

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**LIGHTSPEED MEDIA CORPORATION,
Plaintiff,**

-vs-

**ANTHONY SMITH, et al,
Defendants,**

and

**JOHN STEELE, Consol Plaintiff,
PAUL HANSMEIER, Petitioner
PAUL DUFFY, Movant**

Case No. 12-cv-889-DRH

MINUTES OF SHOW CAUSE HEARING

PRESIDING: Hon. David R. Herndon, Chief Judge

DATE: February 13, 2014 **PLACE:** East St. Louis, Illinois

COURT REPORTER: Laura Blatz **COURTROOM DEPUTY:** Sara Jennings

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF: Paul A. Duffy (via phone)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS: Troy A. Bozarth, Andrew G. Toennies, Daniel G. Booth (via phone), Jason E. Sweet (via phone), John D. Seiver (via phone), Bart Westcott Huffman (via phone)

CONSOL PLAINTIFF, PETITIONER AND MOVANT: Appeared pro se

TIME: 9:00 AM – 10:05 AM

Counsel present as indicated above. Hearing called on defendant's joint motion for contempt or alternatively for order to show case at Doc. 107.

The Court heard argument supporting the motion from Mr. Bozarth and Mr. Toennies. Mr. Hansmeier and Mr. Steele argued regarding the clarity of the order issuing sanctions. Mr. Hansmeier and Mr. Steele acknowledge that they have not paid the fees.

The Court briefly explained the order's purpose. The Court discussed the

possibility of this order being construed as an equity judgment or a money judgment, due to the interest language. The Court heard brief history with regard to the parties and contempt issues. Mr. Steele, Mr. Hansmeier and Mr. Duffy requested the opportunity to provide financial statements for the Court to review.

The Court finds that Judge Murphy's Order is not a money judgment and was equitable in nature. The Court grants Mr. Steele, Mr. Hansmeier and Mr. Duffy ten days to submit asset statements from a certified public accountant to support their financial resources. Motion for contempt taken under advisement.

Court heard argument from Mr. Steele on the Motion to Stay at Doc. 114, requesting a stay pending determination from the appellate court. Defendants argue the motion is untimely. The Court denies the motion to stay as untimely.