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THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People v. Donald J. Trump.

Appearances, starting with the People.
MR. STEINGLASS: For the People, ADA Joshua
Steinglass, Susan Hoffinger, Matthew Colangelo,
Christopher Conroy, Becky Mangold, and Katherine Ellis.
MR. BOVE: Emil Bove for President Trump, seated to my left. I'm joined by Todd Blanche, Susan Necheles, and Gedalia Stern.

THE COURT: Good morning.
A couple of things to go over.
Regarding next week's hearing, I think you
received my email, we're changing the time of that from Wednesday at 2:15 to Thursday at 9:30.

I also wanted to go over the issue regarding the text from Dylan Howard you wanted me to look at. We spoke about it yesterday.

MR. STEINGLASS: To the extent that it may inform your Honor's opinion, we sent counsel, last night, some proposed redactions to remove what I think were their concerns, and I believe they're -- you'll review those.

THE COURT: I read the submissions, including all the legal authority that was handed up.

I also read the relevant portions of the
transcript, which were Pages 1221 through 1226.
Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
Senior Court Reporter
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Page 1332

I note on Page 123, Mr. Bove, at Line 20, says, "I think we're basically on the same page."

And then, on 1224, you express your concern. And your concern is, "At some point, cumulatively, it becomes cumulatively prejudicial."

So, I appreciate your concern, and I agree that there could come a point where it will possibly become prejudicial.

The difficulty is, $I$ don't know at this point what that's going to be. So we're just going to have to keep going through it. You'll make your objections. I'll consider the objections. And at some point, we may get there.

I am relying, primarily, on People v. Settles, S-E-T-T-L-E-S, 46 N.Y.2d 154, at Page 169. This is a Court of Appeals decision. "Naturally, there can be no precise demarkation or formulation of the proof which will constitute sufficient support of evidence of a declaration against penal interests. By its very nature, the determination involves a delicate balance of diverse factors and is entrusted to the sound judgment of the trial court which is aptly suited to weigh the circumstances surrounding the declaration and the evidence used to bolster its reliability."

So, that's really what's going to guide this Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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Court.
But, the fact that you said you're pretty much on
the same page, we're in agreement with who is a co-conspirator in this case: Dylan Howard. We're in
agreement that at least some, if not most, of the responses are coming in for some purpose. And we're also in agreement that there will be redactions to that.

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.
Thank you. I appreciate and understand all of that.

Just for the record, when you said we're in agreement about who's a co-conspirator, we understand the Court's ruling, and we're abiding by it.

Our objection has been noted.
And I will confer with Mr. Steinglass and the Government over the weekend about the proposed redactions, and we'll get back to the Court on Tuesday.

THE COURT: Of course.
Once you do that, please let me know what you suggest the instruction should be to the jury, what is it they're considering that other language for.

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.
Thank you.
THE COURT: We're going to break today at 12:30
to hear the People's motion, motion to compel.
Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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MR. COLANGELO: Thank you.
One update on that.
After further discussions with the third party's counsel this morning, we think we no longer need the Court's intervention on that today.

We will bring it to your attention should it become necessary.

THE COURT: Great.
We'll go to one o'clock.
Is there anything else?
MR. STEINGLASS: There's a few things.
First, is your Honor going to address the issue with the jury that was raised at the end of the day about the, what we consider to be, improper impeachment by omission by Mr. Bove?

THE COURT: Would you like to be heard, Mr. Bove?
MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.
Just to clarify, my intentions for this morning on this issue are to begin by basically saying to Mr. Pecker: I apologize for any confusion about that, clarify a little bit about his relationship with Ms. Hicks, and move on.

There's grand jury testimony on this issue for where a specific question was asked. I'll draw the witness' attention to that and go through it. Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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I've reviewed Bornholdt and its authorities, and I'll lay a proper foundation.

