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(Pledge of Allegiance)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Kim, could you do the roll call for us, please? MS. BARON:

John Poteet?
MR. POTEET:
Here.
MS. BARON:
George Brewer?
MR. BREWER:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Dino Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Tony Cormier?
MR. CORMIER:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Ron Duplessis?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Here.
MS. BARON:

George Floyd?
MR. FLOYD:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Kirby Roy?
MR. ROY:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Darty Smith?
MR. SMITH:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Steve Olave?
MR. OLAVE:
(No response.)
MS. BARON:
Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.
MR. POTEET:
Thank you. Anyone here today for
public comments?
MS. BARON:
No, sir.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. So, hopefully, everyone
has had a chance to read the minutes of the
last meeting and, if so, I'd like to entertain a motion to approve.

MR. SMITH:
I make a motion to approve.
MR. POTEET:
Darty.
Second?
MR. CORMIER:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Tony.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. The motion carries.
Items for discussion, the first
thing we have is our financial report.
Mona.
MS. ANDERSON:
All right. If you will turn in your binders to the financial statements for the month ending March 31st. Cash in the
bank at the end of the month was $\$ 1,787,792$. The hearings and fines accounts receivable was $\$ 515,200$. At the bottom of the page, the current liabilities were $\$ 48,549$, and the primary increase in that was the escrow fines, which will -- if they're approved today will be moved to revenue next month. On Page 2, the deferred inflows were $\$ 289,515$. Those are the deferred 2016 fees. Turning on to Page 5 -- I'm sorry, Page 3, the statement of revenues, expenses, and change in net position -- so on the statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net position, the year-to-date revenue was $\$ 1,440,648$ compared to $\$ 1,078,000$ last year. The salaries and related benefits increased this month about $\$ 4,800$ from the same month last year and the remainder of the expenses decreased $\$ 3,200$ for the month and increased $\$ 18,900$ for the year-to-date. On Page 5, the vehicle maintenance, we had an increase from that mainly due to the age of our vehicles. We have one vehicle that required major repairs and another one that had to be towed and is
having to be replaced. The year-to-date net position was $\$ 665,839$.

On Page 6, you can see the month to month comparison of revenues and expenses last year to this year. On Page 7 is a graph of those amounts and -- between February and March. We were pretty flat on both revenue and expenses. Not much change there. Page 8 shows a comparison of the revenue year-to-date to last year. There were increases in most areas, including the salesmen -- salesperson licenses, auction transaction fees, and hearing costs and fines.

Page 9 is the certificate of deposit summary. There were no changes this month -- I'm sorry, last month. This month, we will have -- the Landmark CDs are up for maturity on -- and we'll mostly likely roll those over.

On Page 10, the accounts receivable hearings report, we had an increase in fines of $\$ 8,800$ and payments of $\$ 26,250$. That first page shows $\$ 6,250$ of that and the second page shows $\$ 20,000$
collected on Lauco, the balance being \$515,200.

So unless there are any questions, that concludes my report. MR. ROY:

Question. Mechanical issues with our vehicles, they're outdated. They're old. I mean, we have funds.

MS . ANDERSON:
Yes, sir. But they really
require that the vehicles be totally out before we can surplus them and order a new vehicle.

MR. ROY:
I did hear that. But these were for the investigators?

MS . ANDERSON:
Yes, sir. And sometimes it's costly for us to maintain those older vehicles that are having problems. They're far off. We have to, you know, tow them back to the office to have them repaired and -- when they're not functioning.

MR. ROY:
How many miles do these vehicles have?

MS . ANDERSON:
It varies.
Derek, do you know off the top of your head? I don't know off the top of my head.

MR. PARNELL:
I think we only have maybe two of them, one under 100,000 miles. This fiscal year, we did budget to purchase two vehicles and we have to submit approval for those two vehicles and it's a little process. We have to get approval and them after we get approval for them to purchase it, we can purchase them. So we budgeted one vehicle for next fiscal year, which, of course, is in July. I'm trying to get two for this fiscal year.

MR. ROY:
Thanks. I'll move on that report.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. We have a motion. I need a second.

MR. SMITH:

I'll second.
MR. POTEET:
Second by Darty.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Financial reports are approved.

All right. The next thing, we have a payment of invoice for Attorney Sheri Morris. Derek.

MR. PARNELL:
Commissioners, you can find in your packet Attorney Morris' bill for services for March 2015. I've reviewed the services performed and the accountant has reviewed the calculations and that they are correct. Attorney Morris' bill for services for March 2015 is $\$ 4,130$. Commissioners, I ask that you approve payment of Attorney Morris' bill.

MR. CORMIER:

I make a motion.
MR. POTEET:
I have a motion from Tony.
I need a second.
MR. BREWER:
Second over here.
MR. POTEET:
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. The next thing on our agenda is a discussion of amended stipulated order. Derek, help us out here, select Car Company.

MR. PARNELL:
Our discussion of the amended stipulated agency order is for Select Car Company located in Shreveport, Louisiana. Commissioners, Select Car Company came before you in an administrative hearing in November of 2014 . He then returned in January of 2015 to ask for additional time
to clear up some of those issues that he was having out there. You should have it in your packet the amended order and the findings during that hearing. And he was given an additional 30 days to clean up some things and make sure that he had everything that he was working on with some of those consumers to clear up some of those issues and concerns that he had out there.

On February 26 th, we did receive from Mr. Anthony several documents, which appear to be noted, and discussed what he has done to alleviate some of those concerns. Mr. Anthony is here today. He wanted to go through and kind of let you all know exactly what he has done, because as I understand the way the stipulated agency order is, is that if he hasn't complied within the time frame that was prescribed that he can get additional fines and his license suspended.

MR. POTEET:
Do you -- at this point, do you think that he has complied with everything? MR. PARNELL:

Not everything. I brought Montie in today. He's kind of more abreast of exactly what's going on with him.

So Montie, can you.
MR. POTEET:
Montie, please get us updated on that.

MR. WISENOR:
I've been communicating with Mr. Anthony pretty much every week, just getting updates on the -- at the time of the first hearing, I think there were five consumers that had not received their plates, registration, and the lender had not had their liens recorded. As of today, four of those have been done. One of them is still pending. Mr. Anthony stated that he's having issues getting the title from another dealer that he purchased a vehicle from. And then, also, another customer's issue has come forward since then, a customer by the name Eddie Washington.

Mr. Anthony maybe can explain the current situation on that, but I believe the title was being held by MAFS on some titles
that they were holding against Select Car Company. But as of now, those two are still pending, as the others were, and we have copies of the registration showing the others were taken care of.

MR. POTEET:
I noticed -- I didn't remember everything on this, but $I$ noticed the last thing on the findings of fact was that there was -- you mentioned MAFS, which is now Nextgear, $I$ think, because they merged with another company. Item \#15, litigation between respondent and Nextgear is still pending in Indiana. Is that the one you're talking about?

MR. WISENOR:
Yes, we can explain.

MR. POTEET:

> Well, we'll get to that in a few minutes. All right. I guess Mr. Anthony -does he need to be sworn in? It's not a hearing.

MR. HALLACK:

> Yes, it's not a hearing.

MR. POTEET:

Okay. Mr. Anthony, do you want to tell us what's going on? MR. ANTHONY:

Well, we have all but one of the titles that are registered and liens recorded, but the one we have, we've not been able to get it from ZBest Cars in Lafayette. We are in the process of filing suit for two titles and before we got our dispute settled, they filed suit against us back sometime ago, but before that, we were trying to get these titles and after about three or four months, we called and checked on the titles and they said they had them. We said, put them in a draft or send them to our bank and we'll get them taken care of if all the paperwork is in line. Well, they don't know how to do that. You know, this is a company that has been in business for some time, but don't know how to handle a title with a draft, which is done by -very, very often, but they didn't know. So they finally sent them and it was not what it should be in there. And we've gone back and we tried to -- there's only one of the
ones now that they still have that we needed the title for and we offered them dollars to get the title, but they came back and didn't want to accept our offer. Of course, this caused us problems with lenders, because it was some four months after we had purchased these cars before they had access to the titles on these cars. And, of course, it caused us problems with the lenders. It's caused us problems with the customer and, of course, with the Commission, you know, this concern. But we have been trying to get them to get that court date set, which they have not done to this date and we just basically are at a stand off with them right now.

MR. POTEET:
Is that -- you said, ZBest. Is that the same title as with Nextgear? MR. ANTHONY:

No. That's a different one.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. So you're in a court battle with zBest to get those titles? MR. ANTHONY:

Yes. But they want to get the court date set, so we can go ahead and get this thing completed and taken care of.

MS. MORRIS:
Do you have a copy of the suit or the suit number?

MR. ANTHONY:
I'm sorry?
MS. MORRIS:
Do you have a copy of the suit or the suit number? MR. ANTHONY:

I don't have it with me, but I do have copies of it. MS. MORRIS:

Maybe you can send that.
MR. CORMIER:
Well, what exactly was the issue with getting the title, is there an excuse for it, what was their reasoning?

MR. ANTHONY:
Because we are asking for some help on getting the liens recorded because of the fact that it's going to cost us extra dollars for penalties and fines and they're

[^0]not wanting to do anything to help us with those things. And that's what we're asking for, because they're the ones that helped with the titles before, for about four or five months before we ever had knowledge of them being there.

MR. CORMIER:
Okay. I see. So it's not that you didn't pay them in time?

MR. ANTHONY:
Right.
MR. CORMIER:
They just didn't have the titles in.

MR. POTEET:
So is the title available right now?

MR. ANTHONY:
Yes, it is available and we have had made the efforts to get it and we made an offer on what we paid for the car to get it, but that's not what they want.

MR. POTEET:
They want more than you offered?
MR. ANTHONY:

More than what we agreed to.
MR. CORMIER:
Did you have some type of draft or buyer's order?

MR. ANTHONY:
I'm sorry?
MR. CORMIER:
Did you have some type of draft when you bought the car stating how much you were going to pay for it?

MR. ANTHONY:
Yes. You know, a draft is almost like a check. You just enclose paperwork in there and it comes to your bank and everything. We go down and if all the paperwork is done correctly where we can get it registered, we go ahead and pay it and our bank sends the money back.

MR. CORMIER:
Right. I know how it works. My question is, the amount y'all agreed on, they want more than the amount $y^{\prime}$ all agreed on?

MR. ANTHONY:
They want more than what we paid
them for the car.
MR. CORMIER:
And do y'all have anything in
writing like a draft bill of sale or anything like that?

MR. ANTHONY:
We've agreed to bring them -from Shreveport to Lafayette, we agreed to bring them cash money to pick up the draft, but we have not gotten them to agree to that yet.

MR. CORMIER:
Okay.
MR. ANTHONY:
But they've changed attorneys on us twice.

MR. POTEET:
I'm having a little trouble
understanding this. Okay. So how much did you offer for the car?

MR. ANTHONY:
We paid them -- well, we first offered them $\$ 2,500$--

MR. POTEET:
Okay.

MR. ANTHONY:
-- and they wouldn't take it because of the problems that we've been through and we came back and offered them the $\$ 3,200$. That's what we paid for it, $\$ 3,200$.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. And you got this car and you took it to your place and you sold it to a retail customer?

MR. ANTHONY:
Right.
MR. POTEET:
So they gave you the car?
MR. ANTHONY:
Yes, we had the car.
MR. POTEET:
But you didn't have an agreed upon price?

MR. ANTHONY:
Oh, yes, we give them a draft at the time that we purchased the car.

MR. POTEET:
Well, why did they want more
money?

MR. ANTHONY:
For the time that we had this car and -- some probably six months now.

MR. POTEET:
Well, $I$ don't want to be hard about this, but it seems to me like you need to go ahead and pay for the car, and then sue them for the title.

MR. ANTHONY:
That's what we're trying.
MR. POTEET:
Because we have a retail customer that's hanging out and the only reason that he or she doesn't have their title -anybody here that's in the car business -and correct me if I'm wrong on this -- but I've got a customer that doesn't have the title that they can't properly register the car that they bought, because you and zBest are fighting over $\$ 700$. I don't think that that's acceptable.

MR. ANTHONY:
We've offered to buy the car back
from the customer and he doesn't want to do it yet. We've offered to put him in another
car. He wants to keep that one. We've made those two offers to the customer.

MR. POTEET:
Well --
MR. DUPLESSIS:
So this is a $\$ 700$ difference
here; is that it? I mean, that's the whole --

MR. ANTHONY:
We've offered him -- you know, we were wanting more money for the problems that we've had the extent that we've been having, because they didn't furnish the title in a timely manner. You know, it was -- it was five or six months they had the -we had the car, but they didn't have the paperwork to us.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, that's an issue. You can't cash a draft without a title.

MR. ANTHONY:
Right.
MR. CORMIER:
Mr. Anthony, your attorneys' fees are going to probably run you more than $\$ 700$
Betty D. Glissman, CCR
to fight this.
MR. ANTHONY:
I don't think he can beat us in court.

MR. CORMIER:
But the problem is, the customer is the one suffering here.

MR. ANTHONY:
Right. I agree.
MR. CORMIER:
You know, we try to --
MR. ANTHONY:
We've offered to do these two things, either one, to buy it back or to put him in another vehicle. At this point in time, just as late as Friday, we made the same offer to him, again.

MR. POTEET:
Well, we're dancing around that issue just to begin with.

MR. TAYLOR:
All dealers probably in the state do it, but at the end of the day, you can't sell a car without a title. I mean -MR. BREWER:

You're not supposed to.
MR. POTEET:
Obviously, it happens, because we have non-delivery of title as our number one issue; is that right?

MR. PARNELL:
Right.
MR. POTEET:
So, again, I'm not a car dealer. I'm in the auction business. So I've got car dealers around this table. Wouldn't it make the most sense -- this is what I think. Wouldn't it make the most sense that he pays ZBest to get that title, close this deal out with the customer, and then go back and fight ZBest?

MR. CORMIER:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
Is there anybody here that disagrees with that?

MR. HALLACK:
And, legally, that's the best
thing to do, because if not --
MR. BREWER:

Actually, he's not supposed to have the vehicle on his lot to sell until he has the title in his possession and he has 21 days, I think it is, to produce the title, but the State can actually go in and issue another title to that consumer and bypass all of y'all, and then don't care if you get your money or not, but it's happened before.

MR. WISENOR:
The customer would have to file a claim against the dealer's bond and go through that process.

MR. BREWER:
Right.
MR. POTEET:
That's not any more expedient -I mean, that's -- you're right. That is a remedy, but that's not any more expedient than the other two things. I mean, if I'm trying to get this consumer his title as quickly as possible, the best thing would be for you to pay ZBest and get the title.

MR. BREWER:
Right, get over with.

MS. BARON:
Will zBest accept what you're offering and give you the title?

MR. ANTHONY:
They won't accept what we paid for it.

MS. BARON:
So they won't give you the title?
MR. POTEET:
They want $\$ 3,200$. They want more money.

MR. TAYLOR:
One has nothing to do with the other for what you sold for in the beginning. Now, you have to pay them whatever and, like I said, countersue for the difference.

MR. POTEET:
Yes. I mean, here we've got what our remedies are. You can do what Mr. Brewer was telling you and you'll be completely out, plus your bond will be filed on and you'll probably no longer be able to do business as a car dealer in our state. In fact, I'm not going to say probably, you
won't. Once there has been a claim against your bond, it doesn't get resolved very well. Your other option is to keep dragging this customer out while you and ZBest fight over $\$ 700$. What $I$ think makes the most sense is to, as soon as possible, get ZBest paid off. Then, get the consumer taken care of. Then, go back and fight ZBest in court or whatever it is you want to do.

Is there anybody here that disagrees with that?

MR. HALLACK:
I would suggest that we have an investigator contact whoever it is he's dealing with at ZBest and try to work -make sure the deal gets worked out.

MR. POTEET:
That will be good.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
At this point, ZBest is actually withholding title and that is strictly against the law for the consumer.

MR. HALLACK:
Unfortunately, they're not licensed by us anymore.

MS. BARON:
No, they're not.
MR. WISENOR:
I believe that the majority of the --

MS. BARON:
They're licensed through the Louisiana Motor Vehicle Commission, not with us.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It doesn't matter. They sold a used car and our commission has the right to regulate the sale.

MR. HALLACK:
Only licensees.
MS . BARON:
Only our licensees.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
If they have a license, we have the right to regulate them.

MR. GUILLORY:
Was it bought directly from ZBest or was it bought through their auction?

MR. ANTHONY:
They used to have a business
probably a couple of miles from where we are located and I bought the car from them directly off the lot and since then, they have closed. MR. GUILLORY:

I'm just -- all I'm curious about is if it was sold through an auction or you just made an offer on the vehicle on their lot.

MR. ANTHONY:
It was bought directly from them. MR. MOTET:

I think that Mr. Hallack, our attorney, has made the best suggestion, which is for Montie to get in touch with ZBest and see if we can't expedite this. But no matter what, we need to get that title.

Mr. ANTHONY:
And I agree with y'all.
MR. MOTET:
Okay.
MR. ANTHONY:
I want to get it done.
MR. MOTET:

All right. So let's move on to the one that's the litigation with Nextgear. I'm assuming that title is still out -MR. WISENOR:

Yes.
MR. POTEET:
-- that you have a consumer with a car with no title, because you can't get it from Nextgear. Tell us a little bit about that one.

MR. ANTHONY:
I traded the car, and then I sold the car. He came in and he wanted to trade it for this Chevrolet and we made a deal and agreed and since then, we still have not been able to get the title, because it's tied up in litigation. We have contacted him and I think the car has been sold from the guy that bought it to someone else. I tried to make contact with them on Friday before $I$ came here to find out what the deal was on it. Then, all the phone numbers that I had were no good anymore. MR. POTEET:

Again, I have to walk through
this. I'm not as smart as some people, but you -- it has been retailed at -- somewhere has the car been retailed, did you retail the car?

MR. ANTHONY:
I retailed it.
MR. POTEET:
And then the retail customer sold it?

MR. ANTHONY:
That is what that customer says.
MR. WISENOR:
He traded it in.
MR. ANTHONY:
Traded it in.
MR. HALLACK:
To another dealer?
MR. WISENOR:
To another dealer in town and he's been contacting me, wanting to try to get -- and the majority of these issues that Mr. Anthony is having were a dispute with the -- either the floor planner or the -and the lender on some -- most of these situations.

MR. POTEET:
But what's the --
MS . BARON:
Have we tried to get the title like we normally do?

MR. WISENOR:
I contacted their local rep and he's supposed to be checking, because he said that even though Nextgear and DSC and MAFS combined, that Manheim is still handling some of their older deals, because all this $I$ think took place during that merge of the two companies. So I've got a man checking on that right now. MR. POTEET:

Okay.
MR. ANTHONY:
I did talk to some of Manheim's people last week and they were unable to find the title, but, you know, the Nextgear rep is in the process of trying to get the title from them. It was bought and sold through Manheim and when they merged, Nextgear is supposed to have the title, but we have not found it.

MR. POTEET:
Why is there litigation between you and Nextgear?

MR. ANTHONY:
Because of the floor plan whenever we had those cars that were out and hadn't been paid off at the time that they made their audit.

MR. HALLACK:
And his defense was they still -under the Manheim agreement, they still owed him money --

MR. ANTHONY:
$\$ 50,000$.
MR. HALLACK:
-- that he could access, but
after the merger, they refused to allow him access to those funds.

MR. CORMIER:
Because he was out of trust, though, basically.

MR. POTEET:
Well, they didn't owe you money. He meant that you didn't have a credit line anymore.

MR. CORMIER:
They cut it off, because he was out of trust.

MR. ANTHONY:
This is a reserve that $I$ had built up over time. I had a reserve, I think $\$ 100$ every car that we bought and floored through Manheim and I had built it up to approximately $\$ 50,000$.

MR. POTEET:
Montie, let me ask a question. Let's look at this in the most bare bones way possible. If we paid -- if he paid Nextgear, MAFS, whoever is handling this, for that car, would he be able to get the title?

MR. WISENOR:
If they can locate the title, because --

MR. POTEET:
Did they lose the title?
MR. WISENOR:
Well, that's what I'm saying, I'm checking into that myself.

MR. ANTHONY:

They misplace paperwork and titles, you know.

MR. POTEET:
Yes. We do that, too, probably, but usually you can get another title. I mean, sometimes it's harder than at other times, but some are easy, some are hard, but they can be replaced. So I guess what I'm saying is, how much do you owe Nextgear to get this car?

MR. ANTHONY:
I think it's $\$ 5,000$, I believe, off the top of my head.

MR. POTEET:
All right. Well, I would suggest here, again, that -- to find the most expedient matter and Montie will help you on that.

MR. WISENOR:
Like I said, one of their reps is going to get the information for me.

MR. POTEET:
Based on what I've heard so far, I don't think we can -- I mean, help me out here, guys. What do you think we should do?

MR. BREWER:
Well, you've been paid for both vehicles they're talking about, right?

MR. ANTHONY:
I'm sorry?
MR. BREWER:
You've been paid your money for the vehicles?

