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| 1 | THE COURT: Good morning. |
| 2 | Please be seated. |
| 3 | THE CLERK: Case on trial continued, People versus |
| 4 | Donald J. Trump. |
| 5 | Appearances, please. |
| 6 | Starting with the People. |
| 7 | MR. STEINGLASS: Good morning, your Honor. |
| 8 | For the People, ADA Josh Steinglass, Susan |
| 9 | Hoffinger, Matthew Colangelo, Christopher Conroy, Becky |
| 10 | Mangold and Katherine Ellis. |
| 11 | MR. BOVE: Good morning. |
| 12 | Emil Bove for President Trump, who is seated to my |
| 13 | left. |
| 14 | And I have with me Todd Blanche, Susan Necheles and |
| 15 | Gedalia Stern. |
| 16 | THE COURT: Good morning. |
| 17 | Would you like to go over what transpired |
| 18 | yesterday? |
| 19 | Do we need to do that, Mr. Bove? Just the email |
| 20 | exchanges that took place yesterday? |
| 21 | MR. BOVE: With respect to the exhibits, your |
| 22 | Honor? |
| 23 | THE COURT: Yes. |
| 24 25 | MR. BOVE: So we received, your Honor, an email <br> regarding the embedded hearsay issue that we raised during |

Tuesday's proceedings.
And, as $I$ understood it, basically agreeing in principle with the defense objection to the concept that a record that is authenticated at the first level for -- as a business record may still present additional embedded hearsay issues within the record.

Following that email, at the Court's direction, we conferred with the Government regarding our pending objections, many of which we had sent on Monday night coming into those proceedings.

And we clarified some of them based on your Honor's guidance.

We received some feedback from the Government, and I think that the conferral process was helpful.

There still are some objections that we have on that secondary level of hearsay, and I'm prepared to walk through those whenever we have the time, given the jury.

THE COURT: Are we able to start proceedings today with the jury, and going through, then perhaps we can break at some point and deal with this?

MR. STEINGLASS: I think so, Judge.
Because $I$ think that in the first hour or two of testimony there is only one document that was flagged by counsel that may arise.

And it's a document that we agree, that there is a
line that they think should not be coming in for the truth that we agree; so I don't think that there is any impediment to starting.

MR. BOVE: I think that we're talking about People's Exhibit 161, which is an invoice that was offered through Mr. Pecker's testimony on Tuesday.

It's an invoice indicating -- from Investor Advisory Services, and the issue that we have with that particular exhibit --

THE COURT: Could that wait until later?
MR. BOVE: I would like to raise it now just because we don't think that it's enough to just have the Judge instruct the jury that the factual assertion we are talking about is not being offered for the truth.

Our position is that a redaction is necessary.
And if $I$ could just put into the record what the
factual assertion is from the invoice.
THE COURT: If I could just interrupt you for one second.

But this won't come up for another hour or two?
MR. STEINGLASS: I think that that's about right.
And we can always -- I could always let you know if it's going to come up.

I do feel that the goal posts are being moved, because what they asked for yesterday was to ask for us to
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| 1 | agree that it's not being offered for the truth, and now |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | they are asking for a redaction. |
| 3 | THE COURT: All right. You both will have the |
| 4 | opportunity to be heard. |
| 5 | I don't want to the keep the jury waiting. |
| 6 | So if we can deal with this during the break |
| 7 | perhaps, I would like to do that. |
| 8 | MR. BOVE: Understood. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Is there anything that you would like |
| 10 | to say regarding the two exhibits that were received on |
| 11 | Tuesday? |
| 12 | MR. BOVE: No, your Honor. We understand the |
| 13 | Court's rulings. |
| 14 | THE COURT: All right. |
| 15 | Very well. |
| 16 | Let's get Mr. Pecker, please. |
| 17 | MR. STEINGLASS: Oh, I'm sorry, Judge. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Yes? |
| 19 | MR. STEINGLASS: May we have one minute to put |
| 20 | something on the record? |
| 21 | THE COURT: Yes. |
| 22 | MR. CONROY: Good morning. |
| 23 | MR. STEINGLASS: Mr. Conroy will do that. |
| 24 | MR. CONROY: Thank you, Judge. |
| 25 | Thank you very much. |


| 1 | $\text { Page } 1102$ <br> I have here, and I am going to hand up to the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Court, another proposed Order to Show Cause that we're |
| 3 | asking the Court to sign with another affirmation. |
| 4 | If $I$ may just have a minute or two to just quickly |
| 5 | go through what's contained in there. |
| 6 | Judge, I'm sorry, could I just also hand up a thumb |
| 7 | drive. |
| 8 | This has full copies of some video clips that we |
| 9 | have transcribed in the affirmation. |
| 10 | (Handed.) |
| 11 | ******* |
| 12 | MR. CONROY: We are asking the Court to sign this |
| 13 | Order to Show Cause to hold the defendant in contempt of |
| 14 | this Court's April 1st order -- the Order that has been at |
| 15 | issue previously in this case -- for submitting four |
| 16 | violations in the last three days: |
| 17 | One on April 22nd. That violation was right |
| 18 | outside the door to this courtroom in one of the defendant's |
| 19 | press -- whatever they are -- conferences that he holds on |
| 20 | his way in and out of court in the area that's set up for |
| 21 | that purpose outside of the door. |
| 22 | And what he said right after court on the 22 nd |
| 23 | was: "But they call the payments to a lawyer a legal |
| 24 | expense in the books." |
| 25 | "They didn't call it construction. They didn't say |

they are building a building."
"They called it a payment to a lawyer because, you know, Cohen is a lawyer representing a lot of people over the years."
"I'm not the only one."
"And wasn't very good in a lot of ways in terms of his representation, but he represented a lot of people."
"But he puts in an invoice or whatever, a bill, and they pay and they call it a legal expense."
"I got indicted for that."
And then later -- this was about a nine-minute event outside -- a few minutes later the defendant went on: "And when they are going to look at all of the lies that Cohen did in the last trial, he got caught lying in the last trial, so he got caught lying, pure lying, and when are they going to look at that."

That same night on a news program the defendant called in and said the following, in the course of about a 20-minute interview, and this is the second violation we are asking the Court to consider.

And the quote is: "But this Judge said that I can't get away from the trial. You know, he's rushing the trial like crazy. Nobody has ever seen a thing go like this. That jury was picked so fast. Ninety-five percent Democrats. The area is mostly all Democrats. You think of
it as just a purely Democratic area. It's a very unfair situation, that $I$ can tell you."

That was not more than several hours before the hearing on Tuesday related to his previous violations.

On Tuesday morning, the 23rd, the day of that hearing, before the hearing, the defendant gave an interview to a TV station that actually aired that night.

And that interview included the following statement by the defendant: "Well, Michael Cohen is a convicted liar and he has no credibility whatsoever."
"He was a lawyer. And he relied on the lawyers, but Michael Cohen was a convicted liar."
"He was a lawyer for many people, not just me, and he got in trouble because of things outside of what he did for me."
"Largely, it was essentially all because of what he did in terms of the campaign."
"I don't think there was anything wrong with that, with the charges that they made, but what he did is, he did some pretty bad things, I guess, with banking or whatever, if that was a personal thing to him."
"David Pecker, I don't know exactly what he's going to be testifying against, but -- or about -- but he will be testifying today."

That's the defendant talking about witnesses in the




Q After Dylan Howard concluded his interview with Karen McDougal, did you and he speak?

A Yes, we did.
Q And what did he tell you?
A He described to me who Karen McDougal was. He repeated again that she was a Playboy model.

She claimed that she had a yearlong relationship with Donald Trump, a sexual relationship.

She claimed she was -- he said that she was 47 years old. And he said that she was a 12 out of 10 .

And then he said that he believed the story could be true or was true, but she had no corroborating evidence.

He said to me that she didn't have anything on her Blackberry.

She didn't have any photos.
She didn't have any expense reports that -- she claimed that she went to Mar-a-Lago and Trump Tower.

So, but he believed the story was true.
He went on to say that he offered her, and her representative, $\$ 10,000$ to buy the story.

And it was refused.
Q Did you ever have a three-way call that day with Dylan Howard and Michael Cohen?

A Yes, I did.
Q How did that come about?

A Michael Cohen was constantly calling me while Dylan Howard was in this meeting interviewing Karen McDougal.

And I told Michael that as soon as I hear from Dylan, I will set up a three-way call.

Q And did that three-way call actually happen?
A Yes. Yes, it did.
I used -- Michael Cohen told me to make sure that I used Signal.

So I set up the Signal call between myself, Michael Cohen and Dylan Howard.

Q And tell us about that conversation, please?
A Dylan described exactly what I just mentioned about who Karen McDougal was, and all of the details that I just stated. And immediately Michael Cohen said it's not true, which is something that he always said.

And then he said, let me -- let me check it out and $I$ will come back to you.

Q Was there any discussion on that three-way call about acquiring the rights to Karen McDougal's story?

A Yes. Michael said that -- well, I will take -- let me just clarify:

When Dylan suggested that he offered $\$ 10,000$ to buy Karen's story, which is including the entire story, what she was claiming, and she refused, Michael suggested that we should go ahead to try to buy the story.

```
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Q And did he say why he wanted you to try to buy the story?
A Well, first he said the story wasn't true.
Then he said that he thought that having that story out -and I should add on, Dylan mentioned that \(A B C\) was interested in acquiring the story.
He also mentioned that a Mexican group made an offer for the story for 8 million dollars.
Michael and I both said that although we didn't believe that there was a Mexican group that was going to buy the story, the ABC offer was interesting because they were offering apparently Karen a slot on Dancing with the Stars.
But I knew from my experience that \(A B C\) doesn't buy stories, so I didn't think they were paying cash for the story.
He -- Dylan, also mentioned that Karen McDougal said that she didn't want her story to be published.
She said she didn't want to be the next Monica Lewinsky. She said that she wanted to restart her career.
He said that -- this is Dylan -- Dylan said that she was a -- apparently a -- originally a fitness model.
And she was the first female model on one of the covers of one of my magazines, for one of American Media's magazines, which was Men's Fitness. This was in -- on a cover in 1999.
So he felt that she would be more interested in coming -- in having American Media buying the story than anyone else.
```



Q So my first question is: Do you remember when that conversation with Donald Trump happened?

A It was the third -- I think it was the third week of June of 2016.

Q So some time -- was it after Dylan Howard had gone out to interview Karen McDougal on June 20th?

A Yes.
Q And after the three-way call that you had had with Michael Cohen and Dylan Howard?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q Where were you when you got this call from Donald Trump?

A I was at an investor's -- at one of my largest investor's meeting in New Jersey.

Q And how did the call come in?
A Oh, I was making a presentation and an update on our business, and the assistant in the office came into the conference room and said: There is a call for you from Donald Trump.

And I left and took the call.
Q And could you tell us about the conversation you had that day with Donald Trump?

A Yes. When I got on the phone, Mr. Trump said to me:
"I spoke to Michael. Karen is a nice girl."
"Is it true that a Mexican group is looking to buy her story

|  | Page 1113 |
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| 1 | for 8 million dollars?" |
| 2 | I said -- I said: "I absolutely don't believe that there is |
| 3 | a Mexican group out there to buy a story for $\$ 8$ million |
| 4 | dollars." |
| 5 | And then he said: "What do you think I should do?" |
| 6 | I said: "I think you should buy the story and take it off |
| 7 | the market." |
| 8 | Q So when the subject of Karen McDougal came up, Donald |
| 9 | Trump described her as a nice girl? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q Based on your conversation with Mr. Trump, did you have |
| 12 | an understanding as to whether he was aware of the specifics of |
| 13 | Karen McDougal's description of the affair? |
| 14 | A Yes, I did. |
| 15 | Q What made you come to such an understanding? |
| 16 | A I think that Michael Cohen gave him the -- spoke to |
| 17 | Donald Trump, which he said he was going to -- which -- excuse |
| 18 | me -- which Donald Trump said on the phone that, "I spoke to |
| 19 | Michael." And I believe that when Mr. Trump said that to me |
| 20 | over the phone that she was a nice girl, I believe that he knew |
| 21 | who she was -- |
| 22 | Q Why would you recommend to Donald Trump purchasing the |
| 23 | story? |
| 24 | A I believed the story was true. |
| 25 | I think that it would have been very embarrassing to himself |

and also to his campaign.

Q After your conversation with Donald Trump, did you have another conversation with Michael Cohen?

A Yes. On the conversation with Donald Trump, he said to me, clearly, that he doesn't buy stories because it always gets out.

And he said to me that Michael Cohen would be calling me. He was going to speak to Michael and he would be calling me back.

Q Now, you used a pronoun there?
A I'm sorry.
Q That's okay.
A I'm sorry about that.
Q When you said "he" in that last answer, were you referring to Donald Trump?

A Yes, I was. I'm sorry.
Q It's okay.
So did there come a time when Michael Cohen followed up with you?

A Yes. He called me that day or the next day.
Q Tell us about that conversation?
A He called me -- he called me and he said that we -- he said we should -- he said: "You should go ahead and buy this story."

So I said to him, I said: "I'm going to have Dylan Howard

```
negotiate the terms."
    And then I said: "Who's going to pay for it?"
    So he said to me: "Don't worry. I'm your friend. The Boss
will take care of it."
    Q Who did you understand "The Boss" to be a reference
to?
    A Donald Trump.
    Q When Michael Cohen said: "The Boss will take care of
it," what did you understand that to mean?
    A That he -- that I would be either reimbursed by the
Trump Organization or by Donald Trump.
    Q Now, did Mr. Cohen say anything to you on that
follow-up call one way or the other that led you to believe that
he was aware of your conversation that you had had with Donald
Trump when you were with your investor in New Jersey?
    A Yes. He told me that he was sitting in Donald Trump's
office when he called me.
    I don't know if he was on speaker phone or not, but he said
that he was there and he heard.
    Q Did he tell you one way or the other whether he was
able to overhear your conversation with Donald Trump?
    A Yes, he did.
    Q What did he say about that?
    A He said that: "I heard what you said to The Boss. And
I want you to go forward and negotiate the" -- excuse me, I'm
```

```
sorry -- "I want you to go forward and negotiate the purchase of
the story."
```

Q And did he give you Donald Trump's view on that
question of whether to go forward to buy the story?

A He just said to go forward to buy the story.
Q Did the topic of the $\$ 30,000$ that you had already laid out on the Dino Sajudin story come up during that conversation with Michael Cohen?

A At that conversation, we didn't have what the purchase price was going to be for the Karen McDougal story as of yet.

Q Okay.
A If I can add?
Q Sure.
A From that conversation, I was authorized basically to go forward and have Dylan Howard negotiate the price and negotiate the terms.

Q And did you, in fact, ask Dylan to go forward and negotiate the terms?

A I did.
Q Now, you told us that Michael Cohen told you that The Boss would take care of it, would pay you back.

How did you feel about Michael Cohen's representation that Mr. Trump would reimburse you?