THE COURT: Thank you.
I think that's sufficient to address the issue.
MR. STEINGLASS: Next. Whatever Mr. Bove's
intentions were with regard to the questions about prior meetings with the DA's Office and reviewing materials, I think that he left a misleading impression that that contact was somehow improper, and I don't think it would be appropriate to wait until the end of the case to give the CJI instruction on pretrial preparation.

I'm handing it up to the Court.
The Court has been very reasonable about giving mid-trial curative instructions or limiting instructions, and $I$ would ask that you give this instruction to the jury this morning.

THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. BOVE: May I have just one moment, Judge?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Whereupon, defense counsel confer.)
MR. BOVE: Judge, I think there was an
instruction along these lines in your preliminary
instructions, so I think the jury is aware of this issue.
I'm not sure it's necessary.
THE COURT: There was a brief reference to it. It Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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was very brief, if I remember.
It's: I advise you, it's common or permissible for the prosecutor and counsel to meet with witnesses before they testify.

I believe that was, pretty much, what I said. So, I can give this instruction just to modify. MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.

I also have a proposed instruction. It doesn't have to be given today. But, it's an instruction on redaction, so the jury doesn't draw any improper inferences from the fact that certain material, personal material or otherwise material that the parties have agreed is irrelevant should not be before the jury or is prejudicial, so that the jury doesn't draw any improper inferences from the existence of those redactions.

Next. I think, again, whether intentionally or unintentionally, Mr. Bove's questioning yesterday improperly conflated the federal prosecutors and state prosecutors, referring to both as "the Government".

Of course, that's, you know -- the state prosecutors are referred to as "the People".

I am not telling Mr. Bove how to refer to us, if that's how he chooses to refer to us.

But, I do think he needs to be clear when he's questioning the witness about prior interviews, which Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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prosecutors he is talking about.
So, if that's unclear from the question, I will object, and I just wanted to explain.

THE COURT: That's fair, because there was more than one prosecutor's office involved here.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
Finally, Judge, I just want to bring the Court's attention to that we caught a reference in People's 174A to a lie detector that was gonna be taken live.

I don't know if your Honor noticed it when we had the witness on the stand.

I don't think your Honor precluded reference to the lie detector. Just the results of the lie detector.

We've taken a broad view of that and have redacted references where we've seen them.

I notified counsel and swapped out a new version of 174 A that contains a redaction just of the word "lie detector".

THE COURT: Is that it for the People?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: How about the Defense?
MR. BOVE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
We can get the witness, please.
COURT OFFICER: Witness entering. Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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(Whereupon, the witness, David Pecker, having been previously duly sworn and/or affirmed, resumes the witness stand and testifies as follows:)

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Pecker.
Welcome back.
I remind you that you're still under oath.
Get the jury, please.
COURT OFFICER: All rise.
Jury entering.
(Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors are present and properly seated.)

THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People v. Donald J. Trump.

All parties and all jurors are present.
THE COURT: Good morning, jurors.
Jurors, before we continue with the cross of
Mr. Pecker, I wanted to give you an instruction regarding yesterday's testimony.

You heard testimony yesterday about the prosecution speaking to Mr. Pecker about the case before the witness testified at this trial.

The law permits the prosecution or an attorney to speak to a witness about a case before the witness testifies and permits the prosecution or an attorney to review with the witness the questions that will or may be Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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Q That was my fault. There was some confusion in the questioning about what had been said and whether Hope Hicks came up.

Do you remember that?
A Yes.
Q I want to apologize and move on to another meeting
from that.
If I ask a bad question today, I think Mr. Steinglass will
tell me, but you can as well, and we'll make sure that I'm
clear.

A Thank you.
Q As I said, we were talking about Hope Hicks; right?
A Yes.
Q And you knew Ms. Hicks long before August of 2015; correct?

A I did.
Q She had worked at Hilpzik Strategies?
A She did.
Q That is a communication and strategy firm; correct?
A It is.
Q They did some work for AMI?
A Yes.
Q That's one of the ways you met Ms. Hicks; right?
A That's correct.
Q I think you said she did some work for Star Magazine? Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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A Yes.
Q Which was an AMI publication under your watch?
A Yes.
Q You testified on Tuesday that she also worked as
President Trump's Communications Director at some point?