MR. ANTHONY:
Yes. It was a trade-in on one of them.

MR. TAYLOR:
Is this your only problem, Nextgear right now? Is this your last problem -- is your total exposure with Nextgear right now, this one?

MR. ANTHONY:
Maybe more than that, but it's possible we could be -- come out on the plus side. Our attorney tried to contact them. He hasn't heard anything from them in two months.

MR. TAYLOR:
Do you have a dollar amount of exposure that you have with Nextgear right
now, not including the $\$ 50,000$, just how much do you owe Nextgear right now, to get square with Nextgear?

MR. ANTHONY:
Probably in the 30 s.
MR. TAYLOR:
In the 30 s. Okay. And $I$ would assume if you're in the $30 s$, there's a lot more other cars out there with people riding around with no -- they don't have titles to their cars; is that correct?

MR. ANTHONY:
No.
MR. HALLACK:
These are the only two, right?
MR. ANTHONY:
Right.
MR. TAYLOR:
Then, why is the $30 s$, if -- Mr.
Hallack, can you help me?
MR. HALLACK:
It's been a long time since I've read the lawsuit. So I'm not sure exactly what all Nextgear is claiming that he owes them for.

MR. WISENOR:
I don't know.
MR. BREWER:
You must still have the cars then.

MR. HALLACK:
That's true. They picked up all their cars.

MR. BREWER:
They picked the cars up, but you still owe them $\$ 30,000$ ?

MR. ANTHONY:
Probably somewhere in the low 30 s.

MR. TAYLOR:
Which means he probably could
have just paid for just those two to get those titles. I mean, I'm sure they're not going to release them.

MS. BARON:
That's what they's supposed to do, but --

MR. POTEET:
Well, I mean, they could be forced to release them. They could be
forced to if it goes that far to get it in the hand of the consumer.

MR. GUILLORY:
Normally -- I've dealt with -through them. Fees, penalties, interest, at the end of the day, the dealer was able to come up with the money to pay for what was the original floor payment to the -- by the state. They released the title, because basically they told them, you don't want to get caught, you are going down the road, you can't recover from it. Your fees, penalties and interest, you just go and do whatever you want. That consumer will get that title and you can either do it clean or you can do it dirty, but one way or the other, he will end up with the title, so the guy just signed off and released it.

MR. WISENOR:
Nextgear already knows if they'll have -- I mean, if we -- if the customer files a claim then we'll go get the title, but that's what Mr. Anthony was trying to avoid by taking care of them before the customers went to that step.

MR. TAYLOR:
So I guess the whole point I'm getting at, do we have enough money today right now to take care of the ZBest problem and the Nextgear problem to get these customers right in their cars?

MR. ANTHONY:
Yes.
MR. TAYLOR:
You do. Okay. How many months are we into this 60 days? I think we gave him 60 days to get everything together and to go through tax time.

MR. POTEET:
Well, we -- the date that I signed the order is January $30 t h$.

MR. TAYLOR:
Didn't we give him a 30-day extension and we are 30 days past the 30 days; is that correct?

MR. POTEET:
Well, 30 days from January 30 th would be March 30 th, and now we're almost to the 30-day extension.

MR. ANTHONY:

I thought we would have the ZBest title, but they wouldn't release it.

MR. POTEET:
Right.
MR. BREWER:
Can I ask you, are you assigning temp tags to these people to drive these vehicles?

MR. ANTHONY:
We give them 7 -- 5 day tags
since the other one expired.
MR. POTEET:
You know you're not supposed to do that, right?

MR. ANTHONY:
I'm sorry?
MR. POTEET:
I said you know you're not supposed to do that?

MR. ANTHONY:
Okay.
MR. WISENOR:
I wasn't aware he was doing that.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
What's the alternative in a
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MR. POTEET:
Let me ask you another question. Let's go back to the item with the dispute with Mid-Atlantic involving the titles to the vehicle. Those were -- that was a consumer lender, Mid-Atlantic, correct?

MR. ANTHONY:
They floor plan.
MR. POTEET:
Oh, they were a floor planner for you?

MR. ANTHONY:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. I thought they were a consumer lender.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Now, you had two floor planners?
MR. ANTHONY:
I had two floor plans at the time.

MR. WISENOR:
No, Mid-Atlantic was a consumer
lender.

MR. POTEET:
That's what I -- I thought Mid-Atlantic was a consumer lender. MR. ANTHONY:

Mid-Atlantic is a consumer.
MR. WISENOR:
I think he misheard you.
MR. POTEET:
So what's the story with those?
MR. WISENOR:
That's what these remaining ones were through -- we had five pending. He took care of four of them and one is -- the one he's talking about, ZBest cars, that's the remaining one.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. Those were the same thing, really?

MR. WISENOR:
Correct.
MR. POTEET:
I mean, the same one that Mid-Atlantic is looking for are tied up with either ZBest or Nextgear?

MR. WISENOR:

Well, the last one with Mid-Atlantic is the one held up at ZBest. MR. POTEET:

Okay.
MR. WISENOR:
The individual, $I$ think he paid cash for -- Mr. Eddie Washington paid cash for that one, basically.

MR. ANTHONY:
We made a swap.
MR. WISENOR:
The swap, $I$ forgot the situation. He did a trade in.

MR. CORMIER:
I have a question. Are any taxes owed on the vehicle?

MR. ANTHONY:
Yes, yes.
MR. WISENOR:
On both.
MR. TAYLOR:
To simplify things, how many customers are out in cars without titles right now?

MR. ANTHONY:

Two.
MR. TAYLOR:
Two.
MR. POTEET:
The Nextgear car and the ZBest car.

MR. HALLACK:
So he's complied with some of the stuff, but not all the stuff.

MR. ANTHONY:
It took us forever to finally
make contact with someone at ZBest and -- if you call them today, you may get -- you'll get someone, but they won't call you back. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Mr. Chairman, I would have to confirm the situation at ZBest, not to soften what is going on here, because it's a difficult entity at times to do business with. I agree. Everyone here would concur with that aspect.

MR. CORMIER:
That's correct.
MR. TAYLOR:
I would think that they would
have get some extension to get these two worked out.

MR. POTEET:
And here's what I'd like to see, you guys hear what $I$ have to say and see if you agree with this or have another alternative. I think we need to spend, let's see, two weeks -- two weeks for Montie to take control of this situation and get back to us -- get back to Derek -- since we won't meet again for two weeks, get back to Derek and make a recommendation, here's where we are, here's what I recommend. At that point, Derek can then recommend at our next meeting what we do next. Does that make sense to everybody? That two weeks should be more than enough time to resolve these issues or get us to the point where we can say, we're not going to get these issues resolved. But I think Montie is the one person in this room that can understand all sides of this and pull it together.

> Do you feel comfortable with
that, Montie?
MR. WISENOR:

Yes, sir. I can do that.
MR. POTEET:
Does anybody have any other suggestions?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I would add to that, Mr.
Chairman, that Mr. Parnell may need to get involved when it comes to zBest. The other part I don't know about, but, you know, I've found that if you have a -- if you're willing to pay -- a lot of times you're not able to pay ZBest, so.

MR. POTEET:
I understand what you're saying. MR. ANTHONY:

They've got two locations, one in Shreveport and one in Bossier, but both of them have been closed down for several months.

MR. HALLACK:
It's hard to make contact with any of them.

MR. POTEET:
So you understand what we're doing here?

MR. ANTHONY:
I understand.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. So we're going to extend this another couple of weeks. Montie is going to take control of the situation, give us answer -- get an answer back to Derek. Derek may have to go to the Louisiana Motor Vehicle Commission and discuss their licensee, ZBest, and what's going on. I think two weeks is enough to get all of that at least to the point where we can make a decision. Right now, you haven't complied. Technically, you haven't complied. So, you know, the only decision we could make now is to give you a little more time with our control of the situation or just say, you're finished. And I think we want to make sure these consumers get taken care of. MR. ANTHONY:

And we want to get them taken
care of.
MR. POTEET:
I believe you.
MR. ANTHONY:
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I've been in business for 40 years -- more than 40 years.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. All right. That's all we need you for right now. You're dismissed. MR. ANTHONY:

Thank you.
MR. POTEET:
All right. The next thing on our agenda is discussion of correspondence received from the Attorney General's Office. MR. PARNELL:

Commissioners, you have in your packet the document from the Federal Trade Commission Office. We received an e-mail from Lisa Magna, who is the Assistant Attorney General with the Department of Justice. Her office was asked to join in a common letter to the Federal Trade Commission concerning the supplemental notice of proposed rule making for the used motor vehicle trade regulation and rules, which is the used car buyer's guide. The request is to know what the Used Motor Vehicle Commission's position is on the
issue. The initial period for response has passed, but the Attorney General's Office still would like to know what the LUMVC's position is regarding the matter. Once we give our position, the AG's Office will contact the Federal Trade Commission to give that response. And if you would look, I sent it out in an e-mail to you all a little bit before Ms. Baron sent it out to you as a packet and just kind of wanted to know our position on it.

MR. HALLACK:
I prepared a little outline.
Okay. Well, basically, what it is, is that the FTC is recommending some proposed changes to the federal regulations that deal with what they call the used car rule. And, basically, it's a bunch of changes to the buyer's guide disclosure. First of all, the most important thing to them is that they want to make some disclosures with regard to vehicle history. There's a concern that dealers do not disclose certain issues, specifically a branded title. So they want to put a place
on the buyer's guide that's posted on the car, whether or not that -- the vehicle has any branded title. So that's an additional thing they want to make. They also want to require dealers to obtain an NMVTIS report. I'm not exactly sure what that is. I know it's a vehicle history report. Maybe somebody can enlighten us on the NMVTIS. MR. DUPLESSIS:

The national motor vehicle transportation identification system. MR. HALLACK:

Okay.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's where you check your recalls, but $I$ don't know if it is serial number driven specifically. I know it has list of the recalls, which really doesn't extend to the deal.

MR. POTEET:
I think that this report -- this is just -- we deal with it a little bit in the auction industry. I think that this report is -- like Ron said, it's a legal type of thing as opposed to, say, a CarFax
and an AutoCheck. This is something if the car has been stolen, if the VIN has been stolen or if it's been recalled.

MR. SMITH:
Or salvaged --
MR. POTEET:
Or it's been salvaged --
MR. SMITH:
-- we have to report it.
MR. POTEET:
You guys -- so that kind of stuff where somebody has reported to a governmental agency, the state or federal, something about the vehicle as opposed to CarFax where, you know, there's a lot of things on CarFax that really wouldn't --

MR. HALLACK:
So it wouldn't include repairs?
MR. POTEET:
No.
MR. HALLACK:
What about flood damage?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Yes.
MR. SMITH:

If it has been reported, that's the thing. We're supposed to report that, if it's been salvaged.

MR. POTEET:
Right. I mean, it's -- so it's a -- you know, I guess there's a fine line here between a CarFax report and NMVTIS report, I've heard it is kind of messed up that way. But it is more of a governmental reporting.

MR. GUILLORY:
It is a repository for the state. Each State agency that deals with auto hulk for flood -- like major flood issues, flood reports through NICB, they will upload one portal of it and it uploads everything that has to deal with flood damage for any amount of claims by VIN number to that deal. Also, as far as the state of Louisiana, I know how that works, because I've seen it. When you -- every month, when auto hulk, they upload to that -- it's a federal -- federal database that uploads to it. So what's pushing this specific deal are clean Mississippi titles that you run them in

Louisiana and they come back auto hulk. MR. POTEET:
Well, I know that one issue with this specific report is that not every state complies in the same way. I don't want to say it's completely voluntary, but it's -the information is not being backed up by the federal government. It's being accepted by the federal government. So some states are more into it. And the idea obviously is that if you have one repository at the federal level, then if somebody in

California can find out something about a vehicle from Virginia, and all of the different combinations that you can think of. So, you know, when I'm looking at something like this, $I$ say that's kind of a nice thing, but at this point, until everybody complies with it in the same manner, you're going to get more information from some states than others.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, according to the proposed changes, the dealer -- the buyer's guide is supposed to advise the customer that the
dealer has this report and must disclose it.
MR. POTEET:
Well, I mean, he can have the report, but I'm just saying -- I'm giving a little background about what $I$ know about it, is that it's not complete.

MR. HALLACK:
And also they're requiring by this proposed amendment that the buyers's guide say that if the dealer has in his possession a vehicle history report -MR. POTEET:

Like a CarFax?
MR. HALLACK:
-- he must disclose it. But the question is, if he's got it in his possession, he's got to provide it. Also, too, the last thing on there is the buyers's guide tells the customer that the dealer must disclose all recalls on the vehicle, which would be on that report anyway, so. MR. BREWER:

I have a question. MR. HALLACK:

Yes.

MR. BREWER:
Go back to D, the customer insists on a CarFax, the dealer has to pay for that CarFax?

MR. HALLACK:
At no charge to the customer, that's correct, only if you have it. In other words, you have to have it in your possession. If you don't have in your possession and the customer comes to you and asks for it, you can charge him for it if you don't have it. But if you have it, you have to give it to him. So, I mean, that's kind of crazy. That would tell a dealer, you know, don't keep CarFax at your dealership.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
No, you've got to. That's how you buy cars.

MR. POTEET:
But I think if you -- if, you know, you think of it in a realistic setting, okay, if you have the vehicle history report in your possession, I don't know why couldn't you give it to them. And
then if you get it and didn't disclose it, CarFax could easily and, you know, I don't know if somebody would sue somebody over that for a $\$ 35$ report or a $\$ 50$ report, I don't know what they charge nowadays, but you can just say, well, I bought the car on May 1st and on April 20th, he had run a CarFax and wouldn't show it to me. I mean, those records are available.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, you've got to remember, this law is only proposing changes to the buyer's guide. It's not saying this is a violation.

MR. POTEET:
I'm just talking about the possibilities. I'm back to Ron's point. If you have the CarFax report or the AutoCheck report on any vehicle, why wouldn't you? I can't explain why somebody would try to hide that from the buyer. I mean, if they were, there's probably other things they're doing, too.

MR. CORMIER:
It's probably a bad CarFax.

MR. HALLACK:
That's -- for them, that's the most important part and the changes they're willing to make on the buyer's guide, is to make sure that the vehicle history is provided. The next thing is as is. They want to do a clarification on as is on the warranty of the buyer's guide. And they want to make sure the customer understands the meaning and significance of a vehicle sold without a warranty and that they -they also want to maintain the dealer's liability for concealing material facts or misrepresenting material facts about the vehicle. So they want to make sure that there's clarification on as is. So they want -- they're suggesting a statement on the buyer's guide to the effect that as is, no warranty means the dealer will not pay for any repairs. But the recommended statement or as is does not cover a dealer for concealed problems, dealer misrepresentations, or dealer misconduct. So everybody has an understanding of that? The as is, no warranty, they want to change
the disclosure on the buyer's guide to say that the as is, no warranty does not cover a dealer for concealed problems, dealer misrepresentations, or dealer misconduct. MS. MORRIS:

This is what the law says. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Well, the question is, what is concealed defect? If you have a switch that doesn't work or you have a minor light that doesn't work that costs you a whole bunch of money, if you have to start working all these things out, his business is going to become usually contentious for cars he bought and sold I think this is going to open it up without clear definitions. This is going to open it up -- it's going to open up a can of worms that, you know, some poor dealers are trying to get an innocuous light to come on and it costs a ton of money and that devalues the vehicle to where it's not serviceable. I don't think $I$ would be in favor of that portion unless it was better defined.

MR. HALLACK:
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Well, that's what they're trying to do. They're trying to make clarifications as to what as is, no warranty means, you know, and if -- they want to make sure that the customer sees on the buyer's guide that this does not mean that the dealer is not responsible for something that he does fraudulently or conceals or misrepresents.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
You know, I think it's simple. I mean, how many cars do you go through, you know, in a week or a month and yourself, Eric, and some of the other dealers. I think it's going to become a contentious issue over minors problems. But what this simply doing it is an implied warranty when the dealer has clearly stated there is no warranty on that car, especially as is, no warranty, older cars, you can't inspect them enough to find out all the defects.

MR. POTEET:
Well, I would expect for this -I agree with you, Ron. I think it's very vague and, you know, things become --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Worse.
MR. POTEET:
-- they become vague.
MR. HALLACK:
It's probably vague now.
MR. POTEET:
Yes. No, I agree with that. I agree with that. But $I$ think that, you know, if they are looking for our input, I would say that one of the things we would want to be behind is something that kind of defines what that means by concealed or -MR. DUPLESSIS:

A better definition.
MR. POTEET:
A better definition there. I don't have any problems with it in a conceptual sense, but when you get down to reality, it does become difficult, like, you know, you have some switch that -- some light that, you know, keeps coming on and off and you can't figure out exactly why. Is that, you know, did you conceal that or maybe you didn't know it and what's the
difference between concealing and not knowing and, you know, when somebody -- when a consumer comes back to you -- again, you guys in the car business, sometimes some people are reasonable and some people are unreasonable. Some people say, look, this 59 cent item is a reason for me to bring this car back. And other people say, oh, look, I got this $\$ 800$ problem, can you help me out with it, can you fix it, you know, we're dealing with people and some are reasonable and some are not, but when you put a vague statement like that, it opens it up to -- kind of a can of worms and I think that's where we're going here maybe.

Dino, what do you think?
MR. TAYLOR:
I'm thinking we're going to have, you know, a bona fide certification program, as is cars.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
When I read this and I've read
all 13 painful long laborious pages of that work and I've got to tell you, I walked away thinking if we don't problems now, we are
fixing to have a whole pile of problems and it is going to go to certification and disclosure, and then it's just going to create -- you know, it's going to create adversarial everything amongst -especially, the low end buyer who is forced to buy some cars to get transportation and that it's going to become contentious.

MR. TAYLOR:
There's nothing about the changes that I had a lot of problem with, except that right there. All of this other stuff, I mean, I already make every customer that buys car from me sing a CarFax, whether it's good or bad or ugly. I don't care. It's fine. They're not angry if it had a little paint work on it when they buy it or whatever, if they know about it up front and they're angry, but it is three weeks later and they're embarrassed.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
They're pissed.
MR. TAYLOR:
So I didn't see a whole lot. I was actually kind of -- I like some of this
stuff except for that one portion.
MR. HALLACK:
I think --
MR. BREWER:
The consumer is not paying any attention to that as is anyway. If something goes wrong with the car that you sold them, they're going to come back to you and once you start working on that car, then as is kind of falls by the wayside. So it depends on the dealer taking care of their customer more than anything.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, we changed our law and I wanted to put that in there, that we changed 783(F)(3) and basically it says that if you put that disclaimer on the vehicle, you kind of waive your right to sue that dealer. And the provision in our law that's in there -when I was talking to Derek and Kim about these proposals to the FTC rules, Derek's and Kim's first response was, well,

783(F)(3) repeals all the redhibition laws and I said, no, it's not, the redhibition law is still there, but if you look at

783(F)(3), you would tend to believe that redhibition is really not there anymore if the buyer puts the as is, no warranty on the car.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
You just don't get redhibition cases on used cars like you once did. But then again, a lot of quality of the American manufacturers has come up substantially. MR. HALLACK:

So what I'm saying is, we have a provision in our law that doesn't take into consideration misrepresentation, concealment, or fraud. So if you read this law straight out, if the dealer has a customer sign an as is, no warranty on the car, then the dealer is not liable for it even if the dealer misrepresented the car. MR. BREWER:

Well, when you turn -- when you go to an auction and turn the red light on, that means as is, what you see is what you get. The expression is, if it breaks in two pieces, you own two pieces. MR. WISENOR:

The burden of proof would be on the purchaser to determine at what point was the misrepresentation, was it concealed by the dealer or was it done before it entered the dealer's possession, but it's civil, correct?

MR. POTEET:
Well, $I$ think that's what we're -- you know, we're all saying, that we need to have some more definition of that before we want to jump in and say, hey, this is a great idea. I mean, it's -- again, it's like Dino said, it all sounds pretty good when you think of it, but then when you start thinking about the actual process of going through one of these things, well, now it gets little bit hairier. You know, at the auction, the difference is, we're not selling to consumers. So, you know, that -the idea there is we do as much as we can to make sure the sellers announce things properly. But, you know, we don't have the same -- same rules. I mean, it's a different thing. Those are professional buyers and you're supposed to be
professional buyers.
MR. TAYLOR:
And you don't have salesmen at your auctions massaging a customer as is, it's going to be okay either.

MR. POTEET:
Occasionally, we have a seller that says that, though.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, there's a recent -- really recent case out there and $I$ just changed my legal research tool to a different thing and I could not print the case, but the case actually discusses the redhibition law and it discusses 783(F)(3) and it's a case involving Ramsey Auto Sales out of Monroe. And what the customer said, and the court bought it, was the customer drove the car off the lot and basically the salesperson said, everything is good, everything is fine with the car. The court accepted that and accepted that as a misrepresentation, because as the customer drives the car off the lot, something goes wrong with it. But Ramsey filed based on this law saying, well,
he signed the as is, no warranty, I'm not liable for anything including my own concealment of the defects the car has, and the Court came back and said, no, redhibition still exists, you are still liable for your own concealment and your own misrepresentation of the car. So the scenario, just like you said, that if you sit there and have them sign the as is, no warranty, and you telling them it is a great car.

