Anderson, Todd F.

August 4, 2017

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION	
AMERICA,) Deposition of:
Plaintiff,) TODD F. ANDERSON
VS.)) Time on record:
RAPOWER-3, LLC, INTERNATIONAL) 4 Hours 14 Minutes
AUTOMATED SYSTEMS, INC., LTB1, LLC, R. GREGORY SHEPARD,)) Case No. 2:15-cv-00828 DI)
NELDON JOHNSON, and ROGER FREEBORN,))) Judge David Nuffer
Defendants.)
August 4, 2017 * 8	3:02 a.m. to 1:36 p.m.
	3:02 a.m. to 1:36 p.m.
Location: Inter	
Location: Inter 173 Eas	rnal Revenue Service
Location: Inter 173 Eas	rnal Revenue Service st 100 North

```
19
    ended up with a lot of bankruptcy, but they did a lot
2
    of general practice work.
3
                 All right. So beginning in 2010 you came
    back to Delta, opened your own firm.
                 You were a sole practitioner at that
6
    point?
           Α.
                 Yes.
8
           Q.
                 Okay. What types of cases were you
9
    working on at that point?
10
                 Family law, domestic, wills and trusts,
                I took a few criminal defense cases when I
11
12
    first started, but largely what walked in the door.
13
                 Okay. With the exception of Mr. Paul's
14
    clients, were you involved in any tax matters?
15
           Α.
                 No.
16
                 Okay. All right. Did there come a time
           0.
17
    where you brought on any other attorneys?
18
          Α.
                 Yes.
19
           Q.
                 Okay. When was that?
                 In October, actually, October of 2010.
          Α.
21
                 Okay. And who was that?
          Q.
22
          Α.
                 Jessica Anderson.
23
                 Is that your wife?
           Q.
24
           Α.
                 Yes.
25
           0.
                 How long had she been an attorney?
```

20 1 How long had she been an attorney? Α. 2 was sworn in in October of 2010. 3 Okay. Where did she go to law school? Q. Oklahoma City University School of Law. Okay. So both of you went to law school Q. 6 together? Correct. Α. 8 Q. Okay. So at that point I think you probably had a few children, right? 10 Α. No. 11 Okay. So Jessica went to law school? 0. No? 12 Well, Danika was -- sorry. Danika was 13 born in September of 2010. 14 0. Okay. 15 And that was our first child, so allow me to correct myself. We had one child. 17 No problem. Q. 18 Α. Okay. 19 All right. So Jessica Anderson started Q. working at your firm. 21 Was she a partner? 22 Α. I don't know how to answer that question. 23 I guess I need more specifics on what you define 24 partner. 25 Ο. I'll rephrase.

```
37
           Ο.
                 (By Mr. Moran) Does looking at
2
    Plaintiff's Exhibit 569 refresh your recollection?
3
                 Refresh my recollection as to the question
          Α.
    of time?
           Q.
                 Yes.
6
                 Yes. It was -- I mean, it was end of
7
    September/first of October. The specific date I
8
    cannot recall.
                 Sure. And that's in 2010?
10
          Α.
                Yes.
                 Okay. All right. We'll probably talk
11
    more about that in a little bit.
12
13
                 In that time frame and in responding to
14
    that -- the CPA's questions, is that the only time
15
    you referred to yourself as RaPower-3's general
16
    counsel?
17
          Α.
                Yes.
18
                 Is it fair to say, and I'm just trying to
           Ο.
    understand your testimony, that at that time Neldon
19
    Johnson was interviewing you and trying to bring you
21
    on as RaPower-3's general counsel?
22
          Α.
                 He clearly wanted something from me.
23
                 Okay. What was that something?
24
                 Don't know. Well, I mean, at the time I
25
    didn't know. At the time that I had the meeting and
```