A Yes.
Q So, what I was asking you about yesterday was your
testimony in response to Mr. Steinglass' questions about
whether Ms. Hicks was in that meeting in August of 2015; right?

A Yes. That's correct.
Q And to be fair, you said that -- on direct, that she
was in and out of the meeting; right?

A That's what I said.
Q It's not as if you suggested to the jury that she participated in the meeting; correct?

A That's correct.
Q And you did not suggest to the jury that you have a recollection of her speaking during the meeting; correct?

A That's absolutely correct.
Q Now, you testified in federal grand jury proceedings;
right?

A Yes.
Q And that was also in August of 2018; correct?
A Yes.
Q And it was about two weeks after the meeting that we Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter
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were talking about at the end of the day yesterday; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q August 13, 2018; does that sound right?
    A Yes.
    Q And there was a court order there; right?
    A Yes.
    Q Just like today?
    A Yes.
    Q And you were under oath; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Just like today?
    A Just like today.
    Q And do you recall being asked the question: "Did you
meet with Donald Trump and Michael Cohen, an employee of the
Trump Organization, at Trump Tower?"
    Do you recall that question?
    MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
    THE COURT: Sustained.
    Mr. Bove, if you are going to advise the witness
    to a particular portion of the transcript, please advise
    the prosecution so that they can turn to it.
        MR. BOVE: Yes.
        Mr. Bernik, for the Court the parties and Mr.
    Pecker, can we please bring up the document marked for
    identification as Exhibit A104. If we can go to Page 5.
    Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
        Senior Court Reporter
```

```
        Please and zoom in on Lines 17 through 19.
        (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screen of
        the witness and the parties, and the witness reviews the
        exhibit.)
    Q Sir, this is from your federal grand jury testimony;
correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you recall being asked this question?
    A Yes.
            MR. BOVE: If we could zoom out, please,
    Mr. Bernik, and turn to the next page, Page 6.
    Q Do you see at Lines 6 and 7, you were asked to tell
the grand jury what happened at this meeting?
    A Yes.
    Q When you were asked that question, you understood it
was in reference to the August }2015\mathrm{ meeting; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q And you answered the question, obviously; right?
    A Could I see the answer?
    Q Yes. Yes.
                            MR. BOVE: We can zoom out entirely, Mr. Bernik,
        and give Mr. Pecker an opportunity to review.
            (Whereupon, the witness reviews the exhibit on
        his screen.)
        A You said it was 6 and 7?
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
            Senior Court Reporter
```



Page 1345

Q During that testimony in August of 2018, you did not describe any specific statements made by Ms. Hicks; correct? MR. STEINGLASS: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained.

Q Let's talk a little bit about what was said during the August 2015 meeting.

You said on your direct that there was discussion about
Bill and Hillary Clinton; correct?

A Yes.
Q And at the time of this meeting, August 2015, the National Enquirer was already running stories about Bill and
Hillary Clinton; correct?

A Yes.
Q That was going on before the meeting; right?
A That's correct.
Q And that was because you had made a business decision
that it was good for the National Enquirer to run those
stories; correct?

A I did.
Q We talked about, yesterday, how you were going to the research meetings; right?

A Yes.
Q And looking at the data?
A Yes.
Q And thinking about what made sense from a business Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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A Yes.
Q Now, you testified on Tuesday that during this
August 2015 meeting, there was also a discussion about running
negative stories about President Trump's opponents; right?

A That's correct.
Q And you testified that there was discussion of that topic during the August 2015 meeting; do you remember that?

A Yes.
Q And three specific opponents, preliminary opponents came up; right?

A Yes.
Q Ben Carson; correct?
A Yes.
Q Marco Rubio; right?
A Right.
Q And Ted Cruz; correct?
A Yes.
Q And you were shown some exhibits by the Government that related to stories the National Enquirer ran about those three men; correct?

A That's correct.
Q There wasn't much new content in those stories; was there?

A I would have to reread the stories to answer that question.

Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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Q We'll take a look at the stories in a minute.
But, let me ask you this: It was standard operating

