes. This was the ticket that she purchased
11	and used.
12	Q. And, again, this ticket can be reprinted off
13	of your system; is that correct?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Did you, in fact, reprint this ticket off
16	your system?
17	A. Yes, I did.
18	Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of that
19	document on your system?
20	A. Yes, it is.
21	Q. This document is kept in the ordinary course
22	of business?
23	A. Yes.
24	MR. POWELL: I would move to introduce

Exhibit 5 into evidence. 1 2 MR. BETZ: I'm checking my record to see if I got it. I probably --3 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 5 MR. BETZ: I probably did but -- 3, 4. It's hidden under. We have it. And no objection. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. And that's exhibit what number? В 9 MR. POWELL: Five. THE COURT: Five will be admitted without 10 objection. 11 Thank you. 12 Proceed. 13 BY MR. POWELL: I believe you have 14 Exhibit 7 in front of you --15 16 Α. I do. O. -- Dennis. 17 18 Can you tell me what that is? This is a document that is actually a credit 19 card processor advising us that the charge, the 20 principal amount of 27.95 for ticket 945688 has -- was 21 disputed by the card holder and it says that the reason 22 23 for the dispute was services not provided or merchandise not received. 24

1	Q. And can you remind the court again on
2	Exhibit 5 what was the ticket number?
3	A. 945688.
4	Q. So, according to Ms. Mauro's testimony and
5	now your testimony, the actual ticket that was disputed
6	in which the credit card payment was reversed was
7	actually the ticket that Ms. Mauro used to take her to
8	the destination?
9	A. Yeah.
10	Q. Is that correct?
11	A. Yeah.
12	MR. POWELL: I would move at this time to
13	introduce Exhibit 7 into evidence.
14	THE COURT: With regard to 7, Mr. Betz?
15	MR. BETZ: Your Honor, may I voir dire
16	the witness on
17	THE COURT: Foundation?
18	MR. BETZ: Excuse me?
19	THE COURT: On foundation?
20	MR. BETZ: Yes.
21	THE COURT: You may.
22	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION:
23	BY MR. BETZ
24	Q. I show you Exhibit 7 right up here. Who is

1	Sage?
2	A. That's our credit card processor.
3	Q. That is who you hire to process your credit
4	cards; is that correct?
5	A. That's right.
6	Q. So that is not my client's credit card
7	company?
8	A. I don't know who your client's credit card
9	company is.
10	Q. Okay. Thank you.
11	MR. BETZ: No further questions.
12	MR. POWELL: Just a couple of follow-ups,
13	Judge, if I may?
14	THE COURT: Pardon me?
15	MR. POWELL: A couple of follow-ups, if I
16	may?
17	THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.
18	FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION:
19	BY MR. POWELL
20	Q. So the when you say it's your credit card
21	company, that's a credit card company that you have to
22	enter into a contract with that allows Suburban Express
23	to accept credit card payments?
24	A. It's a credit card processor, yes. We

1	compensate them for, for receiving and transmitting
2	funds to us.
3	Q. Okay. And, and so you got this from them
4	disputing ticket 945688?
5	A. Right.
6	Q. And then this is kept in your system?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the
9	document kept in your system?
10	A. Yes, it is.
11	Q. Is it held in the ordinary course of
12	business?
13	A. Yes.
14	MR. POWELL: Again, I would renew our
15	admission of Exhibit 7 into evidence at this time,
16	Judge.
17	MR. BETZ: No further objection.
18	THE COURT: All right. Seven will be
19	admitted without objection.
20	MR. POWELL: May I may I approach,
21	Your Honor?
22	THE COURT: Yes.
23	BY MR. POWELL: I'm going to show you
24	what we've marked as Exhibit 8. Can you tell us what

Exhibit 8 is?

A. Exhibit 8 was our response to the chargeback debited by -- Exhibit 7 is a chargeback debt advice, that's where the credit card processor tells us that money has been removed from our account. And Exhibit 8 is our response to the credit card processor explaining that the transaction was valid and requesting that the funds be returned to us.

- Q. And the writing at the bottom is what?
- A. I'm sorry?
- Q. What's the writing at the bottom of that?
- A. Customer also has to click okay on the pop-up window, which tells her that she will be required to present a printed ticket. See Exhibit 4, referring to the exhibits that were in the packet that we sent to the credit card processor and Exhibit 4 was a picture of the pop-up, I'm sure.
- Q. Okay. And so this is your response to the chargeback?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And when you were sending exhibits and these forms you're referring to, can you explain to the court exactly what that consists of?
 - A. It's very time consuming. We receive the

chargeback debit advice and it contains the first four and last four digits of the credit card number.

Sometimes the first four and last four aren't unique.

It sometimes takes us a little time to figure out who exactly has disputed the charge. Once we know who disputed the charge, we then look at the evidence that we have available to us and then, based on the evidence we have available us to, we write a response, we attach the evidence as exhibits and forward that to the credit card company. This can take, you know, 20 or 30 minutes or it can take an hour, hour and a half. It's -- it can be very long and time consuming.

- Q. Case-by-case basis?
- A. Yep.
- Q. And you and/or your staff prepares those services?
 - A. That's correct.

MR. POWELL: At this time, I would move to admit Exhibit 8 -- well, sorry.

THE COURT: As to 8, Mr. Betz?

MR. BETZ: Your Honor, I want to voir dire on the handwritten --

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION:

BY MR. BETZ

- Q. Is -- this handwritten material, is that your handwriting?
 - A. No, it is not.
 - Q. Do you know whose it is?
 - A. Yes. It's the, the bookkeeper.
 - Q. And who is the bookkeeper?
 - A. Her name is Jennifer.
- Q. Do you know what date that was placed on there?
- A. Looking at this, I don't. If I had the entire packet, I imagine I could tell. However, the chargeback response has to be within 30 days, so I would hazard to guess that the handwriting was put on there between 3/22 -- I'm sorry -- received it -- 4/5 is when we received the dispute, so we would have had to respond by 5/5.
 - Q. Okay. But that is a guess on your part --
 - A. No. It --
 - Q. -- because there's nothing dated?
- A. It's not a guess because, if we had not responded within 30 days, they would have kicked the -- they would have kicked the issue and we wouldn't have gotten our money back.

MR. BETZ: Your Honor, I object to the admission of this exhibit, at least as to the handwritten additions to it because there's no foundation really as to time, date and manner in which it was placed there. It could have been yesterday for all we know.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Powell?
MR. POWELL: Yes, Judge.

Dennis clearly testified that this is his office procedure. Jenny is, is the person that does these. He's testified to that, Jennifer. He's already testified as to the procedure of the business. If they don't do it within 30 days, then it gets kicked out. We know that the money was returned to Suburban Express upon documents here coming forthwith on the next one so, you know, we have laid, laid foundation as part of this. It's a document kept in the ordinary course of business. It's held in their system. We've laid all of the proper foundations as a business record exception, Judge.

THE COURT: How did you want to explain the last entry on this handwritten notice or handwritten addition to the correspondence, Mr. Powell, quote, see Exhibit 4, unquote? That would suggest that

1 this document was added to sometime while you were preparing for trial. 2 No, Judge, this is not --3 MR. POWELL: our exhibits are presented here at trial. Each of them has an exhibit sticker done by my office. 5 THE COURT: Then what's the reference to 6 Exhibit 4 mean? 7 MR. POWELL: As Dennis has already 8 testified, Judge, there's a packet that has to be sent 9 requesting that that chargeback be reversed. 10 THE COURT: So there was -- was there 11 some other document that accompanied this one? 12 13 MR. POWELL: This was -- this is 104. can -- I can -- I'd be more than happy --14 THE COURT: Okay. Do we have a 15 completeness rule issue here? 16 MR. POWELL: Your Honor, you know, this 17 is -- this is small claims. I could have brought Jenny 18 in. No. The rules are relaxed in that sense. 19 20 trying --They're not, sir. THE COURT: 21 already explicitly rejected the proposition that we 22 follow Rule 286(b), so the rules of evidence apply in 23 24 this case the same way as if we were in some Microsoft

1 antitrust litigation. So even though we have an amount 2 in controversy of \$26, the rules still apply. 3 objection will be sustained with regard to the handwritten additions to the exhibit. The exhibit will 5 otherwise be admitted. And, Mr. Powell, you may otherwise continue. 6 7 MR. POWELL: Thank you, Judge. THE WITNESS: I believe you have the entire --9

MR. BETZ: Objection.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: There's no question before you, Mr. Toeppen.

MR. POWELL: Judge, I'm just looking to see if I have it in my file, the remainder of the exhibit.

MR. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I apologize for interrupting the proceedings. I have a matter that was scheduled at 2:30. If the court would allow it, I would like to run to my office briefly.

THE COURT: For the record, that's Mr. Fletcher who's counsel of record in the 2:30 cases, 13-MR-1039 and 14-MR-122.

You may be excused, sir, and come back at your convenience.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Counsel hold an inaudible conversation.)

MR. POWELL: May I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION:

BY MR. POWELL:

- Q. And I just -- Dennis, I looked in my file.

 I don't have all five exhibits, but we did attach as

 Exhibit B to the amended verified small claims

 complaint a document and, if you'll look at that, is

 that not the exact same verification page that was from

 Exhibit 4, which has already been admitted into

 evidence minus the handwriting?
 - A. I'm sorry. What's the question?
- Q. Is not Exhibit B to the amended verified small claims complaint an exact true copy of what's been marked as Exhibit 4 in this trial and admitted into evidence minus the handwriting that is now on Exhibit B to the complaint?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And can you tell the court what that handwriting is on Exhibit B attached to the complaint?
- A. That's Jennifer attempting to explain to the reader at the credit card company what --

MR. BETZ: Objection. We need to find out who Jennifer is, some foundation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. POWELL: Judge, may I respond?