88

- 1 testified that you had little to no information,
- 2 right?
- \mathbf{A} . As to specifics.
- 4 O. Okay. So having had little to no
- 5 information, could you give a -- or did you have
- 6 enough facts to give any type of specific legal
- 7 analysis?
- 8 A. I provided a general analysis of tax
- 9 principles based on information that I had. It was
- 10 not applied to any specific circumstances.
- 11 Q. Okay. Thank you.
- 12 A. And when I say "I," I refer to Anderson
- 13 Law Center as a firm and the attorneys of that firm
- 14 that Anderson Law Center did those things.
- Q. You said that Mr. Johnson gave you little
- 16 to no information.
- How was that information, what information
- 18 you did get, conveyed to you?
- 19 A. Orally.
- Q. And all that information was conveyed by
- 21 Neldon Johnson?
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. None of it was from Glenda Johnson?
- 24 A. She was there at some of the meetings as a
- 25 companion, but she did not convey information --

```
129
    really are no specific facts or circumstances for a
2
    written analysis to be given on; right?
                 MR. PAUL: Objection. Foundation.
3
                               I believe that this is a
                 THE WITNESS:
5
    general summary of general tax principles, and it
    does not apply those general tax principles to any
6
7
    specific set of circumstances.
8
           Q.
                 (By Mr. Moran) And so any specific
9
    circumstances that were conveyed from Mr. Johnson to
10
    your firm, those aren't written down anywhere?
11
          Α.
                 Correct.
12
           0.
                 Okay.
13
                 And there's no documentation applying
14
    those circumstances to specific tax principles.
15
           Ο.
                 Okay. Why not?
16
                 Because ultimately -- the specifics of the
17
    conversation are Jessica's, but ultimately Jessica
18
    could not find a way to provide him the affirmative
19
    opinion that those facts applied to the tax
20
    principles were in conformance with law.
21
                 And did that discussion occur before or
           Ο.
22
    after Exhibit 23?
23
                 After.
          Α.
24
                 Okay. So was Mr. Johnson satisfied with
           Ο.
25
    Exhibit 23?
```

183 1 EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. PAUL: 3 Do you know what research was done to Ο. produce the letters that have been referenced today, Exhibit 23 and Exhibit 570? 6 Specifically? Α. Ο. To the best of your recollection. I do not. Jessica did the substantive Α. 9 research and drafting of those documents. 10 Do you believe that she undertook Ο. sufficient legal research to make a reasoned legal 11 analysis as set forth in those two exhibits? 12 13 MR. MORAN: Objection. Assumes facts not 14 in evidence. 15 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 16 Ο. (By Mr. Paul) Do you believe that Jessica 17 Anderson had sufficient time to undertake the legal 18 research that was required to provide the analysis 19 and opinions that are in the two exhibits that we've mentioned? Α. Yes. 22 Do you recall conducting any independent Q. 23 legal research in support of the two exhibits that 24 we've referenced today? 25 Α. I do not.

```
184
                 You don't recall doing any?
          O.
2
                 Not independent, no. I don't recall.
3
                 Did you engage anybody else to do research
          O.
    besides either yourself or your wife?
5
          Α.
                 No.
6
           Q.
                 Do you believe that Exhibit 23 and
7
    Exhibit 570 were accurate when they were written?
8
          Α.
                 I believe they're accurate summaries of
9
    general tax principles, yes.
10
                 Okay. And in the drafting of that, did
    you and your wife try to make every effort to make it
11
12
    correct under the law and an honest and complete
13
    opinion?
14
                 I would not say that about 23.
          Α.
15
           Ο.
                 What about 23 don't you think was not
16
    accurate, honest or complete?
17
                 MR. MARTIN: Objection. Misstates the
18
    testimony, but go ahead. Assumes facts not in
19
    evidence. Go ahead.
                 THE WITNESS: Because it wasn't a final
21
    document, I can't say that it was -- that it hadn't
    been given the full -- I can't say everything you
22
23
    said regarding Exhibit 23.
24
                 (By Mr. Paul) Because you didn't have a
           O.
    chance to finish it?
25
```

185

- 1 A. Correct.
- Q. And you think there may have been
- 3 additional due diligence that you and/or your wife
- 4 would have undertaken before it was finalized?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Was Exhibit 570 provided to the client
- 7 with the expectation the client would rely on it?
- 8 A. I don't know. I don't know.
- 9 Q. Is Exhibit 570 a final version?
- 10 A. Well, I believe so. This is not a signed
- 11 copy, but I believe it's substantially similar to a
- 12 final version.
- Q. Okay. And Exhibit 23 was sufficiently
- 14 completed that you provided to the client as a work
- in progress?
- 16 A. It was provided as a work in progress.
- 17 O. Okay. And you had a level of confidence
- that the information that is included in there is
- 19 legally accurate?
- 20 A. I don't -- I don't know.
- Q. Do you feel that before preparing
- 22 Exhibit 23 and Exhibit 570 that you had sufficient
- opportunity to ask questions of Mr. Johnson related
- to the opinions that you were asked to write?
- 25 A. No. Well, could you --