MR. POTEET:
I mean, I can't argue with that. I think that's the way any of us would feel. MR. HALLACK:

Well, Ramsey Auto Sales didn't agree. They filed based on our law that says if you sign it, you waive it.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
And I think Ramsey did the wrong thing in this case, if the case is cited correctly as what you're saying, I doubt that it is.

MR. HALLACK:
I wish I could print it, because
it was a very interesting case, a lot more details and facts.

MR. TAYLOR:
When you figure it out, can you send it to me.

MR. POTEET:
Well, at the auction, if
something like that happens -- when something like that happens at the auction, I ask the fellow, why did you put the red light on, and then tell the guy there's really nothing wrong with the car, and then I want to ask the buyer, why would you buy a red light car and think there was nothing wrong with the car, because the seller told me there was nothing wrong with the car. Well, what do you want me to do as an auction? You know, we've got the red light on. You two guys have decided to do -- to each make an irrational decision. So fight it out amongst yourselves. That's why we have rules. And $I$ think the same things goes here. You can carry that same thought process through. If $I$ have an as is, no warranty, the last thing $I$ should do is say,
the car is great, everything is fine.
Somewhere along the line, you've got to say, well, why did you have them sign that? I would agree with the court on that. They shouldn't have said a word afterward. And I agree with what Ron says, you can't hide behind the law. I don't think that's right.

MR. HALLACK:
So we should -- what would you
recommend for us to -- would you recommend us making any suggestions back to the Attorney General's Office to say, we would -- we have some concerns about the language, the vagueness?

MR. POTEET:
I think everybody agrees that there's some vagueness there on that. That's going to cause more problems than it's going to help.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Yes, and I think the other
question is -- I'm not sure about the recalls. How do we find recalls on a car if they're not listed for a car. You know, every car that comes in, if I've got to call
the dealer and give him the VIN number and rely upon the person on the other end of the phone, that's an enormous issue.

MR. POTEET:
I think that's a good question, too. I thought -- Nestor, you mentioned that the NMVTIS has a lot of information, but I was under the assumption that NHTSA kept that information, but the point would be, no matter who does it, there should be some sort of a -- and I'm assuming it's the federal repository where somebody punches in the numbers and, boom, the recalls pop up. MR. CORMIER:

CarFax has some recalls on there, but --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
But not all.
MR. CORMIER:
-- but --
MR. POTEET:
But that's not what's being
requires. The requirement is the NMVTIS -MR. CORMIER:

Right.

MR. POTEET:
-- not that you have a CarFax.
So I would say that our suggestion would be back to the Attorney General, where would -where would this repository be and how would I get my hands on it, so I can look at that kind of thing. And we're having some of the same issue in the auction industry, you know, what is the responsibility of the auction with a recalled vehicle, you know. So we're still -- we're still looking for that, because -- well, $I$ can tell you the legal answer, but not right now. I'll talk to you later. But the point is, there should be some place that car dealers and auctions can go and punch in the VIN number and, boom, this is the answer.

MR. WISENOR:
This report is actually listing, along with NHTSA and NMVTIS, the vehicle recall list site at www.safecar.gov. I don't know what -- I never went to that site. This actually -- on this -- Page 2 of this report.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
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But it's going to have to be vehicle specific.

MR. WISENOR:
Go figure it out.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
If it's not vehicle specific, then we have accomplished nothing.

MR. WISENOR:
It just addresses vehicle recall. MR. HALLACK:

So what you're saying is, there may be overall recalls that a dealer may not be aware of that may not be in the NMVTIS report.

MR. POTEET:
Well, there are thousands of recalls, literally.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It gives a threshold and we go to that threshold and we accomplish what that report says that we're doing and we're still in violation, that's a pretty crappy scheme of law to put on everybody, especially not being the dealer. You ask us on a GMC, I can tell you. But for me to go find out
what's on a Nissan that's on a used car lot, that's a whole different threshold, because we don't have that list. We don't have that corporate information the way a Nissan dealer would.

MR. HALLACK:
So you would be opposed to providing recall history?

MR. BREWER:
Well, you're setting yourself up for quite a lawsuit. Let's say that you checked the Honda store and Honda has a recall for an air bag, but maybe you didn't know it and you sold the vehicle and something happens to the people, who is responsible, because $I$ didn't tell him it was a recall? I didn't know.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Or we were informed of the recalls as dealers, that's the issue. MR. POTEET:

But I think what you're saying is that one step is, are you responsible for every manufacturer's cars.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
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That's correct.
MR. POTEET:
And then for the used car dealer, then he's going to be responsible. MR. TAYLOR:

He's going to say, hey, listen up, can you check this recall for me? MR. DUPLESSIS:

Exactly. MR. TAYLOR:

You know that five minutes ago when you said that we've got to have the proper channel to be able to get that information. If you had that information, I mean, if you had that channel to tell the customer --

MR. POTEET:
I think it's okay, but I think it needs to be just like that. When you punch in the VIN number into some national database and it pops out. If it doesn't come up on that, then you're okay, and then if there's some issue that comes up later, you should be able to go back and say, the national database, whatever the national
database is that we're all supposed to be using, it wasn't on it. I can't be held responsible.

MR. CORMIER:
Whenever you go to the vehiclehistory.gov website, it will take you straight to CarFax.

MR. POTEET:
Vehiclehistory.gov. What about the safeguard aspect. Well, again, you know, if the FTC is going to mandate this stuff, they need to have a place that you go.

MR. CORMIER:
So you can check every deal.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
If they can't accomplish it, how can we accomplish it, because calling every dealer is time consuming.

MR. POTEET:
It's impossible. It's not really time consuming. It's impossible. How are you going to call everybody?

MR. HALLACK:
Well, one, we should tell them
that we're concerned about providing the recall history, because there's no reliable repository for that information.

MR. POTEET:
Yes, or there needs to be one. MR. HALLACK:

And then we're also concerned about the as is, no warranty language that you want everybody to consider, because it's vague and it may lead to considerable litigation.

MR. POTEET:
You're an attorney, what do you think?

MR. BREWER:
The auction -- if you have a lemon return, is your title stamped lemon return?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It's stamped buy back.
MR. BREWER:
It's stamped buy back?
MR. POTEET:
It doesn't say lemon, it says buy back.

MR. WISENOR:
It is branded non-conformity
title. That's the way Motor Vehicles describes that or defines that.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, I didn't know there was
such a title. There's a title change when a dealer buys back a car?

MR. POTEET:
If it's bought back for a lemon law.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It's a notation on the title.
MR. HALLACK:
Well, see, that's the last thing
I want to put on here is that the Commission would encourage that it be more uniform.

MS . BARON:
There's your lawsuit.
MR. POTEET:
Is there any other -- those are the big -- I think those would be the big comments from us.

Does anybody else have anything? MR. HALLACK:

Well, the other thing I was going to say was that requiring a dealer to provide the car history, if he has it, might encourage some dealers not to get it. MR. POTEET:

You guys are car dealers. I wouldn't think so, because you want that information.

MR. CORMIER:
That's very common now to ask for so you to provide it. We provide it on every vehicle. It's a monthly fee, like \$9 a month.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It's expensive.
MR. POTEET:
It depends on what you want.
MR. TAYLOR:
But for the car dealer, though, if you're selling 20 cars a month, how many -- I mean, you know --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It's not intrusive or
unattainable to have CarFax. We have AutoCheck. We buy by AutoCheck and we sell
by CarFax. So we actually pull two on every vehicle.

MR. HALLACK:
Why not just CarFax?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, AutoCheck is not an entity
that is known to consumer if they want CarFax.

MR. POTEET:
AutoCheck is much more reliable. That is what we use at the auction.

MR. TAYLOR:
What I'm saying is you can't hide behind one. What is says, if you have two, you have to provide two.

MR. HALLACK:
I don't think it says that.
MR. DUPLESSIS:

> Yes, it does.

MR. TAYLOR:
It says --

MR. HALLACK:
So if you have three, you would have to provide --

MR. WISENOR:

I had a case where AutoCheck and Carfax had totally different reports. AutoCheck didn't get the discrepancy and it has worked everywhere.

MR. POTEET:
Every vehicle that comes to the auction gets run through AutoCheck before it goes onto the block at our auction.

MR. WISENOR:
AutoCheck or CarFax?
MR. POTEET:
AutoCheck. And I'm pretty safe in saying that any national auto auction association, any auction around here deal are with AAA, that they all put every car through AutoCheck. It's an industry standard.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, the difference is CarFax picks up all information. AutoCheck drills down into the dealer's database at night a thing called poling. So they actually go down and pull our repair orders out of our dealership and we've had problems with them, like, reporting replacement of a mirror.

They report that as body damage. That's an issue. If you have a mechanical error, right. And they ruled that as body damage. So they also report mechanical and they report recalls and recall repairs and the satisfaction of those recalls. So it's two totally different entities.

MR. WISENOR:
CarFax listed every service that that car had, because it was taken back to the dealer for every bit of service it had done and the odometer had to be changed at a certain time. So AutoCheck, for some reason, didn't catch that.

MR. POTEET:
One of the common problems with CarFax that we see is that they're going for an inspection and the odometer is recorded wrong and it pops up and it says roll back. MR. TAYLOR:

They had made a CarFax dealer like myself, they made it a pretty easy process. So, I mean, it isn't obvious. It's pretty easy now. It wasn't a couple years ago, I mean, you know --

MR. POTEET:
We -- and, again, most auctions use AutoCheck and most auctions are subscribers to CarFax, because we get so many requests for it and we'll go ahead and, you know, try to compare the two if we have to.

MR. CORMIER:
It says here that NMVTIS is the vehicle history report is intended to only provide data on five key indicators associated with prevention, auto fraud and theft, which was one current state of title and last title date; two, brand history; three, odometer readings; four, total loss history; and, five, salvage history.

MR. POTEET:
Well, that's pretty inclusive. I mean, that's a lot.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
They just need to appeal to the wrong stuff.

MR. POTEET:
I think the dealers and the industry would be -- we have some dealers
back there, do you guys agree. I mean, you don't really care if you have to run a VIN number through something, it's just what is it, where do I find it, how do I make sure. MR. STRODERT:
Yes. I think -- I concur with both of the guys from the standpoint that most larger dealerships automatically give the report to the consumer. But I also agree with you guys that we're dealing with two vehicles on a fence line for over 15 days. I disagree with Mr. Dino from the standpoint, we did everything that we can. The CarFax reads they got it cleared up and AutoCheck reads that it hasn't been cleared up. So we make the vehicle sit on the fence until it's been cleared up, so we need to go and do something with the vehicle, and we have two of them waiting right there. So to be able to depend on any of these third-party providers if it's not national and it is not consistent and it's not the same every single time, it just turns into a mess all the way across the board. MR. POTEET:

Well, $I$ think that is what makes the most sense, in my opinion, is that there should be a national database and it should be run by the government. I mean, it should be something that's not a third-party provider, because it's a different thing and it needs to be something that's pretty basic, so you can put it through. For recalls, I don't understand why that would be so difficult, because most recalls are required by the government. I think most are required by the government and the difference -- Ron and I were talking about this earlier, if the difference between a recall and a campaign is a recall is something that could be safety related. Am I right?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It's the investigation of prior to the actual recall.

MR. POTEET:
Yes.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
So they put on a campaign, and then they certify it through the Department
of Transportation, and then it becomes a campaign.

MR. POTEET:
So that kind of stuff should be in some kind of -- one national database and I think everybody agrees that's that what we need, rather than depending on two independent third-parties that have --

MR. STRODERT:
Well, keep this in mind, too, that you guys are in business with each other. So the reason why AutoCheck has been so successful is because CarFax has said, hey, if you're going to pay a premium price based on the fact that the consumer is so aware of the CarFax brand, so the AutoCheck product is much lower cost to this and that's the reason why there's two of them now. And at the same time, there's also ways on the back end portal of both of those third-party vendors that you can actually control what is shown in a report. I don't know if it's the consumer or what you set up the guidelines for, but there are things on the backend that says, do you want to print
off all of the things that this report is showing. So there's a -- you're putting yourself and you're putting the dealers in a very weird situation and it just seems like you're going to have more problems going on with this and you're going to have some more.

MR. BREWER:
Especially on the recalls -- I mean, the call backs, that's where your problems are going to be.

MR. POTEET:
Well, that's what we're saying.

I think, you know, the two different types of things you're looking at is the government report, which would be recalls and title histories or things like that, whereas, the CarFax and the AutoCheck is going to be more of some of the other stuff that gets onto these reports. I guess the more we talk about it, the more $I$ think -- I don't know why you would need -- I mean, I don't understand. I don't sell cars for a living. So I don't --

MR. HALLACK:

It is very important for discussion, because you have to remember, the feedback that they're getting it from is largely from the Attorney General's Office from every state. They're not really seeing this from a dealer's perspective. So, I mean, that would be a good reason for us to make a comment.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Yes. I think we've made the comments and I think you get the gist of it. I also think the new car dealers need to have input, too, especially -- I would send it forward to their commission with our comments to make them aware.

MS. MORRIS:
When we received this, I did have a conversation with the Assistant Attorney General handling it and I advised her that we only regulate some of the sellers of used cars, that new car dealers with used car lots are not under the regulation of this Commission, so this Commission couldn't really speak as to those dealers, which might have different comments. So they were going to also forward it to the New Car Commission.

MR. POTEET:
All right. Do we need any more conversation on that issue? It seems like we've got mostly a consensus in this room what needs to be done. You're going to have 50 Attorneys Generals?

MR. HALLACK:
Well, I don't think all 50 .
MS. MORRIS:
I think that in your material was a letter that one of them wrote and $I$ think about --

MR. HALLACK:
Oregon Attorney General's Office. MR. POTEET:
-- and I think about half a dozen signed off on there. So they're trying to get a consensus, too, before they answer to the FTC, maybe five letters instead of 50.

MS. MORRIS:
But none of the letters -- when I went to the FTC website, those letters were not posted yet. So they hadn't made it
through. There were some other comments posted. One of them was from a dealer, but it really was kind of nonsensical, but it wasn't really -- -- but you can pull it up and see all the comments that are there. I haven't -- I pulled it up, but it will show you on the website all the comments that have been submitted so far.

MR. POTEET:
Well, I'll give the FTC credit. At least they're trying to reach out and get some input on it.

Okay. Next on our agenda is ratification of proposed penalties. Derek. MR. PARNELL:

You'll find in your packet the stipulated agency orders and proof of payments made for the imposed civil penalties. As always, I determined that the public interest can be served without further administrative proceedings. I'll go through all of them.

MR. POTEET:
Do we need to go through all of them?

MR. HALLACK:
You need to announce them in case somebody is here.

MR. POTEET:
All right. Let's do that. Let's announce them, but let's not go through each one. Announce them and see if there's -MR. HALLACK:

By dealer name only?
MR. POTEET:
Yes, by dealer name only.
MR. PARNELL:
We have Moore Motors, White's Auto Sales.

MR. POTEET:
If there's anyone here that hears their company name or company they want to represent, please let us know. If anybody is here.

MR. PARNELL:
R\&R Wholesale, Central Auto Sales, Incorporated of Baton Rouge, Certified Motors, LLC, Wholesale of Baton Rouge, LLC, Unique Autos, LLC, Xpress Rent to Own, Tint City Auto, Ms. Gator's Auto

Sales, Auto Plaza of Moss Bluff, LLC, Acadian Used Cars, INC, Just Like That Auto Sales, Fares Motor Company, EZ Rider of Baton Rouge Rent to Own, LLC, D\&N Enterprise, LLC, and B\&B Taxes and Auto Sales. The total amount for the fines that were imposed is $\$ 21,050$. Commissioners, I ask that you ratify the fine amount and accept the penalties and stipulated agency order.

MR. TAYLOR:
I make a motion.
MR. POTEET:
A motion from Dino.
Second?
MR. SMITH:
I'll second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Darty.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:

Thank you.
MR. HALLACK:
And I think we still need to include them in the packet -MR. POTEET:

Yes.
MR. HALLACK:
-- because if anybody -- any
Commissioner has a question about why did Ms. Gator's -- you know, what happened there.

MS. MORRIS:
One of the two commissions that I work with, they just put a summary, just one sentence, rather than put the whole consent order. They just put the name and the type of violation and the fine.

MR. PARNELL:
Okay.
MR. POTEET:
All right. Next item is the Executive Director's report.

MR. PARNELL:
All right. If you will turn in your packets, you will find enforcement
documents. The first one that you'll see is alleged issue counts. There were 86 alleged issues for the month of March 2015. The second document is the case report, which illustrates there were 60 cases that were assigned to investigators in the month of March; 7 cases were closed; 52 of them still remain open.

The last document is the
department summary report, which illustrates that there were a total of 30 cases that were closed in the month of March. I do not have any general information moving forward, but if there are any comments or questions, please --

MR. POTEET:
I wanted to ask a question back to what Kirby brought up earlier about the car situation -- our vehicle situation. So did we -- do we have -- do all the investigators have a vehicle?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
And are they all running? Montie
is looking at me.
Are you okay, Montie?
MR. WISENOR:
I don't.
MR. POTEET:
Ronnie doesn't.
MR. PARNELL:
He doesn't have a vehicle, because he's working part-time -MR. POTEET:

Okay.
MR. PARNELL:
-- and so he turned his vehicle in, but everybody else does have a vehicle. MR. POTEET:

And all of our investigators have safe vehicles?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
Is there anything we can do -MR. PARNELL:

To the vehicles themselves or -MR. POTEET:

I'm just thinking, you know, with
the State, we kind of brought up the point that we don't have a money problem.

MR. PARNELL:
No, no.
MR. POTEET:
We can buy vehicles. We can get vehicles fixed, but is there something that we report to the state or the agency, you know, that tells us to pull the trigger to do something?

MR. PARNELL:
No.
MS . ANDERSON:
They do fill out vehicle logs for the month and on the back of the vehicle log, there's a safety checklist and they're all required to have regular oil changes and have their maintenance done.

MR. POTEET:
Maintenance record.
MS . ANDERSON:
And so in that aspect, if there was something that was really ongoing wrong, then it would show up at that point, but we have had instances -- Derek, what was wrong
with Angela's car, was that a converter? MR. PARNELL:

Yes.
MS . ANDERSON:
And it's due to age of the car and there's no way to predict that that's going to go out. So are they safe? As far as we can tell. They're having regular maintenance, but whether or not, you know, some parts are going to go out due to the age of the car --

MR. POTEET:
I'm just saying, $I$ don't want to be held hostage to bureaucratic things when we have money to make sure that we have safe running vehicles.

MR. CORMIER:
I thought we were self-generated. MR. POTEET:

Yes. I don't get that.
MR. CORMIER:
I have a question. Is there a certain percentage, you know, that you can -- you know, we should have to spend on a car? I mean, we might have a $\$ 10,000$ car
and we're pending five grand on it. Do you know if it goes over that amount?

MR. PARNELL:
No, to get rid of the car, not necessarily a percentage in that regard. There's the Division of Administration we have to go through in order to get -- they have to bid out for these vehicles and we have to use one of the vehicles that's on -that they bid out for. So we really can't buy beyond what they have on the documents. So -- but we're going to get -- I'm going to start the process this week of trying to get two vehicles, which means $I$ have to turn it in. It just depends.

MR. TAYLOR:
I think there are several of us here, if you can give us a real short -real short, because I know we are busy. I think we heard the field investigators, and we can hear from the people here. Give us a short rundown of the process to get a car bought.

MR. PARNELL:
What has to happen is, of course,
we have to budget for the car. And I have to go out on the website and figure out which vehicles we want to use. Sometimes, they dictate that you have to have fuel flex vehicles. They say you have to have one per agency, but I've been buying them without that and it kind of saved me a little bit of money in regards to that. We're actually just going to go out -- I submit a letter that -- a letter of intent that I want to purchase a vehicle and I have to explain to them exactly what vehicles I want to trade in to surplus. MR. TAYLOR:

Or add a field investigator? MR. PARNELL:

Or add a field investigator, correct. Once I do that, submit the letter of recommendation, we have to supply a check for the amount of the vehicle that we want to spend. We submit that to them for their approval. In the past -- I don't know if this is going to be the case this year, but in the past, they've said that if the vehicle is not having a lot of issues and it
just has high mileage, that's not something that they wanted to approve.

MR. TAYLOR:
So they object?
MR. PARNELL:
Yes. But I -- then I'll go back and meet with them again and send another letter out to them and sometimes they will approve it. In the past, they -- initially, they rejected the first one that I sulbmitted, and then $I$ sent another letter out to them and they went ahead and approved it. So that's how we got the last car two years ago.

MR. ROY:
Who is they and them?
MS. MORRIS:
Fleet Management.
MR. PARNELL:
Fleet Management. This is all
under the --
MR. ROY:
What Management?
MR. PARNELL:
Fleet Management.