THE COURT: The gentleman can't testify to the set of mind of a second party, so the objection's sustained.

Continue your examination.

BY MR. POWELL: Okay. Dennis, as the owner of Suburban Express, do you oversee what your staff does?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And part of the overseeing is to make sure that these chargebacks are handled correctly?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And what do you do to ensure that the chargebacks are handled correctly?
- A. Well, we have a -- the goal in, in writing a credit -- a response to a credit card chargeback is to clearly communicate to the other party the elements of the, you know, of our position that are important. And to that end, we may in some cases use all capital letters, in other cases, we may circle things and that's what we're seeing here is emphasis being placed

23

24

on part of the e-mail.

- Q. Who handles the chargeback issue? In other words, when a chargeback comes TO your attention, who in your office handles that correspondence with the credit card company requesting it to be returned to you?
 - A. The bookkeeper, Jennifer.
 - Q. And Jennifer is your only bookkeeper?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. How long has she been with you?
 - A. Since 2008.
 - Q. And who taught her how to do that?
 - A. I did.
 - Q. As the owner?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And just like the other handwriting was referencing to an exhibit, can you tell me what that exhibit, exhibit is referencing on Exhibit B to the verified amended complaint?
 - A. I'm sorry?
- Q. What is that handwriting referencing to the amended complaint?
 - A. I don't understand.
 - Q. Exhibit B to the verified amended complaint

1	has handwriting on it?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. What is it what's the handwriting
4	referencing to?
5	A. The handwriting is highlighting
6	MR. BETZ: Objection. He still hasn't
7	established who, who wrote it.
8	THE COURT: Sustained.
9	BY MR. POWELL: Who wrote that?
10	A. That is Jennifer's handwriting.
11	MR. BETZ: May I voir dire?
12	BY MR. POWELL: You've been
13	MR. BETZ: Your Honor, objection.
14	May I voir dire?
15	THE COURT: You may.
16	And just for the record, Mr. Powell, there are
17	no attachments to the verified amended complaint.
18	MR. POWELL: It may not have come in on
19	the copy. Do you have the original complaint?
20	THE COURT: That's what I'm looking at.
21	There are
22	MR. POWELL: Yeah.
23	THE COURT: copies attached to
24	MR. POWELL: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- the original complaint that's been superseded by the amended complaint.

MR. POWELL: You may not have gotten -there was multiple copies made from our office. It may
-- the one that went into the court file may not have
had them. You'll see from the amended complaint, it
didn't change anything.

THE COURT: How can I tell that when there aren't any exhibits attached to the amended complaint?

The amended complaint superseded the original complaint.

MR. POWELL: I understand that, Judge.

attachments, no exhibits attached to the amended complaint, so your inquiry of Mr. Toeppen with regard to exhibits attached to the amended complaint are absolutely meaningless to the court as trier of fact because those aren't before the court.

MR. POWELL: And my comment to that,

Judge, is that the exhibits in the original complaint
and to the amended complaint are identical. The only
thing the amended complaint did was take away the --

THE COURT: Okay. How is the court to

determine that?

I understand, and I apologize to the court if the copy we sent in did not have those attachments, but they are -- the paragraphs are verbatim. The exhibits are verbatim. Nothing was changed. The only thing between those two complaints was taking out the request.

MR. POWELL: It's verbatim.

THE COURT: Inquiry in regard to the foundation, Mr. Betz?

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION:

BY MR. BETZ

- Q. The only question I had is did you personally witness this individual write that material?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. So you do not know as a fact that it was her that did it?
 - A. I answered that question,

MR. BETZ: Your Honor, I, I continue to object because I didn't receive those exhibits and, Your Honor, I specifically, when we were in court on the first appearance, because this was a case that was moving quickly, I said, Your Honor, I request that the amendment be in writing so that we could figure out

what was going on. And Your Honor, said, yes, I agree,
I order it to be done in writing, and we did not
receive exhibits, so I object.

MR. POWELL: May I respond, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Let me inquire, Mr. Powell,

what -- where are you going with this? What are you

endeavoring to establish with Exhibit 8 that hasn't

been established already?

MR. POWELL: I'm just -- I'm, I'm informing the court of the procedure, Judge. There is a -- there is a specific procedure in these cases. Procedures have to be followed, not only when one purchased the tickets to follow the contract procedures, but then when, when it's refuted, there are procedures that have to be followed. All of the procedures were followed here and, ultimately, which is the next document or two, the money was returned, so we're following a set of procedures.

And, and in response to Mr. Betz's continuing objection, he called our office to ask us for a copy of the amended complaint. He said he could not read the first page. He did not say that he didn't have the exhibits, which were on the original complaint, when clearly the amended complaint has four exhibits listed

in it. So, you know, again, my apologies if that happened, I don't think that happened, but needless to say, we can wrap this all up in the next exhibit. I mean, we're fighting over whose handwriting that was and --

ļ

THE COURT: Mr. Betz, did you receive the original complaint with the exhibits attached?

MR. BETZ: Yes, Your Honor. I receive the original complaint --

THE COURT: All right. Then I think -MR. BETZ: -- with the exhibits attached.

THE COURT: -- the remedy under all of the circumstances is to recess for a decent interval, permit you to compare the exhibits that Mr. Toeppen has been testifying to that are apparently attached to the amended complaint and apparently Mr. Powell didn't think court's or counsel's security clearance was high enough to see these exhibits. Mr. Betz, compare those exhibits on this exhibit to which Mr. Toeppen's been testifying with the exhibits that are attached to the original complaint. If they're the same, we'll proceed apace and your objection will be overruled. If they're not, we'll address the issue with professional calm.

We'll be in recess until you're ready to go.

(Recess taken.) 2 THE COURT: Let's go on the record once again in 13-SC-1653. The parties and counsel are again 3 present. 5 We are convening in open court in the wake of a 6 recess. 7 Mr. Betz, did you have occasion to review those 8 documents and are those the same exhibits? 9 MR. BETZ: Yes. We have reviewed the 10 documents and they appear to be the same to me, so I don't have any objection arising (inaudible). My 11 objection, which the court has already upheld regarding 12 the extraneous comments I'm not going to concern myself 13 with since that's already been ruled out. 14 THE COURT: All right. The prior ruling 15 will remain. The inquiry may otherwise proceed. 16 Mr. Powell, you may proceed. 17 MR. POWELL: Yes, Judge. And, again, I 18 19 apologize on behalf of myself and my office staff. THE COURT: It's quite all right. 20 21 MR. POWELL: Those were inadvertently left off. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Quite all right. 23 MR. POWELL: I want to go -- Judge, can 24

1 you confirm for me, I believe Exhibits 2 through 8 have been admitted into evidence with the -- I'm sorry -- 2, 2 3 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 with the exception of the written language on 8? 5 THE COURT: Yes, sir. MR. POWELL: Okay. Thank you. 6 7 FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION: BY MR. POWELL 8 9 Can you please take a look at Exhibit 1A Q. 10 through I again, Dennis? 11 Α. I have it. All right. And, again, I know you created 12 those for the purpose of the trial. Other than the 13 terms and conditions that are included on Exhibit 1G, 14 is everything else the same as it was on February --15 16 Α. 22nd. 17 Q. -- I think, 22nd, 2013? Yes. 18 Α. And, again, the terms and conditions we've 19 already admitted into evidence as a different exhibit; 20 correct? 21 22 Α. Yes. Judge, at this time we would MR. POWELL: 23 move to introduce Exhibits 1A through I with the 24

1	exception of the terms and conditions on 1G
2	(inaudible).
3	MR. BETZ: No objection.
4	THE COURT: Admitted without objection
5	are Exhibits 1A through I.
6	MR. POWELL: Thank you, Judge.
7	BY MR. POWELL: Can you now please take a
8	look, Dennis, at Exhibit 9 in front of you.
9	A. Yes, the demand letter.
10	Q. Do you recognize this document?
11	A. I do.
12	Q. Is this document a true and accurate copy of
13	the letter sent to Ms. Anne Mauro on October 5, 2013?
14	A. It is.
15	Q. Is it a document held in the ordinary course
16	of business on your system?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the
19	letter, demand letter, that's kept in your system?
20	A. Yes.
21	MR. POWELL: We'd move at this time
22	introduce Exhibit 9 into evidence.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Betz?
24	MR. BETZ: May I have a moment, Your

1	Honor?
2	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
3	MR. BETZ: No objection, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Exhibit 9 is admitted without
5	objection.
6	(Inaudible discussion held between
7	counsel.)
8	MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?
9	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
10	BY MR. POWELL: Dennis, I want to show
11	you what's previously been marked as Exhibit 11. Can
12	you please tell the court what that is?
13	A. Yes. This is a reversal denial. This means
14	that our request to have the 27.95 funds returned to us
15	was denied.
16	Q. Okay. Initially, correct?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Okay.
19	MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?
20	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
21	BY MR. POWELL: Let me show you what's
22	been marked as Exhibit 12. So am I correct that, when
23	it was initially denied, then you had to provide
24	further support of the reason why you should get the

money back; is that correct? 1 2 Α. Yes. All right. Can you tell us what Exhibit 12 Q. is? In response to the reversal denial, Exhibit 11, we submitted information again to the 6 credit card company and Exhibit 12 is the information 7 that we submitted. Я And that includes the four exhibits with 9 handwritten notes that was sent back to the credit card 10 11 company; correct? That's correct. Α. 12 And whose writing is on Exhibit 1? 13 14 Exhibit, Exhibit 1, so Exhibit 12, sub 1 is Jennifer's handwriting. 15 And Exhibit 4, whose handwriting -- I'm 16 17 sorry -- Exhibit 12, Sub Exhibit 4, whose handwriting? Jennifer. Ά. 18 Was this document kept in the ordinary 19 20 course of business in relation to this chargeback that 21 you guys were challenging? Yes. 22 Α. Are these true and accurate copies of the 23 second request to have your money returned with the 24