186

- Q. Yeah, and I'll rephrase the question.
- A. Would you rephrase the question for me,
- 3 please.
- Q. Do you feel that before you provided
- 5 Exhibit 570 and Exhibit 23 to Mr. Johnson, that you
- 6 had sufficient time to ask questions regarding the
- opinions you were asked to render?
- 8 A. I was given sufficient time to ask
- 9 questions. I wasn't given sufficient answers.
- 10 Q. Do you know as we sit here today what
- answers you were not given that you sought?
- 12 A. I don't.
- 13 O. Nothing stands out in your mind as to
- 14 information that we felt we needed before we could
- 15 render a final answer?
- 16 A. Not specifically.
- Q. As you were working on Exhibit 23 and
- 18 Exhibit 570 drafting and revising before it was sent
- 19 to the client, do you feel you were able to receive
- 20 sufficient clarification as needed to be fully
- apprised of the opinions you were asked to give?
- A. To the extent that I provided the summary
- of the tax principles discussed, yes. To the extent
- that it was what the client was looking for, no.
- Q. And that you learned after the fact?

187 With a surety I learned after the fact, Α. 2 yes. And your letters, or the letters from your Q. firm were meant to be general overviews of the tax benefits associated with energy equipment? 6 No, I would not say that. They are 7 summaries regarding the specific areas of tax law 8 that are discussed in those documents, not 9 necessarily any specific equipment, because that was 10 the information I was lacking. 11 Ο. Okay. But you reference energy equipment in both letters? 12 13 Yeah. As a general term, yeah. 14 Ο. So you knew that those were provisions of 15 the tax code that you were giving advice on? 16 It was the general arena that we were Α. 17 discussing, yes. 18 You knew you weren't talking about Ο. 19 employee benefits? Α. Correct. 2.1 And you weren't talking about Social Q. 22 Security withholdings? 23 Α. Yes. 24 You were talking about the energy tax 25 credit and depreciation?

188 1 Yes, and I can -- when you put it that Α. 2 way, energy tax credits and depreciation, yes, I can 3 answer those questions because that was clearly what we discussed. 5 How that was applied to a specific set of 6 circumstances, I don't feel I could answer those 7 questions because we didn't have those circumstances. 8 Q. Okay. So those were beyond the scope of 9 your letters? 10 Α. Yes. 11 But as far as the questions that were 12 presented to you and that you answered in the 13 letters, you believe that's an appropriate legal 14 analysis? 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. Okay. 17 Well, as to 570. I will say that as to 18 507. I will not say that as to Exhibit 23. 19 Q. Because it's a work in progress? Α. Correct. 21 And in each of your letters you recommend Q. 22 that anybody that intends to rely on the information 23 in your letters seek independent professional tax 24 advice? 25 I do.

```
193
                     REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2
3
    STATE OF UTAH
                                SS.
    COUNTY OF SALT LAKE
5
                 I, Denise M. Thomas, Certified Real-Time
    Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter in and
    for the State of Utah, do hereby certify:
7
                 That prior to being examined, the witness,
    TODD F. ANDERSON, was by me duly sworn to tell the
    truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;
                 That said deposition was taken down by me
    in stenotype on August 4, 2017, at the place therein
    named, and was thereafter transcribed and that a true
    and correct transcription of said testimony is set
11
    forth in the preceding pages;
12
                 I further certify that, in accordance with
    Rule 30(e), a request having been made to review the
13
    transcript, a reading copy was sent to MR. MARTIN for
14
    the witness to read and sign under penalties of
    perjury and then return to me for filing with
15
    MR. MORAN.
16
                 I further certify that I am not kin or
    otherwise associated with any of the parties to said
    cause of action and that I am not interested in the
17
    outcome thereof.
18
                WITNESS MY HAND this __ DAY day of __ MONTH,
    2017.
20
21
22
                             DENISE M. THOMAS, CRR/RPR
                             Utah License No. 104113-7801
23
25
```