MS. MORRIS:
It's under the Division of
Administration. And this particular administration is not in favor of agencies owning vehicles, because $I$ guess of insurance and other things and the fact that a lot of agencies no longer have vehicles or the State has a contract with Enterprise. And one of those agencies that $I$ work with, their investigators have to go pick up a car at Enterprise on Monday, do their -- if they're traveling out of town, so many miles from their residence, they have -- so they have to do their inspections near the residence on a certain day, their paperwork on a certain day. And then they'll go pick up a vehicle on Wednesday and return it on Friday, and so a lot of agencies were forced to do that. This one was not. And some are self-generated, too. So y'all are kind of lucky to have cars. I don't know if that will change with the change of the administration, but they have really reduced the number of State owned vehicles during this administration. So there's a lot of,
you know, paperwork that you have to go through. It's not as easy to replace a vehicle.

MR. POTEET:
So they want you to jump through hoops is what you're saying.

MR. TAYLOR:
And the reason why I wanted him to explain that, when $I$ first got here, my first question was, you know -- and Kirby was, well, we have the money, why don't we have them. And then, of course, I found out that it was this horrible cumbersome process and $I$ went through this with Derek when $I$ first got here, we've got the money, let's buy a car. That's what I do.

MR. POTEET:
I'm sorry I brought that up.
The next thing on the agenda are the committee reports. Legislative session. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Our only bill this year is House 533. It's being represented by Representative Price and it's going to be heard tomorrow, $I$ believe, at 10 'clock in
the Commerce Committee in the House session of the Capitol.

Sheri, do you want to give us a little more update on that one? It seems to be pretty innocuous.

MS . MORRIS:
These are basically the clean up measures that Mr. Hallack had drafted that have been reviewed at the committee meeting. I was asked by the drafters -- on Page 2 of 4, it says you can't use certified, certification, or other similar terms without having a bona fide certification process. They believed that a bona fide certification process should have some definition or clarification as to what the minimal requirements for a certification process were. I asked them to submit the bill. That is a Class 3 bill. So it had to be pre-filed. We were working up against deadlines. So $I$ said we will send it in and at the next Commission meeting, we'll get some direction as to that, but they felt like that was not defined enough for this statute and might lead to some disagreements
between consumers and dealers as to what was bone fide.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
And I would agree and we have
time to do that, I believe.
MS . MORRIS:
Well, we have a committee hearing tomorrow. So I don't know if that will come up tomorrow in the comments.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Are we prepared at the table to address that, to offer an amendment right on the spot.

MS . MORRIS:
If we have some language that we think would qualify, the minimum standard for certification.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Gentleman, thoughts?
MR. STRODERT:
I mean, basically from what I'm understanding is, is that bona fide is just not legitimate enough to have the bill passed, correct?

MS. MORRIS:

It's not specific enough.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
They want to rely on something. MR. POTEET:

They want to say like the XYZ certification program, here are the guidelines.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
NIADA, KBB, it's a certified set of guidelines at least $I$ would say a 25 , 27 point check something.

MR. POTEET:
Something that everybody can read and say, this is the program that we follow. That is what they are looking for instead of just staying certified, obviously, if I followed you into a room and said, write a paragraph defining certified, we're going to come up with 30 or 40 different answers. MR. HALLACK:

Is there a uniform certification process?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
No.
MS . MORRIS:

It is documented in writing that is available to the consumer.

MR. POTEET:
Right. But you designate one, you could designate one. You have the law is written -- I don't know if $I$ am wrong with this, but if you designate it saying that you can choose one of these three certification programs, this is how it works, you know, something like that, I think that's kind of what they're looking for, right?

MR. STRODERT:
Yes.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Right, and $I$ think it would be KBB, NIADA, or NADA are the ones that are immediately coming to my mind.

Eric, you know. Help me out. MR. STRODERT:

Is there a possibility that we can have the state, like LIADA, which is an association and the NIADA create a certification program.

MR. TAMBLING:

There's actually a certification program that that came in effect, CPO from national --

MR. POTEET:
NIADA.
MR. TAMBLING:
Through NIADA, I can get some information on that.

So while we're on the subject, I had -- one of our associate members had contacted me Friday in reference to the rent to own on this --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Hold on. We'll get to that in a second. We're prepared to address that. Let's finish, so we can get to the table tomorrow. We'll re-address that in one second.

MR. HALLACK:
Just say a commission approved certification process. And then we have -we do a rule and reg and say what it is, NADA does one or what he's talking about. MR. STRODERT:

We'll be more than happy to
present multiple options and have the Commission approve a certification program that would be able to, perhaps, run it through LIADA in a partnership with NIADA. MR. DUPLESSIS:

We're good with that. Why don't we soften the amendment. That would be in conjunction with the qualities of NIADA, Kelley Blue Book, NADA. That would be enough. That would give us easier the sellability at the table and to bring it back into the Commission and get it done.

MR. HALLACK:
That's kind of different wording.
I would say Commission approved certification process.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
They like associations like
NIADA.
MR. POTEET:
Well, why don't we say this, why don't we say -- compromise her, Commission approved such as NIADA? MR. DUPLESSIS:

That would probably work.

What do you think, Sheri?
MR. POTEET:
That gives us options, so when somebody says, what are you talking about here, well.

MS . MORRIS:
You can say NIADA, Kelley Blue Book or approved by the Commission.

MR. POTEET:
And I agree with Robert. If we say Commission approved, that kind of gives it some, you know, stamp of approval from a State agency, but it's going to be something that's easily obtained by dealers and easily obtained by consumers, too.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Right.
MR. POTEET:
Not some secretive thing.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
When you sit at the table and offer those things up, the first thing that, you know, one of the representatives is going say, Ms. Morris, Mr. Poteet, Derek, is this like KBB or is it like Kelley Blue Book
or NADA. I think a lot of times if you make that preemptive strike, then you just settle right into that consumer -- that consumer posts and they see on the windows. But I'm going to leave that up to you.

MR. STRODERT:
I'd like to say, I think leaving out third-party businesses that are for profit companies should be left out. The KBB's of the world, the Edmunds of the world, the Carfaxes of the world, the AutoChecks of world, these are for profit companies. So I think that rolling a certification program that would be approved by a State run association needs to be separate of a third-party vendor, but it needs to be on a commission approved basis and not a third-part. I like the such as NIADA, but is commission approved. So it could be brought in front of the Commission and you guys can approve the certification process and the dealer can implement it, but it has to have --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Okay. I can go with that.

What's going to take place at the table is going to have to take place at the table. MS. MORRIS:

We would substitute commission approved certification process or bona fide. MR. HALLACK:

Or certification process approved by the Commission in accordance with rules and regs.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, it might have to be a little more meatier than that. It might have to include inspection ready.

MR. HALLACK:
If you make it meatier, then you're going to handcuff yourself.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, okay.

MR. STRODERT:
You're going to what?
MR. HALLACK:
If you make it meaty and put a lot of detail in it, you're going to handcuff yourself.

MR. STRODERT:

Such as Commission approved?
MR. HALLACK:
Well, if you try to define what Commission approval would be --

MR. POTEET:
That means the ten of us vote on it, right? Commission approved is anything that the 10 of us vote on.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, the Director will approve it.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, you'll propose it for
approval.
MR. POTEET:
We know what Commission approved means. I mean, I don't think that's any -I don't think that's a lot of language.

MR. HALLACK:
No, but $I$ think you'll have to adopt some rules and regs to say what needs the Commission's approval.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. Well --
MR. CORMIER:

Let them tell us.
MR. POTEET:
-- I think that they can handle it that point.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Get to that point and --
MR. STRODERT:
The rules and regulation for the Commission would be in order to get the approval, to get approved by the Commission. MS . MORRIS:

We can put approved by the Commission, we can just agree to work with NIADA before it gets to the floor, just to get out of committee.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Yes. I think you're going to have to decide what gets it out of committee. That's the whole thing, what you present to the committee, if you give them facts that they understand. Well, these guys are from all different aspects. A lot of times, they don't get what you're trying to do. So then they start -- that's when you get bad attachments. It then becomes --
it's bad, period.
MS. MORRIS:
I think just to take out the word bona fide, because the staff had trouble with it. So I think that's communication that the committee will need.

MR. POTEET:
Bona fide is like the other terms in the other ones, you know, bona fide to me may not be bona fide to you.

MS. MORRIS:
I think we can remove that and put commission approved. We can see what questions they may have about that and we can address that either through the national certification or through rules.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Dwayne, you had something on the rent to own?

MR. TAMBLING:
Yes. I had a dealer contact the association Friday in reference to rent to own portion of that 533 bill and they were concerned with the 30 percent cap on the security deposit. Now, I'm not a rent to
own dealer, but $I$ did a little checking up on this and, of course, I called Keith Kiraly, because he is a rent to own dealer and he had some input, I think, on that procedure.

MR. KIRALY:
Basically, I still buy cars. I
have five dealerships that $I$ buy cars from and, Ron, I am sure you can attest to it. I go in and $I$ bid on a package of cars. What I put into cars and what the dealer bills to me is completely different. He will bill me cars for $\$ 100$ that he stole on a trade.

He'll bill me something that's junk and might put $\$ 3,000$ or $\$ 4,000$ in it. When I get back to my lot, I break them out accordingly, but the paperwork and it might not say that. It might say that the car is $\$ 100$. When $I$ book it into my lot, I might book in for $\$ 3,000$, because it's just how I move the numbers. Of course, my hands are tied. I can only charge what each of the dealership bills to me. That's ludicrous. I mean --

MR. POTEET:

So let me ask you a question. So it's not the 30 percent you're concerned about. The phrase is the documented cost that you're concerned about? MR. KIRALY:

Yes. I mean, how do you document, do you take my word on it? I mean, again, I'm buying a package deal and sometimes I have to step up on a package knowing that he's going to make it up to me on the next package, because I'm helping that dealer out.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. Well, here's how I would look at that from documented cost. The logical standpoint for me would be, you know how much you have in a car. If I ask you, this vehicle on this lot, can you tell me what your cost is on that car, you would have some list that would say, I bought it for $\$ 100$, $I$ put a transmission in it, I repainted it, $I$ put new tires on it. So, now, the cost of that car to me is $\$ 3,500$. Why can't we define cost that way, that your document says, documented cost? I wouldn't
even think that that would be what you paid for it. I would think that that's your end cost before you decide to retail it.

MR. KIRALY:
I mean, we'll get the list from the dealer and we sit down and we move the numbers to where they're supposed to be.

MR. POTEET:
I'm not concerned with that. I mean, you're right. I understand you buy a package of cars, you buy 10 cars for $\$ 10,000$. That doesn't mean they're all $\$ 1,000$ apiece.

MR. KIRALY:
Absolutely.
MR. HALLACK:
Well, there's a lot of confusion on this issue. Derek and I spoke to Mr. Kiraly a couple of weeks ago about this. Security deposit does not mean down payment and it says what a security deposit is. You can take whatever down payment you want to get. If it's an $\$ 11,000$ car and you get a $\$ 10,000$ down payment, that's great. We're not trying to regulate what a dealer gets in
a down payment. All we're trying to regulate is if a dealer takes a security deposit and the sole purpose of the security deposit is to protect the dealer from extraordinary wear and tear, some damage, something beyond normal use, that's all a security deposit is. We had this issue come up in a case that Mr. Wisenor was -- Ronnie Wisenor was working where the customer was -- he was confused as to what -- the difference between a security deposit and a down payment, because it says something about it being non-refundable and we decided we needed to clarify what a security deposit is, and then tell the dealer that if you're going to take a security deposit, which is only for damage or repairs beyond normal use. So he could use it for that, but he can't use it for a down payment. You can take whatever down payment you want. The down payment would be something that would go toward the purchase price of the car. A security deposit has absolutely nothing to do with the purchase price of the car. A security deposit is only to protect the
dealer for damage done to that vehicle.
MR. POTEET:
When I look -- okay. When I look at this sentence, $I$ don't have any problems with any -- understanding any of this except the word documented costs. I mean, a 30 percent -- 20 percent, it could be 80 percent, it could be 10 percent. The documented cost is the key phrase.

MR. TAYLOR:
Why don't we work off the top line selling price?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Why aren't we working off of monthly payments?

MR. POTEET:
Well, why would it be documented costs, because now it's back to Dino's point, why isn't it the price of the car, because the price of the car to the consumer because the documented cost means that at some point -- when do you reveal that? When are businesses required to reveal their cost in something by law?

MR. HALLACK:
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I don't think it's something a lot of dealers do. I don't think a lot of dealers take a security deposit. It's only for extraordinary damage.

MR. POTEET:
Well, why can't --
MR. DUPLESSIS:
I would probably have to disagree. Mr. Kiraly, what is your opinion on that?

MR. KIRALY:
Well, here's the problem, okay, again, I've been a rent to own dealer from -- since its conception, 1998. I got the first license in ' 98 when we went to court and '99 we got the license. There's no uniformity in a contract. And $I$ brought one -- I brought my contract, okay, and I have amended it along the way. Dealers normally take a UCCl form that you get through a bank, mortgage company, and so forth. We have no uniformity. So I have seen contracts of other dealers and I'm appalled. I've seen them in vehicles. I've had consumers bring them to me. Okay. I don't
agree with a lot of things in their contract. My contract says in big bold print, non-refundable security deposit. It does. But then further on in the contract, it tells them how that is refunded to them once this contract is completed. Okay. But, again, $I$ don't know what the other dealers are doing. I know their contracts -- we have no uniformity. So, again, we're going to have to look and see something on that verbiage or something. We have certain rules, but a lot of these dealers are really going extreme on these rules. I mean, they're going overboard. I don't know what this specific dealer did to warrant this even coming up, but we need to come up with some type of a contract or some type of a -with a set of rules, what can be in these contracts.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, that's what 793 does. 793 outlines what you can put in a rent to own contract. And what we had was a situation where a customer was confused, because he was seeing the word deposit that he thought
he would get it back, but it was clear in the funding of the vehicle that it was a down payment, that it went toward the purchase price of the vehicle and what I told you on the phone is, if you use the word security deposit and it's actually a down payment, you need to change the word to down payment, because to a customer, they may look at that and say, well, it was a deposit, it wasn't a down payment if you're using the word security deposit. And so he had the whole contract laid out and he said, see, there's where $I$ put a security deposit on the car, I want my security deposit back. Now, it did say non-refundable -- or, no, it didn't say non-refundable, $I$ don't think it said anything. But, anyway, so what we came to realize is, that's really a down payment, because it was in the payment part of the contract. It was shown as a down payment. The dealer called it a security deposit. Again, a security deposit is only supposed to be -- and it's defined here what it is, that it's only beyond normal wear and tear. A lot of dealers don't have comp and
collision on their policies on that vehicle. I know you do, but some other dealers that do rent to own, they may not have comp and collision. So what happens if the customer goes out there and wrecks that car? You know, maybe that dealer wants to take a security deposit that would cover that.

MR. POTEET:
Well, I think based on what you just said, the wording is documented cost. What if we had this exact same wording and it said the price of the car -- the retail price of the car?

MR. KIRALY:
My contracts shows that. It shows every payment. It shows exactly --

MR. POTEET:
Well, that's what I'm saying. If
you read this provision, it would say -right now, it says, no security deposit -it defines what a security deposit is. I don't know how you can have any other -MR. KIRALY:

My contract defines it how you get it back.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. And then your security deposit shall exceed -- no security deposit shall exceed 30 percent of the rental dealer's price. I would get rid of the documented cost. I don't understand how that helps. Yes, I would think that the retail price, price of the car, something along those lines. And I don't know how that --

MR. HALLACK:
And I think that's the original language.

MR. POTEET:
Let's get rid of documented costs.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Will that cure it?
MR. KIRALY:
I think that would be fair, but one note on that. When you said that some dealers aren't required to get comp and collision, I've had many instances where I require them all to get it. They write a check on Friday for their insurance. If
they get in a wreck that check bounced, they don't -- the insurance company doesn't cover anything.

MR. WISENOR:
That is what they have contingent liability for.

MR. KIRALY:
No contingent liability is to protect the dealer.

MR. POTEET:
All right. Let's change that wording.

MR. HALLACK:
Go back to the way the law was written.

MR. POTEET:
The retail price. Is that
acceptable to everybody in this room, retail price?

MR. HALLACK:
On that one, yes.
MR. POTEET:
What else, do you have another one? Do you have anything else you want discuss?

MR. STRODERT:
The 30 percent, though, I mean, the question is on the security deposit side. So it's not necessarily the down payment side.

MR. POTEET:
No. It defines security deposit and it's completely separate.

MR. STRODERT:
Where did y'all come up with the 30 percent on the security deposit? MR. HALLACK:

You know, originally when we started developing this law about 10 years ago, Butch Wright was adamantly opposed to setting a number. And so it was written -like Ms. Morris said, we're just going to go back to the old language, whatever that is. MR. POTEET:

I think the 30 percent is a number that might be --

MR. HALLACK:
Not to exceed.
MR. POTEET:
Yes. And I think that that
number kind of gets across all of the objections.

MR. HALLACK:
It was discussed in the
legislative committee if you want to know where it came from.

MR. TAMBLING:
They were wanting to know why they were being capped at the 30 percent. MR. HALLACK:

Now, remember, that's not a cap on down payment. You can take any down payment you want.

MR. POTEET:
It's just a security deposit. MR. STRODERT:

The question is, why you are taking a security deposit?

MR. HALLACK:
Only for -- like Mr. Kiraly said, he has comp and collision. Maybe the dealer wants a little fund there in case the customer wrecks the car or has extraordinary damage, you know, or drives it to LA and back every week or something like that, you
know.
MR. KIRALY:
When we first started this in
'99, we didn't require all --- I didn't
require all dealers. You know, some of the dealers couldn't afford it. But as things evolved, as the economy got better, as the cars that were on the program, everything just changed. You know, we learned from the progression of -- you know, don't put the clunkers out there, because the clunkers -you get them back and you're defeating your purpose. Whereas, now, when I go in with these consumers, I may have $\$ 6,000$ in a car that they put up $\$ 2,500$ down. So I'm in bed with them and these people -- I'm indebted for six months before $I$ can break even. So that would be a reason to have that security deposit in place, which is what we did, but I do understand what you're saying on the verbiage and I can change my contracts to that. So we have no problem with that. It's just $I$ was worried about the number we were putting. MR. POTEET:
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I think the 30 percent is
probably going to be driven by the Legislature a little bit. I mean, I think -- to me there's some -- I don't know what the number is, but there's some number that's going to make people unhappy with this. If you put 50 percent, 70 percent, it looks like you're gouging the consumers. If you have the number too low, it looks like they're not getting anything. I'm just thinking 30 percent sounds like some kind of a happy medium that over the years is -MR. DUPLESSIS:

Sellable.
MR. HALLACK:
But what we're saying is that we're going to make an amendment to this bill saying retail price of the car, whereas the --

MS. MORRIS:
Which is higher than the cost. MR. POTEET:

Yes. And you're going to have -you know, if your car is $\$ 9,000$, you're going to get 30 percent back, not your --

MR. STRODERT:
Up to 30 percent.
MR. POTEET:
Up to 30.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's 3,000. So just think of it this way. So this is kind of your -- you know, your cushion in case of repossession. And I think it's probably technically according to Federal Trade Commission illegal to take a deposit on a rent to own car.

MR. KIRALY:
And I try to get at least 50 percent of my cost in the vehicle when I'm doing rent to own.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. What other -- what else do we have? You have some other comments?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Anything else on 533?
MR. KIRALY:
The numbers on the authorizing the rental dealer for aiding a rental dealer to be struck out committed each, that means
we can go ahead and commit with? That's the question I've got on that.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, you've got to remember that has absolutely no meaning whatsoever. It's just crazy language that has to be removed. How it got in our law in the first -MS. MORRIS:

Well, that's old and I think that's before there was a repossession process. That's old language.

MR. HALLACK:
But it's not -- we're not telling them that they have to adopt a repossession process. All you've got to do is have them in default before you repossess the vehicle. MR. KIRALY:

Okay. And my other question is when it says -- on the default, it says you have five days of mailing a notice of default or actual notice of default. Does that mean verbally?

MR. DUPLESSIS:

> Verbal.

MR. KIRALY:

The only problem I have with this and the time $I$ really go after a car and immediately drop the hammer is when that insurance is expired. And I had very bad scenario where we went to get a car down in Terrebonne Parish. They told us -- the police officer told my repo man if he came -- got back in the yard, he was going to have him arrested. He tried to put me on the phone and I could hear the officer saying he didn't give a whatever about who I was. Two days later, the person that we sold it to, boyfriend was driving and hit a van broadside severely injuring two children. If that vehicle would have been off the road because of non-insurance, it would been -- you know, this wouldn't have happened. And that was the only time that we tried -- you know, I work with them on down payment. I work with them on everything. I move everything around with them, but insurance is one of the things that we have a problem with. Especially with contingent liability. I have to make an effort to get it. It states by the
contingent company that $I$ have to make an effort to go get this vehicle.