1 attached exhibits? Α. Yes. 2 MR. POWELL: I would move to admit 3 Exhibit 12 into evidence at this time, Judge. THE COURT: As to 12, Mr. Betz? 5 MR. BETZ: I'm not going to make a 6 technical objection. I don't object. 7 THE COURT: Exhibit 12, accordingly, will 9 be admitted without objection. 10 MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes. 11 BY MR. POWELL: Dennis, I'm showing you 12 what has been marked as Exhibit 13. Can you please 13 tell the court what this document is? 14 This is a reversal acceptance received 15 subsequent to Exhibit 12 being sent to the credit card 16 company. 17 And it's informing you, is it not, that her 18 credit card company is now giving you the money back? 19 20 It's informing that the credit card 21 processor is giving me the money back. 22 Yes. And what was the original reference 23 number again of the chargeback? On Exhibit 13, Exhibit 13 refers to ticket 24

number 94688 -2 Q. And --

В

A. -- in the field labeled original reference number.

Q. -- again, that's the same ticket number that Ms. Mauro actually rode on; correct?

A. Yes.

MR. POWELL: We would at this time enter Exhibit 13 into evidence.

MR. BETZ: No objection.

THE COURT: As to 15 -- 13, Mr. Betz?

THE COURT: Admitted without objection.

MR. POWELL: May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

BY MR. POWELL: I would like to show you what's marked as Exhibit 13B. Can you tell the court what that is?

A. Yes. This is a photocopy of the ticket envelope that contained her ticket. The ticket envelope was provided to the driver (inaudible). The driver collected the ticket. Anne Mauro's ticket was the 41st ticket to be collected. He placed the pile of tickets into the ticket envelope, which is sitting on the table there, and I went into our, our records this

•

weekend, pulled the envelope and located her ticket in the pile and photocopied the envelope and her ticket.

- Q. And is this the procedure that you required every one of your bus drivers is when they get the ticket, they write the number of the ticket --
 - A. Yes. They write -- yes.
 - Q. They give it back to you?
- A. They, they number the tickets as the passengers are boarding. We then do an announcement and take the ticket envelope from the driver. We return the ticket envelope, envelope to the office where it is then scanned, and then the, the, the passenger count is written on the envelope. It's also entered into a loading report, which then feeds into the accounts payable system and the ticket envelopes are boxed in banker's boxes and transported to storage.
- Q. And this document is a true and accurate copy of the document kept in storage in the ordinary course of business at your office?
 - A. That's correct.

MR. POWELL: I would move at this time, Judge, to enter Exhibit 13B into evidence.

THE COURT: As to 13B, Mr. Betz?

MR. BETZ: No objection.

1 THE COURT: Thirteen B is admitted 2 without objection. MR. POWELL: I have nothing further at 3 this time. Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Cross examination, Mr. Betz? 6 MR. BETZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 I promise to be brief. 9 THE COURT: All right. That's all right. 10 Take your time, gentlemen. CROSS EXAMINATION: 11 BY MR. BETZ 12 Exhibit 12 that's been admitted into Ο. 13 evidence, one, two, three, four -- the fifth paragraph 14 of -- down in Exhibit 12, could you read that into the 15 record for the court where it begins also? 16 Also, customer agreed to contact us in 17 writing regarding questions pertaining to the charge. 18 She did not contact us. 19 Q. I show you Exhibit 6 which was admitted into 20 21 evidence by the plaintiff. Did you have an opportunity to see that? 22 Yes. Exhibit 6 has a date on it of 23 Α. 2014-2-28. In the fax section, it says student legal 24

1	service. This is the first time that I've seen this
2	that I saw this refund request.
3	Q. Okay. It is your exhibit being proffered.
4	What is the date on the bottom?
5	A. 2/27/13.
6	Q. Might that be an indicator that that was
7	when it was sent?
8	A. I have no way of knowing that.
9	Q. Well, it's your exhibit?
10	A. The exhibit says is dated 2/27/13. I
11	have way of knowing when the exhibit was sent to us, if
12	it was ever sent to us at all.
13	Q. Well, your attorney proffered it, not me.
14	Did you ever have an occasion to have contact
15	with Robin Mauro, the mother of Ms. Anne Mauro?
16	A. Not that I recall.
17	Q. Okay. Did you receive any letters or
18	anything like that from her?
19	A. I don't recall seeing anything.
20	MR. BETZ: Okay. Nothing further, Your
21	Honor.
22	THE COURT: Redirect, Mr. Powell?
23	MR. POWELL: Yes, I do, Judge.
24	REDIRECT EXAMINATION:

1	BY MR. POWELL
2	Q. Regarding I believe was it reference to
3	Exhibit 6
4	THE COURT: Six.
5	THE WITNESS: The refund request?
6	BY MR. POWELL: Yes. In your search for
7	all of the documentation in this in this case, did
8	you come across that in your file?
9	A. No. This was forwarded to me by you after
10	you received it from Mr. Betz.
11	Q. Thank you.
12	MR. POWELL: Nothing further at this
13	time.
14	THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Powell?
15	Anything further, Mr. Powell?
16	MR. POWELL: No, Judge.
17	THE COURT: Any further inquiry of
18	Mr. Toeppen about those matters, Mr. Betz?
19	MR. BETZ: No, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: All right. Thank you,
21	Mr. Toeppen.
22	You may step down.
23	(Witness excused.)
24	THE COURT: Further evidence for the

plaintiff then, Mr. Powell? 1 MR. POWELL: No, Your Honor. 2 just ask to reserve the right to bring Dennis Toeppen 3 back as a rebuttal witness, if necessary, after defendant's case-in-chief. THE COURT: All right. There's a prayer 6 for an award of attorney's fees, Mr. Powell. Do you 7 intend to proceed under Rule 1.5(c) at this point or do 8 you want the question reserved. What's your 9 preference? 10 11 MR. POWELL: Judge, I actually in rebuttal was going to do that. I can do it now, if you 12 13 wish. Whatever you wish, sir. 14 THE COURT: MR. POWELL: I can do it in our 15 case-in-chief. 16 (Inaudible conversation held between 17 18 counsel.) MR. POWELL: Judge, at this time, I will 19 20 proffer Exhibit 14, which is a copy of the filing fees for costs. Exhibit 15 is the process server for costs. 21 All right. 22 THE COURT: 23 MR. POWELL: Exhibit 17 is proof of the 24 \$16 chargeback fee. And then I would offer an

affidavit of itemized and verified fees and costs at this time, which has everything to date except for the appearance at trial.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Betz, is there any objection to the court receiving these respective proffers?

MR. BETZ: I don't object to the filing fees, the service of process fees because they were incurred. I would like to reserve argument on the (inaudible) trial attorney costs should the plaintiff prevail.

the court will receive Exhibits 14 through 6 -- or pardon me -- 14 through 17 without objection and the defendant is obviously not required to confess any of the claims. The costs are taxed as a matter of law in favor of a prevailing party. The amount of a fee award is subject to the criteria of RPC 1. -- 1.5(c) and it is also a matter of judicial discretion. With those understandings, the exhibits will be admitted.

Does the plaintiff rest at this point?

MR. POWELL: Your Honor, could I just -two seconds -- two minutes to call my client back up to
get one more document into evidence that I failed --

THE COURT: You may.

MR. POWELL: Thank you.

I would call Dennis Toeppen.

May I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

DENNIS TOEPPEN

recalled as a witness, after having been previously duly sworn, was further examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION:

BY MR. POWELL

- Q. Dennis, I'll hand you what was marked as Exhibits 19A, B and C. And starting with Exhibit 19A, can you explain to the court what this is?
- A. Yes. Each row on the exhibit on 15 -- or 19A is -- yeah, each row on 19A represents a trip which goes from one point to another point with intermediate stops.

The tickets that Anne Mauro purchased were for schedule 520IS, which is about halfway down, and when she was unable to board the bus because she didn't have a printed ticket, she purchased a ticket for schedule 530. The important thing about 520IS is that the capacity of that trip was 76 seats and 76 seats were,

in fact, sold. And because Anne Mauro purchased a ticket, a seat was held for her and unable for anybody else to purchase, unavailable to be purchased by somebody else.

- Q. Okay. And then you said 530. Do you mean 520ISU?
- A. No. A schedule 530 is the -- is ticket number -- or ticket number 945688 was on schedule 530 which departs ISR at 3:10 and Armory at 3:40 or 3:45.
 - Q. Okay. And what about 520ISU?
- A. 520ISU is in conjunction with 520IS. The sum of the capacities of 520IS and 520ISU is 112. One hundred and twelve seats is two 56 passenger buses. There were two buses running on that schedule and, had Anne Mauro's seat remained unsold, it would have been available for purchase by anybody wanting to travel from University of Illinois or Illinois State University an hour and 15 minutes.
- Q. So, if I understand you correctly, there was two buses leaving at Anne Mauro's location?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Each bus had a capacity of 50 --
 - A. Fifty-six.
 - Q. -- 56 people?