A Over the years that $I$ know -- that $I$ worked with Michael Cohen, $I$ know he didn't have any authorization to spend

```
or to disburse any funds from the Trump Organization.
    Every time that we went even out for lunch, I always paid.
He never paid.
    So I didn't think that he had any authorization to buy or
acquire or spend any monies.
    Q Without Mr. Trump's approval?
    A Without Mr. Trump's approval. I'm sorry.
    Q During the time -- withdrawn.
    You told us that you gave Dylan Howard the authority to go
ahead and negotiate a deal with Karen McDougal.
    Is that right?
    A That's correct.
    Q Was Dylan Howard giving you periodic updates during
those negotiations?
    A Yes, he did.
    Q And did there come a time when you discussed with Dylan
Howard some of the terms of the potential deal?
    A Yes.
    Q What were some of the terms?
    A Dylan Howard gave me the following terms: To purchase
the lifetime rights from Karen McDougal was going to cost
$150,000.
    Plus Karen wanted to restart her career.
    She wanted to write for the celebrity magazines.
    She wanted to be on the cover of some of the health and
```

```
fitness titles.
    She had a major problem when her breast implants were
removed and she wanted to write some articles about that in
Shape and in some of the other magazines.
    And she also wanted to launch a clothing line, a fitness
clothing line, as well as a beauty product company -- beauty
products.
    And she wanted to -- let me just -- oh, she wanted to be an
anchor for the red carpet events with Radar Magazine.
    Q Did you update Michael Cohen on the negotiations?
    A Yes, I did.
    Q How often did you speak with Michael Cohen during the
period when Dylan Howard was negotiating this deal with Karen
McDougal?
    A We -- we spoke very frequently, probably, at least,
probably daily.
    Q How would you describe his tone?
    A Michael was very agitated. Why is this taking so long?
Why didn't we acquire -- why didn't we buy the story yet? Why
didn't we finish the agreement?
    So he was pretty agitated.
    Q Did you discuss with Michael Cohen the manner of who
would be paying Karen McDougal?
    A Yes. Now that we had the price, that it was $150,000,
I said: "Who is going to pay for this?"
```
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Q Is this a series of texts between you and Dylan Howard from 2016 regarding Karen McDougal?
A Yes, it is.
Q And I should just clarify.
Are portions of phone numbers and email addresses redacted
in this exhibit to protect personal information of the parties
to this text chain?
A (No response.)
Q Did you understand my question?
A Can you repeat it? I'm sorry.
Q Yeah, of course.
My question was: Are portions of the phone numbers and email addresses redacted on this exhibit to protect personal information of the parties to this text chain?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q Okay. So I want to zoom in on the last column of the lines marked DOC 47-240 to 241.
Let me first ask you, is this last column basically a summary of the date, the time of the text, who it's from, who it's to, as well as the body of the text itself?
A Yes, it is.
Q If you look at the -- what does the date and time marked say on this top text?
A 2016/07/23, 19:21:45 UTC.
```
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Q Now, do you understand that to mean July 23rd, 2016, at 7:21 p.m. UTC time?

A Yes.
Q Do you know what UTC time is?
A UTC time is four to five hours ahead of Eastern
Standard Time, depending on what season it is.
Q Okay. So UTC time is four or five hours ahead of New York time?

A New York.
Q Depending on whether it's Daylight Savings or not?
A Yes.
Q Got it.
In July of 2016, was the East Coast, if you know, observing Eastern Standard Time or Eastern Daylight Time in July?

A I'm not sure.
Q Okay. Let me ask it a different way. Was -- is Daylight Savings Time in effect in the summer?

A In the summer? Yes, that's correct.
Q Okay. So is it your understanding that during Daylight Savings Time, New York time was four hours behind UTC, but then when you fall back in the fall and for the winter, New York time is five hours behind?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. So does this exhibit contain the exact copy of text messages that you and Dylan Howard sent to each other on



A Yes. In 2002, the Weider Magazines, which was Shape, Muscle and Fitness, Flex, Health and Fitness titles, were up for sale.

Joe Weider was the founder.
He developed -- he founded all of those magazines.
He also found -- he also discovered Arnold Schwarzenegger, and those guys.

I should say that Joe Weider and Arnold Schwarzenegger had a relationship for 50 years.

So when the magazines were being sold, and I went to see Joe Weider right before the sale, he said to me: "Before we finalize this transaction, you have to meet with Arnold Schwarzenegger."

So I -- he gave me his phone number.
I called up Schwartzenegger.
I went to see him, and he had the following conversation with me:

He said that, you know, "I have been on the covers of Muscle Fitness and Flex, two of the primary magazines you are buying, 70 to 80 times."

He said: "I want to be an Editor-at-Large for both magazines."

And I would like a -- "I want an agreement."
And he said: "I'm" --
And he said: "You bought the tabloids."

He's referring to primarily the Globe and the National Enquirer.

And he said, and as I mentioned, I think, on Monday, we acquired them in March of 1999.

He said that: "I've had a number of litigation and lawsuits against both magazines because you always run negative stories about me."

And he said: "I plan on running for Governor, and $I$ would like for you not to publish any negative stories on me now."

I should say: "Any negative stories about me now or in the future, and $I$ will continue on being the editor for Muscle Fitness and Flex, as the spokesperson."

So I agreed.
And shortly after, he announced on the Jay Leno Show that he was running for Governor.

And a number -- after he made that announcement, a number of women called up the National Enquirer about, about -- about stories that they had -- that they have, I should say, to sell on different relationships or contacts and sexual harassment that they felt that Arnold Schwarzenegger did.

And the deal that $I$ had -- the agreement, I should say, that I had with Arnold is that $I$ would call him and advise him of any stories that were out there.

And I ended up acquiring -- buying them for a period of time.

And then as he became Governor -- and one of the stories that I acquired, I wasn't going to publish, and the person who took that story -- and since we didn't -- since the company --
since we didn't publish it, she brought it to the Los Angeles
Times and the LA Times published the story.

It was very embarrassing.
Most of the press approached Arnold Schwarzenegger when he was Governor about this story.

And his comment was: "I didn't know."
He said: "Ask my friend David Pecker."
So it was very embarrassing to me and the company.
And at that time there was an investigation by the State with respect to Arnold being the editor of -- being an
Editor-at-Large for these two titles.

He had to resign.
And it was a difficult situation.
And it gave me the sensitivity about buying any stories in the future.

So that's where -- that's how I became sensitive on this topic.

Q So let me just ask you one more question about the end of what you were just saying.

Did -- as a result of your agreement to purchase stories, negative stories about Arnold Schwarzenegger on behalf of Arnold Schwarzenegger when he was running for Governor of California,




A ghost writer is someone who would write the article for them and then Karen McDougal would approve it, and -- which was an important point.

And that any time Karen's photo was used in any digital site or in the magazine, she had to have approval of her image.

Q Okay. So now I'm going to blow up Paragraph 3.
(Displayed.)

Q I will just ask you to read it to yourself.
And I will highlight a little portion of it in the middle. (Displayed.)

A Yes.
Q You don't have to read the whole thing to the jury. It's in evidence.

A Okay.
Q But $I$ just want to ask you -- I'm directing your attention to the highlighted portion.

A I see it.
Q What did you understand this paragraph to mean, and what did you understand specifically the highlighted portion to be referring to?

A This paragraph and the highlights here are specifically -- is referencing that we were acquiring her rights for her story on the relationship that she had with a -- with
any married man.
Q And who did you understand the any then-married man to
be referring to?
A That she was referring to Donald Trump.
Q So what does it mean to acquire someone's limited life
rights?
Can you explain that to the jury?
A Yes. It means that you buy the rights for this
specific story and it cannot be published by any other
publishing company.
You cannot discuss it with any other media.
And that it was exclusively owned by American Media.
Q So would you describe this paragraph as the true
purpose of this agreement?
A Yes.
Q So why include that other stuff about the articles that
she was going to have a ghost writer for and the covers that she
was going to appear in front of?
Why include that stuff?
A I wanted to substantiate the $\$ 150,000$ payment.
Q What do you mean "substantiate?"
A With respect to campaign laws, I wanted to have the
contract be a record that stipulates that for the services that
she was going to perform for American Media, American Media has
a basis for it, for the $\$ 150,000$.

So when you -- when we talked about in the previous paragraph all of the articles she was going to run, the photos that she was going to do for the magazines, the posts that she was going to write, $I$ was looking at an amount of money that $I$ would have to acquire or pay for freelancers or other writers or reporters or digital people, and that was to validate, to come up with the $\$ 150,000$.

Q So was it your primary purpose in entering into this deal to buy the life rights?

A Yes, it was.
Q Were the other provisions about the columns placed there to disguise the true nature of this contract?

A Yes, it was.
Q So I want to show you Paragraph 4. (Displayed.)

Q This one is short. Maybe you could just read it.
A Yes.
"In connection with all the rights granted herein to AMI by McDougal, AMI shall pay McDougal the sum of $\$ 150,000$ payable within two business days following the execution of this agreement."

Q So this was the price?
A Yes.
Q Okay. I want to display Page 2, Paragraph 6.

|  | Page 1133 |
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| 1 | (Displayed.) |
| 2 | ********** |
| 3 | Q Can you read this to the jury and tell us what it |
| 4 | means, please? |
| 5 | A "All decisions whatsoever, whether of a creative or |
| 6 | business nature, regarding any of the rights granted by McDougal |
| 7 | to AMI herein, or any rights derived or ancillary thereto, shall |
| 8 | be made by AMI in its sole discretion." |
| 9 | Q Can you explain to us what that means? |
| 10 | A That means that AMI would make the decision whether we |
| 11 | would publish anything -- any story on Karen McDougal. |
| 12 | Q So by purchasing her life rights, you were not |
| 13 | obligated to actually print them? |
| 14 | A No. |
| 15 | Q Did you have any intention of printing them? |
| 16 | A No, we did not. |
| 17 | Q Paragraph 7. |
| 18 | (Displayed.) |
| 19 | ********** |
| 20 | Q Can you read that paragraph to yourself and tell us |
| 21 | what it means. |
| 22 | A All right. |
| 23 | (Pause.) |
| 24 | ******* |
| 25 | A This paragraph clearly states that American Media has |

    sole rights for McDougal's story, and she is not allowed under
    any circumstances to write her own book, post any, any -- to
    post anything on -- on any digital site and not to give any
    interviews.
    So we wanted, as American Media, we wanted to control
    anything to do with this -- with respect to the \(\$ 150,000\) that we
    are paying for a story.
    And if she breached it, she would have to pay the money
        back.
            (Whereupon, Official Senior Court Reporter Susan
        Pearce-Bates relieved Official Senior Court Reporter Lisa
        Kramsky.)
                **********
    (Continued from the previous page.)
Q So, this paragraph, basically, meant that Karen
McDougal was not allowed to take her story anywhere else?

A That is correct.
Q And if she did, she had to return the entire $\$ 150,000$ ?
A That's right.
Q Even though she was still doing the columns and

```
magazine covers?
```

A Yes.
Q Okay. I am going to turn to page three and just ask you -- can we blow up the very bottom? Did Karen McDougal sign this agreement?

A Yes.
Q And who, if anyone, signed the agreement on behalf of AMI?

A Dylan Howard.
Q Do you recognize his signature?
A The signature, and he also put down Chief Content Officer.

Q And at the time, August 5th, August 6, 2016, Dylan Howard was the Chief Content Officer of AMI?

A Yes. He had authorization to sign this agreement.
Q To your knowledge, who was aware of this agreement in AMI?

MR. BOVE: Objection.
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Q And who is the vendor, and what does vendor mean?
A Vendor is the accounts payable for services for the contracts that we purchased, and Keith Davidson is Karen
McDougal's attorney.

Q So, in laymen's terms, this is a bill from Keith
Davidson to AMI?

A It's a bill from Keith Davidson to AMI for Karen's lifetime rights, and we sent a wire transfer, $\$ 150,000$, to his escrow account.

Q We will get to that in one minute.
What's the invoice date?
A 8/9/2016, which is two days, I guess, four days from the date they signed, that we had the signed agreement.

Q With the effective date?
A Yes, the effective date.
Q What's the invoice amount?
A $\quad \$ 150,000$.
Q Okay. I am going to move down this exhibit a little bit and just ask you, what is the account?

A The account is where we -- where it would be coded in the general ledger. This would be coded to the general administration, and it says, outside services. And the outside services, we take it one more, this is the President's Department.

Q So, is it fair to say that this line that we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
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$$

```
blown up has the account information -- the account
information, et cetera? That's AMI's internal recordkeeping of
how they are kind of recording this expense in their own books?
    A That's correct.
    Q Why was this amount coded to the President's
Department?
    A From a budgetary standpoint, the editor's budget is
very limited. As I previously mentioned the other day, they --
I should say today, you -- they can spend no more than $10,000
on their own.
    This is a very, very large purchase. And from the
budgetary standpoint, I budget in the President's account an
overall number budget that during the year if there are great
photos to buy, something unusual, unique, the President's
budget has the expense for it.
    Q And, incidentally, is that the same way you accounted
for payment to Dino Sajudin?
    A Yes, it was.
    Q So getting back to this, did Karen McDougal -- did
AMI, in fact, pay the $150,000 for Karen McDougal's lifetime
rights?
    A Yes, we did.
    Q I believe you said you accomplished that by a wire
transfer?
    A Yes.
```

$$
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Q Okay. I am going to show you People's Exhibit 159 in evidence.

Briefly, for the jury, what is this?
A This is the general ledger detail for the -- for this transaction.

Q And when you say, the general ledger detail, you are talking about AMI's general ledger detail?

A Yes. American Media's general ledger detail of this
transaction.

Q I will just ask to blow it up a little bit. It's still very small.

Does it contain a department that this is being billed to?

A Yes. It says, President's Department.
Q And does it also contain the vendor's name?
A Yes, it does.
Q And so, you record Keith Davidson into the general ledger books at AMI?

A Yes.
Q It includes the amount of the payment?
A Yes.
Q And the date of the payment?
A That's correct.
Q And what was the date of the payment?
A The date of the payment is --
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A The date of the payment would have been August 10.
Q That's 2016?
A 2016 .
Q Turning your attention to page two of the same

```
document, do you know what this is?
```

A Yes.
Q What is it?
A Yes. It's to actually disburse a check. You create a payment voucher, payment request and the payment request here
is $\$ 450,000$ to Keith Davidson and Associates, and it was
approved by Chris Polimeni who is the Chief Financial Officer
of American Media.
Q Just to clarify for the record, did you say that it
was $\$ 450,000$ or for $\$ 150,000$ ?
A It was 150 , it was for $\$ 150,000$.
Q You have to --
A It's $\$ 150,000$.
Q Thank you. Now, I am not going to walk you through
every entry on this page.
Does it contain the statement account code and the
same department code as the general ledger?
A Yes, it does.
Q And, finally, does this appear to be a sticker at the
top that says, high priority?
A Yes.

Q Do you know who placed that sticker up there?
A I -- normally, it would be Liz Routolo. It's Chris Polimeni's assistant and also the accounts payable clerk.

Q Okay. You can take that down. Thank you. Did you ever have any intention of printing Karen McDougal's story about her affair with Mr. Trump?

A No, we never did. No, we did not.
Q Was your principle purpose in entering into the agreement with Karen McDougal to suppress her story as to prevent it from influencing the election?

A Yes, it was.
Q As of 2016, were you aware that corporations, including AMI, are subject to Federal campaign finance laws?

A Yes, I was.
Q Were you aware that expenditures by corporations made for the purpose of influencing an election made in coordination with or at the request of a candidate are unlawful? MR. BOVE: Objection. THE COURT: Grounds. MR. BOVE: May I be heard? THE COURT: Sure.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the record.) MR. BOVE: My objection is, right now there is a ruling in place and that limits the extent to which we can
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put on expert testimony to explain these concepts.
So I think these questions, if they are
permitted, are opening the door to a lot more explanation. I think we are on the precipice of that right now.

MR. STEINGLASS: Judge, first of all, the law is the law. That's the basis of our motions in limine.

I don't think that we are opening the door to any kind of expert testimony on the law. But, anyway, the more important thing here is that this witness' understanding of whether his own conduct violated the law is highly relevant.

I don't think it opens the door.
THE COURT: I agree. He's not asked to provide
the law. He is asked if he has awareness of the law.
MS. NECHELES: I think he was asked, were you aware that there was a law that did the following, and we disagree that the law did the following.

Did you think what you were doing was illegal?
THE COURT: I am going to allow it.
MS. HOFFINGER: We dispute that that's the law, your Honor.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the following occurred in open court.)

THE COURT: Objection is overruled.
Q Do you remember the question?
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A I would have to ask you to repeat it again.
Q Were you aware that expenditures by corporations made for the purpose of influencing an election, made in
coordination with or at the request of a candidate or a
campaign, are unlawful?

A Yes.
Q Did either you or AMI ever report to the Federal
Election Commission in 2016 that AMI had made a $\$ 150,000$
payment to Karen McDougal?

A No, we did not.
Q Why did AMI make this purchase of Karen McDougal's story?

A We purchased the story so it wouldn't be published by any other organization.

Q And why did you not want it to be published by any other organization?

A I didn't want -- we didn't want the story to embarrass Mr. Trump or embarrass or hurt the campaign.

Q When you say, we, who is we?
A Myself and Michael Cohen.
Q But for Mr. Cohen's promise to reimburse AMI -withdrawn.

But for Mr. Cohen's promise that Mr. Trump would reimburse AMI, would you have entered into this agreement?

A $\quad$ No.
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```
payment was made and it is put in the President's account.
```

    And then at the end of a quarter here, I was -- I was
    -- we were planning that the $\$ 150,000$ would be recovered, and
the actual expense would be reported as editorial expenses or
other services depending on this, but here the money was
recovered.

The expense would not be recorded at all in the books, other than the articles and the other services that Karen was going to be providing that had billed dollars behind them.

Q So, I don't want to --
A Well, if $I$ could clarify a little bit more?
Q Sure.
A So, what $I$ am saying is, that is where $I$ kept on discussing this with Michael Cohen. I wanted to explain to him why it was so important to get -- to be reimbursed.

And we had a number of conversations at the end of August, September.

And he, basically, said at the end of each conversation, why are you worried? I am your friend. The boss will take care of it.

Q Was there ever any discussion -- withdrawn.
You said you had a lot of conversations with Michael Cohen in August and September. Was there any conversation about candidate Trump actually acquiring Ms. McDougal's lifetime rights from AMI?
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A Yes. In September Michael Cohen said that Mr. Trump wants to acquire the lifetime rights of the Karen McDougal story, and I should assign the contract over to him.

When I say, over, to Michael Cohen, and I would be reimbursed -- the company would be reimbursed. And he also added on that Mr. Trump wanted all of the content that the National Enquirer had or developed and retained on Mr. Trump.

I told Michael that, you know, these are old files and boxes that are in Florida. The company has been moved to New York City -- and there is nothing in those boxes but old news articles, magazine articles, old files.

He insisted that he wanted those boxes, and he wanted the content. And Michael Cohen called me constantly in the month of September to -- to review and to send those boxes to his office.

Q Did Michael Cohen say why Mr. Trump wanted those boxes and why he wanted the rights to Karen McDougal's story?

A Yes. He said that The Boss said that if I got hit by a bus, and/or if the company was sold, he did not want for someone else to potentially publish those stories.

Q And, now, in terms of selling the rights to Ms. McDougal's story to Mr. Trump, did you have one or several conversations with Michael Cohen about that?

A We had several conversations.
Q Did there come a time when you communicated to Michael
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Cohen a willingness to sell Mr. Trump the rights to Karen McDougal's story, the lifetime rights?

A Yes.
Q Tell us about that?
A I told Michael Cohen that I would sign -- I would sign the rights over to -- I would sign the rights. And he asked me, it's \$150,000?

I said, look, I said, you know, Karen is going to be writing for the various magazines and visual sites. She is going to appear on a couple of covers of the magazines. I value that at $\$ 25,000$. So, I will retain, $\$ 25,000$ as editorial expenses, and $I$ will bill you for the lifetime rights for $\$ 125,000$.

Q So, did you value the portion of the contract, the $\$ 150,000$ you had paid to -- that AMI had paid to Karen McDougal, did you value the lifetime rights at $\$ 125,000 ?$

A Yes, I did.
Q And was that the price that you were willing to sell the lifetime rights to Michael Cohen on behalf of Donald Trump for?

A Yes.
Q Did you discuss the timing of the assignment of rights?

A Michael Cohen wanted the contract done, yesterday, and this is going towards the end of September. So, I facilitated
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to have the agreement, the assignment of the rights, sent over
I told him, I told Michael Cohen that we would have it
done by the end of September, first week of October of 2016.
Q Did you see this as a way to recoup the money, or at
least some of the money, that you had laid out on behalf of
Mr. Trump to buy the story?

A Yes. I, as I said, it was coming towards the end of the quarter. So I wanted to see if I could get the fund re-funded before September 30th.

Q Was there an invoice prepared for this reimbursement?
A Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: May we approach?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the
record.)
MR. STEINGLASS: So, this is the one that $I$ can
probably go another half hour without getting into this.
So, this is the one document that was referenced
earlier that may come up in the next half hour. If I get
through this document, $I$ can get through the initial half
without taking a break if you want.
Last night, counsel told us that they did not
want this line here, agreed upon a flat fee for advisory services to be offered for the truth.
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 Principal Court ReporterThis morning they said they don't want it to come in at all. We don't even think it's true. It is a bogus invoice. But, now, it sounds like this morning they want it redacted, which we think is ridiculous.

MR. BOVE: I guess he thinks I am a worse guy than I am.

When $I$ said we didn't think it should come in for the truth, it is that we think it shouldn't come in at all. My point is asking for the redactions is that this is, if it is not coming in for the truth, an assertion like that which is prejudicial, shouldn't be in front of the jury. A simple way to mitigate the prejudices is to redact it. That's all I meant.

THE COURT: The $\$ 125,000$ for --
MR. STEINGLASS: He just testified the $\$ 125,000$ was the payment that was being billed to Michael Cohen to reimburse Mr. Pecker for the money that was laid out for Karen McDougal.

THE COURT: It wasn't for this?
MR. STEINGLASS: It absolutely was not for this. This is a false business record. It's not only meant to discuss the true nature of the reimbursement --

MR. BOVE: If I could. I don't think Mr. Pecker is going to say he prepared this. Maybe he will.

I think he is going to say Dan Rotstein, a
consultant outside of AMI, not employed by AMI, prepared it. It is not his statement.

THE COURT: He didn't have to prepare it.
Does he know this document? Has he seen the
document?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes. Daniel Rotstein worked part-time for $A M I$ and $I$ think the witness laid the business record foundation.

THE COURT: I am going to allow it.
Are you asking for a limiting instruction regarding the document?

