

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF CARVER

FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

PROBATE DIVISION

Case Type: Special Administration

Court File No.: 10-PR-16-46

In the Matter of:

Estate of Prince Rogers Nelson,

Decedent.

**GRAY PLANT MOOTY'S
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION**

This Motion for Clarification relates to the Gray Plant Mooty (“GPM”) law firm’s Motion for Approval of Payment from the Estate of Prince Rogers Nelson for Services that Benefitted the Estate as a Whole (“Motion”). GPM’s Motion is similar to motions recently filed by the law firms of Holland & Knight, LLP (“HK”) and Lommen Abdo, P.A. (“Lommen Abdo”). For the reasons explained below, GPM respectfully asks the Court to clarify when it intends to rule on GPM’s Motion, and subject to what process.

On December 16, 2016, GPM attempted to file its Motion and supporting materials under seal. On that date, GPM electronically served a complete, unredacted set of its Motion papers on the Special Administrator and all of the non-excluded heirs, and it provided a complete, unredacted set of its Motion papers to the Court. On December 23, 2016, certain non-excluded heirs filed an objection to GPM’s Motion. On January 6, 2017, the Special Administrator responded to the motions of GPM, HK, and Lommen Abdo and acknowledged that its response applies to the motions of all three firms. *See* The Special Administrator’s Response to Three Law Firms’ Motions for Payment of Attorneys’ Fees at 1, note 1. As far as GPM is aware, the

interested parties who objected or responded to GPM's Motion are the only parties who objected or responded to the motions of GPM, HK, and Lommen Abdo.¹

On December 20, 2016, Court staff contacted GPM and asked it to refile its Motion publicly, and not under seal, but with redactions to protect privileged and confidential information. On December 29, 2016, GPM refiled its Motion as instructed by Court staff, publicly and with limited redactions. At the same time, GPM electronically served another complete, unredacted set of its Motion papers on the Special Administrator and all of the non-excluded heirs, and it provided another complete, unredacted set of its Motion papers to the Court.²

In an Order Regarding the Filing of Certain Documents Under Seal dated December 23, 2016, the Court acknowledged that many documents were filed under seal in this matter in early December, including but not limited to the motions of GPM and Lommen Abdo. In that Order, the Court invited the filing parties to refile their documents publicly, with limited redactions, by 12:00 p.m. on December 28. GPM is no longer counsel of record for any interested party and was unaware of the Court's December 23 Order until several days after it was entered. On December 29, shortly after GPM learned of the Order, GPM refiled its Motion papers.

On December 28, 2016, twelve days after GPM initially served an unredacted set of its Motion papers on the Special Administrator and all of the non-excluded heirs, and one day

¹ GPM disagrees with certain aspects of these objections and responses, but it will reserve comment on the substance of its disagreement until instructed by the Court.

² In an Order Regarding the Filing of Certain Documents Under Seal dated December 23, 2016, the Court acknowledged that many documents were recently filed under seal in this matter, including but not limited to the motions of GPM and Lommen Abdo. In its Order, the Court invited the filing parties to refile their documents publicly, with limited redactions. GPM is no longer counsel of record for any interested party and was unaware of the Court's December 23 order until several days after it was entered. On December 29, shortly after learning of the Court's order, GPM refiled its Motion papers.