The first bus of 56 was going to leave the --

- A. The first bus of 56 filled on the U of I campus and headed directly to the Chicago area.
 - O. Yes.

- A. The second bus -- if everybody showed up, the second bus would have had 20 passengers on it before it headed to ISU and then an additional 36 boarded at -- would have boarded at ISU making a full bus there and off, off it would go to the Chicago area.
- Q. All right. So on the -- on this particular time, every ticket was sold out?
 - A. Every ticket was sold.
 - Q. All right. Go to -- move to 19B, please.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. What is this document?
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. Can you explain what this document is?
 - A. I'm sorry. I didn't hear that.

Yes. Nineteen B is the sales history for Schedule 520IS, which is the Champaign portion of that, that schedule. And the third column under the label created indicates the date and time that the ticket — that the ticket was purchased. So what you have here is a list going from the first ticket purchased to the

1 last ticket purchased. And you'll see that the last 2 ticket purchased was Anne Mauro. And the reason the 3 time stamp is important is because it shows that -- you know, it demonstrates that we would have been able to sell her ticket to somebody else. The, the ticket prior to hers was sold at 12:17 -- or 1:17, ten minutes 6 The one before that was sold at 12:52. And so 7 you can see that, on the day of departure, we had a fair amount of activity there. And it's my experience 9 10 that had Ms. Mauro not purchased that ticket at 1:27 11 that by, by the departure time of 2 p.m. from the Armory, 3:15 from Illinois State University, we would 12 have sold her ticket. 13

MR. BETZ: Objection. Pure speculation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. POWELL: So if I look at this exhibit, 19B --

A. Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. -- and let's just use the last seven or eight here, a ticket was purchased at 1:23?
 - A. That's 1:23 a.m.
 - Q. Oh, a.m. All right. And then 10:01 a.m.?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. 11:33 a.m.?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. 11:42 a.m.?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. 11:44 a.m.?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. 12:52 p.m.?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. 1:17 p.m.?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And then Ms. Mauro's at 1:27 p.m.?
11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. Once the system reaches its maximum, which
13	it did here; correct?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Then anyone else that gets online to
16	purchase a ticket for that trip at that time would be
17	rejected; correct?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. All right. Can you now move to Exhibit
20	19C?
21	A. All right. Nineteen C is the ISU portion
22	of that trip and the same information is relevant here.
23	We sold the last ISU ticket at 2:31 p.m. and oh,
24	that's interesting, so actually Mauro's ticket wasn't

the -- wasn't the last sale. A ticket was, in fact, sold after Mauro's ticket at 2:31. And so then prior to that we had one at 1:32, 11:31 and (inaudible).

- Q. And, again, looking at Exhibit 19B at the bottom of page two, 76 sold with a capacity of 76; correct?
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. Yes?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And then Exhibit 19C, looking at the legend at the bottom, 36 sold with a capacity of 36?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. So, likewise, anybody that gets and wants to buy a ticket on just the leg from ISU to the final destination would have also been rejected because the seats were sold out?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. So this was produced by your system?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And your system keeps these running totals on each and every trip purchased?
 - A. Yes, it does.
- Q. And these are held in the ordinary course of business?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Is this a true and accurate copy
3	A. It is.
4	Q of the document produced by your
5	computer system?
6	A. It is.
7	MR. POWELL: At this time, Your Honor,
8	we would move to introduce Exhibit 19A, B and C into
9	evidence.
10	THE COURT: With regard to those
11	exhibits, Mr. Betz?
12	MR. BETZ: I guess, Your Honor, I, I
13	object because I'm not sure the purpose of the exhibit.
14	If the purpose of the exhibit is to prove that but for
15	my client cancelling, someone else would have
16	definitely been able to order a ticket, that's not
17	established by this. It is definitely we have a
18	record here of lots of purchases and there is legs of
19	this, but we don't have it established that anyone was
20	denied the right to use
21	THE COURT: So it's a relevance
22	MR. BETZ: the bus.
23	THE COURT: objection?
24	MR. BETZ: It is a relevance objection.

THE COURT: On the relevance objection,

Mr. Powell?

MR. POWELL: Yes, Your Honor. We wanted to get this introduced into evidence in our case-in-chief to speed up the process. If it does not become relevant, then we will not move to have it entered at the end.

THE COURT: What do you mean if it doesn't become relevant? It's got to be relevant from square one, so --

MR. POWELL: Yes. Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: -- evidence is relevant if it tends to make any material fact that's being disputed more or less likely true. So what relevance does this evidence have?

MR. POWELL: The --

THE COURT: It doesn't -- go ahead.

MR. POWELL: The relevance from this document shows that -- I guess it's more of an anticipatory document, Judge. If the argument that Ms. Mauro makes is that she -- that we received no damages because we received payment by both tickets, then clearly it shows the likelihood that her ticket took up a spot for a seat to still be reserved. Regardless is

the fact that, because she reversed a ticket, or the charge of a ticket, and therefore we were charged \$16 because of privity of contract with our bank, we've still been damaged by her breach of the terms of contract. So this shows for Your Honor that this was a full trip and that her what she is clarifying as a mistake was not an irrelevant one, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Betz?

MR. BETZ: Well, again, it's interesting because at the point in time in which this generated

MR. BETZ: Well, again, it's interesting because at the point in time in which this generated she had hasn't reversed anything. It's the day of this event, so we don't know. She had not reversed her credit card, so I do not see how it is relevant to prove anything.

THE COURT: The objection's overruled.

I'll consider the exhibits mindful of the fact that the court's the trier of fact and can afford it whatever weight it properly observes appropriate.

MR. BETZ: No, Your Honor.

Mr. Betz, any cross examination of Mr. Toeppen?

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr.

Toeppen.

(Witness excused.)

MR. POWELL: Nothing further.

1.3

1	Plaintiff rests at this time, Judge.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Plaintiff rests.
3	Mr. Betz, any evidence on behalf of Ms. Mauro?
4	MR. BETZ: Yes, Your Honor. I would
5	call Robin Mauro to the stand.
6	THE COURT: All right.
7	(Witness sworn.)
8	THE COURT: All right. Have a seat in
9	the witness chair, please.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Betz.
11	MR. BETZ: May I approach, Your Honor?
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	ROBIN MAURO
14	called as a witness, after having been duly sworn, was
15	examined and testified as follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION:
17	BY MR. BETZ
18	Q. Good afternoon.
19	Could you please state your name and current
20	address for the record?
21	A. Robin Mauro.
22	Q. And your current address?
23	A. My address is 333 Woodside Drive in
24	Bloomingdale, Illinois.

- Q. Okay. What is your relationship to Anne Mauro?
 - A. I'm her mother.
- Q. Okay. You heard testimony to the effect that there is a credit card here. Is it your credit card held with authority of your daughter to sign?
- A. Correct. I am the credit card holder. My son and daughter who both are University of Illinois students each have an authorized user card.
- Q. Okay. Do you manage the financial aspects of this credit card?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did there come a time in which you learned about your daughter trying to take Suburban Express to come back to Chicagoland?
- A. Yes. It was very rare, the situation with the car not being able to start that day and all the drama surrounding that and trying to get them home. My son has ridden Suburban Express on several occasions without a printed ticket and Suburban Express is the only company that our children have ever ridden as far as a bus company goes. They have taken Amtrak, but Suburban Express is the only one.
 - Q. Okay. Did there come a time -- do you --

first of all, did she make it to Chicago that day? 1 She finally did. 2 Α. 0. And where did she make it to? 3 Α. She made it to I think Westmont or wherever 4 the Woodridge Mall is. I'm not exactly sure where it is. But it's further south. And obviously she was 6 refused to be able to get on that bus and it was 7 purchased obviously in a parking lot in very close 8 9 proximity at the bus stop. 10 Q. Did you pick her up that day? 11 Α. Actually, her -- I think her brother did. Q. Okay. 12 13 'Cause he got home -- he got home earlier (inaudible). 14 And it's your credit card. Are you the 15 16 person who filed the dispute with the credit card company? 17 Correct. 18 Q. And what is the credit card company name? 19 20 Α. Chase. 21 Q. And have you ever filed a dispute before regarding a transaction? 22 23 Α. Yes. And could you describe briefly what the 24

1	process of filing a dispute is?
2	A. Well, the process is, first of all, you
3	have to go ahead and try and rectify the situation with
4	the merchant first and that's the first question they
5	ask you when you file a dispute. In this case
6	Q. Did you do so?
7	A. Yes, we did.
8	Q. What did you do?
9	A. Annie, under the direction because on
10	the website, there's clearly a refund request form, she
11	filled it out and, as it was put into evidence, it was
12	filled out on February 27th and mailed directly to the
13	address noted.
14	Q. To the best of your knowledge and
15	information and belief, did you ever receive a reply to
16	that?
17	A. We did not receive a reply until about July
18	
19	Q. Okay. When
20	A of 2013, which was four months later.
21	Q. When did you dispute the credit card
22	charge?
23	A. At the end of March.
24	Q. And who did you dispute it with?

- A. With Chase.
- Q. And how do you -- how do you go about doing that?
- A. I make a phone call and explain the situation. And, in this case, since there were two charges for Suburban Express on the same day, and knowing that they were purchased, you know, what I would deem sequentially, we disputed the first charge believing that to be the ticket that she did not ride.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And that was based on the direction that -- what Chase was directing me to do.
- Q. Do you recall who at Chase directed you to do that?
 - A. I don't remember the -- customer service.
- Q. Okay. And what, what was the result of that when you disputed this with Chase?
- A. They put a temporary credit on my card and (unintelligible). But prior to doing that, in addition to writing the letter, I also made several phone calls to Suburban Express's office of which I just got an automated machine and, in addition, and on a couple of occasions went by their office and it was always dark, the one on Sixth Street.