MR. BOVE: Judge, we would ask just to make sure that a foundation is laid that Mr. Pecker saw this contemporaneously.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. BOVE: Thank you.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the
following occurred in open court.)
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q So you told us, I believe, Mr. Pecker, that there was an invoice prepared for this reimbursement, is that right?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q I would like to show what is in evidence and is being displayed as People's Exhibit 161.

Do you recognize this document?
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A Yes, I do.
Q What is it?
A That is an invoice from Investment Advisory Services. This is not an American Media company. This company is owned by a man by the name of Daniel Rotstein.

Daniel Rotstein was the head of human resources and the head of administration for American Media for probably close to 20 years. And he -- he resided with the company and he took a position -- and he took a position as an executive of the -- in the -- he lives in Florida. I think it's in Plantation, and he was working there four-days a week.

Daniel Rotstein was a very valuable employee to me and I wanted to keep the relationship. So, I asked him if he would still continue to work for American Media as a consultant.

He did performing these services and administration services. And what -- what another aspect $I$ asked him to do is, when $I$ had large payments to be made on behalf of American Media or something to be received, I requested that Daniel to handle it through his company.

And the reason was, is that if $I$ had anything -- if there was a large disbursement within the American Media finance department, they, the finance people, would tell the tabloid editors.

For example, if we read that a private plane would fly a celebrity to one place, if we hired certain photographers,

```
paparazzi photographers, I didn't want that type of
communication to go through the company. So, to have them
outside was much more beneficial.
Part is that we had some pretty difficult experiences within the company whereby, the payroll register for American Media, the company based in Florida, was hidden upon each post, and the top executives' salary and compensation was listed right on the front page of the paper.
So, I had a number of incidents over the years.
So I asked Daniel, Daniel Rotstein, to handle this for me.
```

So, I called him, and said, look, I don't want to have a check from the Trump Organization going through American Media. I don't know exactly how it's going to be reimbursed.

So, I would like for you to speak to Michael Cohen directly and work out with him, whereby, you bill him the invoice for $\$ 125,000$ and reimburse American Media.

So, I called Michael Cohen to tell him about -- that Daniel Rotstein would be handling this reimbursement.

And I asked Daniel Rotstein to call Michael Cohen directly. I made the introduction. Michael told me that he created a company called, Resolution Consultants, that would -that we should bill and Daniel Rotstein prepared the agreement, the assignment and the invoice.

THE COURT: I am going to instruct the jury, Mr.
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Steinglass?
MR. STEINGLASS: Sure.
THE COURT: Jurors, so, this document has been
accepted into evidence. I direct you to not consider this
document for the truth of its contents. It is being
accepted into evidence for the fact that this invoice was
created, not for the truth of what it says.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you, Judge.
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q Let me ask you this, is it fair to say that you asked Daniel Rotstein to be the middle man to disguise the fact that money would be flowing from Michael Cohen to AMI?

MR. BOVE: Objection.
MR. STEINGLASS: Sustained.
Q I am not trying to be offensive.
Can you just give us a shorter answer, a short answer about why you used Daniel Rotstein in the first place to create this invoice?

A I used Daniel Rotstein to create the invoice because I did not want to have a payment received in the AMI finance department from the Trump Organization or Michael Cohen.

Q Why not?
A Because I believed that that payment would raise a lot of questions and issues and be communicated to the rest of the editors which is something I didn't want to happen.

Q Okay. So I am going to blow up the top of this invoice, and I am going to ask you a few questions about it.

First, of all what is the date of this invoice?
A $\quad 9 / 21 / 16$.
Q Who is being billed?
A Resolution Consultants LLC.
Q And I think you alluded to this a few minutes ago, but what was your understanding of the purpose of using Resolution Consultants to reimburse AMI for the Karen McDougal payment?

A When I spoke to Michael Cohen, he said he was creating a company to receive the lifetime rights and that would
reimburse -- it would reimburse and pay the $\$ 125,000$.

Q So you were using Investor Advisory Services and Michael Cohen was using Resolution Consultants?

A That's correct.
Q What is the description of services provided in this invoice?

A It says, agreed upon flat fee for advisory services.
Q Was this invoice actually for advisory services?
A No, it wasn't.
Q What was it really for?
A This was for the lifetime writes of the Karen McDougal story.

Q Why did the invoice from Investor Advisory Services say, agreed upon flat fee for advisory services?
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A That was -- that comment was pulled from Michael Cohen. That's what he wanted the invoice to say.

Q Did you discuss with Michael Cohen the matter of where the money to reimburse you, where this $\$ 125,000$ was going to be coming from?

A I assumed it was coming -- I shouldn't say that.
I assumed he was being reimbursed. He was always
being reimbursed.
Q By whom?
A By the Trump Organization or Donald Trump.
Q Okay. I am showing you People's 162 in evidence.
Do you recognize this?
A Yes.
Q What is it?
A This is the -- this is an assignment from American Media to the -- this is an assignment from American Media to
Resolution Consultants assigning the rights to the Karen
McDougal story.

Q Are you familiar with the terms, assignor and assignee?

A Yes.
Q Can you explain to the jury what those terms mean, and who was the assignor and the assignee?

A Well, the assignor, American Media, owns the rights to the Karen McDougal story. And has the right to decide to
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```
counsel?
A I did.
Q And based on that conversation, did you come to the
decision that you no longer wanted to be reimbursed for the
money that AMI had laid out to acquire Ms. McDougal's lifetime
rights?
    A Yes, that's correct.
    Q Did you communicate that decision to Michael Cohen?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you know about when it was that you communicated
that decision?
```

    A It was the first week of October.
    Q Of 2016?
    A It was the first week of October of 2016.
    Q Tell us about that conversation.
    A Yes. I called Michael Cohen, and I said to him that
    the agreement, the assignment deal is off. I am not going
forward. It is a bad idea, and I want you to rip up the
agreement.
He was very, very, angry. Very upset. Screaming,
basically, at me.
And I said, I am not going forward with this
agreement. Rip it up.
And he said, excuse me, Michael Cohen said, The Boss
is going to be very angry at you.
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| 1 | $\text { Page } 1161$ <br> THE COURT: So, there are a couple of things we |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | would like to go over. Let's just take a short break. |
| 3 | Let's come back in five or ten minutes, and then we can get |
| 4 | started. |
| 5 | MR. STEINGLASS: Okay, thank you. |
| 6 | (Short recess is taken.) |
| 7 | THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People |
| 8 | versus Donald J. Trump. All parties are present. |
| 9 | THE COURT: All right, counsel. Let's go over |
| 10 | what the disputed issues are. |
| 11 | MR. STEINGLASS: Judge, would it be convenient |
| 12 | for you if I handed you a binder that has all the exhibits? |
| 13 | THE COURT: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. STEINGLASS: Mr. Bove, you are good? You |
| 15 | have one? |
| 16 | MR. BOVE: Yes, I have one. |
| 17 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 18 | MR. STEINGLASS: Also, Judge, before we get |
| 19 | started, I know you suggested in an email that no further |
| 20 | letters were necessary. We were about to hit send on our |
| 21 | response letter to counsel's letter. |
| 22 | I don't want the state of the record being that |
| 23 | there is a written submission from the defense and not from |
| 24 | us. |
| 25 | I wonder if you would let me pass this up? |
|  | Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter |

I don't care if it is publicly filed or not. THE COURT: You can hand it up.

MR. STEINGLASS: While $I$ am doing that, $I$ will
hand you a copy of the law cited therein that I am going to refer to during this argument.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.
The first disputed exhibit is the second one referenced in your email from yesterday, and you also referenced this morning, People's 169.

And this is a December 9, 2016, email from Cameron Stracher, the General Counsel of AMI, purportedly to Mr. Sajudin.

And the defense's position on this one is that while there is a business records foundation for the header, these are factual assertions in the body of the email where -- I don't think -- there is no foundation for an argument that the general counsel of AMI is a co-conspirator, and it can't come in on that basis, and it should be excluded.

MR. STEINGLASS: First of all, I agree with the
last point. I am not seeking to admit this as a co-conspirator's statement. We don't think that Mr. Stracher is a co-conspirator.

```
    Just give me one second, please.
```


event. There is no statement in here that we are trying to prove the truth of. It is admissible to show the fact that AMI released Sajudin from the NDA and the date they released him.

There is nothing coming in for its truth in a traditional sense anyway.

MR. BOVE: The factual assertion that AMI is releasing Sajudin pursuant to this email, is the one that we are challenging on the hearsay grounds.

I appreciate the point that your Honor just made Judge, which is that it is possible that the witness, Mr . Pecker, or another could lay a business records foundation for the embedded hearsay issue.

Also, the testimony on Tuesday was directed to the header information on these emails and that's why I think the record is clear. We are not disputing that first level of business records foundation, but to the extent that additionally embedded hearsay is going to be offered pursuant to that business records exemption on the second level, Mr. Pecker would have to address, or the custodian, would address the content of the communication that is involved.

THE COURT: Turning to the second argument, I don't necessarily agree that this is not being offered for the truth of the matter asserted. It's always such a
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potential prejudice is to just simply redact this piece.
And I think that's particularly appropriate given your Honor's in limine ruling limiting the extent to which facts concerning the Sajudin and McDougal incidents or whatever we call them from coming in.

So that's the argument, Judge, for the bottom email.

From our perspective, there are the same issues as you continue up the thread. And I think here, just as -- I don't -- just as it's conceded by everybody that Mr. Stracher was not a member of any conspiracy, I don't think there is a foundation now or any argument that Barry Levine of AMI was a member of a conspiracy.

So that is an additional impediment to these coming in on any basis.

MR. STEINGLASS: So, several things.
First of all, we are not, we made this clear both in the letter response and in correspondence to counsel, we are not seeking to admit the bottom portion of the email for its truth. We don't think it is true and we elicited testimony to that point, very clear testimony, from Mr. Pecker that he did not believe Mr. Sajudin story to be true.

However, it is necessary context to understand the rest of the email string which is very much about both
a business record and co-conspirator statements.
So, let me explain why as to both. This is much more akin to Exhibit 164 then it is to Exhibit 169 insofar as it was AMI's business to purchase stories and according to Pecker they used emails to conduct that business and Howard did so as part of his regular course of his job responsibilities. And is, therefore, under a business duty to do so truthfully.

This is really just a class in business records.
Separately, we believe it's admissible as a co-conspirator statement and has res gestae of the state's election law conspiracy. And let me say first in that regard, and I am going to come back to this with certain other exhibits or portions of exhibits, we have more than established the prima fascia case of conspiracy to promote or prevent election law violations by unlawful means.

And that is all we have to do to admit evidence under the co-conspirator hearsay exception to establish a prima facia case, and we have done far more than that.

Further, we have elicited sufficient testimony to conclude prima facia that Dylan Howard is a member of the conspiracy, and insofar as -- should I stop?

THE COURT: Yes. I agree with you.
I think that established that Dylan Howard would be part, or was part of this conspiracy. Therefore, he
would be a co-conspirator and that statement is attributed to him.

Going down to the bottom portion, what Mr. Bove is asking is if you can redact it.

How difficult would it be to redact some portions of it?

MR. STEINGLASS: It is not a question of difficulty of redacting it. It is a question of the fact that the rest of the email chain doesn't make any sense and it is not clear that they are talking about the Dino Sajudin story.

So, I think that -- I think that -- it really is admissible to contextualize the remainder of the email chain and the prejudice argument is not an argument to make when nobody is claiming that there is any truth to these allegations, and I believe the witness testified that it was 1,000 percent untrue.

THE COURT: I agree. What would you like me to do, a limiting instruction on this?

It's been testified about.
MR. BOVE: It has, Judge. There are details in here about the underlying -- not just what came from Mr. Sajudin, but the following investigation, the woman who was allegedly involved in this, her name, there is a lot of information in here.

And I just -- we came into this trial under the understanding from Your Honor's limited ruling that the details regarding Sajudin and McDougal would be limited, and this to goes -- is the opposite of that. And I will just leave it at that.

THE COURT: I think there are a lot of details that can be redacted. But honestly, I don't see, necessarily, what the prejudice is to defense.

But, why don't you go ahead and redact the several details. The point can still be established. As far as the 9:35 a.m. portion of it, I already ruled on that, and also the $2: 15$ p.m. portion as well.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
We will send the proposed redactions to counsel.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.
The negotiation dispute, Exhibit 172A, this is a thread of text messages between Mr. Howard and -MR. STEINGLASS: Who?

I am sorry. I apologize. I didn't mean to --
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. BOVE: So, these messages, Judge, they can't possibly be in furtherance of a conspiracy between Mr. Howard and the relative, particularly in light of their relationship that we are talking about. And they are not
business records.
I actually, this is more an issue I think for cross at this point, but Mr. Pecker testified that AMI collected business communications from business phones. These are personal communications perhaps on an AMI phone.

So there is -- I don't think there is a plausible argument that the text of the communications are business records. So they should not come in.

THE COURT: Mr. Steinglass, these are texts between Dylan Howard and another person.

Does that other person work at AMI or have anything to do with AMI?

MR. STEINGLASS: So, no, Judge. I think I can provide some color here without mentioning exactly who it is. It is a first degree relative of Mr. Howard.

And to be clear, we are not trying to admit these as business records. They have already been authenticated so far as they came from an AMI device. And they do, undoubtedly, contain a bit of hearsay. I agree with Mr. Bove on that.

I think that it is useful to -- I think that they are independently admissible. And I think it's useful to break the texts into two groups. One are the texts from June and July of 2016, and the other are the texts from November, 2016, really from election night.

| 1 | Page 1171 <br> So, let me start with the texts from June and |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | July. |
| 3 | THE COURT: If I can just interrupt you for a |
| 4 | second. Is it your argument that because these were |
| 5 | obtained from an AMI device, that's what makes it a |
| 6 | business record? |
| 7 | MR. STEINGLASS: I am saying that they are not |
| 8 | business records. I am saying that they are |
| 9 | authentic because they came from an AMI device and the |
| 10 | foundation for authenticity was laid, but I am not seeking |
| 11 | to admit them as business records. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Neither one of these parties are |
| 13 | going to be testifying here, right? |
| 14 | MR. STEINGLASS: That's true. But I -- I still |
| 15 | think I have an argument. |
| 16 | THE COURT: If you can just approach and let me |
| 17 | know what the relationship is that we are talking about. |
| 18 | (Whereupon, the proceedings continued |
| 19 | without a side-bar discussion taking place.) |
| 20 | (Whereupon, Principal Court Reporter, Susan |
| 21 | Pearce-Bates, was relieved by Senior Court |
| 22 | Reporter, Theresa Magniccari.) |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter |  |

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
So let me start.

You have the exhibit, Judge?

THE COURT: I do.

MR. STEINGLASS: On Page 2, there is a text on
June 18, 2016 -- by the way, there may be some texts in here that we can redact, but these specific ones we believe are admissible.

Candidate -- this is a text from Mr. Howard to his relative.
"Candidate denies he had an affair. Nevertheless, I'm going to California on Sunday and Monday to interrogate the claim to understand the veracity of her claims. I suspect it's true."

Response: "Why would you go to California if you're not going to print it?

Answer from Mr. Howard: "No, she's American. I'm going for other reasons."

Response: "For the Awards?"
Answer from Mr. Howard: "No, for the campaign."
Answer from the relative: "Oh, sorry, I see now."

Response from Mr. Howard: "Mind you, in the event that he's elected, it doesn't hurt, the favors $I$ have done, provided it's kept secret. And I'm assured this mission is
known only to me and D.P.," which is David Pecker.
And the response: "Information is powerful."
Then flipping to Page 4, this is also on the same day in June. Mr. Howard tells his relative: "Nothing is on email," et cetera. "Burner phones."

And another text: "I thought about it.
Information is powerful, and I'm collecting a lot."
So this first group of texts, we believe, are admissible as to Howard's state of mind, including declarations of future intent. He is a co-conspirator. As we've already discussed, his state of mind is relative. Declarations of future intent are exceptions to the hearsay rule, and we provided some law, both in our memo and in the cases that I've handed up.

Primarily, People versus James. That's 93
N.Y. 2nd 620, at Page 628 to 631, which is Court of Appeals from 1999, which discusses Hillman, which is a U. S. Supreme Court case at 145 U.S. 285.

So those texts we believe are admissible on those grounds, a state of mind and declaration of future intent.

I think that the text -- there is another category of texts, and we're happy to redact the intervening texts that don't fall into one of these categories.

The next -- I skipped one from July 26, 2026, on

Page 6 of the exhibit. There is a text, "I need to meet with Keith tomorrow for Michael Cohen, and we'll return thereafter."

That falls into that first category.
Okay. So, I am sorry.
Moving to the second category, which are the election night texts. There is a text from Dylan Howard to his relative that says, "He's in with a massive chance."

And then on the next page, Page 7, another text to his relative: "At least, if he wins, I'll be pardoned for electoral fraud."

There is a response from his relative that says: "Trump victory imminent."

And on the next page, Page 8, there is a response from Mr. Howard: "I get pardoned, so it's fine, nowhere."

Another text from Mr. Howard to his relative:
"He's just been named President Elect."
Response: "Oh, dear."
Another response --
THE COURT: I think I can stop you at this point.
Anything else you want to say?
MR. BOVE: Respectfully, this is the first time, and I am not faulting anybody -- this is a developing
conversation. They're responding to arguments we're making.

This is the first time that the Government has invoked these exceptions with us.

I think these are, in truth, these are very, very substantive factual assertions that are being offered for their truth and are inadmissible hearsay.

To the extent that your Honor is entertaining these arguments, we would like an opportunity to consult.

THE COURT: All right. So I think I kept the jury waiting long enough for now. I will rule on this at another time.

MR. STEINGLASS: I will cite the law. I only read the texts, not the law.

Also, the James case, which I handed up, and the Settles case.

Another case is People versus Settles, which is a seminal case.

We believe the later statements are declarations against penal interest. For that proposition, we cite James, and Settles is a Court of Appeals case. The site is 46 NY 2d 154, at 167.

THE COURT: So during the lunch recess, I will go back and read those decisions and see if it changes my mind.

But for the time being, I am excluding these texts.

The fact that they're there, you're not offering them for business records -- the fact that they came off an AMI device to me is of no consequence. The fact that Dylan Howard is one of the individuals texting and we established that he is one of the co-conspirators within this context is also of no consequence to me.

Ultimately, what we have here is a private conversation between the co-conspirator and a family member that has nothing to do with the business that is being offered for its truth. And I don't see how the defense gets to cross examine anyone on this.

There is a real confrontation clause issue with this. I think that it would be error at this point to allow it.

I will go back and read the decisions, see what I am missing, but I think there is a confrontation clause issue.

Anything else?
MR. BOVE: There's one more exhibit, we don't necessarily need to take it up now.

THE COURT: We will get to it in the morning.
MR. BOVE: Okay.
THE COURT: So let's bring the witness back.

By the way, are we going to be done with Mr. Pecker today with direct and cross?

MR. STEINGLASS: Give me one second, please.
I think I probably have a good two to three hours left.

THE COURT: I am not going to rush you. You can have as much time as you want.

MR. BOVE: I appreciate it, Judge. There is a lot more to come. Obviously, we're not going to finish today. (Witness entering courtroom.) ***

THE COURT: Mr. Pecker, you remain under oath. Let's get the jury, please.

THE WITNESS: Thank you Judge.
***
(Jury entering courtroom.)
***

COURT OFFICER: All rise.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Please be seated.
THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial. People versus Donald J. Trump. All parties are present.

THE COURT: Jurors, thank you for your patience.
Mr. Steinglass.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.

A. December 9, 2016.
Q. Thank you.

I want to now direct your attention to October of
2016. Did you come to learn about a video and audio recording of then candidate Donald Trump that was released by Access Hollywood?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell the jury what was the gist of that recording?
A. The gist of that recording was a conversation between Donald Trump and Billy Bush, who was an anchor for Access
Hollywood, going on a bus to a set, and the comments from Mr.
Trump was, "You can grab a woman by the genitals," and it was
under sexual comments that were made.
Q. Was that tape released publically?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall what happened when that tape was released publically?
A. Yes, I do; it was very embarrassing, very damaging to the campaign.
Q. Do you remember the date on which that tape was released?
A. I remember it was the first week of October of 2016.
Q. Okay.

So you don't remember the actual date. It's okay if

Q. And did you have any conversation with Michael Cohen about a Radar Online article?
A. Yes. The Radar Online is a digital website. It was launched in late 2000, and American Media acquired it during that period of time.

And unbeknownst to me, Michael Cohen said that on that digital site there is a posting of Donald Trump being a Playboy Man and I should immediately take it down. That Mr. Trump was very upset.

I said to Michael, I was unaware of this posting.
Q. I'm going to show you what's in evidence as People's 167. I will show everyone actually.

And I am going to ask you, if you recognize this email?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is the email that after I spoke to Michael Cohen, I called up Dylan Howard and I asked him about this Playboy Man article on Donald Trump, and he discovered that this was posted prior to our position. I was also unaware of it. He would take it down immediately.

So I said to him, do that, notify Michael, remove the article and notify Michael Cohen.

The email that he sent here is explaining it to Michael about the story.
(Displayed.)

A. Yes.
Q. What is the date on that Playboy Man article?

Sorry, go back to the bottom portion for a moment.
A. Yes.
Q. What is the date of the original article that was being removed?
A. October 27, 2008.
Q. Thank you.

MR. STEINGLASS: And now I would like to blow up
the top portion of this email.
(Displayed.)
Q. Was this email also sent to anyone else?
A. Yes.
Q. I should say, this email chain?
A. Yes.
Q. To whom was it sent?
A. It was sent to Hope Hicks.
Q. When was that?
A. October 8, 2016, at 8 p.m.
Q. Thank you.

By the way, Mr. Pecker, in all the years you have known
Mr. Trump, have you ever known him to use email himself?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever communicated with him by email?
A. Never.
Q. How did you communicate with him?
A. By phone. Mostly by office phone.
Q. Who did you go through when you communicated by office phone?
A. I would go through his administrative assistant Rhona Graff.
Q. Okay.

Mr. Pecker, do you know of someone named Stephanie
Clifford?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know her by any other name?
A. Stormy Daniels.
Q. Who is Stormy Daniels?
A. Stormy Daniels is or was a porn star.
Q. Have you ever met her in person?
A. No. No, I never did.
Q. Let me ask you in a different way.
A. Sure.
Q. Did you communicate directly with Ms. Daniels ever?
A. I never did.
Q. How did you come to learn of her in connection with this case?
A. I was having dinner with my wife and I received an urgent call from Dylan Howard. So I walked out. So I walked out of the restaurant and took the call, and Dylan said that he
received a call from his two best sources, Keith Davidson, who we know is the attorney for Karen McDougal, and this other source, Gina Rodriguez, who is an agent for those type of celebrities.

He said that she, being Stormy Daniels, is trying to sell a story that she had a sexual relationship with Donald Trump, and Dylan can acquire the story for $\$ 120,000$ from Keith Davidson if we make the decision right now.
Q. Do you remember what night it was? You said were you having dinner?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember what night it was?
A. I thought it was a Saturday night. I know it was the first week of October.
Q. You think it was a Saturday night before or after the Access Hollywood tape came out?
A. This would have been after the Access Hollywood came out.
Q. If I pull up calendar on my phone from October of 2016, would that refresh your recollection as to what date it was?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to the date of the Saturday night that you had your dinner interrupted by Dylan Howard?
A. That would have been Saturday, October 8th.
Q. Thank you.

I will take it back.
MR. BOVE: I object. Technically that answer is
nonresponsive. The question is; does that refresh your recollection?

THE COURT: I will allow it.
Q. Now, after your initial conversation with Dylan

Howard, did you have a series of texts back and forth with him?
A. Yes, I did.
(Displayed.)
Q. I am showing you what is in evidence as People's 174A, and as we're pulling it up, we can show it to everyone, please.

I am going to ask if this is a record of texts between you and Dylan Howard from October and November of 2016 ?
A. That's correct.

MR. STEINGLASS: And I am going to ask that we blow up the last column or the lines marked 47.260 through 265.
(Displayed.)
Q. Are you able to read that, Mr. Pecker?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. My first question is: What is the date and timestamp on the first text?
A. It's 2016, October 9. The time is UTC time. So it would be -- I remember it was about 10 o'clock at night. I am not sure how you calculate that.
Q. Let's see if we can work together. 0025, is that 12:25 a.m. in UTC time?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I think you testified earlier that during
daylight savings UTC time is four hours ahead of New York time?
A. Yes.
Q. If it's 12:25 a.m. UTC, does that correspond to 8:25

New York time?
A. Yes.
Q. Where was it that you were having dinner with your wife? I don't want the restaurant, just the city.
A. In Greenwich, Connecticut.
Q. Also New York time?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is this text from?
A. Dylan Howard.
Q. And who is the text to?
A. It was to me. "Woman wants $\$ 120,000$, has offers from The Mail and GMA. Want her to talk and do lie detector live. I know the denials were made in the past, but this story is true. I can lock it on publication now to shut down the media chatter and we can access next steps thereafter. Okay?"



the story. There would be no conversations, no paperwork. He would not be involved in enabling the story to be purchased other than handing it to Michael Cohen.

And the no fingerprints, there was no paper trail.
Q. And how did you respond to that?
A. I said to him, "Great work."
Q. I am sorry to ask you this, what does "thx" mean?
A. I am -- thanks.
Q. Around this time, in October of 2016 , did you also have any conversations with Michael Cohen about Stormy Daniels?
A. Yes, also a number of conversations.
Q. Can you tell the jury about some of those conversations?
A. Michael Cohen asked me to pay for the story, to purchase it.

I said, I am not purchasing this story. I am not going to be involved with a porn star, and I am not -- which I immediately said, a bank. After paying out the doorman and paying out Karen McDougal, we're not paying any more monies.
Q. How did Michael Cohen take that?
A. He was upset. He said that The Boss would be furious at me and that $I$ should go forward in purchasing it.

I said, I am not going forward and purchasing it. I am not doing it. Period.
Q. Do you know whether Michael Cohen was also speaking