MR. POTEET:
Well, do you want something in
there about that, about insurance?
MR. HALLACK:
No. Well, default is not having --

MS. MORRIS:
Default includes not having --
MR. KIRALY:
I've got to wait five days --
MR. POTEET:
Well, that's what it's pointing to.

MR. HALLACK:
He's got to wait five days before he repossesses the vehicle?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Yes. That's the way it's
written.
MR. HALLACK:
Do y'all think that's a bad provision?

MR. POTEET:

No. It's only insurance.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, with his testimony, it clearly is a bad provision.

MR. KIRALY:
Very bad.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
I don't think it serves anybody.
MR. POTEET:
Only because of the insurance.
MR. KIRALY:
There's no entity in Louisiana that finances cars that polices them for the insurance better than a good rent to own dealer. We try to call these insurance companies all the time.

MR. HALLACK:
I'm --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
We got it. What do y'all think, because we'll be here all day discussing it. I think it was one of those great ideas we had without all the intended consequences when we discussed it.

But, Mr. Kiraly, that's why we
have you here and we're listening to you today.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, we've got to get rid of that provision that says something about repossession 14:220. That makes no sense whatsoever. It has never made any sense. Repossession in accordance with --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I agree with that. I mean, we're addressing it right now. Let's keep it in order of the specific insurance issue you brought up, because $I$ think that's a real issue.

MS. BARON:
Could you put the five days, within five days of the delivery of notice except in the case of cancelled insurance?

MR. HALLACK:
Time out. By law, he's required to send the customer a letter of default. Okay.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
We've got two issues. We have payment and we have payment of insurance, to
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totally separate thresholds --
MR. HALLACK:
They're covered in one statute.
MS. MORRIS:
They are.
MR. HALLACK:
They are.
MS . MORRIS:
Lapse of insurance is an event of default this allows you to repossess the vehicle.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Right. And the statute, as it's written right now, requires the dealer to put the customer on notice of default, whether it's nonpayment or lapse of insurance. He's required by law, as it is written right now, to put him on notice of default. All we're saying is, during that time, he cannot repossess that vehicle and we're talking about five days. Well, that's a bad five days.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, you've got 10 days. You've got 10 days from the notice of cancellation.

MR. KIRALY:
You can't get in there and fix with the exception of default of insurance? MS. MORRIS:

But the insurer can't cancel -MR. HALLACK:

That's not the whole statute.
MS . MORRIS:
-- but the insurer can't cancel the insurance.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, let me get the statute, but
I promise you it's in there. It says the dealer must put them on notice of default for non-payment --

MR. POTEET:
I don't think we're arguing that point. What we're trying to figure out is the situation he's talking about where they have no insurance.

MR. HALLACK:
But you're not without insurance.
MS. MORRIS:
But the insurer has to notify you.

MR. HALLACK:
No, he's on -- he knows.
MS. MORRIS:
Correct. And so the insurance -at the time the notice of cancellation comes out, it's not, in fact, cancelled.

MR. HALLACK:
That's right.
MR. KIRALY:
If they write a bad check and they give me the check for payment and that check bounces, they have no insurance. There is no grace period with the insurance company, none. We have to find out through our sources when we're checking these people's insurance. We call -- I have girls that do that, to check and make sure. I mean, we're checking on Friday, they have insurance. On Monday, they don't have insurance, you know, on Monday afternoon. Sometimes by the time we get the notice, they've already had their notice. So does the notice from the insurance company work in lieu of my notice?

MR. HALLACK:

This is the most incredibly dealer friendly repossession you could ever imagine. All we're trying to do is, we're trying to clarify it and make it to where it's a workable deal.

MR. POTEET:
I understand that.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
We're all there. We're all there.

MR. POTEET:
We're all there.
MR. HALLACK:
It's not workable, right now.
MR. POTEET:
You're right.
MR. HALLACK:
It's meaningless.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, because the police officer interfered with that process, they also could have liability and we're trying to find -- and, Mr. Kiraly, I think you are the epitome of ethics in the rent to own business. Some of your colleagues may not
be quite to the level you are at. So we're faced as a Commission with balancing the scales between ethics, the consumer, and federal law, and what we think is the best, and I'm kind of thwarted on this one.

MS. MORRIS:
Mr. Kiraly is maybe saying that the first payment bounces, because if you have one payment if you are bound for coverage, they can't cancel you that quickly, because the insurer has to send you a notice of cancellation and you, in fact, have insurance for a period longer -MR. DUPLESSIS:

It's 10 days normally.
MS. MORRIS:
-- to pay, and then you have continuous coverage. MR. BREWER:

We can eliminate that by having the customer pay cash for his insurance. MS. MORRIS:

A money order or certified check. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Well, I don't know that that's
practical in the normal scheme of business for every consumer. While $I$ think some of his clients probably do have money orders, you know, if you ask an average person who has a checking account and things are tight, they can occur. So I'm not sure that sending everybody down to either the post office or the convenience store to get a money order --

MS. MORRIS:
I'm not even sure if the insurer can cancel it if the check bounced, because if they have -- they have to go back and check on the funds.

MR. HALLACK:
See what the law says default
means. Default means the failure of a rental customer to bring the rental account current within five days after the rental payment is due or the failure of the rental customer to maintain minimum insurance required pursuant to a rental purchase agreement. So you can put them in default. The law clearly says that's the reasons for default. All this says is that you've got
five days after you put them in default that you can't repossess the vehicle. You've got to give them five days' notice.

MR. TAYLOR:
I believe any financing entity in the world, I believe they'll give them more than five days to get these people up and going. I believe what you believe, this is very fair.

MR. HALLACK:
Yes. I don't know if they're saying that they don't want any notice at all before repossession. Is that what y'all are saying?

MR. STRODERT:
I think what I'm concerned -- and tell me if I'm wrong -- is there's a concern that if the insurance lapses and the customer or the consumer has no insurance, that means that if they drive that vehicle for the next five days, it cannot be picked up and repo'd. They drive that vehicle and something happens in that five-day period, the liability turns to the dealer and the dealer is basically saying, hey, that's fine
on the five-day default to give them an opportunity for payment, if that's the way the law would read, but for insurance purposes, you have a five day window that you've got to pray to God that that renter is not going to drive that vehicle and go do some sort of damage that would put the dealer at some sort of liability.

MR. HALLACK:
Okay. The customer is supposed to be provided with notice of cancellation from the insurer. According to that notice of cancellation, it's my understanding the notice also goes to the owner of the vehicle. So the dealer is supposed to get that notice of cancellation, also. Am I right?

MR. KIRALY:
That's the way it's supposed to the work, yes.

MR. HALLACK:
Right.
MR. KIRALY:
But they don't send you one all the time. They really don't.

MR. HALLACK:
But I've talked to Dave before. I've talked to several other rent to own dealers and they're on some kind of database and they know immediately when somebody has --

MR. STRODERT:
What most dealers do that we've run across through the state association is they will create a -- when $I$ pay my last payment, and then there's another date that says they are due on this date the insurance and what a dealer like Mr. Kiraly would do is, they will pick up the phone and clarify their insurance to make sure that that renter is not driving around without insurance. And the dealer would also have to go one step further and they'll go to try to disable using GPS devices inside of the vehicle so that vehicle is not moving. So the dealer doesn't have the liability.

MR. HALLACK:
But you see my point is, if you're aware -- if you receive notice, whether you get the notice of cancellation
from the insurer or if you get something from like a database or something to the effect that right then, there's no insurance, then you need to put the customer in default in accordance with the law. You know, that's what you've got to do. This just says -- then you've got five days before you can go get it. So if you get a notice of cancellation, which gives everybody a 10-day grace period -- and that is the law. That's not happenstance. They are given a 10-day grace period. We're inside 10 days at five days. So if you get that notice of cancellation like they're required to give you or if you see it on a database, then you've got to know that you've five days to -- before you can go get that vehicle. You just can't immediately run out there and get it.

MR. KIRALY:
I don't do it that way. That's using your scenario.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's correct.
MR. TAYLOR:

If we're doing it this way, we are setting it up for people to do snatch and grab on the first day, $I$ don't think that's right.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Let's try to wrap this up. I think, number one, that you guys can pay the payment, which if $I$ was in your shoes, I'm not sure $I$ would want to do it, and then you could get a reimbursement on that. The other thing we can do is maybe change the language on notification and putting them in default and $I$ think that could be by e-mail. That could be -- let's face it, that's the way y'all notify your customers today. MS. MORRIS:

Well, that's why we have actual notice. You can deposit the certified mail, so you will have a record of it, but if you can actually notify them, you still have to approve.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Do we have a definition of
notice?
MR. KIRALY:

It could be two weeks.
MS. MORRIS:
You would have to change it to say certified mail.

MR. HALLACK:
It doesn't say certified mail in the law. I don't know what it says.

MS. MORRIS:
It says notice by mail. If you just put it in the regular mail, you're not going to have any proof that you did it. You're going to have to have proof of mailing or certified mail.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Do we have a definition of
notice?
MS. MORRIS:
It says it's five days of the letter of mailing of the notice of default or actual notice. So actual notice could be if the customer came to you and you had a conversation with them, if you texted them.

MR. HALLACK:
The day of mailing --
MS. MORRIS:

If it comes down to this --
MR. HALLACK:
Right.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Keith made a good point. We'll go for a text or an e-mail.

MS. MORRIS:
Or a telephone call, but you have to have proof of it if you're arguing this point.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, we're not trying to make this difficult for the dealer.

MR. KIRALY:
I am not trying to make it difficult either, because it's just as vague to me. You know, I'm looking at it. I need to know what the rules are. I'll play the game by the rules.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I don't think anybody is
defending this. This is one of the things that this is a legislative process. You argue a lot at that point, but $I$ think we've kind of made -- have we made the point?

MR. HALLACK:
We're not making any changes,
right?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
I think we've clarified, Mr.
Kiraly and Derek and everybody in NIADA what to disseminate to your constituents, which is -- you know, our clients as well, exactly what they should tell them to do and that would be text would be legal, an e-mail, a phone conversation, but you have to retain proof and records, because you have 10 days to cure within the notice of insurance, the business y'all are in are to keep the insurance up, but we're not saying you've got to go past five days. You put them in default. You're in default, you have five days to cure in the period and if don't do it, we're going to get the GPS and we're going to come get your car and/or both or all of the above. So we're on your side, but we have to be on the consumer side and be able to settle this.

MR. STRODERT:
And $I$ don't mean to be dragging
this any further, because $I$ think you need to close this thing out, but on the notification of default. Can we initiate the GPS device to shut down a vehicle?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Five days.
MS. MORRIS:
This does not address disable the car. This is physically repossessing the car. So I don't think this precludes from disabling it.

MR. HALLACK:
You can't just disable it.
MS. MORRIS:
If you don't have possession of it, you're going to do any damage. MR. POTEET:

The law says you can't do that. MS. BARON:

So you can disable it the same day you -MR. POTEET:

You can disable it, you can't go get it.

MR. GUILLORY:

I would put this to where, in my simple mind, it's real easy to understand. It's no different if you kill that vehicle, because you know they're in -- that's especially putting a dealer in liability. It's no different than a trooper stops you and you don't have insurance. He's not going to give you five days to get your stuff right. He's going to take that vehicle right there on the spot.

MR. STRODERT:
I think that's the big concern. MR. POTEET:

I think the interpretation of our attorneys is you can disable it, which would stop, you know --

MR. TAYLOR:
That disabling is in your
agreement. This don't mention anything about disabling.

MR. POTEET:
I think those two things are distinct enough that you don't need to be concerned about that. Go ahead and disable it on day one, but don't go get it.

MS. MORRIS:
Your contract needs to say
clearly that it's equipped with a GPS device and if you fail to pay -- if $I$ have evidence the car is uninsured, it's going to be disabled.

MR. HALLACK:
It would make the disabling device even more important.

MR. KIRALY:
The only problem with telling them about the GPS in my car that's registered to me, they're going to -MR. HALLACK:

You don't need to let them know that you have a disabling device.

MR. TAYLOR:
You do need to let them know.
You have to.
MR. POTEET:
If they disable it and if they do something to it, don't you know it.

MR. STRODERT:
Yes. Then, you're going to back and it is the same thing as being in
default, because through the contract it's going to state something --

MR. POTEET:
I think there's some point where -- I mean, you get down to -- it's like a bell curve. I mean, you're going far and far enough out, we're going to find it, an example that somebody is getting around this. I think we've got to go with where, you know, the --

MR. STRODERT:
One thing that $I$ would say on that, so basically if I'm a rent to own dealer and my renter on Friday afternoon, the insurance is done. So I get that notification. I basically initiate the GPS and hopefully it works and the car is not hidden or its somewheres why it didn't work and they didn't take it out already so between that Friday, there's no insurance on that the vehicle and they drive that vehicle, I have until Wednesday, praying to God that nothing happens to it between Friday and Wednesday, and basically there's no liability issue. I'm only just saying t
his, because it's going to come up with the dealers. And so basically we say, yes, for those five days, you are at risk, you cannot go pick up that car.

MR. POTEET:
Or pay the premium.
MR. STRODERT:
Or pay the premium.
MR. POTEET:
It's back to what Mr. Taylor said a few minutes ago, you've already got a dealer friendly rule. You put the due day on day one, you're not going to have any kind of rules. It's going to go the opposite way. Somebody is going to say, I don't know what you guys are trying to pull over on us, but let's make it 30 days.

MR. TAYLOR:
Do you think what we are writing this year would be bad, what somebody else writes in to oppose this, It would be bad. MS. MORRIS:

It's consumer protection. So
they're --
MR. POTEET:
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Yes. I mean, they're already on the consumer side. So the point would be if we make it any more liberal towards the dealer, it's going to get -- it's going to create --

MR. STRODERT:
End up getting pushed back. MR. DUPLESSIS:

And, of course, they're not going to come to this committee to write the law. They're going -- y'all are going to be down there and we're caught in the gap, because we can't lobby for you. I think y'all better, you know, try to define it and disseminate the knowledge as best you can to the committee before you go down there and all sit at the table all unorganized, take this one and run with it.

MR. POTEET:
And Ms. Morris' point, I think, you know, whether you think it's a good idea or not or it's expensive, pay the premium. If that's what you're concerned about, pay the premium for them, and you're going to get it back later.

MR. HALLACK:
The purpose of the contingent liability coverage was supposed to cover the dealer during that period, right?

MR. POTEET:
All right. Guys, have we got anything else on legislative?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, yes, we have the recital of -- Do you want to cover that, by the New Car Commission?

Well, on April 2, which I believe was Thursday, a committee of us went down to New Orleans to meet with the New Car Commission and we had -- that delegation was Mr. Parnell, myself, Mr. Poteet, Ms. Morris and Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR:
Is it okay if we get a copy back here?

MR. POTEET:
Sure.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
And there was a gentleman from the Governor's Office, and he's with the

Board of Commissions, which falls under the Administrative Procedures Acts of the Governor's Office. We basically went down and we were going to bring the case of the finance license to their light. And, you know, I always thought that you should have an expectation of a meeting when you go in and hopefully your expectations when you leave. Well, I think mine were satisfied on both ends. I felt like the New Car Commission -- we started off in a forum and Ms. Morris brought together the points of law, which we think are vague and may be not necessarily in their favor and not clear. She brought the points of law and I believe they were, at some point in time, questioning our motivation and I think they thought it was about revenue. Well, I looked around the table and none of us were on the commission for the revenue and we weren't getting anything out of it. I think my comments were to try to do something noble. We were looking at the way the boards and commissions are situated with their scheme of law and basically the

Administrative Procedures act is properly stated in the Constitution and by statute, that there was no representation. There was a large fee, by which it didn't have -- it didn't seemingly have a lot of published guidelines and it didn't have an educational program that was attached to it. And my point was that while they continue to govern finance companies such as FHA and, I guess, Santander, GMAC, Ford Motor Credit, those companies were national scope, and for new car dealers, being one, there's a lot of information. We have NADA. We have LADA, and we have a tremendous amount of mandatory requirements by GM Financial, Capital One, Chase, and Allied. They have seminars for us with the new federal credit bureau that's going around inspecting and that NIADA and LIADA does not have the resources and they don't have the presence of those -- of the lenders of that nature to disseminate all of the credit -- all of the credit information, TILA, Z, Regulation M. It just goes on and on and on. Everything with the federal bureau of credit that is out. And they
really didn't want to address that to a great degree and that's maybe a point that, Sheri, you can speak to later, but I felt like we were to some degree belittled and I was very uncomfortable in that. I think we were all uncomfortable. Were we prepared for the meeting? No. If we would have gotten together and spent maybe a weekend in seclusion, $I$ don't think we would have been prepared for the meeting that took place. And I thought it was a bit unprofessional and at the end of the day, they told us that they would take it under advisement.

Well, this doesn't really fall under their commission. It also falls under the scheme of the laws of the boards and commissions and the Administrative Procedures Act. After it was over, I personally felt a little shallow and I think the rest of my colleagues and Commissioners did as well. So I think we were disappointed. I don't know what more we could have done in retrospect, but I did ask Sheri to write a recital, which I believe that you have now, and I think that you've
probably heard enough from myself on the issue and I would like the other

Commissioners maybe and legal counsel to speak about it. Not to put anybody on the spot.

MR. POTEET:
Well, you know, my feeling was that they -- they were -- what's the old saying, they were loaded for bear when we walked in the door and $I$ don't think that they -- I'm not sure what they think our real motive was, but they expressed that they thought our motive that it was a revenue grab. I can assure everybody in this room, this is not a revenue grab. We don't need the revenue. We're doing fine where we are. We're concerned about our dealers and we're concerned about the consumers. So, you know, as we sat through that meeting and talked about some of the things that, to me, became obvious, number one, everybody -- whether you're a new car dealer or a used car dealer, you're under the same guidelines, except for the exemptions allowed for the new car dealers.

So it's like here's the law for all of us to follow and, oh, by the way, you guys don't really have to follow all these things. So at the end of the meeting, I did make that comment, but $I$ think it was so far down at the end that nobody either heard it or didn't really feel like they needed to respond, but $I$ just said, why don't you just give us all the same exemptions that you give your own new car dealers and call it a day? That's not really what we were shooting for, per se, but it did kind of bring up the point that this is not the same. You're saying that you're regulating your dealers and our dealers the same, but you're not. You're not charging your guys $\$ 400$. You don't have a certain number that they have to do. And Sheri has done a good job of kind of bringing these things together, all the differences, and how used car dealers are treated, and then new car dealers by the same commission that's supposedly regulating both. So as I read through this and look at the options, things are pretty -- I mean, I think this is pretty
fair. We're not asking for a lot. We're just asking that everybody be treated the same. At the very least, let's just make everybody treated the same. So that's what I have to say.

I mean, do either of one of you have anything to say? Derek, you were there, too.

MR. TAYLOR:
When was this Motor Vehicles
Finance Act written?
MR. POTEET:
1958.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
And then again in '07, I think. MR. TAYLOR:

Outside of everything that's been said that $I$ do agree with, there's one key factor and the key factor is that indirect lending was a non-factor in the $50 s$, and so why -- the first question is why we want it now. You know, why haven't we had this for all of those years. Well, we wouldn't have fell under their guidelines back then, and what we're trying to do is just govern our
dealers and if they're going to tie lending with -- why do they need us to come aboard and we're just trying to get our separation there and trying to get our dealers back. If they don't want them, I think that we still need to have -- you know, this is an important issue on a state level and I think we owe it to our dealers to make sure that they know what's going on out there and that we should start paying a lot more attention to this on our side and not depend on that entity. I hope I made myself clear.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I agree with you. If there's one group of people that really need the education, it's the used car side, because they do not have the relationships. In fact, $I$ think a lot of what they deal with it is credit. I deal with a lot of credit, but it doesn't matter, because I've got Allied and GM Financial and Chase and so forth and I've got good education coming down the pipe, but $I$ do not see any of those certifications coming through other creditors. I don't know if they're extended
through Chase or anything else, because I'm strictly new car.

MR. TAYLOR:
No, no, they are not. They're not coming through our indirect lenders. The only one that offers any type of anything, which is Allied, you can pay to go to courses with them, which I've been to several of them. They're very good and very helpful, but no, we're not provided what you're providing.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, you see they're mandatory
for me with General Motors and GM Financial. It's a violation of our dealer agreement not to attend -- be certified and actually have a plan in place, a very simple plan, but in regards to privacy, HIPAA, it's pretty -it's pretty strict. It's down to locking the door of the finance office, documents sitting on the receptionist's desk that's working a new car file. It's at that level and do we do it? You better do it, because you never know who's going to come in and you don't want that to get out. You don't
want to have an adversarial relationship with your lenders. The credit unions, on the other hand, I do not believe -- I've never seen anything come across my desk or my computer, my e-mails, that would -- that would indicate that there's that level of education compliance, concern, and development of a plan for a used car dealer. It's going to come down to the feds. So I think that it is important. It is there for education and I feel personally -- I can't speak for the rest of Commissioners, but I do think that it's going to become a concern and I think we have an obligation to regulate and they charge you a fee. I do think they need to let you know what to expect and that's a lot of federal regulation. So I think that they're -- you know, they're charged with that.