1	Q. Okay. Do you recall how many phone calls
2	you might have made?
3	A. I think it was like eight or nine.
4	Q. Okay.
5	MR. BETZ: These exhibits are getting
6	out of control.
7	THE COURT: That's okay.
8	BY MR. BETZ: I'll show you I'll mark
9	it in the presence of the court as Defendant's Exhibit
10	1. Could you describe what this is?
11	A. It's a copy of my AT&T wireless cell phone
12	bill.
13	Q. And there are areas that are marked in
14	yellow. What do they reflect?
15	A. That's the number of the only number
16	(inaudible) Suburban Express here in Champaign.
17	Q. And how many times did you call that number
18	and what dates?
19	A. It looks like it was nine. The first call
20	was about a week after they would have received the
21	letter on March 6th. I tried at a couple of points in
22	time that day, didn't get just got an automated
23	machine that directed me to the website.
24	Q. Did you go to the website?

A. Yes. I went to the website and all that's on there is a claim request form and their phone number. There's no place to send an e-mail or anything like that.

Q. Okay. Did you continue to make phone calls?

- A. Yes, I did. I tried again thinking maybe they work on Saturdays since that's when they are transporting the students, so I tried on Saturday morning, the 9th. I tried again on Monday, the 11th, oh, later again in the afternoon on Monday, the 11th, tried again Tuesday, March 12th in the morning, Wednesday, March 13th and then again I tried again in the afternoon. And then, at that point, I got a little frustrated, still wasn't getting a response from the letter, so then I tried one more time on March 22nd and again got the automated machine so, at that point, I sort of gave up.
- Q. Okay. Did you ever at any time get through to anyone in telephonic conversation?
- A. No. It was just an automated machine that directed me to their website.
- Q. As -- later on in the summer of 2013, were you able to talk to someone?

- A. The first time I actually spoke to someone was after the letter came in October. Anne -- the letter came to our address in Bloomingdale. Anne, as a University of Illinois student, was, of course, away at school.
 - Q. Did you open the letter?
- A. Yes, I did, because the window envelope clearly said Anne E. Mauro, the address, and then it said regarding your debt in big bold letters so, of course, I opened it.
- Q. Okay. And as a result of that opening that letter in October, what did you do, if anything?
- A. I read it, got pretty irritated, of course, 'cause at this point I knew everything was resolved with the credit card company. And the next morning I tried that number once again. And I had the opportunity to talk to a girl named Denise in the office here in Champaign.
 - Q. Okay. And what did you ask Denise?
- A. I asked Denise how can we resolve this? We thought this was all behind us. I never got any response and it was within my right to go ahead and dispute the credit card charge.
 - Q. And did anything happen as a result of

1 that? 2 She said she was relatively new and that Α. 3 she'd try and get back to me. Did she get back to you? Α. No. I had to call again. 5 6 ٥. And --7 And then she said she would get back to me. 8 And then, when she got back to me, she said just send a 9 letter. ο. To do what? 10 Α. 11 She said just send a letter. 12 Q. Did you send a letter? 13 Α. Yes, I did. 14 Q. Okay. 15 I sent it on March -- or excuse me --16 October 16th. The issue, I know it said -- the letter, 17 the October 5th said we had to have payment within 10 18 days, but that letter was not received until after the 19 Columbus Day holiday because of mailing deadlines. 20 Is this a copy of the letter that you sent? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Did you get any response to that letter? 23 Α. Well, not to the letter. The response was 24 someone, someone was showing up to my door serving

1	papers to my daughter.
2	Q. So you are the individual who made the
3	decision with regard to disputing the credit card?
4	A. Correct. She did not ride the bus.
5	Q. Okay.
6	A. And she was there at the stop ready to
7	board it.
8	Q. Did you have you ever ridden Suburban
9	Express?
10	A. I may have when I was college.
11	Q. Okay.
12	A. I was here '81 through '85. I'm a
13	graduate.
14	Q. Okay. Did you have an occasion as a result
15	of this situation with your daughter to read the terms
16	of agreement in terms of this purchase?
17	A. Yes. We yes, I did.
18	Q. Okay.
19	A. And I realize it says it's a printed
20	ticket, but I also know that plenty of people I know
21	have ridden without a printed ticket, so
22	MR. BETZ: Okay. Nothing further, Your
23	Honor.
24	THE COURT: Cross examination.

1	Mr. Powell?
2	MR. POWELL: Thank you, Judge.
3	CROSS EXAMINATION:
4	BY MR. POWELL
5	Q. So am I correct, Ms. Mauro, that your
6	October 16, 2013 correspondence to Suburban Express
7	marked as Defendant's Exhibit 2, that was in response
8	to their demand letter of October 5?
9	A. Right. And with that, in addition to that
10	letter, I also attached the original claim request form
11	from February 27th, 2013 with that.
12	Q. But this is the letter you sent
13	A. Correct.
14	Q in response to the October 15
15	A. Correct.
16	Q or October 5 letter from Suburban
17	Express?
18	A. Correct. And I didn't get a response.
19	Q. But you understood that they were telling
20	your daughter, which you opened and read and informed
21	your daughter, that they were claiming these fees and
22	costs as a result OF your daughter's
23	A. Right. But I also understand I'm in the
24	

1	Q. Was that correct?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And then you sent a response letter on
4	October 16?
5	A. Uh-huh.
6	Q. Did you ever send them a check for \$26?
7	A. No. I, I talked to my credit card company
8	and they said not to.
9	Q. Okay.
10	A. Because they said it's against the law in
11	credit card relations.
12	Q. So you did not send a check for \$26?
13	A. I called Chase and they told me that it's
14	your cost of doing business and that I am not obligated
15	to pay those costs.
16	Q. So you relied upon a third party to tell
17	you what you had to do or what not to do?
18	A. I of course relied on my credit card
19	company. They've been loyal to me since 1985.
20	Q. Did you send Chase a copy of the of the
21	contract?
22	A. They have the copy of the contract.
23	Q. Did you specifically talk to them about
24	A. Uh-huh.

1	Q the contract?
2	A. Uh-huh.
3	Q. And you chose not to send in the \$26;
4	correct?
5	A. I'm in the finance industry and I know that
6	
7	Q. Ms. Mauro
8	A you don't do that.
9	Q did you or did you not turn in
10	A. I'm not no. Of course, I made a
11	decision not to pay the \$26, so the reality is you
12	should not being suing Anne Mauro, you should be suing
13	me.
14	Q. Well, how old was your daughter when you
15	gave her signatory powers on your credit card?
16	A. I'm sorry?
17	Q. How old was your daughter
18	A. When she was just starting to drive. When
19	she was 16.
20	Q. So at age 16, you allowed her to sign your
21	credit card as an additional assignee?
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. And my mother did that same thing when I
24	was in school. It was a nice gesture.

1	How old was your son when you gave him
2	signatory power?
3	A. Same thing, when they both got their
4	driver's license and had to be driving that car and
5	needed gasoline or emergency credit.
6	Q. And, and you understood, did you not, that
7	by giving them the signatory power, they could be bound
8	by contracts for payment?
9	A. This is true.
10	MR. POWELL: That's all I have.
11	Thank you.
12	THE COURT: Anything further, sir?
13	MR. POWELL: No, Judge.
14	THE COURT: Redirect, Mr. Betz?
15	REDIRECT EXAMINATION:
16	BY MR. BETZ
17	Q. What business are you in?
18	A. I'm a CPA and I have my MBA in finance and
19	I'm a consultant.
20	Q. Have you you, you've testified on direct
21	that you had, in fact, had other credit card disputes
22	over the years?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Have you ever been charged for such a

dispute?
A. No. Because it's, it's the merchant's cost
of doing business and that's a known fact.
Q. Okay.
MR. BETZ: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Any cross examination on
those matters, Mr. Powell?
MR. POWELL: No, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you,
madam.
You may step down.
(Witness excused.)
THE COURT: Any further evidence,
Mr. Betz?
MR. BETZ: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any rebuttal evidence,
Mr. Powell?
MR. POWELL: I rest.
THE COURT: Any rebuttal evidence,
Mr. Powell?
MR. POWELL: No, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. Then argument in
support of the prayer of the complaint, Mr. Powell?
MR. POWELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

Judge, this is a, a very simple case. There was an offer. There was an acceptance by an adult who had signatory power on a credit card given by her mother.

Ms. Mauro testified that she knew the terms, understood the terms of having to have a printed out ticket.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If you look at exhibit -- the exhibit where she had wrote in and gave it to her attorney that sent it to you -- to us where she said I was running late, I had a car break down, she was trying to get on a bus hurriedly, she saw the first one that was available, she made the purchase and disregarded the fact that she had to print it out. Obviously, there was a printer available because she took the 3:45 bus only an hour and 45 minutes later. And if you look at Exhibit 1, Judge, all of those bus options from destination to pick-up and drop-off are all available on there. it's obvious what happened. It was about 1:15 or so, she saw that a 2:00 was left and she hurriedly tried to get on with an iPhone because supposedly somebody told her that it was okay to do that when the contract term specifically stated five times you must present a printed ticket, warning, you must present a printed Five times. She agrees to that. ticket. But now she doesn't want to take responsibility for the fact that

she didn't have a printed ticket. So she goes back and she purchases another ticket that was leaving just an hour and 45 minutes later, clearly finds a place to print off a ticket, boards, and is taken home to her destination.

disputes. What's her reasoning for disputing the first charge? Because they wouldn't let me on the bus without a printed ticket, the same thing she agreed to when she bought the ticket. The simple fact of the matter is it's a simple breach of contract. Here's the terms. You either agree to them and click, because if she wouldn't have, she never could have purchased the ticket and she admitted -- and she admitted on the stand she saw that requirement, so --

THE COURT: So the evidence establishes that --

MR. POWELL: -- offer --

THE COURT: -- albeit that Ms. Mauro didn't tender a written ticket for the first trip, the credit transaction was processed and the plaintiff was paid for that ticket?

