


This 7.31.2015 email occurred after deposition of Johnston. Bohreer told Meigs at deposition break that the opposing lawyers messed up and Meigs could get all legal expenses paid and did Meigs want to have Bohreer/Zucker represent her. Meigs said yes to representation but nothing more was said to Meigs afterwards even upon asking multiple times to both Bohreer and Zucker. Brady presented as the corporate lawyer at the deposition but did not know anything about the corporation whilst Frankfort, a family lawyer, could answer all questions regarding Asyntria. In the memorandum to Bergman regarding the situation, Zucker states that the lawyer who drew up the contracts to steal shares of stocks and all was a family lawyer. Johnston deposition shows Frankfort dual-represented. Also, per check, Brady was retained much later after the contract formation and appeared to be a quick stand-in as a corporate counsel as Frankfort knew all answers in the deposition while Brady asked strange questions. Thus, post deposition, Bohreer would be mistaken to believe that Brady was the corporate lawyer who screwed up rather than Frankfort as all knew from the deposition that the lawyer who wrote the corporate contracts to steal shares was presumed to be the corporate lawyer. No one would have initially suspected that a family lawyer such as Frankfort would write corporate contracts when Brady was a corporate lawyer... unless Brady was not the company corporate lawyer at that time.



Either way, Zucker and Bohreer refused to represent Meigs on these dual-representation claims against Frankfort and for some strange reason gave those claims to the mediator, Bergman to handle. How did Bergman handle these claims? Threats, alcohol, and abandonment. The appearance is that Bergman was to use his super mediator skills that led him to be president of a national mediation organization and to be the then current sitting- chair of the Texas State Bar on ADR to manipulate and abuse Meigs into submission.... A horrendous experience for Meigs for what again appears to be to protect Frankfort regardless of the damage to Meigs or to the oath each lawyer took to uphold the Constitution. Notice also that Meigs claims in the memorandum were kept from her. Why would Meigs' lawyers prevent Meigs from knowing her claims? To prevent Meigs will to fight? To control Meigs at all levels? Why?