```
with Dylan Howard around this time?
    A. I found out after that he was speaking to Dylan Howard,
which I was not pleased about.
    Q. Why?
    A. Because it was my understanding, what I instructed
Dylan Howard to do, is to stay out of it, out of the story, out
of the selling process.
    Q. How did you come to learn that Dylan Howard did not, in
fact, follow those orders?
```

A. Dylan came to my office towards the end of October and said that there was an agreement between Keith Davidson and Michael Cohen. It was for $\$ 120,000$.

And Michael Cohen was supposed to wire the funds to Keith Davidson twice and he never did.

Dylan was upset. He was very agitated and said that Michael Cohen is going to make him look very bad with his two top sources. And he said, you understand, when you renege with a source, what the impact would be.

So he asked me if $I$ would get Michael Cohen on the phone.

I set up a Signal call to Michael Cohen. So it was Michael Cohen, myself and Dylan Howard.

Dylan Howard was very aggressive with Michael Cohen on the phone for not paying. Michael Cohen said that $I$ should pay. He said, "David, you should pay."

```
                                    Page 1193
    I said, "I am not paying for this story. I didn't want
to be involved in this in the beginning."
    I said, "I am not doing it."
    I said, "Michael, my suggestion to you, you should buy
the story, you should take it off the market, because if you
don't, and it gets out, I believe The Boss will be very angry
with you."
    Q. Do you remember when that phone call took place?
    A. I think it was like October 20, towards the end of
October.
    Q. Can we show the witness privately 302A, Page 23.
                (Displayed.)
    A. In front of me.
    Q. Is this a record of an interview between yourself and
the FBI?
    A. Yes, it is.
    Q. Does it refresh your recollection as to the date that
your three-way call with Michael Cohen and Dylan Howard took
place?
    A. No, I don't think it does.
    Q. Does it --
    A. There is no date.
    Q. 302B, Page 5.
        You said you used the Signal app to make this call?
    A. That's correct.
```

Q. Why did you use the Signal app?
A. Michael Cohen requested that every time we have a conversation, that $I$ should use the Signal app.

And the way he explained it to me, the call is deleted after a period of time, and it's encrypted, there are no messages.
Q. So I am showing you another document.

Do you recognize this document to be another record of an interview with you with the FBI?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know, roughly, what month and year that
interview was conducted?
A. When the interview was conducted?
Q. When the interview was conducted.
A. August 2018 .
Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to when the three-way conversation took place between yourself, Michael Cohen and Dylan Howard?
A. Yes, it's around the 30th of October, 2016.
Q. Okay. And I will ask you to keep reading.

Take a look at the second paragraph in particular and see whether it does or does not -- does that refresh your recollection with a little bit more precision on that date?
A. Yes, I remember. I said October 20 , I remember it was the end of October. Yes, that's correct, October 25.


| 1 | Page 1196 <br> A. Dylan called me to tell me that he verified that Karen |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | McDougal is not speaking to ABC. |
| 3 | I called back Keith Schiller and I asked him to relay |
| 4 | that to The Boss, what he heard is not true. |
| 5 | Q. And what, if anything, did Keith Schiller say in |
| 6 | response? |
| 7 | A. He responded back and said The Boss was very pleased. |
| 8 | Q. All right. |
| 9 | So directing your attention to November -- |
| 10 | MR. BOVE: Objection. |
| 11 | Move to strike the last answer. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Sustained. |
| 13 | What is the last question? |
| 14 | Q. Directing your attention to November 4, 2016, did you |
| 15 | become aware that the Wall Street Journal published an article |
| 16 | that day revealing aspects of the Karen McDougal's story? |
| 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | Q. How did you become aware of that? |
| 19 | A. Our communications director from American Media |
| 20 | received a number of calls from the Wall Street Journal and had |
|  | a series of questions about Karen McDougal's agreement; that |
| 22 | American Media purchased her story on her relationship with |
| 23 | Donald Trump, and also they questioned my relationship with |
| 24 | Donald Trump. |
| 25 | (Displayed.) |

Q. I am going to show just the witness and the parties, please, Court Exhibit 180.

I will ask you to take a look at this exhibit. Do you

```
recognize it?
```

A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is the Wall Street Journal article that was published on November 4.
Q. The one you just mentioned that referred to the Karen McDougal story?
A. Referring to the Karen McDougal story.

MR. STEINGLASS: I offer it into evidence.
MR. BOVE: No objection, subject to the limiting instruction.

THE COURT: Again, jurors, it's not being admitted for the truth of the matters asserted, simply that it was proof that it was published on that date.
(Whereupon, exhibit was received in evidence.)
MR. STEINGLASS: If I could publish it to everyone now.
(Displayed.)
Q. I am going to ask you, Mr. Pecker, did the article reveal the fact that $A M I$ had paid McDougal the rights to the story about the affair with Donald Trump?
A. Yes.


Page 1199

```
have given this information or the information to the Wall
Street Journal.
    I said, the only other individual that had the
agreement was Karen McDougal. So Karen McDougal or her people
or someone from her staff or herself gave it to the Wall Street
Journal. Not us.
    I don't believe that Donald Trump believed it over the
phone. He was very agitated. He couldn't understand how this
could happen. Our call ended very abruptly.
    Q. What do you mean when you say "the call ended
abruptly?"
    A. He didn't say good-bye, which was very unusual.
(Theresa Magniccari relieved as
Court Reporter by Laurie Eisenberg.)
```

| 1 | Page 1200 <br> (The following proceedings are continued from the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | previous page:) |
| 3 | Q Now, around the time of this Wall Street Journal |
| 4 | article on November 4th, did a Wall Street Journal reporter |
| 5 | contact AMI for comment? |
| 6 | A Yes, they did. |
| 7 | Q And did AMI put out a statement claiming that, quote: |
| 8 | AMI had not paid people to kill damaging stories about |
| 9 | Mr. Trump? |
| 10 | A Yes. That was the statement that we issued. |
| 11 | Q Was that the truth? |
| 12 | A No, it was not. |
| 13 | Q Did AMI also claim that the payment to McDougal was |
| 14 | not for her story, but, rather, for her columns and her |
| 15 | exclusive life rights? |
| 16 | A That's correct. |
| 17 | Q Was that true? |
| 18 | A No, it was not. |
| 19 | Q Who authorized those statements? |
| 20 | A I did. |
| 21 | Q Why did you authorize AMI to put out false statements |
| 22 | about the true nature of the deal with Karen McDougal? |
| 23 | A I wanted to protect my company; I wanted to protect |
|  | myself; and I wanted, also, to protect Donald Trump. |
| 25 | Q I'm going to show you People's Exhibit 174 again. |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |

MR. STEINGLASS: This can go to everybody. (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)

Q Does this exhibit contain texts between you and Dylan
Howard?
A Yes, it does.
MR. STEINGLASS: I'm, specifically, going to ask
that you zoom in -- yes.
For the record, texts 289 through 294.
Q What dates were these texts sent?
A They were sent November 5, 2016.
Q And who -- I'm sorry. You already told us who the
texts were with.
So, that first text, who was it from, and who was it to?
A From Dylan Howard to me. To me.
Q And what is the body of the text?
A The body of the text is: "No change. She's still
underground per Keith."

Q What is your recollection of why you were having this exchange, if you have one?

A The Wall Street Journal article was published on November 4th. It received an enormous amount of press. And I was very concerned that -- if Karen was still going to comply with the agreement that we had, and I didn't know if she went off the reservation.

So, I asked Dylan to call Keith Davidson. And he came back


issues.

Q What did you understand that to mean?
A That there was no mention on cable news or broadcasts about the Karen McDougal story. And he was saying, "one day of discomfort," that would be one day of a lot of bad press. And, um -- and, um, that the press was just reporting campaign
issues, not anything related to Karen McDougal.

Q And how did you respond?
A "Thank you. Thanks."
Q After the Wall Street Journal article, did AMI also amend its agreement with Karen McDougal?

A Yes.
Q In what way?
A We received a call from a different attorney representing Karen McDougal. And the attorney stated that Karen was getting a number of calls from the press to do various interviews, and she has been bombarded and would like to speak to the press.

So -- and the lawyer who was representing her said he wanted the Confidentiality Agreement amended so she has the right to speak to the press, without suffering any penalties.

Q Did you, in fact, amend the agreement at some point?
A Yes, I did.
Q Prior to doing that, did you speak about the idea of releasing or amending, I guess, the agreement that you had with

```
Ms. McDougal? Did you speak about that with Michael Cohen?
A Yes, I did.
Q And how did he -- what did he say about that?
A He said it was a very bad idea; that -- that The Boss
``` would be very angry; that, Why did you pay her the \(\$ 150,000\); and he highly recommended that I didn't amend the agreement or allow her to speak to the press.

Q Did you take that advice?
A No, I didn't.
Q I'm now showing you what's in evidence already as People's Exhibit 157.

MR. STEINGLASS: We can show this to everyone. (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)

Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes, I do.
Q What is it?
A This is the amendment to the licensing agreement of Karen McDougal to allow her to speak to the press.

Q Why did you want to allow Ms. McDougal to speak to the press at this point?

A I felt that the -- The Wall Street Journal article already set the stage and the tone of what the story is. And I wanted to try and keep some form of control on -- around the story, so -- so it's not gonna go any further than where it already was out in the public marketplace. That was one.

I believe it's Dylan Howard.
    Q All right.
    And what was the date that it was signed on behalf of
American Media?
    A December 7, 2016.
    Q So, is it fair to say that by the time of this
amendment, Mr. Trump had already been elected President?
    A That's correct.
    Q Now, around the same time, and I'm talking
November/December of 2016 , did you meet with Michael Cohen
in Trump Tower?
    A Yes, I did.
    Q Can you tell the jury a little bit about that meeting?
    A I had a meeting with Michael Cohen at his office at
Trump Tower. He was still asking me about the boxes of the
National Enquirer information that was in -- that \(I\) had brought
up from our offices in Florida to New York.
    And I told him that \(I\) had a -- an executive go through all
the boxes, and the only information that's there are old
articles on Donald Trump, news -- newspaper clippings; there
was nothing damaging that he should be concerned about; and I
am not going to allow Michael Cohen to go through those boxes.
    And -- and -- and we were arguing back and forth on that.
And I told him, "I'm not doing it." I said, "You" -- um -- and
then Michael said to me -- this was around November/December,
```