MR. POWELL: Yes. Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So none of that is of

any consequence to the outcome of this case.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. POWELL: Well, you're right, Judge, which is fine.

THE COURT: Okay. Then why are you discussing it?

MR. POWELL: Because that's going to be the argument.

So here's the second piece of the puzzle. now she purchases her second ticket under the exact same terms and conditions and that's the one that she actually uses, hands to the bus driver to get on the bus and gets dropped off to her destination and that's the one, ironically, that gets reversed. So the simple fact of the matter is, on that ticket, what is she reversing? What's her beef? And if her beef is, which I suspect, as we've seen here in trial, is that, well, but really we meant to reverse the first one because that's the one that she didn't ride on, but her mother took care of that transaction for her. So where it becomes relevant, Judge, is regardless of which one got reversed, if look on the letter of the law, you're The relevance is the second one she used and right. reversed, therefore, we're owed. If you'd listen to their argument, we're still owed because it was still a breach of contract.

ì

THE COURT: But after this skein of transactions between Chase, which was what, the elder and the younger Ms. Mauro's credit card holder and then the plaintiff's credit card servicer, you ultimately got credit for the second ticket.

MR. POWELL: That's correct, which is why we're not -- why that's not a part of our damages.

THE COURT: Precisely.

MR. POWEIL: We were paid. But to accept the argument that we took it upon ourselves to be liable for any chargeback fees is absurd. And here's why. Just like in opening statement where I correlated this with the bank and checks, right, the recourse, the bank, you, as a customer at the bank is contracting with your bank to deposit funds and to -- and to collect the money from your account and among other things, but that's what relevant here, right, so you sell a product or a service to Mr. Smith and he writes you a bad check. And I tender to the court who gets charged by your bank, Judge, for the tendering of that bad check? It's you because the bank has privity of contract with you, not the third party. And then you have to go after the third party to get your funds back

and any consequential damage that result therefrom.

2

3

5

б

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I have that contract, Your Honor, which, not that it's really relevant, but it, it's the contract that says you agree to that chargeback, so you get charged this.

MR. BETZ: Objection. That was not introduced into evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained. It's stricken. It's not in evidence, counsel.

MR. POWELL: Fine. So we disputed it. We got the money back and we were assessed \$16 for which Ms. Mauro nor her mother -- here the relevancy is Ms. Mauro, Anne Mauro, has not paid us that. They then request us to not charge them that fee because she wasn't able to ride, although it was Suburban Express's position, as you've heard in evidence today, that they breached the contract. The breach of that caused them damages and, in this case, it was because they reversed an appropriate contractually agreed charge. Suburban Express then charges the mere \$10 for the office of having to look this information up, send out the collection check and they only requested \$10 for that. When I said this is much more than a \$26 case, Judge, it's because this type of behavior cannot be

acceptable. The contract terms are there for a purpose and Suburban Express has a legitimate business where they want and they need their customers to follow in order to provide the quick and reliable service at a small rate. So --

that business purpose, assuming that there is a business purpose to be legitimate and salutary and even compelling, is to file a small claims case seeking an award of \$26 that takes three-and-a-half hours of trial with a proposed fee award of \$1,182.28 up to the date of trial with another what, we've been here for another two-and-a-half hours, so it looks like you bill \$200 per hour. so another \$500, that's, that's the remedy you think is viable here, counsel?

MR. POWELL: Judge --

THE COURT: Have you ever heard of the common law maxim of de minimis non curat lex?

MR. POWELL: I have, Judge. And I have -- and I have case law on that.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. POWELL: Okay. If I may approach?

THE COURT: You may submit those in due

course. Please --

MR. POWELL: Okay.

Α

THE COURT: -- finish your argument.

MR. POWELL: So, you know, a corporation as Suburban Express cannot, under the supreme court rules, bring an action on its own behalf.

THE COURT: That's correct.

MR. POWELL: So that they have to hire counsel. And the hope is that they hire competent counsel. And there is many things that you look at when you're seeing — and the case law specifically states that, you know, yes, it's the court's discretion, but is — as you're saying just because it's \$26 is not something you consider. There's other elements that you consider, but that's not one of them. And, again, Judge, it's not \$26 on this case, it's 26 times a hundred, times a thousand. I mean, I currently have on file right now numerous cases with these chargeback issues, so it's not just — yes, well, against Ms. Mauro it's one, but it multiplies and it has multiplied.

The costs -- you know, the court's cost is \$77 to file a small claims complaint. The service fee was \$95 dollars to have her served. All requirements under the law. But what you have to look at is she was told

pay the \$26 that your breach caused us to incur and it all goes away and, if you don't, this is what can happen.

And so, you know, in summation, when you look at the fees, Judge, I reviewed the file and filed a verified complaint in .4 hours. I've only spent 5 -- until this trial, I have only spent 5.4 hours on the entire case. Our fee is \$250 an hour. I reduced that by 20 percent. I am only charging \$150 for round trip from Bloomington to Champaign for a 2.2 round trip cost.

I think when you look at the case law that I will hand you, Esker & Sons, Inc. versus Cle-Pa's Partnership, you'll see that the fees aren't outrageous. You can see exactly what we billed for item by line item. It takes time, any lawsuit takes time and I did it minus the trial in 5.4 hours.

We have to consider what's going on here and my client is asking the court for your help. If this was a one instance and done, do you think my client would spend --

MR. BETZ: Objection.

THE COURT: Where's the evidence, first, that there's some what -- as Mr. Toeppen put it early

in his testimony that there's some, I don't know even how to put it, some, some, some epidemic of, of fraud by, by passengers? Where, where in the -- where in the record is there any evidence beyond the face of this case, sir, and how, how would that inform the court as a trier of fact in resolving this case?

MR. POWELL: Okay, Judge.

forum. And it may be a small claims case, literally a \$26 small claims case, counsel, but it is nonetheless a case that's governed by objective application of the rule of law, which I might remind you we are both under respective oaths to uphold. So this is not a political arena. This isn't a business administration class.

This isn't some sort of model problem at night MBA school. It's a case litigated under the rule of law.

Objective rules and dispassionate analysis are to be brought to bear. So mindful of that mode of analysis,

Mr. Powell, what findings of fact and conclusions of law would you suggest the court make?

MR. POWELL: That Ms. Mauro breached the terms of a contract. That, number one, there was a contract, that she breached it and that damages resulted therefrom. And upon the court's finding that

there was a valid contract, that there was a breach of that contract and that damages did result, then you follow the law where attorney's fees may be reasonable if the fees are — they are reasonable if they're disproportionate to the monetary amount of an award. In determining the reasonableness, the court may look to various factors, the skill and standing of the attorney, the nature of the case, the novelty of the issues involved, the significance of the case, the degree of responsibility required, the customary charges for comparable service, the benefit to the client, the reasonable connection between fees sought and the amount involved in the litigation. Those are all elements, Judge.

And you ask what relevance does this have to my client? The relevance is is that it was a breach and it's one of many that we're dealing with. And so if we take each of these cases singularly, I can't answer that question for you. But I can tell you when you look at the benefit of the client and the detriment to the client if this doesn't stop, you have to all come back to was there a contract and was there a breach and was there damages. And then you look at my bills.

And, yes, my fee is 200 an hour reduced 20 percent, but

I did this entire thing in 5.4 hours, costs of which were warned of the defendant that would happen, so the \$26 payment was her option and she chose not to do it following her breach that she acknowledged that she didn't follow the terms of the contract.

For that reason, Judge, we'd ask for the \$16 for the charges filed against us, the \$10 in an early and cheap attempt to collect it and for costs and attorney's fees pursuant to the terms of the contract.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Powell.

A couple of questions, sir. Among these exhibits, what, what language in the terms and conditions are you relying on with regard to the \$16 chargeback fee? There is a liquidated damages provision of \$500, which the plaintiff has apparently abandoned.

MR. POWELL: That's correct. We didn't ask for that. We could have, but we didn't.

THE COURT: So where -- looking at the exhibits attached to the complaint, which the record establishes are also attached to the amended complaint, which of the terms and conditions?

MR. POWELL: Okay, Judge. Let me refer you to Exhibit 3 because that's the actual contract terms that was admitted into evidence.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. POWELL: Paragraph four, bullet point four for the breach of not having a printed ticket.

THE COURT: Okay. That's -- I'm asking where in this -- these written terms and conditions there's, there's any text or intendment that would warrant recovery of the \$16 chargeback fee?

MR. POWELL: The very last bullet point of Exhibit 3. You agree to pay any and all collection costs, including attorney's fees, should collection or other legal action become necessary and that the agreed venue for any legal action arising would be Ford County, which now, again, we've changed and brought it here in Champaign County. So ---

THE COURT: All right. And another question, Mr. Powell, this \$10 fee, what -- how did you arrive at \$10?

MR. POWELL: Mr. Toeppen hires staff to -- and pays them a salary and they get these cases in and a mere \$10 is all that he is charging for his office staff.

