## Bradford D. Lund

6638 N. 66<sup>th</sup> Place Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

March 5, 2021

L. Andrew Gifford (<a href="mailto:landrewgifford@gmail.com">landrewgifford@gmail.com</a>)
Robert L. Wilson (<a href="mailto:robertlwilson@prodigy.net">robertlwilson@prodigy.net</a>)
Douglas M. Strode (<a href="mailto:dougstrode@gmail.com">dougstrode@gmail.com</a>)
The First Republic Trust Company (<a href="mailto:Mharrington@firstrepublic.com">Mharrington@firstrepublic.com</a>)
Michael Laubenstein (<a href="mailto:Mlaubenstein@firstrepublic.com">Mlaubenstein@firstrepublic.com</a>)

Dear L. Andrew Gifford, Robert L. Wilson, Douglas M. Strode, Michael Laubenstein and the First Republic Trust Company:

I am writing to demand that you refrain from using trust funds of which I am the named beneficiary, Sharon D. Lund Residuary Trust fbo Bradford D. Lund, to pay any legal fees to Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp ("MSK") relating directly or indirectly to your opposition to my peremptory challenge for Judge Suzuki to be replaced by another judge to hear names cases relating to me.

On February 23, 2021, the California Court of Appeals summarily rejected in one sentence MSK's legal position and granted my request for a writ, issuing an Alternative Writ of Mandate Order, granting my request to have Judge Suzuki vacate his order denying my § 170.6 peremptory challenge and granting the same, or alternatively show cause why a writ of mandate should not issue. I therefore must express my feeling that MSK showed negligence or indifference to the law and spent legal fees from my estate that you authorized for no good reason. They filed 33-pages in opposition and were unable to distinguish the leading California case supporting our position on the peremptory challenge. Obviously, the Court of Appeals agreed: They ignored those 33 pages filed by you and MSK and issued a one sentence verdict in favor of our position, citing the leading California case my attorneys cited.

In either event, MSK should not be paid legal fees out of my or my sister's trust.

You are also on notice that I continue to believe that each of you individually and collectively have again taken actions hostile to my interests in what I feel is clear violation of your fiduciary duties owed to me. I am still seriously considering taking additional legal action for this and past violations of your duties. You have violated the terms of my trust and have wasted millions of my trust assets for your own personal gain. You have not acted in my best interest. Your hostility is very well documented.

In my opinion, I feel that MSK should be embarrassed by a summary dismissal of their legal

work in one sentence by the Court of Appeal when they agreed with my attorneys' position and issued the writ of mandamus. You should also be embarrassed, in my opinion, to have asked them to do so.

In any event, I demand that you not use any trust funds associated with the trust of which I am the beneficiary to pay MSK.

I await your immediate written assurance you will not pay MSK for this embarrassing failure and summary rejection by the California Court of Appeals.

I am sending this letter to you by both email and mail.

Ila lane

Sincerely,

Bradford D. Lund