the exact time -- Michael said to me that he wasn't reimbursed

```
for the monies that's owed to him on the Stormy Daniels'
payment was number one.
    Number two, he said that the bonuses for the Trump
Organization are normally paid out around Christmastime, and he
hasn't received his bonus. He hasn't received his bonus. And he
asked me if I would talk to The Boss on his behalf, to tell him
everything that he did, to try to help him get his bonus.
    Q You did use a couple of pronouns at the end of that
sentence.
    A Sorry.
    Q You said "try to help him get his bonus".
    Try to help who get whose bonus?
    A He asked me to speak to Donald Trump to help Michael
Cohen get his bonus.
    Q I'm sorry to be so formal.
    You understand why.
    A That's okay.
    Q I think you said one of the things Michael tells you
is he hadn't yet been repaid in connection to the payments to
Stormy Daniels?
    A That's right.
    Q What did you understand that to mean?
    A That Michael Cohen paid Stormy Daniels out of his own
funds, which was the first time I heard of that.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1209 \\
\hline 1 & This, I never -- I wasn't involved in the transaction, so I \\
\hline 2 & didn't know how it was paid. \\
\hline 3 & Q And, what did you understand him to be complaining \\
\hline 4 & about? \\
\hline 5 & A I understood -- I understood he was complaining that \\
\hline 6 & he has not been repaid. \\
\hline 7 & Q And -- withdrawn. \\
\hline 8 & I believe you told us earlier that you had been under the \\
\hline 9 & impression that this was going to be paid for by either Donald \\
\hline 10 & Trump or The Trump Organization; is that right? \\
\hline 11 & A That's correct. \\
\hline 12 & Q So, what happens -- withdrawn. \\
\hline 13 & Did there come a time when Donald Trump, himself, entered \\
\hline 14 & the room? \\
\hline 15 & A Yes. \\
\hline 16 & While I was having a conversation with Michael Cohen, \\
\hline 17 & Donald Trump came into the room; and he -- and Michael Cohen \\
\hline 18 & said to Donald Trump that, "I'm talking to David about the -- \\
\hline 19 & the -- all the old Enquirer files. I went through them." \\
\hline 20 & "I" being Michael Cohen. \\
\hline 21 & "I went through the files. We have nothing to be concerned \\
\hline 22 & about." \\
\hline 23 & And then I asked Mr. Trump, "Can I walk back to your office \\
\hline & with you? I want to talk to you about a few things." \\
\hline 25 & And he said, "Fine. Come with me." \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}



A When I -- in -- when I -- there's a waiting room. So, when \(I\) got to the waiting room, Keith Schiller was there. And Keith asked me -- he said, "How's our girl?" Which, he was referring to Karen McDougal.

So, I said, "She's cool. She's, um, very quiet. No issues."
And then he was commenting that he was -- "he" being Keith, was -- Schiller -- was excited about going to --

MR. BOVE: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: Overruled.
Q You can answer.
A He was excited about going to Washington.
And then \(I\) was waiting in the waiting room -- I was waiting in the waiting room.

And, shortly after, Rhona said that, "The President would like to see you now."

And I walked into Mr. Trump's office.
Q What was that like?
A On that day when I went there, when \(I\) walked into his office, around his desk he had James Comey, Sean Spicer, Reince Priebus and Michael Pompeo; and they were updating Mr. Trump on the Fort Lauderdale shooting.

Q Are you referring to a shooting that had taken place in the Fort Lauderdale Airport that day?

A Yes. In the airport. That's correct.
Q What were they saying?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & A They were giving -- they were around Mr. Trump's desk. \\
\hline 2 & I just walked in. And they were giving him an update. They were \\
\hline 3 & finishing up their meeting. \\
\hline 4 & And then Mr. Trump introduced me to each of them. And then \\
\hline 5 & he said, "Here is David Pecker. He's the owner, the publisher \\
\hline 6 & of the National Enquirer, and he probably knows more than \\
\hline 7 & anybody else in this room," as a joke. \\
\hline 8 & Unfortunately, they didn't laugh. \\
\hline 9 & (Whereupon, the jurors laugh.) \\
\hline 10 & A And then, they left before him. They left. \\
\hline 11 & And Mr. Trump asked me to sit down to chat. \\
\hline 12 & Q And can you tell us about that chat, please? \\
\hline 13 & A Yes. \\
\hline 14 & He asked me how \(I\) was doing. \\
\hline 15 & I said, "I'm doing okay." \\
\hline 16 & He asked me how Karen was doing. \\
\hline 17 & And I told -- he asked, How's Karen doing -- How's our \\
\hline 18 & girl -- How's my girl doing -- How's our girl doing, he said. \\
\hline 19 & I said, "She's -- she's writing her articles. She's quiet, \\
\hline 20 & easy. Things are going fine." \\
\hline 21 & So, he said, "I want to thank you for handling the McDougal \\
\hline 22 & situation." \\
\hline 23 & And then he said, "I want to" -- he also said, "I want to \\
\hline & thank you for the doorman story, the doorman situation." \\
\hline 25 & Q And what did you understand Mr. Trump to be thanking \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

you for regarding the Karen McDougal story and the doorman
story?
A I felt that he was thanking me for buying them and for
not publishing any of the stories and helping the way I did.
Q And did he say why he was so appreciative?
A He said that the stories could be very embarrassing.
Q What do you understand that to mean?
A I felt that it was going to be very embarrassing to
him, his family, and the campaign.
Q Now, did he ever say anything to you that made you
think that his concern about these stories getting out was for
his family, rather than for his campaign?
A I thought it was for the campaign.
Q What makes you say that?
A Every time we -- the conversations that I had with

```
Michael Cohen with respect to both of these stories, the family
was -- his family was never mentioned; and the conversations
that I had directly with Mr. Trump, his family wasn't
mentioned.
    So, I made the assumption it was the -- the concern was the
campaign.
    Q And was -- withdrawn.
    Did there come a time when you perceived that Donald
Trump's concern shifted in some way?
    A (No response).


```

was asking you?
A Yes.
Q Can you please share with us that recollection?
A Prior to the election, if a negative story was coming out with respect to Donald Trump and we spoke about it, he was always concerned about -- he was concerned about Melania -Melania Trump, he was concerned about Ivanka, he was concerned about what the family might hear or say about it it. Not saying

``` whether it was true or not.

After the campaign, and when \(I\) was in his office and we were discussing this, he was concerned on the doorman story with respect to if the -- if the story came out, which wasn't true, about him having an illegitimate child -- and I didn't hear or discuss that it was -- he was concerned that what would Melania say, or what would Ivanka say, what his family would say.

It was, basically, what would be -- the impact be to the campaign or election.

Q Was that true for your conversations with Donald Trump about the Karen McDougal story, as well?

A Yes.

Q After Mr. Trump announced his candidacy for President, did he ever say anything to you that indicated that he was concerned about what Melania Trump or Ivanka Trump would think about these affairs?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1219 \\
\hline 1 & admonitions \\
\hline 2 & Please do not talk, either among yourselves or \\
\hline 3 & with anyone else, about anything related to the case. \\
\hline 4 & Please continue to keep an open mind. \\
\hline 5 & Do not form or express an opinion about the \\
\hline 6 & defendant's guilt or innocence until all the evidence is \\
\hline 7 & in, I have given you my final instructions on the law, and \\
\hline 8 & I have directed you to begin your deliberations. \\
\hline 9 & Please do not request, accept, agree to accept, \\
\hline 10 & or discuss with any person any receipt or benefit in \\
\hline 11 & return for any information concerning the trial. \\
\hline 12 & Report directly to me any incident within your \\
\hline 13 & knowledge involving an attempt by any person to improperly \\
\hline 14 & influence you or any member of the jury. \\
\hline 15 & Do not visit or view any of the locations \\
\hline 16 & discussed in the testimony. \\
\hline 17 & Do not use any program or electronic devices to \\
\hline 18 & view any place discussed in the testimony. \\
\hline 19 & Do not view or read or listen to any account of \\
\hline 20 & the case. That would include the reading or listening to \\
\hline 21 & the reading of any transcripts of the trial or the reading \\
\hline 22 & of any posts on the court's site. \\
\hline 23 & Do not attempt to research any fact, issue or law \\
\hline 24 & related to the case. \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{25} & Do not communicate about the case by any means, \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR \\
\hline & Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

including by telephone, text message, or internet.
Do not look for any information about the law
involved in the case or the people involved in the case.
I would like to start at 2:15.
Enjoy your lunch.
COURT OFFICER: All rise.
(Whereupon, the jurors and the the alternate
jurors are excused.)
THE COURT: Please be seated.
Thank you, sir.
You can step down.
(Whereupon, the witness is excused.)
THE COURT: As we break for your lunch recess, I
ask you to please give yourselves enough time so we can
actually start up at 2:15.
Thank you.
(Whereupon, a luncheon recess is taken.)
*****************************************
(Whereupon, the case is recalled in the afternoon
session.)
THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial. People v.
Donald J. Trump.
All parties are present.
THE COURT: Good afternoon.
MR. STEINGLASS: Good afternoon.

```


that post-dated the conspiracy; and so, we're only seeking to admit the texts that go up through October of 2016.

These are, first off, admissible as a business
record, insofar as it was the regular course of AMI's business to purchase stories such as Ms. Daniels' story; and Howard conducted that business as part of the regular job responsibilities and was under the business duty to do so truthfully.

Again, even if the underlying content isn't admissible as a business record, the Court has determined Mr . Howard is a co-conspirator; and these are core statements in furtherance of the conspiracy, insofar as they involve discussions with Ms. Rodriguez involving the acquisition of the Stormy Daniels story.

I do agree with Mr . Bove, the factual statements contained in Ms. Rodriguez's texts should not be considered for the truth, and her portion of the conversation should only be admitted to contextualize Mr. Howard's conversations with her.

MR. BOVE: I think we're basically on the same page.

Our point here is, admittedly, somewhat new on this one.

Judge, in exercising your discretion about what's going to come in and how at this trial there is a tipping
point where there are factual assertions in these documents that are being put in front of the jury, we appreciate the limiting instructions.

At some point, cumulatively, it becomes cumulatively prejudicial.

It becomes extremely hard during deliberations where the juror sorts through what is the truth, what is not. They can sort through the exhibits.

These texts messages, when you look at the assertions Ms. Rodriguez is making, these are very, very substantive and go directly to what's going on.

And we're not going to have an opportunity to cross-examine her.

That's why we think for these messages, in light of that, they should not come in.

They are, admittedly, her statements; are not in furtherance of the conspiracy; and, therefore, to offer them not for their truth is unduly prejudicial to us.

MR. STEINGLASS: If you want me to say anything more?

THE COURT: It's up to you.
MR. STEINGLASS: We don't think they're too prejudicial in any way, shape or form.

This is core, the conspiracy being enacted in real time in terms of this is the effort to buy up the
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Stormy Daniels story, discussions about the Stormy Daniels story. It is really a core part of the conspiracy.

So, I think any possibility of prejudice can be cured, as it has with several other documents, by instructing the jury that any factual assertions in the Rodriguez portions of those texts should not be considered for the truth, but only to contextualize Mr. Howard's responses.

If there's one or two lines that are not necessary to contextualize Ms. Rodriguez's -- Mr. Howard's communications, and Defense Counsel wants to bring those one or two lines to our attention, we can consider whether it's appropriate to redact them.

We are not looking to prove the truth of what Ms. Rodriguez is saying.

However, what she's saying is semi-important in terms of what AMI's motivation was in terms of buying up that story and preventing it from being released.

THE COURT: I'm looking at 15 pages of texts?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes. It is 15 pages of texts.
I don't think it has to be resolved today,
insofar as I don't think we're going to walk through these texts with Mr. Pecker.

So, if Your Honor wants to take a look and see if there's specific offending texts that Your Honor feels are

```

    Q Good afternoon, Mr. Pecker.
    A Good afternoon.
    Q When we broke before lunch, we just finished talking
    about a meeting you had in Trump Tower on January 6, 2017; do
you remember that?
A Yes, I do.
Q Directing your attention to July of that same year,
2017, did there come a time when you visited the White House?
A Yes, I did.
Q How did that come about?
A I received a call from President -- President Trump's
Office from his assistant, Madeleine -- I think it was
Whitehout [sic]. I can't remember her last name.
And she said, "The President is on the phone."
Mr. Trump called and invited me to the White House for
dinner.
Q Did he say why?
A He said it was a thank you dinner, and he invited
myself and my wife.
Q And what did you say?
A I said that, "I'll speak to my wife and I'll get right
back to you."
Q And did you do that?
A I did.
And my wife didn't want to go to Washington.

```

And I called back Mr. Trump and explained to him.
And he said, "Look. Business friends, business associates.
```

It's your dinner."

```

Q "Your dinner" meaning?
A My thank you dinner.
Q So, who did you bring -- did you go?

A Yes. Yes.
Q Who did you bring?
A I brought all business associates.
Q You don't have to tell us everybody you brought.
But, among the people you brought, did it include Dylan
```

Howard?

```

A Yes.
Q Did it include David Brodsky?
A Yes, it did.
Q Do you remember who you coordinated the logistics of your visit with?

A I coordinated -- we coordinate everything through Madeleine at the White House.

Q So, what happened when you went?
A When we arrived at the White House, I was taken -- we were all taken to the Oval Office.

And in the Oval Office, Jared Kushner was there, Sean Spicer was there.

And each of the people that I brought to the White House
was able to take a photo with Mr. Trump in the Oval Office.
Q Did the subject of Karen McDougal come up at all?
A At the time to have dinner, Mr. Trump asked me to join him in a walk from the Oval Office to the -- to the dining area. We passed the Rose Garden.

And as we walked out, President Trump asked me, "How is" -"How is Karen doing?" He said, "How's Karen doing?"

So, I said, "She's doing well. She's quiet. Everything is going good."

Q And who do you understand "Karen" to be a reference to?

A "Karen" was Karen McDougal.
Q Now, you mentioned that you and Dylan Howard posed for photos in the White House that day?

A Yes, we did.
Q I'm showing you and the jury what's in evidence as People's 179.

And \(I\) just want to ask you if you recognize this series of documents. You can scroll through a little bit, if you want. (Whereupon, exhibits are shown on the screens.)

A Yes.
Q And are these a series of texts between Dylan Howard and Keith Davidson, produced in response to a subpoena served on AMI?

A Yes, it was.



A Dylan came to my office and said that he spoke to Keith Davidson, and Keith thought that it would be a good idea that if I had a lunch with Karen McDougal, they would like to come to New York for a meeting, see the offices of American Media.

Q What was the purpose of the lunch?
Let me ask you this. What was discussed at the lunch?
A When we had lunch -- when I had lunch with Karen, she talked about the articles that she was preparing with the ghost writers. She was a little bit upset because Dylan Howard had to change some of the ghost writers because they weren't working well with Karen.

And, she talked about her idea and concept of going forward and launching a -- a -- some beauty products that we talked about, originally, that she brought up in the original agreement.

Then she, subsequently, said that she wasn't pleased because everything was taking -- everything -- the articles were taking a while, she hasn't been, um -- trained for media training, because she wanted to be that anchor on the red carpet for Radar -- for the Radar digital site.

So, she was stating what she would like to get done.
From my standpoint, the purpose of the meeting was to make sure that we were complying to her agreement and that she was comfortable with what we committed to her on what we were going





And that was, basically, the conversation.
Q When you said "he was very upset", "he couldn't" believe that you "did it", who is the "he" you're referring to?

A "He", referring to Donald Trump.
Q Did there come a time after that when you spoke with Mr. Trump and other members of his White House staff?

A Yes.
Q When in relation to the call that you had with
```

Mr. Trump alone?

```

A I -- it was right after the call that I had with Mr. Trump.

Q And who else was part of that call, besides yourself and Mr. Trump?

A Hope Hicks. And Sanders.
Q Okay.
Can you tell the jury about that call a bit?
A Well -- on that call, what I was planning to do -- and I mentioned it on the previous call to Mr. Trump, that I was going to extend Karen McDougal's contract. It was for six months. The contract was up. And I felt that from that last lunch that I had with her, that we had fulfilled some of the obligations that she was looking for, specifically her beauty products and media training. So, I was gonna send a contract.

He thought that was -- on our original conversation, he thought that that was also a bad idea.

So, when I received the second call, when I got the call back, and Hope Hicks and Huckabee -- Sanders Huckabee, when she was on the call, I explained to them, to the two of them, that -- why \(I\) was going to extend her agreement.

And both of them said that they thought that it was a good idea.

Q What was the reason that you gave for why you wanted to extend Karen McDougal's contract?

A I wanted to extend her contract so she would not go out and give any further interviews or talk to the press or say negative comments about American Media or about Mr. Trump.

Q Now, you said when you had your individual conversation with Mr. Trump, he was skeptical of that?

A Yes.
Q How about when you explained the reason that you wanted to extend her contract to Mr. Trump, Ms. Hicks and Ms. Sanders; how did Mr. Trump react to the new plan, or how did he react to that plan during that second conversation?

A He said, "It's your business. You do whatever you plan on doing."

Q Directing your attention to March of 2018, did there come a time when Ms. McDougal filed a lawsuit against AMI?

A Yes, she did.
Q Briefly, what was the nature of that lawsuit?
A The lawsuit was -- was, basically, for one reason. She

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1240 \\
\hline 1 & Q Did Mr. Trump contact you in connection with \\
\hline 2 & Ms. Daniels' appearance on Anderson Cooper? \\
\hline 3 & A Yes, he did. \\
\hline 4 & Q Can you describe for the jury how that conversation \\
\hline 5 & went? \\
\hline 6 & A When Mr. Trump called me, he said to me the same. He \\
\hline 7 & asked me if I saw the Stormy Daniels interview with Anderson \\
\hline 8 & Cooper. \\
\hline 9 & I said, "Yes, I did." \\
\hline 10 & He said that, "We have an agreement with Stormy Daniels \\
\hline 11 & that she cannot mention my name or do anything like this. And \\
\hline 12 & each time she breaches the agreement, it's \$1 million penalty. \\
\hline 13 & And based on the interview with Anderson Cooper, Stormy Daniels \\
\hline 14 & owes Donald Trump \$24 million." \\
\hline 15 & Q That's what Donald Trump told you? \\
\hline 16 & A That's what he told me. \\
\hline 17 & Q Directing your attention to early 2018, do you \\
\hline 18 & remember receiving a letter from the Federal Election \\
\hline 19 & Commission around that time? \\
\hline 20 & A Yes, I do. \\
\hline 21 & Q Did you speak with Michael Cohen after receiving the \\
\hline 22 & letter? \\
\hline 23 & A Yes. \\
\hline 24 & Q Can you describe that conversation for us? \\
\hline 25 & A When I received the letter from the Federal Election \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Commission, the FEC, I called up Michael Cohen immediately.
And he -- and I asked him, I said, "Michael," I said, "I
just received this letter."
So, he -- so, Michael Cohen said, "So did I."
I said, "What are you gonna do about that?"
He said, "I'm gonna respond and I'm gonna send them a
letter."
I said, "I'm very worried."
And Michael Cohen says to me, "Why are you worried?"
I said, "What do you mean?"
He says, "Jeff Sessions is the Attorney General, and Donald
Trump has him in his pocket."
I said, "I'm very worried."
Q Directing your attention to September 21, 2018, were
you aware that AMI entered into a Non-Prosecution Agreement and
a Statement of Facts with the Southern District of New York?
A Yes.
Q And is the Southern District of New York, is it your
understanding that those are federal prosecutors?
A Yes. I understand that.
Q Were you still CEO of AMI at the time that agreement
was executed?
A Yes, I was.
Q What is your understanding of that Non-Prosecution
Agreement?

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1242 \\
\hline 1 & A We admitted to a campaign violation. \\
\hline 2 & Q And -- \\
\hline 3 & MR. BOVE: Objection. \\
\hline 4 & Move to strike. \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: Overruled. \\
\hline 6 & Please approach. \\
\hline 7 & (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held \\
\hline 8 & at sidebar:) \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: What's the objection? \\
\hline 10 & MR. BOVE: I may have misheard. \\
\hline 11 & I thought I may have heard he admitted to a \\
\hline 12 & election violation. \\
\hline 13 & THE COURT: Can you read that back? \\
\hline 14 & (Whereupon, the requested portion was read back \\
\hline 15 & by the court reporter.) \\
\hline 16 & MR. BOVE: I think that's a mischaracterization \\
\hline 17 & of the agreement. \\
\hline 18 & We understand the agreement is coming in with a \\
\hline 19 & limited instruction. \\
\hline 20 & We don't think there should be testimony about \\
\hline 21 & what he did there. \\
\hline 22 & THE COURT: The agreement is coming in? \\
\hline 23 & MR. BOVE: Yes. We're not going to object. \\
\hline 24 & It's coming in subject to the limiting \\
\hline 25 & instructions. \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

THE COURT: When would you like the limiting instructions?

MR. BOVE: When it's admitted, please.
MR. STEINGLASS: I actually do think that's a fair characterization of it.

In any event, to the extent that the operation of the witness' mind differs from the agreement, the agreement will be in, and everything will be cleared up.

That's how I read the agreement, is that they admitted to a campaign finance violation.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court:)
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court:)

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
Q In addition to that, did this agreement impose a
requirement on \(A M I\) and its representatives to cooperate and
give truthful testimony and information?

A Yes.
Q And as a result of that, would AMI not be criminally prosecuted for campaign finance violations?

A That is correct.
Q As part of that agreement, did AMI make several admissions, including in Statements of Facts?

A Yes, they did.



MR. STEINGLASS: Can we please blow up Page 1,
Paragraph 1?
Q Can you read that, or would you rather have me read it and tell me if \(I\) get it right? That's up to you.

A You want me to read the entire paragraph?
Q Whichever you prefer.
A Sure.
"Based on the cooperation and implementation of remedial measures described below, and strictly subject to the terms, conditions and understandings set forth herein, the Office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York will not criminally prosecute American Media for any crimes, except for criminal tax violations, if any, as to which this Office cannot and does not make any agreement," closed paren, "related to its participation, between in or about August 2015 up to and including in or about October 2016, in making a contribution and expenditure, aggregating \(\$ 25,000\) and more during the 2016 calendar year, to the campaign of a candidate for President of the United States. This conduct is described more fully in the Statement of Facts, which is" --

THE COURT: You may have missed a line. After
"President of the United States" comma.
THE WITNESS: Oh.
"President of the United States," comma, "to the
extent AMI has disclosed such participation to this Office