THE COURT: 1 That's true, but the law 2 requires that the \$10, the collection fee, be reasonable, so what evidentiary basis is there for a 3 finding of reasonableness aside from your ipse dixit that this time expended was even quantified much less monetized? 6 7 MR. POWELL: If you look at Exhibit, Exhibit 9 --8 THE COURT: Exhibit 9. 9 10 Okay. Go ahead. MR. POWELL: -- for \$10, Mr. Toeppen or 11 his staff has to take time away from their day to find 12 out the violation, to place the terms and conditions of 13 the violation in the collection letter, every case is 14 different, and then they place it in the mail and pay 15 for postage and they send it. 16 THE COURT: Okay. You're up to about 49 17 cents --18 MR. POWELL: The stamp. 19 THE COURT: -- for the stamp. 20 21 MR. POWELL: Yes. THE COURT: Now -- all right. Thank you, 22 counsel. 23 Mr. Betz, what's the defendant's position here? 24

MR. BETZ: May it please the court and counsel.

It has been a long afternoon and, and I didn't quite anticipate it was going to be that long. I'm going to try to make it a little briefer.

THE COURT: Well, counsel, I'll say the same thing to you as I said to Mr. Powell, it's the court's -- not the court's case, it's the party's case.

MR. BETZ: That's correct.

THE COURT: Take as much time as you reasonably need. We've been here we're going on three hours or more and that's, that's fine. One of the few things the court has in relative abundance is time, so don't truncate your presentation for any reason, much less that one.

MR. BETZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

I will still try to be succinct and brief.

Your Honor, I really think that the issue here, the analogy to this being like writing out a check is in apropos. There is a state law regarding writing, writing checks. If you bounce a check, you can get attorney's fees. It's written into state law. It can also be criminally prosecuted. As someone who has represented folks in those kind of cases, I have dealt

with that issue, uttering and publishing, and banks, of course, can charge the fee because it is allowed under the law.

1

2

٦

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The difference, this is not a check. This is a credit card. And there is a bilateral agreement between Ms. Mauro and the credit card company. part of that agreement, they have a right to dispute credit charges. It is one of the few things in federal banking law that is an absolute right. They have under the 15 U.S.C. Section 1643, which is the Federal Truth in Lending Act and the Banking Act, which subsequently became Dodd-Frank and Regulation Z, you have a right when you get notice of that charge, you have 30 days in which to dispute it. It is an absolute right under federal law. Federal law also states there can be no charge for that dispute. The section is charges for error resolution. If a billing error occurred, whether as alleged or in a different amount or matter, the creditor may not impose a charge related to any aspect of the error resolution process, including charges for documentation or investigation and must credit the consumer's account if such charge was assessed pending resolution. The act grants the consumer error resolution rights. The creditor should avoid any

chilling effect on good faith assertion of errors that might result if charges are assessed when no billing error has occurred.

What we have here is an attempt to circumvent the federal law by this agreement. In fact, the agreement states that you are to direct all questions and concerns pertaining to the credit card charges or credits to Suburban Express. He is modifying the bilateral agreement between the credit card holder and the credit card company. He does not have the power to do that. He is not a part of that bilateral agreement. He is also trying to very directly circumvent the federal right to challenge a credit transaction, which they did, in fact, do and Ms. Mauro's mother did it a few days later.

They also — in his contract he says that it's irrevocable, et cetera, yet online they went within five days and filed a written challenge, which they have a right to do according to his own website and that he's supposed to respond within 30 days, and it was late the next summer in which there was some sort of response. This is an extremely one sided, almost bullying sort of contract.

Now people can enter into bad contracts. I've

done it a few times myself. However, this is so one sided as to almost shock the conscience that you're not — you're not permitted to challenge the terms and conditions. You're not permitted to follow federal law when you have the federal right to dispute that ticket. To me, the printing issue is almost irrelevant here. It's the intimidation that's going on trying to — an original filing, which included — which was 43 dollars some odd cents which included that ticket on a verified complaint and then we have this amended complaint down to 26, which is really nothing more than the \$10 and the \$16 because it acknowledged the illegitimacy of the original charges because they'd already been solved at the time the pleading was filed.

I have a problem with that particular issue that this is such an onerous sort of environment, in fact, it confers jurisdiction in Ford County. I haven't raised the jurisdictional issue simply because they couldn't afford an attorney that went to Ford County, formy but it does suggest to me the intent here to discourage and chill anyone challenging any of the terms and conditions. If you have an error, it's very difficult to challenge. You have to do it in writing. Well, they did it in writing, got nowhere. The mother

that she made without answer and finally got through to someone late in the summer. This is like a, a game of gotcha. If you — if you do it on Tuesday, it's (inaudible) on Wednesday. I don't think there's a way to challenge an error here. They have made it extremely difficult. Again, I believe several provisions of this contract are absolutely void and unenforceable. And I'd point to the agreement regarding questions regarding the credit card. That's not the proper party to do it. The — I think everything flows from that because that's where the gravamen of the case is is that she chose to challenge the credit card charge. Everything else flows from that particular point.

I would ask that the court find in favor of the defendant in whole.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Betz.

Mr. Powell, argument in rebuttal and what at last would you offer on the common law doctrine of de minimis non curat lex? I don't need to read any cases necessarily. I'm familiar with the law. What propositions of law would you have the court invoke?

MR. POWELL: The proposition of the law,

1

2 3

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Your Honor, is that there was a time in this dispute --THE COURT: There was what?

MR. POWELL: There was a time in this dispute where it was -- they were asking for \$26. And knowing what was coming, of what our only option was, it does -- you know, it's meaningless on how many times they were contacted. There's no law that says that we have to accept someone's breach. The damages were made They offered here's the \$26 to send us and it's all done and they chose to ignore it and now it's turned into exactly what they were warned of.

MR. BETZ: Objection.

MR. POWELL: Be advised.

MR. BETZ: Objection. It was admitted into evidence that she replied to that offer.

MR. POWELL: Again -- I don't understand what that objection was.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, it's simply I'm not taking it as an evidentiary proffer. argument. Go ahead.

MR. POWELL: That's fine.

So, so the court understands, you know, there was an offer. Here's, here's your breach -- here's your breach and here's our damages, \$26. Pay it and be done. No. That wasn't acceptable. So they, they want to fight this. Well, there's nothing by law that requires us to say, oh, okay. We'll, we'll waive it and forgive it. That's, that's not a requirement. And we didn't do that. And when we warned what would have happened, we're following through.

If you listen to Mr. Betz's argument, Suburban Express should have no recourse to anyone that files a chargeback request regardless of what the reasoning is because, in this case, we had a breach and they still requested a chargeback. So — and, again, Judge, this is one case. Okay. So now, oh, well, all you have to do is cancel the credit card payment saying you didn't authorize it, saying that you didn't get the services that you bought with no recourse. The next person does it because there's no recourse, the next person does it because there's no recourse. This isn't a \$26 case, Judge. Yes — and we had other options and I, I chose not to file and request those, so \$26 actual damages initially was done — was done at my advice.

THE COURT: Do you think your -- a prayer for \$500 in liquidated damages would have withstood scrutiny under the law?

MR. POWELL: That -- I'm sorry, Judge.

1 That's --2 Well, you're suggesting that, THE COURT: that with great magnanimity the plaintiff has forsworn 3 any claim under the terms and conditions to seek a \$500 liquidated damages award. 5 Do you think that --MR. POWELL: That's --6 7 THE COURT: -- liquidated damages clause 8 is valid? 9 MR. POWELL: That's not a part of this case, Judge. 10 THE COURT: I understand it isn't, but 11 you're suggesting that, that you're, you're simply 12 13 pursuing a 26 hundred -- or a \$26 claim here and, and 14 that you've voluntary forsworn seeking liquidated damages of 500. Do you think the \$500 liquidated 15 damage award would be valid under the law given the 16 purpose and definition of liquidated damages? 17 MR. POWELL: In this case, I chose not to 18 19 file it because I questioned it. THE COURT: I understand that. Please 20 answer my question. 21 MR. POWELL: Under, under this case? 22 THE COURT: 23 Yes. 24 MR. POWELL: I can't say it is, but I

didn't do it. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. MR. POWELL: You know, I didn't plead it. 3 THE COURT: All right. 5 MR. POWELL: Under other circumstances, absolutely it would be valid but, in this case, I, I 6 didn't plead that. 7 THE COURT: Okay. MR. POWELL: So, so again, if I may 9 approach, Judge, I just -- I have the cases here that I 10 11 would like to give you. 12 THE COURT: All right. Why don't you 13 cite for them for the record as well, please. MR. POWELL: Okay. As far as privity of 14 15 contract, when there is actually --16 THE COURT: And I don't believe there's 17 been any privity issue raised. I don't think we're at issue with regard to, to privity; are we? 18 MR. POWELL: Yes. It's been raised by 19 defendant saying that they have an automatic right to 20 21 dispute anything they want at no ramification to them. 22 And we're -- and, and the argument which I made through this trial is that we only have privity of contract 23 with our holder. And this case law says on a breach of

24

contract, that's true. This is Barbara Mellander versus Kileen --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. POWELL: -- Fourth District Appellate Court, 1980.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. POWELL: Again, not that Your Honor needs this, but just so the record is complete, we've got the elements for breach of contract, Finch versus Illinois Community College Board, Fifth District Appellate Court, Illinois, 2000. And the attorney's fees, just so you — the elements, which also establishes attorney's fees may be reasonable even if the fees are disproportionate to the monetary amount of the award is J.B. Esker & Sons, Inc. versus Cle-Pa's, C L E dash P A apostrophe S, Partnership, Illinois Fifth District Appellate Court, 2001.