MR. POTEET:
Do you have any comments?
MS. MORRIS:
No. I think it's been very well
covered. They said they would take it under advisement. They didn't give us a time line

[^1]to respond or anything. So should we do some follow-up or I don't know. Where do we move it from here?

MR. POTEET:
I was kind of under the impression that maybe the next step would be for Derek to get back with them and try to get this to the level where it's actually mediated. Does that sound right? MR. DUPLESSIS:

Yes.
MR. POTEET:
I don't know how else to word that, but we have our position. We think we're right and obviously they have their position and they think they're right. So somewhere along the line, $I$ don't think that this is -- I think we all agree with this, that we don't think it's a legislative option, at least not at this point.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Not this year, not in the fiscal session.

MR. POTEET:
It would result in a larger fight

I think. So I think the next steps is to have somebody at the Governor's Office on board with the Commission to sort of mediate it a little bit, at least look at it and see -- you know, if we're wrong, I would like somebody to tell me that we're wrong, other than the people over at the LMVC. So that's my position.

MR. TAYLOR:
Who's governing again?
MR. POTEET:
That was the man that was there at that meeting. But he was not there to make any decisions. He was only there to observe.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, LAIDA probably would do what they want with the legislative scheme of law. My personal recommendation, and I think my fellow Commissioners, along -- as well as Sheri who has a lot of legislative experience would urge you to not take this up in session. I think with cool heads, this plan will prevail. I don't think that it would behoove you or anyone else to try
and bring something to this legislative session. That's just a word of advice. Now, after the session.

MR. POTEET:
I agree with that. I think we've got -- you know, it's sort of -- you take certain steps and we don't want to get too far along, because we don't want it to explode. We want -- Mr. Kiraly is here. I thought we did a pretty good job of working that thing over with the insurance the way we did it. It wasn't -- we did it slowly and eventually we won the battle, but I think if you go in there and cause an explosion, it can result in a lot of problems down the road. This is the best step. If we can't achieve anything through the Governor's office after this session, then we jump in and we start thinking about next year's session. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. POTEET:
All right. Any other comments
for today, anything that we need to be thinking about for the next meeting at this point in time, items for the next agenda? The next meeting will be May 18th. All right.

MR. FLOYD:
Well, I would like to bring something to light.

MR. POTEET:
Okay.
MR. FLOYD:
I have a dealer that contacted me and I'm also in the same situation. When you pay for a vehicle at the auction, the title doesn't come in and you've floor planned the car, you've sold the car, and now you're paying interest to the floor planning company. Who is truly at fault -when you buy a car at the auction, we're penalized a late fee for not paying on time. So shouldn't -- should the seller of that vehicle be penalized or the auction be penalized when the title is not available? MR. CORMIER:

I thought it started when the
title, that is your floor plan.
MR. POTEET:
At my auction -- $I$ can only speak
for my auction, specifically. At my auction, there is a remedy, actually the National Auto Auction Association and Auction insurance has a remedy that is to bring the vehicle back. We've already discusses this. You're not supposed to sell the car without a title. Am I right? No matter where you buy the car or how you buy the car, the statement you've made is that you sold the car and you didn't know where the title is, you're already in violation of the Commission. So the remedy at the auction is, if you buy a vehicle here -because you've got to remember, where do we get our titles? We get them from the seller and the legal transaction is between the seller and the buyer. The auction is a facilitator, but we're not legally responsible for that title unless we do something to mess it up in some way, we lose it, we damage it, you know, we don't fill it out properly. So as a buyer, your question
really gets to the point as to what can we do to make sellers get the titles to us in a timely manner.

MR. FLOYD:
Correct.
MR. POTEET:
Trust me, I would love to have some kind of law that required the seller to get the title to the auction within $X$ number of days, because except in rare instances, I don't make any money until the transaction is completed. I don't get my buy fee or my seller fee until the title comes in and I present it to the buyer. So in answer to that question, if you're at a little bit -when you're buying from another dealer, whether you're buying directly from that dealer or you're buying through an auction, you're taking their word that they're going to have the title to you within a certain period of time. And the only thing that the auction can do is to say, bring the vehicle back. That's why in most of our -- the rules and the rules anybody follows through AAA, one of the first things that's said is
when you get a vehicle from the auction, do not do anything to it, because the title may not come to you. So I don't think that answers your question to say is there a remedy, but $I$ can say that from the standpoint of what are your rights, your rights are limited to when you get that title.

MS . BARON:
If a dealer sells a car to you -or gives the car to you to auction off, shouldn't they be under the 20 day rule just as well?

MR. POTEET:
No, they're not.
MS . BARON:
They're not?
MR. HALLACK:
It's not a retail sale.
MR. POTEET:
It's not a retail sale.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, then on your draft, your
instructions on your draft, just have to write in your instructions not to honor the
draft until the title is presented. That's your -- that's a cure. That's why they have instructions on your draft.

MR. BREWER:
Some auctions have a mileage -if you put over 500 miles on it, you know, you can't bring it back.

MR. POTEET:
Or we'll charge you for it.
MR. BREWER:
But all dealers that sell cars that don't have the titles, well, you just caught every once in a while.

MR. FLOYD:
Well, I called the auction and they've called the dealer and they don't call back. They say, we've trouble with this dealer. When you have trouble with a dealer, what can be done? Numerous calls, calls, calling, calling, calling. This is a big dealer in Baton Rouge, so.

MR. POTEET:
Well, you're talking about -- I mean, you're talking about the difference between the law and just the every day
process of doing business. You know, that's like if you get a bad meal in a restaurant five times in a row, why do you keep going back to that restaurant? I mean, if you've got a dealer that doesn't get titles to you on time -- at our auction -- I mean, most of our buying dealers that are there on a regular basis can go around the room and say, this guy gets the titles on time, this guy never gets them on time, this guy you never know what is going to happen, this guy loses titles. So most of my buyers know that and that's why within the auction arena, we don't allow the transaction to go through until the title comes. In other words, we're not making you pay. We hold the check, but we don't take any money out of your account. We don't deposit your check until we get the title.

MR. FLOYD:
Right.
MR. POTEET:
So I would -- personally, I would
like to see something that required dealers to get titles to auctions within a certain
time.
MR. HALLACK:
It's a violation of the new car law. And Mr. Guillory -- All Star apparently has a real bad problem of getting titles and -- but that's the truth, right, Mr. Guillory? He had to go to All Star and say --

MR. GUILLORY:
I had to go to the New Car Commission to get them to assign an investigator to take care of it.

MR. POTEET:
That's the issue. You're talking about the New Car Commission.

MR. GUILLORY:
I will say, once I made contact with that investigator for this district and he went to All Star and -- within five days, my dealer had his -- it magically appeared. No, what happened is, I'll just say it, they went and -- they finally went and satisfied the lien on the car and got the title.

MR. POTEET:
There are many, many, reasons
this happens. And, again, $I$ can only speak for the experience $I$ have at our auction, but it's generally large new car dealerships that are a problem. Used car dealers cannot have this problem. They usually get us the titles within a week to 10 days. Smaller new car dealers tend not to have this problem, but, you know, I can could name names, obviously, I won't, but there's -- I know which ones. When they bring cars to our action, we say $60,80,90$ days, if we're lucky. We actually have sent our title clerk to a specific dealership and sat down and did 60 titles in one day. We did. We almost had to force our way in. We said, we'll just work the titles for you. And I empathize, but $I$ don't know any other answer than what Nestor has just said here, is for us to go to -- make a complaint to the New Car Commission or get one of our investigators to go and, you know, run the ball for you a little bit.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, let me clarify this and I'm going to tell you why we have a problem --
the same reason I have problems. You will find -- and I know All Star does business with Chase. The banks now are destroying the titles. They do not keep a paper file on hand. They take the title. They scan it. They put it into a digital file and they shred the title. And then you actually have to go through act of cancellation. You have to pay the fee. Then, you have to apply for a duplicate title and don't make the mistake that I'm taking up for All Star. That's not the issue. I'm just citing the issues. So you might want to try to get duplicate titles or something and maybe you've got to visit the All Star manager or whoever's auction, but that's the issue we're having today. MR. CORMIER:

Especially with Chase. MR. DUPLESSIS:

If I am not mistaken, isn't that one of the New Car Commission's licensees. MR. CORMIER:
Yes, sir.

MR. POTEET:

Well, I mean, this is definitely an issue and, you know, if -- I don't have a complete answer for that. I know that our auction in Houston, we've got two dealers over there that they got so bad that we actually convinced them not to ever sell a car until they have the title in their hand and we store their cars for them, and I'm talking about two -- one dealership we regularly have 100 to 190 cars of theirs at our auction awaiting title. But they have agreed not to run them and we have agreed to withhold them for no charge. Now, everybody is happy, because here is the problem. Houston is closer to Mexico than we are and guess what, a lot of our customers from Mexico, come to the United States, buy these cars, take them back to Mexico, and then they can't get a title. You know what, if any of you have ever sold a car to anyone outside of the United States, whether it's Canada, Mexico, Puerto Rico -- not Puerto Rico, Guatemala, that's a problem. When that car gets out of the country and there's no title, everybody is in trouble. The
auction is in trouble. The seller is in trouble. The buyer is in trouble. The consumer at the other end, they're in trouble. So, you know, I wish I could convince all new car stores to not sell their cars until they have a title, but that's the way business is. If I made a law or made a rule at my auction that way, I would go out of business in a month, because the other auctions wouldn't follow that. So we all are on the same playing field.

Any other comments? Sorry I couldn't help you there. Okay.

MR. BREWER:
I make a motion.
MR. SMITH:
Second.
(Meeting adjourned at 12:06 p.m.)

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETTY D. GLISSMAN, Certified Court Reporter, Certificate No. 86150, in and for the State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle Commission April 20, 2015, meeting was reported by me in the stenotype reporting method, was prepared and transcribed by me or under my personal direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

This May 5, 2015, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

BETTY D. GLISSMAN, CCR
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER


Betty D. Glissman, CCR

|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { associate }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 109:10 } \\ & \text { associated }[1]- \\ & \text { 85:12 } \\ & \text { Association }[1]- \\ & \text { 172:6 } \\ & \text { association }[5] \text { - } \\ & \text { 83:14, 108:23, } \\ & \text { 112:15, 116:22, 146:9 } \\ & \text { associations }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 110:18 } \\ & \text { assume }[1]-39: 8 \\ & \text { assuming }[2]-32: 3, \\ & 73: 11 \\ & \text { assumption }[1]- \\ & 73: 8 \\ & \text { assure }[1]-162: 14 \\ & \text { AT }[1]-1: 15 \\ & \text { Atlantic }[7]-44: 5, \\ & 44: 7,44: 24,45: 3, \\ & 45: 5,45: 23,46: 2 \\ & \text { attached }[1]-160: 7 \\ & \text { attachments }[1]- \\ & 115: 25 \\ & \text { attend }[1]-166: 16 \\ & \text { attention }[2]-66: 6, \\ & 165: 10 \\ & \text { attest }[1]-117: 9 \\ & \text { attorney }[4]-11: 21, \\ & 31: 14,38: 20,79: 13 \\ & \text { Attorney }[111-11: 13, \\ & 11: 17,11: 23,51: 11, \\ & 51: 17,52: 2,72: 12, \\ & 74: 4,90: 4,90: 18, \\ & 91: 16 \\ & \text { Attorneys }[1]-91: 8 \\ & \text { attorneys }[2]-21: 15, \\ & 153: 15 \\ & \text { attorneys' }[1]-24: 24 \\ & \text { auction }[40]-8: 12, \\ & 26: 10,30: 23,31: 7, \\ & 53: 23,67: 21,68: 18, \\ & 71: 7,71: 9,71: 18, \\ & 74: 8,74: 10,79: 16, \\ & 82: 11,83: 7,83: 8, \\ & 83: 13,83: 14,171: 14, \\ & 171: 19,171: 22, \\ & 172: 3,172: 4,172: 5, \\ & \text { 172:16, 172:20, } \\ & 173: 9,173: 18, \\ & 173: 22,174: 1, \\ & 174: 11,175: 15, \\ & 176: 6,176: 13,178: 2, \\ & 179: 16,180: 4, \\ & \text { 180:11, 181:1, 181:8 } \\ & \text { Auction }[2]-172: 6, \\ & 172: 7 \\ & \text { auctions }[7]-69: 4, \\ & 74: 16,85: 2,85: 3, \\ & \text { 175:5, 176:25, 181:10 } \end{aligned}$ | ```audit \({ }_{[1]}-35: 8\) authorizing [1] - 132:23 auto [5]-55:13, 55:21, 56:1, 83:13, 85:12 Auto [10] - 69:16, 70:16, 93:14, 93:21, 93:25, 94:1, 94:2, 94:5, 172:6 AutoCheck [19] - 54:1, 59:18, 81:25, 82:6, 82:10, 83:1, 83:3, 83:7, 83:10, 83:12, 83:16, 83:20, 84:13, 85:3, 86:15, 88:12, 88:16, 89:18 AutoChecks [1] - 112:12 automatically [1] - 86:8 Autos [1] - 93:24 available [5]-19:16, 19:19, 59:9, 108:2, 171:23 AVENUE \({ }_{[1]}\) - 2:19 average \({ }_{[1]}\) - 143:4 avoid [1] - 41:24 awaiting [1] - 180:11 aware [5] - 43:23, 75:13, 88:16, 90:15, 146:24 Aye [8]-6:12, 6:13, 11:4, 11:5, 12:8, 12:9, 94:20, 94:21``` <br> B\&B [1] - 94:5 backed [1] - 56:7 backend [1] - 88:25 background [1] 57:5 <br> backs [1] - 89:10 bad [15]-59:25, 65:15, 115:25, 116:1, 134:4, 135:23, 136:4, 136:6, 138:22, <br> 140:10, 156:20, <br> 156:21, 176:2, 177:5, <br> 180:5 <br> bag [1] - 76:13 <br> balance [1] -9:1 <br> balancing [1] - 142:2 <br> BALHOFF [1]-2:22 <br> ball [1] - 178:22 <br> bank [5]-7:1, 16:16, <br> 20:14, 20:18, 122:21 <br> banks [1] - 179:3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Betty D. Glissman, CCR