```
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            (The following proceedings are continued from the
        previous page.)
    ******
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q Okay. I'm now going to skip to the statement of
admitted facts, which is on Page 4.
It starts on Page 4, and I'm going to ask you to walk us
through some of these paragraphs, please, most of these
paragraphs, actually, starting with Paragraph 2.
Go ahead.
A To read the --
Q Just read it.
A Just read it.
"As set forth in more detail below, on or about August 10,
2016, AMI made a payment in the amount of \$150,000 in
cooperation, consultation and concert with and at the request
and suggestion of one or more members or agents of a candidate's
2 0 1 6 ~ p r e s i d e n t i a l ~ c a m p a i g n ~ t o ~ e n s u r e ~ t h a t ~ a ~ w o m a n ~ d i d ~ n o t
publicize damaging allegations about that candidate before the
2 0 1 6 ~ p r e s i d e n t i a l ~ e l e c t i o n ~ a n d ~ t h e r e b y ~ i n f l u e n c e ~ t h a t ~ e l e c t i o n . " ~
Q And, once again, is that candidate Donald Trump?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Paragraph 3, please.
(Displayed.)

```
```

    A "In or about August 2015, David Pecker, the Chairman
    and Chief Executive Officer of AMI met with Michael Cohen, an
    attorney for a presidential candidate, and at least one other
    member of the campaign.
    At the meeting, Pecker offered to help deal with negative
    stories about that presidential candidate's relationships with
women by, among other things, assisting the campaign by
identifying such stories so they could be purchased and their
publication avoided.
Pecker agreed to keep Cohen apprised of any such negative
stories."
Q Paragraph 4.
(Displayed.)
*******
Q I'm sorry. Before you read Paragraph 4, did you
understand Paragraph 3 to be a reference to that August 2015
meeting that you described several times at Trump Tower
involving yourself, Mr. Cohen and Mr. Trump?
A That's correct.
Q Okay. I'm sorry.
Paragraph 4.
A "In or about June 2016, an attorney representing a
model and actress attempting to sell her story of her alleged

```
extramarital affair with the aforementioned presidential candidate, contacted an editor of the National Enquirer.

Pecker and the editor called Cohen and informed him of the story.

At Cohen's urging and subject to Cohen's promise that AMI would be reimbursed, the editor began negotiating for the purchase of the story.

On June 20th, 2016, the editor interviewed the model about her story.

Following the interview, AMI communicated to Cohen that it would acquire the story to prevent its publication."

Q And who did you understand that model, when that paragraph refers to a model, who did you understand that to be a reference to?

A Karen McDougal.
Q Thank you.
Paragraph 5, please.
(Displayed.)

A "On or about August 5th, 2016, AMI entered into an agreement with the model to acquire her limited life rights to the story of her relationship with any then-married man, in exchange for \(\$ 150,000\).

It was also agreed that AMI would feature her on two magazine covers and could publish over 100 magazine articles
authorized by her.
AMI agreed to pay the model \(\$ 150,000 "\)-- substantially more money than AMI otherwise would have paid to acquire the story --
"because of Cohen's assurances to Pecker that AMI would
ultimately be reimbursed for the payment.

Despite the cover and article features to the agreement, AMI's principle purpose in entering into the agreement was to suppress the model's story so as to prevent it from influencing the election.

At no time during the negotiation for or acquisition of the model's story did AMI intend to publish the story or disseminate information about it publicly.

On or about August 10th, 2016, AMI sent \(\$ 150,000\) to an attorney representing the model."

Q Okay. Paragraph 6, please. (Displayed.)

A "Between in or about late August 2016 and September 2016, Cohen called Pecker and stated that he wanted to be assigned to the limited life rights portion of AMI's agreement with the model, which included the requirement that the model not otherwise disclose her story.

Pecker agreed to assign the rights to Cohen for \(\$ 125,000\).
Pecker instructed a consultant who works for AMI to complete the assignment through a company unaffiliated with AMI.

On September 30th, 2016, Pecker signed" --
Q Let me just stop you for one second. That consultant, who is that?

A That is Daniel Rotstein.
Q Okay. Keep going.
A "On September 30th, 2016, Pecker signed an Assignment Agreement, which contemplated the transfer of the limited life rights portion of AMI's agreement to an entity that had been set up by Cohen for \(\$ 125,000\).

The consultant delivered the signed Assignment Agreement to Cohen, along with an invoice from a shell corporation incorporated by the consultant for the payment of \(\$ 125,000\), which falsely stated the payment was for an 'agreed upon' 'flat fee' for advisory services.

However, in or about early October 2016, after the Assignment Agreement was signed, but before Cohen had paid the \(\$ 125,000\), Pecker contacted Cohen and told him that the deal was off and that Cohen should tear up the Assignment Agreement."

Q And Paragraph 7.
(Displayed.)
A "Following the 2016 presidential election, AMI published articles written by the model in OK! Magazine and Star Magazine, featured on the cover of Muscle and Fitness, Hers, and published articles in Radar Online featuring the model.
```
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    The publication of these articles was intended, at least in part, to keep the model from commenting publicly about her story and her agreement with AMI."
Q Paragraph 8, please.
(Displayed.)
A At all relevant times, AMI knew that corporations such as AMI are subject to Federal Campaign Finance Laws, and that expenditures by corporations, made for purposes of influencing an election and in coordination with or at the request of a candidate or campaign are unlawful.
At no time did AMI report to the Federal Election Commission that it had made the $\$ 150,000$ payment to the model."
Q And, lastly, Paragraph 9, please. (Displayed.)
*******
A "AMI has cooperated with the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York and the Federal Bureau of Investigation during its investigation and provided substantial and important assistance to the investigating agents and prosecutors during the course of the Grand Jury investigation in the Southern District of New York.
Among other things, AMI has made various personnel from AMI available for numerous interviews, engaged outside counsel to ensure the integrity of its compliance with and responses to

```



\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1257 \\
\hline 1 & 2019, regarding his knowledge of: \\
\hline 2 & One. Meetings with Donald J. Trump, Michael Cohen, and \\
\hline 3 & other employees of the Trump Organization concerning Donald J. \\
\hline 4 & Trump; \\
\hline 5 & Two. Transactions between American Media and Karen \\
\hline 6 & McDougal; \\
\hline 7 & Three. Transactions between American Media and Michael \\
\hline 8 & Cohen; \\
\hline 9 & Four. Transactions between Michael Cohen and Stephanie \\
\hline 10 & Clifford. \\
\hline 11 & And, five, any information relevant to the background and \\
\hline 12 & context of the above subjects." \\
\hline 13 & Q Okay. Thank you. \\
\hline 14 & I'm going to skip to the bottom of Page 2 and the top of \\
\hline 15 & Page 3. \\
\hline 16 & (Displayed.) \\
\hline 17 & ********** \\
\hline 18 & MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you. \\
\hline 19 & Q Can you read that part, please? \\
\hline 20 & A "Examples of materially false or incompetent \\
\hline 21 & information or testimony include, but are not limited to the \\
\hline 22 & following:" \\
\hline 23 & Q Can I just stop you for a second before you answer \\
\hline 24 & that. \\
\hline 25 & Was it your understanding that you were obligated to tell \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

the truth or you could face perjury charges?
A Yes, I do.
Q And does this portion that you are about to read give
you examples of what would be considered not being truthful?
A Yes.
Q I'm sorry. Now you can go back and read them.
A "One. Withholding the name of a person involved in
criminal activity;
Two. Identifying as a participant a person who is not
involved in criminal activity.
Three. Transposing the roles of participants in criminal
activity.
Four. Knowingly giving incorrect or misleading information
about his participation or the participation of others in
criminal activity.
Five. Misrepresenting the source of his knowledge."
Q And, Mr. Pecker, was it understanding that if you did
any of these five things, you would be breaching your agreement
with the New York County District Attorney's office?
A Yes, I understand that.
Q And as part of your agreement, were you also required
to attend meetings as requested?
A Yes.
Q And was AMI obligated to furnish non-privileged
documents and records?

```


```

you hadn't yet testified, what you were saying would be
treated -- you would basically be getting immunity for what you
were saying in terms of the pre-Grand Jury interviews?
A Yes, I understood that.
Q Did you sign similar letters in connection with
subsequent meetings with members of the DA's Office?
A I did.
Q Directing your attention now to May --
MR. STEINGLASS: We can take that down, thank you.
Q Directing your attention to May of 2021. Did AMI enter
in a Conciliation Agreement with the Federal Election
Commission?
A Yes, they did.
Q And did someone sign that agreement on behalf of AMI?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember who?
A Jeff Pascoe, who is the current general counsel.
Q And as part of that Agreement, did AMI agree, quote,
"not to the contest that AMI's payment to Karen McDougal to
purchase a limited life story, right, combined with its decision
not to publish the story in consultation with an agent of Donald
J. Trump and for the purpose of influencing the election,
constituted a prohibited corporate in kind contribution in
violation of 552 USC Section 30118 (a)?
A Yes.

```


A Oh. It agreed that -- they agreed that they violated the campaign violation.

Q And -- withdrawn.
Directing your attention to April of 2018.
Did you come to learn that the FBI had conducted search warrants at the home and office of Michael Cohen?

A Yes.
Q How did you learn that?
A The FBI came to my home on that same day and had a search warrant for my phone.

And I subsequently received a call from Dylan Howard that he received -- that he had his phone also taken by search warrant from the FBI.

And he mentioned to me that he also heard that Michael Cohen had the same -- had a -- had his office or apartment at that time, if \(I\) recollect, received a search warrant and took his office equipment and telephone.

MR. STEINGLASS: Just one moment, please.
(Pause.)
**********

Q The phone that the FBI seized on that day, your phone, is that the phone that you had been using to communicate via text with Dylan Howard and Michael Cohen and other people relevant to this case?

A Yes.

Q When was the last time that you saw or spoke to the defendant, roughly?

A It would -- the last time we spoke was, I think, January or February of 2019.

Q And has he tried to reach out to you since then?
A Not directly.
I have friends who belong to Mar-a-Lago, and they run into Mr. Trump and he sends his regards.

Q Did you ever respond?
A No, I did not.
Q Why not?
A I felt that with the investigation that was going on at the same time, I thought that it would be inappropriate to respond or have any conversations at all with Mr. Trump.

Q Mr. Pecker, as you sit here today, do you have any bad feelings or ill will towards the defendant?

A Not at all. To the contrary.
As I talked about, I think it was on Monday, I felt that Donald Trump was my mentor.

He helped me throughout my career.
And I could just give one additional example: In 2001, after the 9/11 attack, my offices in Boca Raton, the American Media building, I had just renovated it, it took about a year to renovate it, and \(I\) just consolidated all of the tabloids in this building.

And in the first week or the second week of October of 2001, we received multiple Anthrax letters in white envelopes to the various magazines.

One of the editors opened up the envelope, inhaled weaponized Anthrax and then -- and ended up dying not too long after that.

And at the same time, within a matter of hours or within a day, the FBI took quarantine of the building because the building was filled with Anthrax.

I then, at that time, all of the content that \(I\)-- that the tabloids had, photos, stories, was all quarantined and we had to vacate the building, as I said.

And I, basically, was in a very, very, difficult place from a busy standpoint, a personal standpoint.

And the first person who called me, if I needed help, was Donald Trump.

And he was very helpful.
He gave me -- he recommended an attorney.
He helped introduce me to -- at that time Sandy Weill was the chairman of the Travelers Insurance Company, who had the insurance on the building and helped tremendously in continuing on with my business.

So I have no ill will at all.
And I still consider him a close -- I still, even though we haven't spoken, I still consider him a friend.

Q I didn't hear that last part?
A I said: Even though we haven't spoken and I haven't seen him, I still consider him a friend.

Q Thank you very much, Mr. Pecker.
MR. STEINGLASS: No further questions.
THE COURT: Your witness.

MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can we approach for one minute,
Judge?
THE COURT: Yes.
(At Side Bar.)
******

THE COURT: Yes?
MR. STEINGLASS: We don't have any exhibits for -if they are planning on using any on cross, and we would ask that we be provided them so that we don't have to delay every time they try to show an exhibit that we haven't seen yet.

THE COURT: Is there anything that you need to turn over?

MR. BOVE: I don't have anything that \(I\) intend on offering.

I have exhibits -- I have documents and exhibits that I'm going to use to refresh his recollection, and if \(I\) need to lay a foundation on a document that may impeach him
with an inconsistent statement, but right now \(I\) don't intend on offering anything.

MR. STEINGLASS: Which is fine, but if he's going to show this witness documents -- do you have copies of the documents that you are going to show him for us?

MR. BOVE: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Great. Perfect. That's all I
would ask for.
MR. BOVE: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
(Side bar concluded.)
*******

THE COURT: You may inquire.
MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOVE:
Q Mr. Pecker, my name is Emil Bove. And I represent
President Trump.
Now, you testified that you were an executive at AMI from about '99 to 2020; right?

A That's correct.
Q And, though, your title in that period were
President --
A It was Chairman, President and CEO.
```

    Q Chairman of the Board of Directors; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And as part of your work as a Chairman of the Board of
    Directors, you met with the other directors?
A Yes.
Q You got to know them well; correct?
A Yes.
Q And AMI also had investors; right?
A Yes.
Q And I think you said you owned 10 percent of AMI during
this period?

```
    A That's correct.
    Q Do you still have equity in AMI's successor?
    A Yes. But a lesser of an amount.
    Q And in this same time frame, while you were an
executive at AMI, the investors were sophisticated people;
right?
    A Correct.
    Q Experienced in business?
    A Yes.
    Q And you had fiduciary obligation to those investors;
correct?
    A \(\quad\) I do.
    Q And you know what that means; right?
    A Yes.
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```

Q And, on Tuesday, you referred to AMI's model as checkbook journalism; correct?
A That's correct.
Q And in connection with AMI's checkbook journalism, under your watch, you only published about half of the stories that you purchased; correct?
A I would say that's about right.
Q And all of those -- in all of those instances where AMI's examined stories, it included Source Agreements; right?
A That's correct.
Q And in connection with those Agreements, you would purchase the rights to a story?
A Yes.
Q And the Agreements typically required the source of the information not to disclose it to others?
A That is correct.
Q And that's a basic non-disclosure tradition; right?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q And the thinking there is that the story is less valuable to AMI if the source discloses it to someone else; correct?
A Correct.
Q And these Source Agreements gave you a measure of control over the information that was going to be a part of the story?

```



Q And in all of the scenarios that we just talked about, your ability as an executive and leader at AMI was to control the release of the story was standard?

A Yes.
Q Standard operating procedure at AMI between 1999 and 2020?

A Yes.
Q And, in fact, AMI had predecessors, right, it has been around for a long, long, time?

A 85 years plus.
Q And AMI has used hundreds of thousands of Source Agreements in the ways that we just talked about; correct?

A Yes.

Q Now, you've talked both on Tuesday and today about employees at AMI who help you do those things; right?

A Yes.

Q One of them is Dylan Howard?
A That's correct.
Q And let's focus on 2015 to 2017?
A Okay.
Q Mr. Howard was the Chief Content Officer at AMI?
A Correct.
Q And he had some other titles in the subsidiary publications; right?

A \(\quad \mathrm{He}\)--
```

    Q I think it was Editor-in-Chief of the National
    Enquirer?
    A Yes.
    Q And you also mentioned a man today named Daniel
    Rotstein; right?
A Yes.
Q And he worked at AMI prior to 2015; right?
A Correct.
Q And in this period that I'm focused on, 2015 to 2017,
he was a consultant; correct?
A Yes.
Q And he had a consulting company named Investor Advisory
Services?
A Yes.
MR. BOVE: Can we take a look at People's 161 in
evidence.
(Displayed.)
*********
Q And this is an invoice that we talked about this
morning that Mr. Rotstein prepared; correct?
A That is correct.
Q And you used Mr. Rotstein to take care of large or
sensitive payments on behalf of AMI; right?
A Yes.
Q And your purpose in doing that --

```
```
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            MR. BOVE: We can show this publicly, I'm sorry,
        thank you.
            (Displayed.)
                        **********
        Q Let me just step back a minute.
        A Sure.
        Q Now that everybody can see this, this is one of the
    invoices that Mr. Rotstein prepared; right?
A That's correct.
Q And you saw it around the time that he prepared it;
correct?
A Yes.
Q And so this is his company; right?
A This is his company.
Q And when you were at AMI during this period, 2015 to
2017, you were using Mr. Rotstein to take care of large or
sensitive payments on behalf of AMI; right?
A I did.
Q And you did that because you were concerned about
leaks; right?
A Yes.
Q That's the purpose of using Mr. Rotstein?
A Yes.
Q You had had situations at AMI prior to 2015 where
information got to the employees and then those employees leaked