THE COURT: All right. And you suggested, Mr. Powell, that you had -- you were familiar with the doctrine of de minimis non curat lex and that you had some case law with regard to that legal doctrine. Have you any such authority?

MR. POWELL: Judge, I -- this -- what was done today could not be done in 5.4 hours. All right.

So here's how conscience I was of that law, Judge. I told my client --

THE COURT: Are you familiar with the doctrine?

MR. POWELL: I am familiar with the doctrine.

THE COURT: All right. And how do you think it applies to this case, if at all?

MR. POWELL: I don't think that does apply to this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Why not?

MR. POWELL: Because everything done here was done with a conscious regard for that. It was done at my suggestion. We billed the client anything additional above us. I think Your Honor knows that 5.4 hours for what we've done so far is very, very reasonable and low. It just — it wasn't applicable because I made it not applicable.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Well, this case is remarkable at various levels and the court will incorporate by reference into this ruling from the bench some of the comments that the court made during the course of colloquy with counsel.

The court is neither cognizant of nor does the

court deem a matter of consequence to the outcome of this case that there might be some concern on the part of the plaintiff beyond the scope of the record in this case to somehow send messages to past, present or prospective clients. Courts don't send messages.

Courts render judgments on matters that are raised by pleadings in the case at hand. And this is a contract case. And that's all it is.

7

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now the court isn't entirely convinced that Mr. Powell understands the legal maxim of which the court made mention, the doctrine of de minimis non And even so, his proposed application of this and his explanation as to why that doctrine is potentially of no application is circular and he's assuming as a premise the fact that it doesn't apply and circular reasoning is simply neither fodder nor firmament for any court in rendering a decision. The doctrine goes back centuries and it essentially translates to this English notion, and that is that the law doesn't concern itself with trifles. And we're dealing here with a claim for \$26, a claim, litigation, the trial of which has now entered its fourth hour and the prelitigation of which purportedly took some \$1,182.20 in attorney's fees, not including

three hours for the trial.

Я

Now one valid point, albeit not a dispositive point, that Mr. Powell makes is that under Part I of the Illinois Supreme Court Rules, a corporation such as Suburban Express has no choice but to hire a lawyer to pursue a small claim and so this isn't a case in which absent a waiver of the application of the court of the pertinent Part I Supreme Court Rules Mr. Toeppen or a corporate agent could himself or herself have pursued this claim and thus avoid incurring attorney's fees. And that's certainly something to be taken into account in this case. But be that as it may, we have here a claim for \$26.

Now as the appellate court observed in *People*versus Durham, and the court is quoting here from 391

Ill.App.3d at 1102 through 1103, quote, litigation like
this brings the judicial system into disrepute.

Rational citizens not connected to the law would deem
this appeal an utter waste of time and resources for
all concerned. The time and money already spent during
this appeal amounts to squandered resources. We will
not be part of further squandering. The maxim de
minimis non curat lex, again, the law does not concern
itself with trifles, retains force in Illinois and is

wholly applicable in this case. The maxim applies even to constitutional claims and it's function is to place outside the scope of legal relief the sorts of injuries that are so small that they must be accepted as a price of living in society rather than made a federal case out of. Period. And the court will, for the purpose of this quotation, omit reference to the internal quotation marks and citations.

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's really noteworthy that the Durham case dealt with an appeal from and criminal conviction in which a defendant claimed that he was entitled to relief for time spent in custody against a \$300 fine that had been imposed as part and parcel of a criminal conviction. And there was some suspicion, albeit no evidence of record, that the defendant had perhaps met -- spent a matter of days in custody, and so those who are unfamiliar with that phase of the law or area of the law know it, under the Illinois law one is entitled credit against a fine for time spent in pretrial custody at the rate of \$5 per day. And the appellate court held that this doctrine of de minimis non curat lex was applicable to the facts of record in the Durham case and that it was just a trifle and a waste of resources for the appellate court to remand the case to the trial court to further litigate a claim that had an amount in controversy of roughly 10 to \$15. And we've got a similar situation here, a claim for \$26. And with all due respect, one could read a transcript of this case or listen to the audiotape or just look at the common law record, the docket sheet, and see all of the time that's been brought to bear in this case, all of the expense to which the parties have respectively been put, all of the efforts of truly able counsel in the case, and both lawyers are truly capable members of the bar as to whom the court implies no criticism, but one could look at this case globally and objectively knowing nothing about the law or the legal system and wonder just what on earth the parties and the court have been doing all of these months.

К

Ŕ

Now the court doesn't necessarily believe that that common law doctrine is of dispositive application here, nor does the court believe that it is a matter of consequence, much less a dispositive facet of this case that the parties have this dispute and couldn't resolve it between themselves. The court has chosen to apply rules of contract law objectively and dispassionately in this case in arriving at its conclusion.

There are two elements of damages here, a \$16

chargeback from the plaintiff's credit card processor and a \$10 fee for apparently sending a letter to either the elder or younger Ms. Mauro or both and perhaps even looking at the Suburban Express records during the course of endeavoring to resolve this dispute. There's also a prayer for \$1,182.20 in attorney's fees, apparently to be awarded in pursuit of recovery of this \$26 claim, plus -- and we're now well into our third hour -- three plus hours of expenses at \$250 an hour for trying the case, or discounted to \$200 as the case may be. So even assuming that Mr. Powell's discounted rate of \$200 is applicable, we're looking at roughly \$1,782.28 in a proposed attorney fee award to recover \$26 plus court costs. And If I could channel Glenn Beck all I could say is really?

Now just because there is a disproportion between an amount in controversy and an ultimate award of damages on the one hand and a fee award on the other does not necessarily defeat a claim that a proposed fee award is reasonable. The ultimate standard under the law, and Illinois law is no exception, is that any fee has to be reasonable. The amount in controversy and the ultimate yield of a case if the claimant is successful is not a matter of consequence. There have

been cases in which a court simply entered declaratory relief and and awarded no monetary damages which have involved attorney fee awards of hundreds of thousands of dollars, so I'm not suggesting that the disproportionality between a \$26 claim and a proposed award of some \$1,700 is per se unreasonable but, nonetheless, the nature of the claim here would cause the court to harbor grave concerns about whether the proposed award of fees is even close to being reasonable.

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That said, the bottom line is this. The court's of the view that Mr. Betz's claim that federal law precludes recovery of this chargeback fee is well-taken. In addition, even if that legal premise is an errant one, there's simply nothing in the text of this somewhat draconian set of rules and regulations that would permit recovery of this. The bullet point on which able counsel relies suggests that there's a right to recovery -- recover collection costs and that textually would include and it would also implicitely include fees incurred, costs incurred during the course of collection and not a freestanding element of And it seems to the court that the recovery damages. of this \$16 fee is a dispute that exists as and between Suburban Express and its credit card manager and neither the elder or the younger Ms. Mauro can be looked to to compensate the plaintiff for that.

1.0

With regard to the \$10 fee, the law requires, and there's a Fourth District Appellate Court case right on point, that a collection agent is entitled to fees. As is the case with attorney's fees, although they're governed by evidentiary rules and elemental rules that are stripped from and different from the rules of professional conduct, the collection fees have to be reasonable. And there is nothing on this record that would establish this \$10 collection fee as being anything beyond speculative and subjective.

Now it's readily evident that the plaintiff and able counsel think that they're being reasonable and magnanimous by just charging \$10, but that begs the question of reasonableness and there's simply no objective basis on this record with regard to how the court could objectively determine, one, what amount of time went into this collection activity and, two, how that time spent by the Suburban Express employees could be reasonably monetized. So, accordingly, the court finds that this claim is without factual and legal basis.

The court enters a finding and judgment in favor of the defendant and against the plaintiff. costs are taxed to the plaintiff. Judgment is entered accordingly. There is no written judgment order required.

Now it is now well past closing time, so to say. The court is under instructions from the presiding judge to not stay late given scheduling and union contract concerns and so the court is unable to address for trial 13-SC-1650, Suburban Express against Mr. Cater Minnis and I apologize to the parties and able counsel for its inability to preside.

I'm simply going to show, gentlemen, that 13-SC-1650 is continued until further order of court.

Mr. Powell, the court is not going to hold you and your client to trial in this courtroom. It appears as though the legal landscape of the case is the very same as Ms. Mauro's. And the court has articulated as best it can what the court's understanding of the applicable law is. And the court will not take umbrage and will perfectly well understand, sir, if you should care to invoke Section 2-1001 of the Code of Civil Procedure in the other case and seek assignment to another judge, that's a perfectly legitimate tactical

decision and it's an absolute right that you and your client have. If you wish to try the case in Courtroom D here, confer with Mr. Betz and contact Madam Clerk and get date for trial. If you should decide to exercise your right for substitution of judge, the Section is 2-1001 of the Code of Civil Procedure, just file the motion. It will be referred here and they're granted by law as a matter of course. The matter will be allotted or assigned to another judge for trial.

Thank you, able counsel, for your patience. Thanks to the parties.

The court will be in recess.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT CHAMPAIGN COUNTY, ILLINOIS

I, LAURA B. WORKMAN, an Official Court Reporter

for the Circuit Court of Champaign County, Sixth

Judicial Circuit of Illinois, transcribed the

electronic recording of the proceeding in the

above-entitled cause to the best of my ability and

based on the quality of the recording, and I hereby

certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate

transcript of said electronic recording.

Official Court Reporter

Dated this 24th day of April, 2014.