Betty D. Glissman, CCR

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:3, 121:9, 121:21, } \\ & \text { 121:23, 125:10, } \\ & \text { 126:6, 131:21, 132:15 } \\ & \text { costly }[1]-9: 19 \\ & \text { costs }[6]-8: 13, \\ & 61: 11,61: 20,121: 6, \\ & 121: 18,126: 16 \\ & \text { counsel }[1]-162: 3 \\ & \text { countersue }[1]- \\ & \text { 28:16 } \\ & \text { country }[1]-180: 24 \\ & \text { counts }[1]-96: 2 \\ & \text { couple }[4]-31: 1, \\ & 50: 5,84: 24,119: 19 \\ & \text { course }[9]-10: 16, \\ & 17: 4,17: 8,17: 11, \\ & 100: 25,104: 12, \\ & 117: 2,117: 21,157: 9 \\ & \text { courses }[1]-166: 8 \\ & \text { court }[1]-182: 24 \\ & \text { Court }[3]-70: 4, \\ & 72: 4,182: 3 \\ & \text { court }[8]-17: 13, \\ & 17: 23,18: 2,25: 4, \\ & 29: 8,69: 17,69: 21, \\ & 122: 15 \\ & \text { cover }[6]-60: 21, \\ & 61: 2,125: 7,127: 2, \\ & 158: 3,158: 10 \\ & \text { coverage }[3]- \\ & 142: 10,142: 18,158: 3 \\ & \text { covered }[2]-138: 3, \\ & 167: 24 \\ & \text { CPO }[1]-109: 2 \\ & \text { crappy }[1]-75: 22 \\ & \text { crazy }[2]-58: 14, \\ & 133: 6 \\ & \text { create }[5]-65: 4, \\ & 108: 23,146: 10,157: 5 \\ & \text { credit }[9]-35: 24, \\ & 92: 10,160: 17, \\ & 160: 22,160: 25, \\ & 165: 19,167: 2 \\ & \text { Credit }[1]-160: 10 \\ & \text { creditors }[1]- \\ & 165: 25 \\ & \text { CREEK }{ }_{[1]}-1: 20 \\ & \text { cumbersome }[1]- \\ & 104: 13 \\ & \text { cure }[4]-126: 18, \\ & 151: 13,151: 18,175: 2 \\ & \text { curious }[1]-31: 6 \\ & \text { current }[4]-7: 4, \\ & 14: 24,85: 13,143: 19 \\ & \text { curve }[1]-155: 6 \\ & \text { cushion }[1]-132: 8 \\ & \text { customer }[43]- \\ & 14: 21,17: 10,22: 10, \\ & 23: 12,23: 17,23: 24, \\ & 24: 2,25: 6,26: 15, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ```27:11, 29:4, 33:8, 33:11, 41:21, 56:25, 57:19, 58:2, 58:6, 58:10, 60:9, 62:5, 65:13, 66:12, 67:16, 69:4, 69:17, 69:18, 69:23, 77:16, 120:9, 123:24, 124:8, 125:4, 129:23, 137:21, 138:15, 142:21, 143:18, 143:21, 144:19, 145:10, 147:4, 149:21 customer's [1] - 14:20 customers [5] - 41:25, 42:6, 46:23, 148:15, 180:16 cut [1] - 36:2``` <br> D\&N ${ }_{[1]}$ - 94:4 <br> damage [12]-54:22, <br> 55:17, 84:1, 84:3, <br> 120:5, 120:17, 121:1, <br> 122:4, 129:24, 145:7, <br> 152:16, 172:24 <br> dancing [1] - 25:19 <br> Darty [3]-5:9, 11:3, <br> 94:19 <br> DARTY $_{[1]}$ - 2:12 <br> darty ${ }_{[1]}-6: 6$ <br> data [1]-85:11 <br> database [10] - <br> 55:23, 77:21, 77:25, <br> 78:1, 83:21, 87:3, <br> 88:5, 146:4, 147:2, <br> 147:16 <br> date [11] - 7:14, 7:20, <br> 8:1, 8:10, 17:13, <br> 17:14, 18:2, 42:15, <br> 85:14, 146:11, 146:12 <br> Dave [1]-146:2 <br> days [39]-13:5, <br> 27:4, 42:11, 42:12, <br> 42:19, 42:20, 42:22, <br> 86:12, 133:20, <br> 134:12, 135:12, <br> 135:17, 137:16, <br> 137:17, 138:21, <br> 138:22, 138:24, <br> 138:25, 142:15, <br> 143:19, 144:1, 144:7, <br> 144:21, 147:7, <br> 147:13, 147:17, <br> 149:18, 151:12, <br> 151:16, 151:18, <br> 152:6, 153:8, 156:3, <br> 156:17, 173:10, |  | ```130:6, 146:4, 146:8, 156:2, 160:12, 162:18, 162:25, 163:10, 163:15, 163:21, 163:22, 165:1, 165:4, 165:8, 175:11, 176:7, 176:24, 178:4, 178:7, 180:4 dealership [5] - 58:16, 83:24, 117:23, 178:13, 180:9 dealerships [3] - 86:8, 117:8, 178:3 dealing [3] - 29:15, 64:11, 86:10 deals [2]-34:11, 55:13 dealt [1]-41:4 decide [2]-115:18, 119:3 decided [2]-71:19, 120:13 decision[3]-50:13, 50:15, 71:20 decisions [1] - 169:14 decreased [1] - 7:19 default [25] - 133:16, 133:19, 133:21, 135:7, 135:10, 137:21, 138:10, 138:15, 138:19, 139:3, 139:14, 143:16, 143:17, 143:23, 143:25, 144:1, 145:1, 147:5, 148:13, 149:19, 151:17, 152:3, 155:1 defeating [1] - 130:12 defect [1]-61:9 defects [2]-62:21, 70:3 defending [1] - 150:22 defense [1] - 35:10 deferred [2] - 7:8, 7:9 define [3] - 114:3, 118:24, 157:14 defined [3]-61:24, 105:24, 124:23 defines [5] - 63:13, 80:4, 125:21, 125:24, 128:7 defining [1] - 107:18 definitely [1] - 180:1 definition [6]-63:15, 63:17, 68:10, 105:16,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 148:23, 149:15 | dictate [1] - 101:4 | $13: 12,129: 4,136: 24$ | $16: 21,20: 3,20: 8,$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:16 } \\ & \text { degree }[2]-161: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 17,64: 1,68: 18 \\ & \text { 83:19, 87:13, 87:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 69:14, 69:15, 172:9 discussing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:21, 24:20, 174:23, } \\ & \text { 174:24, 175:1, 175:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:14, 165:13, } \\ & \text { 166:12, 168:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 161:4 delegation [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 120:11, 175:24 } \\ \text { differences [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:21 } \\ & \text { discussion [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { drafted }[1]-105: 8 \\ & \text { drafters }[1]-105: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 168:21, 169:16, } \\ & \text { 170:21, 174:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:15 } \\ & \text { deliver } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:20 } \\ & \text { differe } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 19,12: 15,12: 19, \\ & 51: 10,90: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dragging [2] - 29:3, } \\ & \text { 151:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:23, 179:20 } \\ & \text { Duplessis }[1]-4: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 137:17 | 56:15, 68:24, 69:12, | dismissed ${ }_{[1]}$ - 51:5 | drills [1] - 83:20 | duplicate [2] - |
| Department [2] - | 76:2, 83:2, 84:7, 87:6, | dispute [4]-16:10, | drive [5]-43:7 | 179:10, 179:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:17, 87:25 } \\ & \text { department }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:14, 90:25, 107:19, } \\ & \text { 110:14, 115:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 33:22, 44:1, 44:4 } \\ \text { disseminate }[3]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:20, 144:22, } \\ & 145: 6,155: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { during [5] - 13:4, } \\ & 34: 12,103: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:10 } \\ & \text { deposit }[36]-8: 16, \\ & \text { 116:25, 119:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:12, } 153: 3,153: 6 \\ & \text { difficult }[5]-47: 19, \\ & 63: 20,87: 10,150: 13, \\ & 150: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:7, 157:15, 160:21 } \\ & \text { distinct }[1]-153: 23 \\ & \text { district }[1]-177: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { driven [2] - 53:17, } \\ & \text { 131:2 } \\ & \text { drives [2]-69:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 138:19, 158:4 <br> Dwayne [1] - 116:18 <br> DWAYNE [1] - 3:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:7, 120:11, } \\ & \text { 120:14, 120:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { digital }[1]-179: 6$ | 103:2 | driving [2]-134:13, | $E$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:23, 120:25, } \\ & \text { 122:3, 123:3, 123:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dino [4] - 4:14, } \\ 68: 13,86: 12,94: 1 \end{gathered}$ | 51:14, 96:4, 96:9 | p [1] - 134:3 | e-mail [5] - 51:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:6, 124:10, } \\ & 124: 11: 124: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{DINO}_{[1]}-2: 13$ | documented [11] | DSC [1]-34:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 8,148: 13,150: 6, \\ & 151: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 124:11, 124:13, 124:14, 124:21, | Dino's [1] - 121: direction [2]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:1, 118:3, 118:15, } \\ & 118: 25,121: 6,121: 9, \end{aligned}$ | due [6] - 7:23, 99:5 99:10, 143:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { e-mails [1] - 167:5 } \\ & \text { easier [1] - 110:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:22, 125:7, } \\ & \text { 125:20, 125:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:23, 182:10 } \\ & \text { directly }[4]-30: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:17, 121:21, } \\ & \text { 125:10, 126:6, 126:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:12, 156:12 } \\ & \text { DUPLESSIS [103] } \end{aligned}$ | easily [3] - 59:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:3, 128:3, 128:7, } \\ & \text { 128:11, 129:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 31:3, 31:11, 173:17 | documents [4] - <br> 13:11, 96:1, 100:11, | 2:9, 4:23, 24:5, 24:18, <br> 29:19, 30.10, $30 \cdot 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:14 } \\ & \text { easy }[5]-37: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 129:18, 130:19, | Director's [1] - 95:22 | 166:20 | 43:24, 44:18, 47:15, | 84:22, 84:24, 104:2, |
|  | dirty [1] - 41:16 | ollar [1] - 38:24 | 49:5, 53:9, 53:14 | 153:2 <br> economy [1] - 130:7 |
| 176:18 DEREK [1] - | disable [8]-146:19, | dollars [2]-17:2, | 54:23, 58:17, 61:7 | Eddie [2] - 14:22, |
| Derek [16]-10:4, | 152:20, 152:23, | done [17]-13:13 | $64: 21,65: 21,67: 5$ | 46:7 |
| 11:14, 12:16, 48:10, | 153:15, 153:24, | 13:16, 14:16, 16:21 | 70:19, 72:20, 73:17, | Edmunds [1] |
| 48:12, 48:14, 50:7, <br> 66:20, 92:14, 98:25 | 154:21 | 17:14, 20:16, 31:24 | $74: 25,75: 5,75: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:10 } \\ & \text { education }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $66: 20,92: 14,98: 25,$ 104:14, 111:24, | disabled [1] - 154:6 disabling [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:4, 84:12, 91:7, } \\ & 98: 18,110: 12,121: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 18,76: 25,77: 8, \\ & 78: 16,79: 19,80: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 165:16, 165:22, |
| 119:18, 151:6, 164:7, | 152:11, 153:18, | 155:15, 161:23, | 81:14, 81:22, 82:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:7, 167:11 } \\ & \text { educational }[1] . \end{aligned}$ |
| 168:7 <br> derek [1] - 50:8 <br> Derek's [1] - 66:21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 153:20, } 154: 8,154: 16 \\ \text { disagree }[2]-86: 12, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:18, 175:19 } \\ & \text { door [2]-162:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:18, 83:18, 85:20, } \\ & \text { 87:18, 87:23, 90:9, } \\ & 104: 21,106: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:6 } \\ & \text { effect }[3]-60: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| describes [1]-80:4 designate [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:9 } \\ & \text { disagreements [1] - } \\ & \text { 105:25 } \end{aligned}$ | doubt [1] - 70:22 <br> down [41]-20:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:10, 106:18, } \\ & \text { 107:2, 107:8, 107:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:2, 147:3 } \\ & \text { effort [2] - 134:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 108:4, 108:5, 108:7 } \\ \text { desk [2] - 166:21, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { disagrees [2] } \\ 26: 21,29: 11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:11, 49:18, 63:19, } \\ & \text { 83:21, 83:23, 119:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:15, 109:13, } \\ & \text { 110:5, 110:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:2 } \\ & \text { efforts [1] - 19:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 167:4 <br> destroying ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disappointed }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 161:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 119:20, 119:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:24, 111:16, } \\ & \text { 111:20, 112:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { either }[10]-25: 14, \\ 33: 23,41: 15,45: 24, \end{gathered}$ |
| 179:3 | disclaimer [1] | $120: 12,120: 1 \mathrm{~s}$ | 113:10, 113:17 | $69: 5,116: 15,143: 7,$ <br> 150:16, 163:6, 164:6 |
| ```detail [1] - 113:23 details [1]-71:2 determine [1] - 68:2 determined [1] -``` | ```66:17 disclose [5] - 52:24, 57:1, 57:15, 57:20, 59:1``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:20, 120:21, } \\ & \text { 124:3, 124:7, } 124: 8, \\ & \text { 124:10, 124:18, } \\ & \text { 124:20, 128:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:12, 115:5, } \\ & \text { 115:16, 116:17, } \\ & \text { 121:13, 122:7, } \\ & \text { 126:17, 131:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:16, 163:6, 164:6 } \\ & \text { eliminate [1] - } \\ & \text { 142:20 } \\ & \text { embarrassed [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:19 } \\ & \text { devalues }[1]-61: 21 \\ & \text { developing }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | disclosure [3] 52:19, 61:1, 65:3 disclosures [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:12, 130:15, } \\ & \text { 134:5, 134:20, 143:7, } \\ & \text { 150:1, 152:4, 155:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:5, 132:20, } \\ & \text { 133:23, 135:19, } \\ & \text { 136:2, 136:7, 136:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:20 } \\ & \text { empathize }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 178:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:14 } \\ & \text { development }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $52: 22$ <br> discrepancy [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:11, 157:16, } \\ & \text { 158:13, 159:3, 163:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:9, 137:23, } \\ & \text { 138:12, 141:8, } \end{aligned}$ | enclose [1] - 20:13 encourage [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:8 } \\ & \text { device }[4]-152: 4 \text {, } \\ & \text { 154:3, 154:9, 154:16 } \\ & \text { devices }[1]-146: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:3 } \\ & \text { discuss [2] - 50:9, } \\ & \text { 127:25 } \\ & \text { discussed [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:23, 166:19, } \\ & \text { 167:9, 170:16, 178:13 } \\ & \text { dozen }[1]-91: 18 \\ & \text { draft }[13]-16: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:19, 142:14, } \\ & \text { 142:24, 147:23, } \\ & \text { 148:5, 148:22, } \\ & \text { 149:14, 150:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 17,81: 4 \\ & \text { end }[13]-7: 1,25: 23, \\ & 41: 6,41: 17,65: 6, \\ & 73: 2,88: 20,119: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
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| ```95:10 general [1] - 96:13 General [4]-51:17, 74:4, 90:19, 166:14 General's [5] - 51:11, 52:2, 72:12, 90:4, 91:16 generally \({ }^{[1]}\) - 178:3 Generals [1]-91:8 generated [2] - 99:18, 103:20 gentleman [2] - 106:19, 158:24 George [2]-4:10, 5:1 GEORGE [2]-2:7, 2:10 girls [1] - 140:16 gist \([1]\) - \(90: 11\) given [2]-13:5, 147:12 GLISSMAN [3] - 1:25, 182:3, 182:23 GM [3] - 160:15, 165:21, 166:14 GMAC [1] - 160:10 GMC \({ }_{[1]}\) - 75:24 God [2]-145:5, 155:23 gouging [1] - 131:8 govern [2]-160:8, 164:25 governing [1] - 169:10 government [6] - 56:8, 56:9, 87:4, 87:11, 87:12, 89:16 governmental [2] - 54:13, 55:9 Governor's [4] - 158:25, 159:3, 169:2, 170:18 GPS [6] - 146:19, 151:19, 152:4, 154:3, 154:12, 155:16 grab [3]-148:3, 162:14, 162:15 grace [3]-140:13, 147:10, 147:12 grand [1]-100:1 graph [1] - 8:6 great \([6]\) - 68:12, 70:10, 72:1, 119:24, 136:22, 161:2 group [1]-165:15 Guatemala [1] - 180:23 guess [8] - 15:20, 37:8, 42:2, 55:6, 89:20, 103:5, 160:9,``` | 180:16 <br> guide [12]-51:23, 52:19, 53:1, 56:24, 57:10, 57:19, 59:13, 60:4, 60:8, 60:18, 61:1, 62:6 <br> guidelines [6] 88:24, 107:7, 107:10, 160:6, 162:24, 164:24 <br> Guillory [2]-177:4, 177:7 <br> GUILLORY [8] - 3:8, 30:21, 31:5, 41:3, 55:11, 152:25, 177:9, 177:16 <br> guy $[7]$ - $32: 19$, 41:17, 71:11, 176:9, 176:10, 176:11 <br> guys [17]-37:25, 48:5, 54:11, 64:4, 71:19, 81:6, 86:1, 86:7, 86:10, 88:11, 112:21, 115:22, 148:7, 156:16, 158:6, 163:2, 163:16 <br> H <br> hairier ${ }_{[1]}-68: 17$ <br> half [1] - 91:18 <br> hallack [1] - 105:8 <br> Hallack [2]-31:13, <br> 39:20 <br> HALLACK [109] - <br> 2:18, 2:19, 15:23, <br> 26:22, 29:12, 29:23, <br> 30:14, 33:16, 35:9, <br> 35:15, 39:14, 39:21, <br> 40:6, 47:7, 49:20, <br> 52:12, 53:12, 54:17, <br> 54:21, 56:22, 57:7, <br> 57:14, 57:24, 58:5, <br> 59:10, 60:1, 61:25, <br> 63:5, 66:2, 66:13, <br> 67:10, 69:9, 70:15, <br> 70:24, 72:8, 75:10, <br> 76:6, 78:24, 79:6, <br> 80:5, 80:14, 80:25, <br> 82:3, 82:16, 82:22, <br> 89:25, 91:9, 91:15, <br> 93:1, 93:8, 95:2, 95:7, 107:20, 109:19, <br> 110:13, 113:6, <br> 113:14, 113:21, <br> 114:2, 114:9, 114:19, <br> 119:16, 121:25, <br> 123:20, 126:11, <br> 127:13, 127:20, <br> 128:12, 128:22, <br> 129:3, 129:10, |  | ```HENRY[1]-2:12 hereby [1] - 182:5 hidden [1] - 155:18 hide [3] - 59:20, 72:6, 82:13 high [1] - 102:1 higher [1] - 131:21 HIGHWAY [1] - 2:22 HIPAA [1] - 166:18 histories [1] - 89:17 history [12]-52:22, 53:7, 57:11, 58:24, 60:5, 76:8, 79:2, 81:3, 85:10, 85:14, 85:16 hit [1] - 134:13 hold [2] - 109:14, 176:16 holding[1] - 15:1 Honda [2] - 76:12 honor [1] - 174:25 hoops [1] - 104:6 hope [1] - 165:12 hopefully [3] - 5:24, 155:17, 159:8 horrible [1] - 104:13 hostage [1] - 99:14 House [2]-104:22, 105:1 Houston [2]-180:4, 180:15 hulk [3]-55:13, 55:21,56:1 \|``` | ```INC [1] - 94:2 include [3] - 54:18, 95:4, 113:13 includes [1] - 135:10 including[3]-8:11, 39:1, 70:2 inclusive [1] - 85:18 Incorporated [1] - 93:22 increase [3] - 7:5, 7:22, 8:23 increased [2]-7:17, 7:20 increases [1] - 8:11 incredibly [1] - 141:1 indebted [1] - 130:16 independent [1] - 88:8 Indiana[1]-15:14 indicate [1] - 167:6 indicators [1]- 85:11 indirect [2] - 164:19, 166:5 individual [1] - 46:6 industry [4]-53:23, 74:8, 83:16, 85:25 inflows [1] - 7:8 information [15] - 37:21, 56:7, 56:20, 73:7, 73:9, 76:4, 77:14, 79:3, 81:8, 83:20, 96:13, 109:8, 160:13, 160:22 informed [1] - 76:19 initial [1]-52:1 initiate [2]-152:3, 155:16 injuring [1] - 134:14 innocuous [2] - 61:19, 105:5 input [4] - 63:10, 90:13, 92:12, 117:4 inside [2]-146:19, 147:13 insists [1] - 58:3 inspect [1] - 62:20 inspecting [1] - 160:18 inspection [2] - 84:18, 113:13 inspections [1] - 103:14 instances [3] - 98:25, 126:23, 173:10 instead [2] - 91:21, 107:15 instructions [3] - 174:24, 174:25, 175:3 insurance [44] - 103:6, 126:25, 127:2,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 134:4, 134:16, 134:22, 135:5, 136:1, 136:10, 136:14, 136:15, 137:12, 137:18, 137:25, 138:9, 138:17, 139:3, 139:10, 139:20, 139:22, 140:4, 140:12, 140:13, 140:16, 140:19, 140:20, 140:23, 142:13, 142:21, 143:21, 144:18, 144:19, 145:3, 146:12, 146:15, 146:17, 147:4, 151:13, 151:15, 153:7, 155:15, 155:20, 170:11, 172:7 insurer [7]-139:5, 139:9, 139:24, 142:11, 143:11, 145:12, 147:1 intended [2]-85:10, 136:23 intent [1] - 101:10 interest [4]-41:5, 41:13, 92:20, 171:17 interesting [1] - 71:1 interfered [1] 141:21 interpretation [1] 153:14 <br> intrusive [1] - 81:23 investigation [1] 87:19 <br> investigator [5] 29:14, 101:15, 101:17, 177:12, 177:18 investigators [7]9:16, 96:6, 96:21, 97:16, 100:20, 103:10, 178:21 $\qquad$ involved [1] - 49:8 involving [2] - 44:5, 69:16 irrational [1] - 71:20 issue [27]-14:20, 18:18, 24:19, 25:20, 26:5, 27:6, 52:1, 56:3, 62:16, 73:3, 74:8, 76:20, 77:23, 84:2, 91:5, 96:2, 119:18, 120:7, 137:12, 137:14, 155:25, 162:2, 165:7, 177:14, 179:12, 179:16, 180:2 issues [13] - 9:6, | $$ <br> KBB [3] - 107:9, <br> 108:17, 111:25 <br> KBB's [1] - 112:10 <br> keep [8]-24:1, 29:3, <br> 58:15, 88:10, 137:11, <br> 151:14, 176:3, 179:4 <br> keeps [1]-63:22 <br> KEITH [1] - 3:12 <br> Keith [2]-117:2, <br> 150:5 <br> Kelley [3] - 110:9, <br> 111:7, 111:25 <br> kept [1] - 73:9 <br> key [4]-85:11, <br> 121:9, 164:18, 164:19 <br> kill ${ }_{[1]}-153: 3$ <br> KIM ${ }_{[1]}-3: 3$ <br> Kim [2] - 4:3, 66:20 <br> Kim's [1] - 66:22 <br> kind [33]-13:15, <br> 14:2, 52:10, 54:11, <br> 55:8, 56:17, 58:14, <br> 63:12, 64:14, 65:25, <br> 66:10, 66:17, 74:7, <br> 88:4, 88:5, 92:3, 98:1, <br> 101:7, 103:20, <br> 108:11, 110:14, <br> 111:11, 129:1, | $\qquad$ <br> $2: 5$ 146.4, 150.25, <br> 163:12 <br> 163:19, 168:5, 173:8 <br> KIRALY [25] - 3:12, 117:6, 118:5, 119:4, 119:14, 125:14, 125:23, 126:19, 127:7, 130:2, 132:13, 132:22, 133:17, 133:25, 135:11, 136:5, 136:11, 139:1, 140:9, 145:18, 145:23, 147:20, 148:25, 150:14, 154:10 <br> kIRALY [1] - 122:11 <br> Kiraly [10]-117:3, <br> 119:19, 122:9, <br> 129:20, 136:25 <br> 141:23, 142:7, <br> 146:13, 151:6, 170:9 <br> KIRBY [1] - 2:11 <br> Kirby [3] - 5:5, 96:18, <br> 104:10 <br> knowing [2] - 64:2, <br> 118:10 <br> knowledge [2] 19:5, 157:15 <br> known [1] - 82:7 <br> knows [2] - 41:20, <br> 140:2 <br> KOCH [1] - 2:21 <br> LA [1] - 129:24 <br> laborious [1] - 64:23 <br> LADA [1] - 