```
procedure for the National Enquirer to, sort of, recycle
```

content from other publications and frame it slightly
differently; correct?
A Correct.
Q That's cost effective?
A Correct.
Q Information from the public domain goes into the
National Enquirer. It's quick and easy.
Correct?
A Yes.
Q Good for business?
A Yes.
Q Consistent with your fiduciary obligations; correct?
A Yes.
Q And for at least some of the articles that you
testified about on Tuesday, that's exactly what you did; right?
A Yes.
Q There was already negative information in the public
domain about Ben Carson, and so you ran it in the National
Enquirer; right?

A Yes.
Q And because that was quick, and efficient, and
cost effective, you would have done that whether or not you had
Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
Senior Court Reporter
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discussed it with President Trump; correct?
    A Yes.
                            MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, if we could take a look at
        Government Exhibit 153A, please. This can be shown to the
        jury. This is in evidence.
            (Whereupon, the exhibit is shown on the screens.)
    Q Mr. Pecker, this is one of the exhibits we looked at
on Tuesday; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And there are five headlines here relating to Ben
Carson; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And there's some dates on the page. Do you see them?
    A Yes.
    Q And the date range is, basically, from what I can
tell, October 2015 to December of 2015; right?
    A Yes.
    Q So, you see that there's an article -- the top article
on this page relates to some kind of issue with a surgery
performed by Dr. Carson; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And in this timeframe, 2015, you were leading AMI;
right?
    A Yes.
    Q And you were familiar with what was going on with
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
                            Senior Court Reporter
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```
other publications; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q You had to be, right, in order to do your job?
    A Yes.
    Q And you had to be on top of what was in the public
domain at the time; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q You had to keep track of current events; right?
    A Yes.
    Q So, you knew, did you not, that in May 2015,
The Guardian published an article regarding several malpractice
suits against Dr. Carson; correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q And so, in May 2015, long before any of the articles
on this page, The Guardian had covered this issue; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And, in fact, The Guardian article referenced seven
malpractice claims against Dr. Carson; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And the article referenced on the top of the screen,
that's -- the child there, her name is Karly Bailey; right?
    A I don't remember her name.
                            MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, if we could, for Mr.
    Pecker, the parties and the Court, bring up what's been
    marked for identification as Defense Exhibit A133.
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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(Whereupon, the exhibit is shown on the witness' and the parties' screens.)

MR. BOVE: If you could turn to Page 3, please.
Q And I want to see, Mr. Pecker, if this refreshes your recollection about the name of the child.
(Whereupon, the witness reviews the exhibit on his screen.)

A Yes, it does.
Q What was her name?
A Karly Bailey.
MR. BOVE: We can take that down.
Thank you.
If we could bring back up People's 153A. That can be for everyone, please.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q That photograph on the top of a child is actually