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & it to the public and that was commercially damaging to AMI; \\
\hline 2 & correct? \\
\hline 3 & A Correct. \\
\hline 4 & Q And so that's now why you were using Mr. Rotstein in \\
\hline 5 & this period, 2015 to 2017? \\
\hline 6 & A Yes. \\
\hline 7 & MR. BOVE: We can take that down. \\
\hline 8 & Thank you. \\
\hline 9 & Q In late 2016, did you have a sense of what the average \\
\hline 10 & paid circulation of the National Enquirer was? \\
\hline 11 & A Around 350,000. \\
\hline 12 & Q And in that same timeframe, late 2016, as the election \\
\hline 13 & was approaching, you know that the circulation and \\
\hline 14 & subscribership of the New York Times was many, many multiples of \\
\hline 15 & that; correct? \\
\hline 16 & A Yes. \\
\hline 17 & Q And you had been indicating during this period, in the \\
\hline 18 & lead up to the election, that 70 percent of AMI's revenue came \\
\hline 19 & from newsstand sales; correct? \\
\hline 20 & A Yes. \\
\hline 21 & Q And you believed that basically the rest of AMI's \\
\hline 22 & revenue came from ad sales and subscriptions? \\
\hline 23 & A That's correct. \\
\hline & Q And there was a bit of a science to the way that you \\
\hline 25 & were running AMI and the National Enquirer in this timeframe; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

right?
A Yes.
Q This timeframe being 2016 and a lead up to the
election; correct?
A That's correct.
Q You had researchers who calculated and assigned a score
or a rating for potential stories; right?
A Yes.
Q And the purpose of having them do the research was to
figure out how to maximize profit for AMI; right?
A Yes.
Q Getting back to the fiduciary duty that we talked
about.
A Yes.
Q You actually participated in those meetings; correct?
A Yes.
Q In quantitative assessment of how AMI was going to make
money based on stories was something that you were personally
involved in?
A Yes, I was.
Q And focused on?
A Yes.
Q And I think you said on Tuesday that by that time, the
Celebrity Apprentice -- the research showed that President Trump
was the top celebrity in terms of helping sell the National

```
```

Enquirer?
A Absolutely.
Q And, so, that's the Celebrity Apprentice that we are
talking about in the early 2000s; correct?
A Yes.
Q And that was already established in your mind that
President Trump was one of the people who could drive the most
sales and maximize the most profit for the National Enquirer;
right?
A Yes.
Q And so you ran articles about President Trump because
it was good for business; correct?
A It was good for business.
Q Let's talk a little bit about how you met President
Trump?
A Yes.
Q You have known him for about 40 years; right?
A That's right.
Q And so that takes us back to around the late 1980s?
A Yes.
Q And I think you said on Tuesday that you met him
through Ron Perelman and Nick Ribis?
A Yes.
Q You had a launch party for George Magazine at
Mar-a-Lago.

```



```

in August 2015 by a long time?
A Yes.
Q It was a lot of interactions; correct?
A Yes.
Q And several stories; right?
A Yes.
Q In addition to Trump Style, you also used the National
Enquirer to run positive stories about President Trump; right?
A Yes, I did.
Q Again, long before 2015; correct?
A Yes.
Q And because that was good for business; right?
A Yes.
Q And this sort of took off, this idea of using the
National Enquirer to promote President Trump because it was good
for you around the time of The Apprentice, the first show?
A That's correct.
Q And this is in the early 2000s; correct?
A Yes.
Q And I think you said on Tuesday, by that time, early
2000s, you and President Trump had a mutually-beneficial
relationship; correct?
A That is correct.
Q In addition to a friendship?
A Yes.

```


A That's right.
Q The first time you heard that phrase was from a
Prosecutor; right?

A That's correct.
Q This relationship that you had with President Trump, this mutually-beneficial relationship, you had similar relationships with other people; right?

A I did.
Q Meaning that there were other people for which you would provide a head's up if there was a potentially negative story; correct?

A Yes.
Q And other people that you would promote in the National Enquirer because it was good for you and it was good for them; right?

A Yes.
Q And that included celebrities; right?
A Yes.
Q And most celebrities want positive treatment in all publications; right?

A They do.
Q And you also had a relationships like this with other politicians; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you are aware that many politicians worked with the
```

media to try and promote their image; right?
A Yes.
Q And to promote their brand; correct?
A Yes.
Q To facilitate their campaigns; correct?
A Yes.
Q Standard operating procedure as you understand it;
correct?
A Yes.
Q And then sometimes when the politicians are doing that,
that is to try and win elections; right?
A Yes.
Q Nothing surprising about that; is there?
A No.
Q And that's your personal experience; correct?
A Yes.
Q And you are also aware from your decades of experience
in this industry; right?
A Yes.
Q That includes even presidential candidates; correct?
A Yes.
Q Long before 2016; right?
A That's correct.
Q We talked a little bit, you and I, about Mr. Ron
Perelman; right?

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Page 1287} \\
\hline & Q & And it was a story that was sort of calling into \\
\hline 2 & question & the Planet Hollywood restaurant chain; is that right? \\
\hline 3 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 4 & Q & And Mr. Perelman was a part owner of the Planet \\
\hline 5 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Hollywood restaurant; is that right?} \\
\hline 6 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 7 & Q & And you happened to be president and chief executive \\
\hline 8 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{officer of Premiere at that time, and you prevented this story} \\
\hline 9 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{from running; correct?} \\
\hline 10 & A & I did. \\
\hline 11 & Q & And that was because you understood that Mr. Perelman \\
\hline 12 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{would have wanted that; right?} \\
\hline 13 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 14 & Q & And you were protecting his interests; correct? \\
\hline 15 & A & I was. \\
\hline 16 & Q & And there is nothing wrong with that; is there? \\
\hline 17 & A & No. \\
\hline 18 & Q & And you testified today about having done something \\
\hline 19 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{similar for Arnold Schwarzenegger; correct?} \\
\hline 20 & A & I did. \\
\hline 21 & Q & Around the time that he was running for the Governor of \\
\hline 22 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{California; right?} \\
\hline 23 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 24 & Q & That was in 2003? \\
\hline 25 & A & Yes. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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Q And in that period, were you trying to acquire AMI's holding into the fitness phase; right?

A I did.
Q And I think you mentioned some of the publications, Shape, Muscle and Fitness, Men's Fitness, Flex; correct?

A That's correct.
Q And as you tried to make those acquisitions, it was a huge deal; right?

A Yes.
Q Worth about \(\$ 365\) million?
A That's correct.
Q And so you wanted this to go through very much;
correct?
A I did.
Q And I think you said it this morning, that you talked about it with Joe Weider?

A Yes, I did.
Q Who was sort of a celebrity in the fitness phase and owned some of these publications?

A Yes.
Q And Mr. Weider said: "I'm interested, but we need Arnold's blessing."

Correct?
A Yes.
Q And in order to move forward with this -- would you
```

call it a giant acquisition, \$365 million?
A Yes.
Q To move forward with this giant acquisition, you needed
Arnold's blessing; correct?
A Yes.
Q And so you went and met Arnold personally?
A I did.
Q And you reached an agreement?
A Yes, we did.
Q And there were a few aspects to this agreement, is that
correct, at the time; right?
A Yes.
Q And at the time of this agreement, he had not yet
announced his candidacy to become the Governor of California;
right?
A That's correct.
Q And so one aspect of the agreement was that
Mr. Schwarzenegger did not want any more negative stories
written about him in your magazines; right?
A Yes.
Q And I think you said this morning that he had expressed
some concerns with you that in the past the National Enquirer
had run some pieces that he didn't like?
A Yes.
Q And you agreed, did you not, to make that happen, to

```
```

stop running negative stories about Arnold Schwarzenegger?
A I did.
Q And Mr. Schwarzenegger also asked for help because he
thought that there were a number of women that were going to
come out and make accusations ones he announced his campaign; is
that correct?

```
    A Yes.
    Q And you agreed to help him with that; correct?
    A I did.
    Q And in addition to that, Mr. Schwarzenegger we given
equity in AMI; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q How much equity was he given in AMI in 2003?
    A I -- I remember it was less than ten percent.
    Q How much was that worth at the time?
    A It was probably worth at the time around \(\$ 50\) million.
    Q \(\quad \$ 50\) million in equity on a \(\$ 365\) million acquisition;
right?
    A Well, it was equity of the whole company.
    Q It's a significant amount, relative to the size of the
deal?
    A Yes.
    Q And Mr. Schwarzenegger was also given executive
positions, executive titles at least in AMI's affiliates;
right?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Page 1291} \\
\hline 1 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 2 & Q & And then he announced his candidacy; correct? \\
\hline 3 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 4 & Q & And I think you've said before that at that time women \\
\hline 5 & started & coming out of the woodwork; right? \\
\hline 6 & A & That's correct. \\
\hline 7 & Q & And so this morning you mentioned one story that you \\
\hline 8 & purchase & d for Arnold Schwarzenegger; correct? \\
\hline 9 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 10 & Q & Purchased in 2003; right? \\
\hline 11 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 12 & Q & But, in fact, 30 or 40 women came to you and AMI was \\
\hline 13 & followin & \(g\) that, the announcement of his candidacy; correct? \\
\hline 14 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 15 & Q & And you spent almost a million dollars purchasing the \\
\hline 16 & rights t & o those stories; correct? \\
\hline 17 & A & I didn't think it was that high. \\
\hline 18 & Q & Several hundred thousand? \\
\hline 19 & A & It was hundreds of thousands of dollars. \\
\hline 20 & Q & And Mr. Schwarzenegger never paid you back for that; \\
\hline 21 & correct? & \\
\hline 22 & A & No, he did not. \\
\hline 23 & Q & Now, I think that the one story that you described \\
\hline 24 & purchasi & ng this morning, was it -- the source of that was \\
\hline 25 & Gigi Goy & ette? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1292 \\
\hline 1 & A Yes. \\
\hline 2 & Q And you bought the rights to a book that she wanted \\
\hline 3 & to publish about her relationship with Mr. Schwarzenegger; \\
\hline 4 & correct? \\
\hline 5 & A That's correct. \\
\hline 6 & Q And you actually, during the candidacy, sent \\
\hline 7 & reporters to Ms. Goyette to bring her to Hawaii to get her away \\
\hline 8 & from California so that Mr. Schwarzenegger could campaign; \\
\hline 9 & correct? \\
\hline 10 & A I did. \\
\hline 11 & Q And at some point there was some backlash over this; \\
\hline 12 & correct? \\
\hline 13 & A Yes. \\
\hline 14 & Q And that happened when you were investigated about an \\
\hline 15 & FEC's disclosure relating to the equity interest granted to \\
\hline 16 & Mr. Schwarzenegger; right? \\
\hline 17 & A That's correct. \\
\hline 18 & Q And I think you testified this morning that there was \\
\hline 19 & an investigation in California? \\
\hline 20 & A Yes. \\
\hline 21 & Q There were no findings against AMI in connection with \\
\hline 22 & that investigation; correct? \\
\hline 23 & A No. \\
\hline 24 & Q And as a result -- there was also an internal \\
\hline 25 & investigation at AMI; correct? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1293 \\
\hline 1 & A Yes. \\
\hline 2 & Q And I don't want to get into what you said to your \\
\hline 3 & attorneys or not, but as a result of that investigation, you and \\
\hline 4 & AMI decided to implement new policies and procedures around this \\
\hline 5 & type of issue with assisting a campaign like Mr. \\
\hline 6 & Schwarzenegger's; right? \\
\hline 7 & A Yes. \\
\hline 8 & Q And you did that, right, you implemented policies and \\
\hline 9 & procedures? \\
\hline 10 & A We did. \\
\hline 11 & Q And you followed them; correct? \\
\hline 12 & A I did. \\
\hline 13 & Q Followed them including in connection with the events \\
\hline 14 & you described in 2015, 2016 and 2017; correct? \\
\hline 15 & A I thought I did. \\
\hline 16 & Q You thought you did? \\
\hline 17 & A Yes. \\
\hline 18 & Q You have also purchased a story relating to Tiger \\
\hline 19 & Woods; right? \\
\hline 20 & A I didn't -- we didn't purchase -- I should say, yes, it \\
\hline 21 & was a Source Agreement so we did purchase it, yes. \\
\hline 22 & Q And you purchased some photographs; right? \\
\hline 23 & A We purchased a story about Tiger Woods from a source, \\
\hline & but all the investigating photographs, all the investigative \\
\hline 25 & works was done internally. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{1} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Page 1295} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Illustrated.} \\
\hline 2 & Q & So he needed some convincing to sit down with AMI; \\
\hline 3 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{right?} \\
\hline 4 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 5 & Q & And so you bought the rights to these photographs; \\
\hline 6 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{correct?} \\
\hline 7 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 8 & Q & And at the time that you bought the photographs, you \\
\hline 9 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{had no intention of running the story; correct?} \\
\hline 10 & & No. I wasn't going to run it. \\
\hline 11 & Q & The purpose of buying the story -- \\
\hline 12 & A & Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me. \\
\hline 13 & Q & The purpose of buying the photographs was to leverage \\
\hline 14 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{them against Tiger Woods to get him in the magazine; right?} \\
\hline 15 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 16 & Q & Now, we talked about these mutally-beneficial \\
\hline 17 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{relationships?} \\
\hline 18 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 19 & & Another one you had was with a man named Ari Emanuel? \\
\hline 20 & A & Yes. \\
\hline 21 & Q & Who is he? \\
\hline 22 & & He's the chairman and CEO -- excuse me. He's the CEO \\
\hline 23 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{of Endeavor.} \\
\hline 24 & & And you've known him since the 90s; right? \\
\hline 25 & A & Yes. Since the early 90s. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```
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    Q And since that time, if you hear a negative story about
    Mr. Emanuel, you will let him know; correct?
A Yes, I do.
Q And where you have an opportunity and a way that you
think would be beneficial to him, you run stories to promote
him; correct?
A Yes.
Q And there have been instances, have there not, where
you helped him suppress potentially negative stories relating to
Ari Emanuel; right?
A There are.
I just want to clarify. Maybe it might not be Ari Emanuel
personally, but one of his celebrities.
Q Tell us which celebrities that work with Mr. Emanuel
that you have helped suppress negative stories for?
A A story on Mark Wahlberg.
Q What was the story about Mr. Wahlberg?
A He had a -- this is going back awhile ago. He had an
argument or -- with his wife and that, and this story was
bubbling and going to come out.
Q And so at the request of Mr. Emanuel, AMI acquired the
rights to that story; correct?
A We didn't publish the story.
Q You did not publish the story?
A That's correct.

```
```

    Q But you acquired the rights to it; right?
    A We didn't acquire the rights.
    Q Tell us how you prevented the story from being
    published?
A I advised Mr. Wahlberg's group on where they should
purchase the rights for the story from. And I didn't publish --
and we didn't publish it.
Q Going back to Mr. Emanuel?
A Yes.
Q You also helped his brother Rahm; correct?
A Yes.
Q And that was in about 2009; correct?
A Yes.
Q And Ari Emanuel reached out to you because Rahm had a
problem?
A Yes.
Q And in this timeframe, Rahm Emanuel had just left his
position with President Obama; right?
A Yes.
Q And he left that position to go campaign to be the
Mayor of Chicago; correct?
A Yes.
Q And it was while his campaign was active at the time
that Ari Emanuel reached out to you; right?
A Yes.

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1299 \\
\hline 1 & I'm sorry. Yes, yes. \\
\hline 2 & Q And so you were -- \\
\hline 3 & A We were thinking about -- right, we were thinking about \\
\hline 4 & trying to acquire Playboy. \\
\hline 5 & Q And in connection with those negotiations, those \\
\hline 6 & negotiations were going on at the time you suppressed this \\
\hline 7 & story; right? \\
\hline 8 & A Yes. \\
\hline 9 & Q And you did that in a manner that you believed was \\
\hline 10 & consistent with the policies and the procedures that you \\
\hline 11 & implemented after the incident with Mr. Schwarzenegger; correct? \\
\hline 12 & A Yes. \\
\hline 13 & Q And there were no issues with the FEC following that; \\
\hline 14 & correct? \\
\hline 15 & A No. \\
\hline 16 & Q And no issues with any other regulators; correct? \\
\hline 17 & A No. \\
\hline 18 & Q And the story was, in fact, suppressed at that time \\
\hline 19 & because AMI purchased the rights; correct? \\
\hline 20 & A Yes. \\
\hline 21 & Q How much did that cost? \\
\hline 22 & A \(\quad \$ 20,000\). \\
\hline 23 & Q Now, you testified on Tuesday about a meeting at Trump \\
\hline & Tower that you said happened in August of 2015. \\
\hline 25 & Do you remember that? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

```

                                    Page 1301
    Q And so in preparation for your testimony, the People have brought to your attention certain events that helps place your memory within dates; right?
A Well, any time $I$ have spoken to a Prosecutor, they asked me -- when they asked me any of these questions, they always said: Do you remember, to the best of your knowledge, and to be as truthful as you can.
Q So you testified -- you said that you've testified in Grand Jury proceedings with the District Attorney; correct?
A Yes.
Q And that was in 2023; right? Last year.
A Yes.
Q And during those Grand Jury proceedings, you stated, did you not, that the meeting took place in the first week of August 2015; right?
A Yes.
Q And you changed your testimony here; right?
A Yes, when I discovered that it was in the middle -that it was the middle of August.
Q And when you say that you "discovered," what you mean is that somebody told you that, notwithstanding what you testified about in the Grand Jury, President Trump was actually not in New York City during the first week of August; correct?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1302 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: Overruled. \\
\hline 2 & A I -- I don't recall anyone telling me about that, that \\
\hline 3 & Mr. Trump was away in the first week of August. \\
\hline 4 & Q So in the Grand Jury you were under oath; right? \\
\hline 5 & A Yes. \\
\hline 6 & Q And there was a court reporter, like the one who is \\
\hline 7 & sitting in front of you now; right? \\
\hline 8 & A Yes. \\
\hline 9 & Q And you understood that it was what you said was being \\
\hline 10 & taken down; right? \\
\hline 11 & A Yes. \\
\hline 12 & Q Important to tell the truth, obviously? \\
\hline 13 & A Yes. \\
\hline 14 & Q And you wanted to; right? \\
\hline 15 & A Yes. \\
\hline 16 & Q And, in 2023, you said that your best memory was that \\
\hline 17 & this meeting took place in the first week of August; right? \\
\hline 18 & Correct? \\
\hline 19 & A Yes. \\
\hline 20 & Q And then you changed your testimony, this week, on that \\
\hline 21 & issue; right? \\
\hline 22 & A Yes, that's correct. \\
\hline 23 & Q And you are saying that you are not aware that \\
\hline 24 & President Trump was not in New York City during the first week \\
\hline 25 & of August 2015? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q Why did you change your testimony?
A I thought that -- I didn't know the exact date. I
thought -- I know it was in the first half of August, so I
thought it was the middle of August, that's what \(I\)
recollected.
    That's why I corrected my -- the dates, yes.
    Q Well, you --
    A I didn't believe that the exact date was --
    Q I understand. And I don't mean to put you on the
spot.
    What I'm getting at, though, is that these things happened a
long time ago; right?

A Yes.
Q And even when you're doing your best, and I'm sure you are right now, it's hard to remember exactly what happened when;
right?

A Yes.
Q And when you are remembering about conversations that you had, it's hard to remember what people said almost ten years ago; correct?

A You -- Ahhhh, yes.
Q And so there are some instances where your mind sort of fills in gaps; right?

A To the best of my knowledge.
Q And you do your best to explain what happened in a way that makes sense; correct?

A To what I remember.
Q Yeah, to what you remember.
And you fill in some details to keep things in sequence; right, and to make them sound logical?

A I try to make them -- to what I remember. And to be
truthful.

Q I understand.
But there are some gaps; correct?
A Yes.
Q Because it was a long time ago; right?
A Yes.
Q And when you are describing one of these meetings that happened almost ten years ago, there are times when there are gaps in your memory and you have to fill in with what you assume happened based on other events; correct?

A I didn't feel that \(I\) added in language or things that \(I\) remembered for whatever the event would be, it's what I best remembered from the meeting that I had --

Q Did --
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection. He didn't finish his answer.

THE COURT: Sustained. Please allow him to finish.

Q I apologize. You can finish your answer.
A Oh. No. What I'm saying is that in any of these meetings, it was my best recollection at the time that \(I\)
remembered today or at the time that I gave the testimony to the
Grand Jury and when I gave my testimony today.

Q And you have had a lot of meetings with Prosecutors and
law enforcement to discuss these things; right?

A Yes.
Q You met with the Prosecutors who are here?
A Yes.
Q To prepare your testimony; right?
A I met with Prosecutors here; that's correct.
Q When was the most recent meetings that you had with the Prosecutors?

A 2 or 3 weeks ago.
Q And how many -- how many meetings would you say that
you had this year with the Prosecutors?

A Over the year, maybe three or four meetings, maybe five in total.

Q It sounds like a lot.
Do you remember when they were?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q Do you remember when the meetings were?
A Well, I remember the last -- there was meetings in
```