160:13 <br> Lafayette [2]-16:8, 21:8 <br> laid [1] - 124:12 <br> LAIDA [1] - 169:17 <br> Landmark [1]-8:18 <br> language [9] - 72:13, <br> 79:8, 106:15, 114:18, <br> 126:13, 128:18, <br> 133:6, 133:11, 148:12 <br> lapse [2]-138:9, <br> 138:16 <br> lapses [1] - 144:18 <br> large [2]-160:4, <br> 178:3 <br> largely [1] - 90:4 <br> larger [2]-86:8, <br> 168:25 <br> last [17] - 6:1, 7:15, <br> 7:18, 8:5, 8:10, 8:17, <br> 15:8, 34:19, 38:14, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:2 } \\ & \text { lending }[2]-164: 20, \\ & \text { 165:1 } \\ & \text { letter }[9]-51: 19, \\ & \text { 91:13, 101:9, 101:10, } \\ & \text { 101:18, 102:8, } \\ & \text { 102:11, 137:21, } \\ & \text { 149:19 } \\ & \text { letters }[3]-91: 21, \\ & \text { 91:23, } 91: 24 \\ & \text { level }[6]-56: 12, \\ & \text { 142:1, 165:7, 166:22, } \\ & \text { 167:6, 168:8 } \\ & \text { liabilities }[1]-7: 4 \\ & \text { liability }[11]-60: 13, \\ & 127: 6,127: 8,134: 24, \\ & 141: 22,144: 24, \\ & 145: 8,146: 21,153: 5, \\ & \text { 155:25, 158:3 } \\ & \text { liable }[3]-67: 17, \\ & 70: 2,70: 6 \\ & \text { LIADA }[3]-108: 22, \\ & \text { 110:4, 160:19 } \\ & \text { liberal }[1]-157: 3 \\ & \text { license }[5]-13: 21, \\ & 30: 19,122: 15, \\ & \text { 122:16, 159:5 } \\ & \text { licensed }[2]-29: 25, \\ & 30: 7 \\ & \text { licensee }[1]-50: 10 \\ & \text { licensees }[3]-30: 15, \\ & 30: 17,179: 22 \\ & \text { licenses }[1]-8: 12 \\ & \text { lien }[1]-177: 23 \\ & \text { liens }[3]-14: 15, \\ & 16: 5,18: 23 \\ & \text { lieu }[1]-140: 24 \\ & \text { light }[9]-61: 10, \\ & 61: 19,63: 22,67: 21, \\ & 71: 11,71: 14,71: 18, \\ & \text { 159:5, 171:8 } \\ & \text { likely }[1]-8: 19 \\ & \text { limited }[1]-174: 7 \\ & \text { line }[8]-16: 17, \\ & 35: 24,55: 6,72: 2, \\ & 86: 11,121: 12, \\ & 167: 25,168: 17 \\ & \text { lines }[1]-126: 9 \\ & \text { Lisa }[1]-51: 16 \\ & \text { list }[5]-53: 18,74: 21, \\ & 76: 3,118: 20,119: 5 \\ & \text { listed }[2]-72: 24, \\ & 84: 9 \\ & \text { listen }[1]-77: 6 \\ & \text { listening }[1]-137: 1 \\ & \text { listing }[1]-74: 19 \\ & \text { literally }[1]-75: 17 \\ & \text { litigation }[5]-15: 12, \\ & 32: 2,32: 17,35: 2, \\ & 79: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:11, 116:2, } \\ & \text { 116:11, 131:20, } \\ & \text { 133:8, 135:9, 137:15, } \\ & \text { 138:4, 138:8, 139:4, } \\ & \text { 139:8, 139:23, 140:3, } \\ & \text { 142:6, 142:16, } \\ & \text { 142:22, 143:10, } \\ & \text { 148:16, 149:8, } \\ & \text { 149:17, 149:25, } \\ & \text { 150:7, 152:7, 152:19, } \\ & \text { 154:1, 156:22, } \\ & \text { 167:22, 174:9, 174:16 } \\ & \text { multiple }[1]-110: 1 \\ & \text { must }[5]-40: 4,57: 1, \\ & \text { 57:15, } 57: 20,139: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:7, 166:24, 167:4, } \\ & \text { 176:10, 176:11 } \\ & \text { New [9] -91:1, } \\ & \text { 158:10, 158:14, } \\ & \text { 159:10, 177:10, } \\ & \text { 177:15, 178:19, } \\ & \text { 179:22 } \\ & \text { new [16]-9:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:20 } \\ & \text { non-insurance }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 134:16 } \\ & \text { non-payment }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 139:15 } \\ & \text { non-refundable }[4] \text { - } \\ & \text { 120:13, 123:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:23 } \\ & \text { numerous }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 175:19 } \end{aligned}$ | ```160:15 one [91] - 7:24, 7:25, 10:9, 10:15, 14:16, 15:14, 16:4, 16:6, 16:25, 17:21, 24:1, 25:7, 25:14, 26:4, 28:13, 32:2, 32:10, 37:20, 38:10, 38:16, 41:16, 43:11, 45:13, 45:14, 45:15, 45:22, 46:1, 46:2, 46:8, 48:20, 49:16, 49:17, 55:15, 56:3, 56:11, 63:11, 66:1, 68:16, 76:23, 78:25, 79:5, 82:14, 84:16, 85:13, 88:5, 91:13, 92:2, 93:7, 95:13, 95:14, 96:1, 100:9, 101:5, 102:10, 103:9, 103:19, 105:4, 108:4, 108:5, 108:8, 109:10, 109:17, 109:23, 111:23, 122:17, 126:21, 127:21, 127:24, 134:22, 136:22, 138:3, 142:5, 142:9, 145:24, 146:18, 148:7, 150:22, 153:25, 156:13, 157:18, 160:12, 162:22, 164:6, 164:18, 165:14, 166:6, 173:25, 178:14, 178:20, 179:22, 180:9 ones [6] - 17:1, 19:3, 45:11, 108:17, 116:9, 178:10 ongoing [1] - 98:23 open [4]-61:16, 61:17, 96:8 opens [1] - 64:13 opinion [2]-87:2, 122:9 opportunity [1] - 145:2 oppose [1] - 156:21 opposed [8] - 6:15, 11:7, 12:11, 53:25, 54:14, 76:7, 94:23, 128:15 opposite [1] - 156:15 option [2]-29:3, 168:20 options [3] - 110:1, 111:3, 163:24 order [14]-9:12, 12:16, 12:20, 13:3, 13:18, 20:4, 42:16,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 124:15, 124:1 |  |  |
|  | 90:12, $90: 21,118: 22$, $160: 11,160: 17$ | none [3]-91:23 | objections [1] - |  |
|  | 162:22, 162:25 | 140:14, 159:19 nonpayment [1] | 129:2 |  |
|  | 163:10, 163:21 | 13 | obligation [1] - |  |
|  | 6:22, |  | 167: |  |
|  | 178:3, 178:7, | 92:3 | e [1] - 169: |  |
|  |  |  | [2] |  |
| N | 51.9, 60.6, 95.21 |  | 111:14, 111: |  |
|  | 104:19, 105:22, $118: 11,144.21$, | 41:4, 122:19, 142: | obvious [2] - 84:2 162:21 |  |
| NADA [5] - | 168:6, 169:1, 170:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tation }[1]-80: \\ & \text { te }[1]-126: 21 \end{aligned}$ | obviously [5]-26:3, |  |
| 109:23, 110:9, 112:1, | 171:2, 171:3, 171:4 | - 13:1 | 56:10, 107:16, |  |
| 160:13 <br> name [6] - 14 | Next [1] - 92:13 | nothing [8]-28:13, | 168:15, 178:9 |  |
| 93:9, 93:11, 93:17 | 15:11, 15:13, 17:19 |  | $69:$ |  |
| 95:16, 178:8 names [1] - 178:9 | 32:2, 32:9, 34:9, | $155: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { occur }[1] ~-~ 143: 6 ~_{\text {octer }}^{\text {[3] }} \\ & \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| National [1] - 172:6 national [11] - 53:10, | 36:14, 37:9, 38:14 <br> $38 \cdot 16,38 \cdot 25,39 \cdot 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { notice [32]-51:2 } \\ & \text { 133:20, 133:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84: 12,84: 18,85: 15 \\ \text { OF [1] - 1:6 } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 77:20, 77:25, 83:13, | 39:3, 39:24, 41:20 | $138: 18,138: 25$ | offer [7] - 17:4 |  |
| 86:21, 87:3, 88:5, $109: 3,116 \cdot 15,160: 11$ | 42:5, 45:24, 47:5 | 140:5 | 19:21, 21:20, 25:17 |  |
| 109:3, 116:15, 160:11 nature [1] - 160:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NHTSA [2] - 73:8, } \\ & 74: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $140: 21,140: 22$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 31:8, 106:12, 111:22 } \\ \text { offered [8]-17:2, } \end{array}$ |  |
| near [1] - 103:14 | ADA [14] - 107:9 | $: 12,144: 3$ | 19:24, 21:23, 22:4 |  |
| necessarily [3] - | 108:17, 108:23 | $: 12,145: 1$ | 23:23, 23:25, 24:10 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 100:5, 128:4, 159:14 } \\ \text { need [34]-10:23, } \end{gathered}$ | 109:5, 109:7, 110:4 | 145:12, 145:1 | 25:13 |  |
| 12:4, 15:21, 23:6, | $0: 23.111: 7$ | $145: 16,146: 2$ | offers [2]-24:2 |  |
| 31:17, 48:7, 49:7, | 2:19, 115: |  | 166:6 |  |
| 51:5, 68:9, 78:12, | 151:6, 160:18 | 148:24, 149:9 | Office [10]-51:1 |  |
| 85:21, 86:17, 88:7, | B [1] - 55:15 | 149:1! | 51:15, 52:2, 52:5, |  |
| 89:22, 90:12, 91:4, | [1] - 56:1 | 149:20, 151:13 | 72:12, 90:4, 91:16 |  |
| 92:24, 93:2, 95:3, | night [1] - 83:21 | noticed [2] - 15 | 158:25, 159:3, 169:2 |  |
| 116:6, 123:16, 124:7, $147: 4,150: 17,152: 1$ | Nissan [2]-76:1 |  | office [5] - 9:22, |  |
| 147:4, 150:17, 152:1, | 76:4 | notification [3] - | 51:18, 143:8, 166:20, |  |
| 153:23, 154:15, | [8]-53: | 148:12, 152:3, 155:16 | 170:18 |  |
| 165:2, 165:6, 165:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 8,55: 7,73: 7 \\ & 73: 23,74: 20,7 \end{aligned}$ | notify [3] - 139:24 | OFFICE [1] - 2:19 officer [3] - 134:7 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:16, 171:1 } \\ & \text { needed }[3]-17: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 85:9 noble [1] - 159: | November [1] $12 \cdot 24$ | 134:10, 141:20 often [1] - 16:2 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:14, 163:7 } \\ & \text { needs [8] - 77:19, } \end{aligned}$ | nobody [1] - 163:6 | nowadays [1] - 59:5 | oil [1] - 98:17 |  |
| 79:5, 87:7, 91:7, | $\begin{gathered} \text { non }[9]-26: 4, \\ \text { 120:13, 123:3, } \end{gathered}$ | $18$ | AVE [1]-5:14 |  |
| 112:15, 112:17, | $124: 15,124: 16$ | 55:18, 73:1 | old [5] - 9:8, 128:18, |  |
| 114:21, 154:2 | 134:16, 139:15, | $77: 20,86: 3,103: 24$ | 133:9, 133:11, 162:8 |  |
| NESTOR [1] - 3:8 | 164:20 | $128: 16,128: 21,$ | older [3]-9:19, |  |
| Nestor [2]-73:6, $178: 18$ | non-conformity [1] - | 129:1, 130:23, 131:5, | 34:11, 62:20 |  |
| net [3]-7:12, 7:14, |  | 131:9, 148:7, 162:21, | nce [8]-29:1, 52:4, |  |
|  |  |  | 123:6, 175:13, 177:17 |  |
| never [6] - 74:22, | non-factor [1] |  | One [2]-155:12, |  |
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| S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:2, 126:3, 128:3, } \\ & \text { 128:7, 128:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { separation [1] - } \\ & 165: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { significance }[1]- \\ 60: 10 \end{array}$ | sound [1] - 168:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | :15, 129:1 | [1] - 53:16 | ${ }_{[1]}-105: 12$ | 131:11 |
| 97:17, 99:7, 99:15 | 130:18 | served [1] - 92:20 <br> serves [1] - 136:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { simple }[3]-62: 11, \\ & 153: 2,166: 17 \end{aligned}$ | sources [1] - 140:15 |
| guard [1] - 78:10 | 31:16, 48:4, 48:5 | 4:9 | lify ${ }_{[1]}-46: 2$ | 56:4, 75:2, 75: |
| safety [2]-87:1 | 48:8, 65:24, 67:22 | 84: | ly [1] -62:17 | 107:1, 123:15, |
| 98:16 | 80:15, 84:17, 92:5 | ceable [1] | g [1] - 65:14 | 137:12, 178:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { salaries }[1]-7: 16 \\ & \text { sale }[4]-21: 4,30: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:7, 96:1, 112:4, } \\ & \text { 116:13, 123:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 61:22 | single [1] - 86:23 | ally |
| 174:19, 174:21 | 124:13, 143:16 | 11:19, 11:21 | $21,119: 6,1$ | pend [3] - 48: |
| Sales [7]-69:16, | 146:23, 147:15 | session [8] - 104:20, | site [2] - 74:21, 74:23 | 99:24, 101:21 |
| 70:16, 93:14, 93:22, | 165:23, 166:13, | 105:1, 168:23, | sitting [1] - 166:21 | spent [1] - 161:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 94:1, 94:3, } 94: 6 \\ & \text { salesmen [2] - 8:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:4, 176:24 } \\ & \text { seeing [2] - } 90: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:23, 170:2, 170:3, } \\ & 170: 18,170: 20 \end{aligned}$ | situated [1] - 159:24 <br> situation [12] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spot }[3]-106: 13, \\ & 153: 10,162: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:3 } \\ & \text { salesperson }[2] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:25 } \\ & \text { seemingly } \left.{ }_{[1]}\right] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { set }[5]-17: 13,18: 2, \\ 88: 23,107: 9,123: 18 \end{array}$ | 14:24, 46:12, 47:17, <br> $48 \cdot 9,50 \cdot 6,50 \cdot 17$ | square [1]-39:3 <br> staff [1]-116:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 12,69: 19 \\ & \text { salvage }[1]-85: 16 \\ & \text { salvaged }[3]-54: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:5 } \\ & \text { sees }[1]-62: 5 \\ & \text { Select }[4]-12: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { setting }[4]-58: 23, \\ 76: 10,128: 16,148: 2 \\ \text { settle }[2]-112: 2, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:4, 96:19, 123:23, } \\ & \text { 139:19, 171:13 } \\ & \text { situations [1] - } 33: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { stamp }_{[1]}-111: 12 \\ \text { stamped }[3]-79: 17, \\ 79: 20,79: 22 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 54:7, } 55: 3 \\ & \text { Santander }{ }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 12:20, 12:22, 15: } \\ \text { self [2]-99:18, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:23 } \\ & \text { settled }[1]-16: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \mathbf{s i x}[3]-23: 3,24: 15, \\ & 130: 17 \end{aligned}$ | stand [1] - 17:15 <br> standard [2]-83:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:10 } \\ & \text { sat [2] - 162:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:20 } \\ & \text { self-generated [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { several }[5]-13: 11, \\ 49: 18,100: 17,146: 3, \end{gathered}$ | slowly [1] - 170:12 <br> smaller [1] - 178:6 | 106:16 <br> standp |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:13 } \\ & \text { satisfaction }{ }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:18, 103:20 } \\ & \text { sell }[8]-25: 24,27: 2 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:9 } \\ & \text { severely }{ }_{[1]}-134: 14 \end{aligned}$ | smart [1] - 33:1 <br> SMITH [9] - 2:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:7, 86:13, 118:16, } \\ & \text { 174:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 84: 6 \\ & \text { satisfied [2] - 159:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 25,89: 23,172: 9 \\ & 175: 11,180: 6,181: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shall [2] - 126:3, } \\ & 126: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $5: 10,6: 3,10: 25,54: 4,$ | Star [6] - 177:4, |
| 177:22 | sellability ${ }_{[1]}$ | shallow [1] - 161:19 | 181:16 | 179:11, 179:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { saved }[1]-101: 7 \\ & \text { scales }[1]-142: 3 \\ & \text { scan }[1]-179: 5 \\ & \text { scenario }[3]-70: 8, \end{aligned}$ | ```110:11 sellable [1] - 131:14 seller [8] - 69:7, 71:15, 171:21,``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { SHERI }[1]-2: 21 \\ \text { Sheri }[7]-11: 13, \\ \text { 105:3, 111:1, 161:3, } \\ \text { 161:24, 163:18, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Smith }[1]-5: 9 \\ & \text { snatch }[1]-148: 2 \\ & \text { soften }[2]-47: 18, \\ & 110: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { start [7] - 61:12, } \\ & \text { 66:9, 68:15, 100:13, } \\ & \text { 115:24, 165:10, } \\ & 170: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:5, 147:22 } \\ & \text { scheme }[5]-75: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:18, 172:20, } \\ & \text { 173:8, 173:13, 181:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:21 } \\ & \text { shoes [1] - 148: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { sold }[16]-22: 9, \\ 28 \cdot 1430 \cdot 11-31 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { started [4]-128:14, } \\ 130: 3,159: 11,171: 25 \end{gathered}$ |
| 143:1, 159:25, | sellers [3]-68:21 | shooting [1] - 163:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 14,30: 11,31: 7 \\ & 32: 12,32: 18,33: 8 \end{aligned}$ | state [11] - 25:22, |
| 161:16, 169:18 | $\begin{gathered} 90: 20,173: 2 \\ \text { selling [3] - } 68 \end{gathered}$ | short [3]-100:18, | 34:22, 60:11, 61:15 | 28:24, 41:9, 54:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { scope }[1]-160 \text { : } \\ & \text { se }[1]-163: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { selling [3] - } 6 \\ \text { 81:20, 121:12 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 100:19, 100:22 } \\ \text { show }[3]-59: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:8, 76:14, 134:13 } \\ & \text { 171:16, 172:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 12,56: 4,85: 13, \\ & 90: 5,146: 9,155: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| seclusion [1] - 161:9 | sells [1] - 174:10 | 92:6, 98:24 | 180:20 | 165:7 |
| Second [1] - 6:7 <br> second [15] - 6:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seminars [1] - } \\ & \text { 160:16 } \end{aligned}$ | showing [2]-15:4, 89.2 | sole [1] - 120:3 | STATE [1] - 1:6 |
| $6: 11,8: 25,10: 24$ | send [9] - 16:15 | shown [2] - 88:22 | someone [3]-32:19, 47:12, 47:14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { State }[11]-27: 5, \\ 55: 13,55: 19,98: 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| 11:1, 11:3, 12:4, 12:6, 94:15, 94:17, 94:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:16, 71:5, 90:13, } \\ & \text { 102:7, 105:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 124:20 | sometime [1] - 16:11 | 98:8, 103:8, 103:24, |
| 96:4, 109:15, 109:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:7, 105:21, } \\ & \text { 137:21, 142:11 } \end{aligned}$ | shows [6] - 8:9, 8:24, 8:25, 125:1 | metimes [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:22, 111:13, } \\ & \text { 112:15, 182:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:17 } \\ & \text { secretive [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:24 } \\ & \text { sending }[1]-143: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:16 } \\ & \text { shred }_{[1]}-179: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:3, 102:8, 118:9, } \\ & 140: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { statement }[6]-7: 11, \\ & 7: 13,60: 17,60: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:19 } \\ & \text { security [30] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sends }[1]-20: 18 \\ & \text { sense }[8]-26: 12 \end{aligned}$ | Shreveport [3]- <br> 12.21, 21.8, 49:17 | somewhere [4] $33 \cdot 2$ 40.13, 72.2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:13, 172:12 } \\ & \text { statements }[1]-6: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 116:25, 119:20, | 26:13, 29:6, 48:16 | shut [1] - 152:4 | 168:17 | states [3]-56:9, |
| 119:21, 120:2, 120:3, | 63:19, 87:2, 137:6, | de [8] - 38:20 | somewheres [1] | $56: 21,134: 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:7, 120:11, } \\ & \text { 120:14, 120:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $137: 7$ sent [5]-16:20, | 128:4, 128:5, 151:21, | 155:18 | States [2] - 180:17 |
| 120:23, 120:25, | $\begin{gathered} \text { sent }[5]-16: 23, \\ 52: 8,52: 9,102: 11, \end{gathered}$ | 151:22, 157:2, | on [1] - 29:6 | $180: 21$ |
| 122:3, 123:3, 124:6, | 178:12 | 165:11, 165:16 sides [1] - 48:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sorry }[8]-7: 10,8: 17, \\ & 18: 8,20: 6,38: 5, \end{aligned}$ | statute [6]-105:25, |
| 124:11, 124:13, | sentence [2]-95:15, | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}[4]-67: 16$ | $43: 16,104: 18,181: 12$ | 138:3, 138:13, 139:7, |
| 124:14, 124:21, | 12 | $70: 9,70: 18,72: 3$ | sort [5] - 73:11, | 139:12, 160:2 |
| 124:22, 125:7, | separate [3] - | signed [4] - 41:18, | 145:7, 145:8, 169:3, | staying [1] - 107:16 |
| 125:20, 125:21, | 112:16, 128:8, 138:1 | $42: 16,70: 1,91: 19$ |  | stenotype ${ }_{[1]}$ - 182:8 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:16 } \\ & \text { workable [2]-141:5, } \\ & \text { 141:14 } \\ & \text { works [4]-20:20, } \\ & 55: 20,108: 10,155: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yourself }[5]-62: 13, \\ & 76: 10,89: 3,113: 16, \\ & \text { 113:24 } \\ & \text { yourselves [1] - } \\ & 71: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Z |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:14 } \\ & \text { worried }[1]-130: 23 \\ & \text { worse }[1]-63: 2 \\ & \text { wrap }[1]-148: 6 \\ & \text { wreck }[1]-127: 1 \\ & \text { wrecks }[2]-125: 5 \text {, } \\ & \text { 129:23 } \\ & \text { Wright }[1]-128: 15 \\ & \text { write }[6]-107: 17, \\ & 126: 24,140: 10, \\ & 157: 10,161: 24 \text {, } \\ & \text { 174:25 } \\ & \text { writes }[1]-156: 21 \\ & \text { writing }[3]-21: 4 \text {, } \\ & 108: 1,156: 19 \\ & \text { written }[7]-108: 6, \\ & 127: 15,128: 16, \\ & 135: 21,138: 14, \\ & 138: 18,164: 11 \\ & \text { wrote }[1]-91: 13 \\ & \text { www.safecar.gov } \\ & {[1]-74: 21} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ZBest [26] - 16:7, } \\ & \text { 17:18, 17:24, 23:19, } \\ & \text { 26:14, 26:16, 27:23, } \\ & \text { 28:2, 29:4, 29:6, 29:8, } \\ & \text { 29:15, 29:20, 30:22, } \\ & 31: 16,42: 4,43: 1, \\ & 45: 14,45: 24,46: 2, \\ & 47: 5,47: 12,47: 17, \\ & 49: 8,49: 12,50: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| X |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Xpress [1] - 93:24 } \\ & \text { XYZ }_{[1]}-107: 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $Y$ |  |
| ```y'all [14]-20:21, 20:22, 21:3, 27:7, 31:20, 103:20, 128:10, 135:23, 136:20, 144:13, 148:15, 151:14, 157:11, 157:13 yard [1]-134:8 year [16] - 7:14, 7:16, 7:18, 7:20, 8:1, 8:5, 8:10, 10:10, 10:16, 10:18, 101:23, 104:22, 156:20, 168:22 year's [1]-170:20 year-to-date [4] - 7:14, 7:20, 8:1, 8:10 years [7]-51:2, 84:25, 102:14, 128:14, 131:12, 164:23``` |  |
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