```
recycled from The Guardian article; correct?
```

A Yes.
Q And so, there are four articles on this page that
relate to these medical malpractice claims; correct?

A Yes.

Q And all of them contain information that was recycled from a publication months earlier in The Guardian; right?

A That's correct.
Q And do you recall that in 2016, The Guardian website Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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had about 40 million unique users in the United States?
    A I don't recall that.
                            MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, can we please bring up a
        document marked for identification. This is just for the
        Court, the parties and Mr. Pecker. It's been marked for
        identification as A138.
                            (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the witness'
        screen and the parties' screens, and the witness reviews
        the exhibit on his screen.)
        A I don't see where it says 40 million.
            MR. BOVE: Can we turn to the next page, please?
            (Whereupon, the witness reviews the exhibit on
        his screen.)
        A Yeah. 40 million unique users.
            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            Move to strike his answer in terms of the base of
        his knowledge.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
            MR. BOVE: We can take that down, Mr. Bernik.
            Q Did that document refresh your recollection that, in
2016, The Guardian had about 40 million unique users on its
website?
                            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
        A I --
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
            Senior Court Reporter
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THE COURT: No. Don't answer the question. THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. BOVE: If we could bring up People's 153A, please. This is for everyone, please.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q You see the fourth headline on this page?
A Yes.
Q There's a reference to military service?
A Yes.
Q It's hard for me to see from here, but I think it's dated November 11, 2015?

A November 11th.
Q And do you recall, this is also a situation where the National Enquirer posted information that was already in the public domain?

A I don't recall this exact article. We're -- I don't recall exactly where the information was derived from this article.

Q Do you recall, five days earlier, Politico ran a headline: Exclusive: Carson claimed West Point scholarship but never applied?

A I don't recall.
MR. BOVE: If you could please bring up for the the parties, the witness, and the court the document marked A134. Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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```
been published about Mr. Rubio; correct?
    A I don't recall the book.
                            MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, if you could please bring
        up for the Court, Mr. Pecker, and the parties, a document
        marked for identification as Defense Exhibit A141.
            (Whereupon, a document is shown on the parties'
        screens.)
        Q Do you have that on your screen?
    A No.
    Q I can hand a copy up.
    A Okay.
                            (Whereupon, a document is given to the witness.)
                    MR. BOVE: If I could hand a copy up to the
        Court, as well.
            (Whereupon, a document is given to the Court.)
            THE COURT: Thank you.
            (Whereupon, the witness reviews the document.)
            Q Have you had a chance to look at that?
            A Yes.
            Q That was a copy of the National Enquirer article where
we saw the headline on the screen; right?
    A Yes. That's correct.
    Q Having reviewed that, does that refresh your
recollection that what was really going on in the article was
you were reviewing a book that had been published; right?
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
                        Senior Court Reporter
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A Correct.
Q So, it wasn't new information published; correct?
A That's correct.
Q Substantially, everything in the exhibits you were shown in 153A, 153B and 153C, what was going on was the
National Enquirer was recycling information from other
publications because it was cost effective and made business
sense?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You can answer.

A Yes.
Q And you talked about the National Enquirer relying on sources; right?

A Yes.
Q There was a source network of sorts; right?
A That's correct.
Q And one of the things that can be valuable to somebody in this industry is cultivating a network of sources; right?

A Yes.
Q So the people that work for you can draw on those sources to get sensitive details; right?

A Yes.
Q But, that's not what was happening with respect to the articles we just looked at; right?

Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
Senior Court Reporter
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Street Journal article relating to Karen McDougal; do you
remember that?
    A Yes.
    Q That was People's Exhibit 180; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q That article came out before the election, you said;
right?
    A Yes.
                    MR. BOVE: This is in evidence.
                    Can we bring that up, People's 180, please?
                    (Whereupon, the exhibit is shown on the screens.)
                    MR. BOVE: Can you zoom in on the top half,
        please.
    Q You see it? Above the headline, it says, "Election
2016;" right?
    A Yes.
    Q So, this is Wall Street Journal coverage prior to the
2 0 1 6 ~ e l e c t i o n ; ~ c o r r e c t ?
    A That is correct.
                            MR. BOVE: If we can go to Page 2 of the exhibit,
        please, and zoom in on the second to last paragraph.
            (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
    Q Do you see where it says "Since last year, the
    Enquirer has supported Mr. Trump's presidential bid, endorsing
    him and publishing negative articles about some of his
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
            Senior Court Reporter
```
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opponents"?
    A Yes, I see that.
    Q So, this was out there prior to the election; correct?
    A Yes.
        MR. BOVE: You can take that down.
        Thank you.
    Q I want to stick with the August }2015\mathrm{ meeting.
    Okay?
    A Yes.
    Q At that meeting, the concept of "catch and kill" was
not discussed; correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q And there was no discussion of a financial dimension
to any agreement at that meeting; correct?
    A Yes. That's correct.
    Q And you testified on Tuesday about a Source Agreement
with somebody named Dino Sajudin; do you remember that?
    A Yes, I do.
    Q You said you learned of Mr. Sajudin's false story in
about October of 2015?
    A That's correct.
    Q You testified on Tuesday that you never discussed this
story directly with President Trump; correct?
    A That is correct.
    Q And President Trump never paid you any money in
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
            Senior Court Reporter
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```
connection with that Sajudin story; right?
    A No, he did not.
    Q And Cohen didn't pay you any money, either; did he?
    A No.
    Q You testified Tuesday there was a Source Agreement
between AMI and Mr. Sajudin; right?
    A Yes.
                            MR. BOVE: That is People's Exhibit 154 in
    evidence, if we could bring that up.
                    (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
    Q This is that Source Agreement; correct?
    A Yes, it is.
    Q I think you said on Tuesday that this is a standard
AMI document; am I right?
    A Yes.
    Q A document that AMI used in connection with standard
operating procedures?
    A Yes.
    Q Yesterday, you said that AMI had entered into hundreds
of thousands of Source Agreements like this; correct?
    A Over the years, yes.
    Q Over decades; right?
    A Yes.
    Q Even before you were leading AMI; right?
    A Before. (Nods yes).
    Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
                            Senior Court Reporter
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| 1 | Page 1361 <br> MR. BOVE: Now, if you can please zoom in on the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | payment line. |
| 3 | Q So, I think you testified on Tuesday that the standard |
| 4 | time period for one of these agreements was 90 or 120 days? |
| 5 | A Yes. |
| 6 | Q And, here, somebody -- there's a blank in a template; |
| 7 | right? |
| 8 | You see where it says, "Exclusivity period"? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q And somebody filled in "three months" or 90 days? |
| 11 | A That's correct. |
| 12 | Q Do you see the payment line where it says, "Payable |
| 13 | upon publication as set forth below"? |
| 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q And so, there was no money due to Mr. Sajudin when |
| 16 | this agreement was signed; correct? |
| 17 | A That's correct. |
| 18 | Q And you believed that if this story was true, it was |
| 19 | worth a lot of money; right? |
| 20 | A Yes. |
| 21 | Q What I'm asking about now is your -- what was in your |
| 22 | mind in 2015 as this was happening. |
| 23 | Okay? |
| 24 | A I understand. |
| 25 | So, when it was reported to you that somebody was Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |
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saying the things that Mr. Sajudin was saying, you believed
that if those were true, it could be the biggest National
Enquirer article ever?
    A That is correct.
    Q And I think you testified about the Enquirer's
coverage of Elvis Presley's death; right?
    A Yes.
    Q I think, if I'm recollecting correctly, there were
about 6.5 million sales associated with the National Enquirer's
coverage of that death?
    A That is correct.
    Q And you thought that if this story was true,
Mr. Sajudin's claim was true, that it could sell 10 million
National Enquirers; right?
    A I did.
    Q So, if this story was true, you were gonna run it;
correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Because you had a fiduciary obligation to do that;
right?
    A That is correct.
    Q It would have made business sense, to put it mildly,
to run such an article if it was true; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And as soon as you heard the story about Mr. Sajudin,
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
                Senior Court Reporter
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you knew that to be the case; right?
    A I did.
    Q It took AMI a little bit of time to verify or try to
verify the story; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And I think you testified that it wasn't really
completed, you didn't have a firm sense of it until late
December 2015?
    A That's correct.
    Q So, several weeks, maybe a month, at least, after this
agreement was signed; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And at some point in the time between when this
agreement was signed and when the vetting process was
completed, Mr. Sajudin started to make threats; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q He was threatening to go someplace else; right?
    A That is correct.
    Q And that is why you decided to pay Mr. Sajudin
$30,000; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Because you could not have him taking his story to
another publication if it was true; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q It would be too great a loss to AMI to lose control of
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
                            Senior Court Reporter
```