March.

```
    And I think December or January, February, around those
months.
    Q So December of 2023; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And February of 2024?
    A February of 2024, I -- you know, I don't have my
calendar in front of me so \(I\) don't remember all of the dates.
    Q Because, in fairness, it's hard to remember the dates
of these things even when they happen a few months ago; right?
    A Yes.
    Q You've also met with Federal Prosecutors; correct?
    A I did.
    Q And you testified about that a little bit today;
correct?
    A Yes.
    Q How many meetings did you have with Federal
Prosecutors?
    A I remember five to six meetings.
    Q And do you remember, roughly, when those were?
    A They would have been in June and July and August of
2018.
    (Whereupon, Official Senior Court Reporter
    Laurie Eisenberg relieved Official Senior Court Reporter
    Lisa Kramsky.)


A That was in 2023.
Q And then you had a series of meetings before the trial with the prosecutors; correct?

A Yes.
Q And they tried to give you a sense of what this would be like?

A Yes.
Q They asked you questions that sounded a lot like the questions that Mr. Steinglass asked over the last couple of days; right?

A Like the questions, yes.
Q I'm sorry. I didn't hear that.
A The answer is yes.
Q Very similar; right?
A Yes.
Q Maybe not a script, but you knew what was coming;
```

right?

```

A Yes.
Q You understood the topics that you would be asked about; right?

A Yes.

And I also went through the -- my -- the -- I also -- as you mentioned earlier, I did appear in front of the grand jury twice.

Q Right.

And so -- so, to help you remember things today that you did not remember very well at the time --

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
Q Let me start that over.
To help you remember things from your testimony today that
you didn't remember at the time of your preparation, you went
back and read things that you said in 2018 and 2019 ; correct?
        MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: Sustained as to form.
            Please rephrase.

Q There are things that you did not remember very well
that you testified about today that you used other documents to
refresh yourself on; correct?

A Yes.
Q Things that you, independently, don't have a strong recollection of, so you're going based on what you said previously?

A (Pause). Um -- any documents that I reviewed, I was consistent to what \(I\) said when I -- when I'm going back to the original grand jury testimonies that I had.

Q And that was important, right, to be consistent with what you had said previously?

A \(\quad\) No.
Just refresh my memory.

Q But, you also understood that you couldn't say anything different than what you said under oath previously;
right?

A What I said under oath was the truth.
That's all I planned on doing today.
Q And so, when you met with Mr. Steinglass and the other prosecutors, they gave you a sense of what you'd be asked
```

today; correct?

```

A Uh, yes.
Q Maybe not a script, but there were no questions that were a surprise to you; correct?

A It was not a script. And -- I wouldn't say about being surprised.

Q You were not surprised; correct?
A No.
Q Now, let's get back to that August 2015 meeting.
You testified that Michael Cohen invited you to this meeting; right?

A Yes.
Q And you had actually known Cohen since the Two
```

Thousands; correct?

```

A Yes.
Q And in your relationship with Michael Cohen, he was somebody that always wanted something for himself; correct?

A Yes.


Q And so, once you met Mr. Cohen, you started to work with him on a mutually-beneficial relationship for President Trump; right?

A Can you repeat that again, please?
Q He became sort of an intermediary to help you provide information to President Trump about potentially negative stories; right?

A Yes.
Q And also when there were situations where President Trump could be promoted in the National Enquirer; right?

A Yes.
Q You started to work with President Trump's personal attorney, Michael Cohen, on those issues; correct?

A Yes.
Q For at least eight years prior to the August 2015 meeting; right?

A Yes.
Q And in 2015 and 2016, Cohen was always clear with you that he was not working for the campaign; correct?

A Yes.
Q He was his personal attorney; right?
A Yes.
Q And you testified on Tuesday about this August 2015 meeting in Trump Tower?

A Yes.


```

it was really important to get all the details out; correct?

```

A Yes.
Q That's what the prosecutors demanded; right?
A Yes.
Q And that's what the agents demanded; right?
A Yes.
Q And in this meeting, the July 26, 2018 meeting, you did not tell anyone that Hope Hicks participated in the

August 2015 meeting; correct?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Please approach.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held
at sidebar:)
THE COURT: What's the objection?
MR. STEINGLASS: My objection is Bornholdt.
THE COURT: It's what?
MR. STEINGLASS: Bornholdt.
He hasn't laid the foundation that Mr. Pecker was
asked that question; so he's trying to impeach by omission, without laying the foundation.

Either he was specifically asked about that, or the omission would be unnatural. It's certainly not that level of fact that qualifies as an admission being unnatural.

It's, clearly, a Bornholdt violation.

MR. BOVE: I can do a little more work on this, Judge. I can lay the foundation.

THE COURT: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held
in open court:)
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q Before that break, we were talking about a meeting with prosecutors and agents in July of 2018; right?

A Yes.
Q And the prosecutor and agents asked you to tell them everything that you knew about the events that were later
listed in the Non-Prosecution Agreement; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you -- one of the topics that you covered for them was the August 2015 meeting; correct?

A Yes.
Q And they wanted to know what happened at the meeting;
right?

A Yes.
Q In order to tell them what happened at the meeting, you had to tell them who was there; correct?

A Yes.
Q And when you were asked that question about who was there, you did not mention Hope Hicks; correct?

A Could I see the -- what you're referring to?

```

    A I don't know which page you're referring to.
    That talks about --
    Q That's why I wanted to give it to you.
    My question is, at no point in that document does it
    indicate that you told the government that Hope Hicks was at
your August 2015 meeting?
(Whereupon, the witness reviews the exhibit.)
THE COURT: Can we pull up for ourselves just the
other pages in the document?
MR. BOVE: Yes.
And we can flip through, Judge?
THE COURT: Please.
(Whereupon, documents are shown on the witness'
screen and on the parties' screens.)
MR. BOVE: If we could go directly to Page 11,
please.
Zoom in on the paragraph beginning: "Later in
2015."
Q Do you see that, Mr. Pecker?
A I do.
Q That's a point in the meeting where you were
specifically asked about what happened during a August 2015
meeting at Trump Tower; right?
(Whereupon, the witness reviews the exhibit.)
A Yes.

```
```

Q And you did not mention Hope Hicks being there;
correct?
A No.
But, I -- I don't know --
Q Just yes or no.
A Um, no.
Q And you had another meeting with the prosecutors in
August of 2018, you said; right?
A Yes.
Q I think that was on August 2, 2018; correct?
A I don't remember the exact date.
Q You remember it was in August; right?
A In August.
Q And you remember being asked about the August 2015
meeting again; correct?
A I don't remember.
Q You don't remember if it came up?
A Well, I have to see it. I --
Q You need to see the report to remember what you're
asked about?
A Yes.
MR. BOVE: Will you bring up, please, for the
Court, the witness, and the parties, the document marked
for identification as Defense A102.
(Whereupon, the exhibit is shown on the witness'

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1321 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: Yes? \\
\hline 2 & MR. STEINGLASS: Now I'm looking at Defendant's \\
\hline 3 & A102, and I don't see a single paragraph where he's asked \\
\hline 4 & anything about that meeting. \\
\hline 5 & The witness asked to be shown the paragraph where \\
\hline 6 & he's asked about the meeting. \\
\hline 7 & It's, clearly, not in here. \\
\hline 8 & I objected. You overruled the objection. \\
\hline 9 & He was allowed to ask: At any point, did you \\
\hline 10 & mention that Hope Hicks was at that meeting? \\
\hline 11 & And, yet, he was never asked -- I don't see any \\
\hline 12 & paragraph in which he was asked. \\
\hline 13 & The witness asked to be directed to the \\
\hline 14 & paragraph, and Mr. Bove went on to another topic. \\
\hline 15 & THE COURT: Is it anywhere that he was asked \\
\hline 16 & there? \\
\hline 17 & MR. BOVE: This is a report. It isn't \\
\hline 18 & memorializing the questions. \\
\hline 19 & THE COURT: Well, then how can he answer the \\
\hline 20 & question? \\
\hline 21 & The question is: Were you asked? \\
\hline 22 & MR. BOVE: I am entitled to put questions to this \\
\hline 23 & witness that he went into the meeting, that he would have \\
\hline 24 & had the ability to correct if he remembered -- \\
\hline 25 & THE COURT: The question is, you're asking him: \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR \\
\hline & Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Page 1322 \\
At no time did you say -- at no time did you say that Hope
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 2 & Hicks was there; and you handed him the document. \\
\hline 3 & Right? \\
\hline 4 & MR. BOVE: Uh-huh. \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: Presumably, to refresh his \\
\hline 6 & recollection. \\
\hline 7 & So, I just asked you, is there anything in that \\
\hline 8 & document that says you were asked that question. \\
\hline 9 & Your answer is, well, they don't write down the \\
\hline 10 & questions. \\
\hline 11 & So, it's a bit disingenuous to hand the witness a \\
\hline 12 & document to refresh his recollection. \\
\hline 13 & I take it we're not going to finish today? \\
\hline 14 & MR. BOVE: No. \\
\hline 15 & I have a little more on this topic. \\
\hline 16 & THE COURT: And then redirect? \\
\hline 17 & MR. STEINGLASS: Yes. There's redirect. \\
\hline 18 & Do you know how much more this is going to be? \\
\hline 19 & I am trying to plan for tomorrow. \\
\hline 20 & MR. BOVE: At least a couple of hours. \\
\hline 21 & (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held \\
\hline 22 & in open court:) \\
\hline 23 & THE COURT: Jurors, we're going to stop at this \\
\hline 24 & time. \\
\hline 25 & Before I excuse you, I ask you not to discuss the \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1323 \\
\hline 1 & case, either among yourselves or with anyone else. Do not \\
\hline 2 & discuss anything about the case. \\
\hline 3 & You may tell the people with who you live and \\
\hline 4 & your employer you are a juror and give them information \\
\hline 5 & about when you are required to be in court, but you may \\
\hline 6 & not talk to them or anyone else about anything related to \\
\hline 7 & the case. \\
\hline 8 & Do not any any time during the trial request, \\
\hline 9 & accept, agree to accept, or discuss with any person the \\
\hline 10 & receipt or acceptance of any payment or benefit in return \\
\hline 11 & for supplying any information concerning the trial. \\
\hline 12 & You must promptly report directly to me any \\
\hline 13 & incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any \\
\hline 14 & person to improperly influence you or any member of the \\
\hline 15 & jury. \\
\hline 16 & Do not visit or view any locations discussed in \\
\hline 17 & the testimony. \\
\hline 18 & Do not read, view or listen to any accounts or \\
\hline 19 & discussions of the case reported by newspapers, \\
\hline 20 & television, radio, the internet, or any other news media. \\
\hline 21 & This would include the reading or the listening to the \\
\hline 22 & reading of the transcripts. \\
\hline 23 & Do not attempt to research any fact, issue or law \\
\hline & related to the case, whether by discussion with others, by \\
\hline 25 & research in a library, or on the internet, or by any other \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
source. This includes visiting any court sites.
I want to emphasize that in addition to not speaking face-to-face with anyone about the case, you must not communicate about the case with anyone by any other means, including by telephone, text messages, emails, chat rooms, blogs, or social websites.

You must not provide any information about the case to anyone by any means whatsoever. That includes posting of information on the case or what you're doing on the case on any device or internet sites, including blogs, chat rooms, social websites, or any other means.

Finally, you must not Google or search for any information about the case or the law which applies to the case or the people involved in the case, including the defendant, the witnesses, the lawyers or myself.

See you tomorrow morning at 9:30.
Have a good evening.
COURT OFFICER: All rise.
(Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors are excused.)

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
You can step down.
(Whereupon, the witness is excused.)
THE COURT: Please be seated.
Mr. Steinglass, can you elaborate on your

Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
Senior Court Reporter
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1325 \\
\hline 1 & objection, please? \\
\hline 2 & MR. STEINGLASS: Yes. \\
\hline 3 & My objection is an objection under People v. \\
\hline 4 & Bornholdt. \\
\hline 5 & I think Mr. Bove, arguably, laid a foundation to \\
\hline 6 & ask about People's A101, which at least contains some \\
\hline 7 & reference, a paragraph that references the August 2015 \\
\hline 8 & Trump Tower meeting. \\
\hline 9 & However, he then showed the witness People's \\
\hline 10 & Exhibit A102, which, insofar as I can tell, doesn't have \\
\hline 11 & anything at all about the August 2015 meeting. \\
\hline 12 & He asked a question: Did you ever say anything \\
\hline 13 & about the presence of Hope Hicks at this meeting? \\
\hline 14 & The witness says: I don't know. I need to see \\
\hline 15 & the document. I need to look through it. \\
\hline 16 & He wasn't given that opportunity. \\
\hline 17 & I objected because I thought that question was \\
\hline 18 & improper, because I thought it violated Bornholdt. \\
\hline 19 & There was no indication the witness was asked \\
\hline 20 & about the August 15th meeting during the interview, and \\
\hline 21 & there was no indication that admitting it would be an \\
\hline 22 & unnatural omission under People v. Bornholdt. \\
\hline 23 & The witness asked to be shown the document so he \\
\hline 24 & could look and it and be shown if there was a discussion \\
\hline 25 & in the August 2015 meeting at Trump Tower. \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR \\
\hline & Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1326 \\
\hline 1 & I don't see any. \\
\hline 2 & Perhaps Counsel sees one. \\
\hline 3 & But, I think that was a totally improper line of \\
\hline 4 & questioning. I think it left the jury with the \\
\hline 5 & misimpression that the witness was asked about it and \\
\hline 6 & omitted it. That's a prior inconsistent statement; and I \\
\hline 7 & think it's a prior omission by Bornholdt. \\
\hline 8 & THE COURT: Is there anything in that that says \\
\hline 9 & he was asked if Hope Hicks was there and his response to \\
\hline 10 & that? \\
\hline 11 & MR. BOVE: I don't have a specific response to \\
\hline 12 & that. \\
\hline 13 & The question to the witness was, does he recall \\
\hline 14 & discussing that. \\
\hline 15 & This document was marked Defense A102. \\
\hline 16 & It contains a substantial set of redactions, so I \\
\hline 17 & don't know what's underneath those, and I don't know what \\
\hline 18 & came up. \\
\hline 19 & It's appropriate for me to ask if he remembers. \\
\hline 20 & He then asked me to show a document. \\
\hline 21 & THE COURT: He didn't ask for A102. \\
\hline 22 & MR. BOVE: He understood. He asked for a \\
\hline 23 & document to refresh his recollection about the meeting he \\
\hline 24 & was talking about. \\
\hline 25 & So I gave it to him. \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

THE COURT: Well, you gave him A102, which gives the impression that there's something in this document that will refresh his recollection.

MR. BOVE: What I perceive refreshed his recollection was he did not recollect this meeting with Hope Hicks.

THE COURT: Hear me out.
If a witness says, "I don't remember. Do you have anything you can give me that might refresh my recollection?", and then you hand him the document, the message that sends to the jury and to everyone else in this room is there's something in that document that's going to refresh your recollection.

But, there wasn't anything in that document; and, therefore, it's misleading.

So, we're going to correct this tomorrow morning in the presence of the jury.

I'm going to ask you to please be very careful with that.

I'm not accusing you of having done it deliberately.

But, it still left the jury with the misimpression that he had omitted something.

If you want to hand him something to refresh his recollection, you should actually hand him something that
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 1328 \\
\hline 1 & will actually do it. \\
\hline 2 & MR. BOVE: What I was seeking to refresh his \\
\hline 3 & recollection on is that her name was not in the document. \\
\hline 4 & I understand your ruling, that amounts to there \\
\hline 5 & was something improper or needs a correction instruction. \\
\hline 6 & The point of my question was, she was not in \\
\hline 7 & there. \\
\hline 8 & THE COURT: Mr. Bove, are you missing my point? \\
\hline 9 & I don't think you're responding to what I'm \\
\hline 10 & saying. \\
\hline 11 & I'm saying you asked him the question. You gave \\
\hline 12 & him a document in response to that question, which gave \\
\hline 13 & everybody the impression that what he was looking for was \\
\hline 14 & contained in that document. \\
\hline 15 & And that was not the case; right? \\
\hline 16 & MR. BOVE: Yes. \\
\hline 17 & THE COURT: So, please be careful. \\
\hline 18 & Anything else? \\
\hline 19 & MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, Judge. \\
\hline 20 & Mr. Colangelo has an application. \\
\hline 21 & MR. COLANGELO: Thank you, Your Honor. \\
\hline 22 & If the Court permits the People to make an \\
\hline 23 & application tomorrow to compel compliance with a \\
\hline 24 & third party subpoena, this is a witness from The Trump \\
\hline 25 & Organization for a custodial witness. \\
\hline & Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR \\
\hline & Senior Court Reporter \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