```
such a story, if true; right?
```

A Yes.
MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, could you please publish
People's 155. This is also in evidence.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q So, this is the Amendment to that Source Agreement;
right?
A Yes, it is.
Q And this one is dated December 17, 2015.
Do you see that at the bottom?
A Yes.

Q And this agreement was entered into after Mr. Sajudin started to make those threats; correct?

A Yes.
Q And in exchange for $\$ 30,000$, Mr. Sajudin agreed to the exclusivity period in perpetuity; right?

A Yes.
Q This is where you bought the rights of the story forever?

A I did.
Q And that is because it was still possible, in your mind, when this agreement was signed, that the story was true?

A That's correct.
Q And you could not walk away from that possibility, however small it might be; right? Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR

Senior Court Reporter

A Yes.
Q Walking away from Mr. Sajudin's story would not make
business sense; right?

A $\quad$ No.
Q It would not have been your standard operating procedure; correct?

A No.
MR. BOVE: We can take that down.
Thank you.
Q I want to talk a little about about Ms. McDougal, if that's okay.

A Yes.
Q Just to be clear, President Trump did not pay you any money related to Karen McDougal; right?

A No.
Q Nor did Cohen; correct?
A Correct.
Q I want to focus on 2016, when there were negotiations relating to and involving Ms. McDougal.

Okay?
A Okay.
Q When you first learned about this story, you understood that Ms. McDougal did not want to publish it; correct?

A Yes.
Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
Senior Court Reporter

a weaker magazine, so we purchased it. The purchase was in 2002 .

Q One of those purchases that involved

```
Mr. Schwarzenegger in 2002, 2003?
```

A Yes.
Q Thank you for clarifying that.
I'm sorry about that.
Getting back to 2016, you understood that Ms. McDougal's main interest was not publishing the story; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you testified about a meeting that you had with one of your investor's offices in New Jersey; right?

A Yes.

Q You said that President Trump got through to you on the phone during that meeting?

A Yes.
Q Was that at Chatham Asset Management?
A Yes.
Q What was the presentation that day?
A I was reading the quarterly results, biannual results.
Q Somebody interrupts the meeting, that presentation, and says, "President Trump is on the phone;" right? MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.
A Didn't say "President" Trump. Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter

```
    Q You knew you had an important --
    A Yes.
    He said, "Donald Trump is on the phone."
    Q When you got on the phone, you knew that it was
President Trump; right?
                            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
                    THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q You talked to President Trump that day in connection
with the meeting; right?
                            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: What's your objection?
            MR. STEINGLASS: He wasn't "President" Trump in
            June of 2016.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
            MR. BOVE: If I could just have a moment, Judge?
    Q I just want to make sure we're talking about the same
meeting.
    Okay? Exclusive
    There was a meeting where you said you gave an investors'
presentation to; right?
    A Yes.
    Q During that meeting, you received a phone call; right?
    A Yes.
    Q Who was on the phone?
    A Donald Trump.
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
            Senior Court Reporter
```

Q When was the meeting?
A June of 2016.
Q And during that conversation, during that call, you discussed Karen McDougal; right?

A Yes.
Q And you told President Trump that Ms. McDougal did not want to publish the story; correct?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q What do you remember about the phone call?
A Mr. Trump called my -- my office in -- either it was in New York or Florida. And since $I$ was in Chatham, New Jersey, my assistant transferred the call to -- to Chatham.

And when the call came in, the assistant in the office -small office -- came over and asked me to come out, that Donald Trump was on the phone.

And when I spoke to Mr. Trump, he said that he wanted to know what was -- he asked me -- he said, "I spoke to Michael.

And I wanted to talk to you about Karen McDougal."
So, he said : Is it true that there's a Mexican group

```
that's looking to buy the story for $8 million?"
```

And I said, "No, I don't believe that's true."
Two, he said that -- that -- (pause) -- um -- (pause) -- I want to recollect it completely.

Q Thank you. Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR

Senior Court Reporter

```
    A He said that, um -- (pause) -- he normally -- oh. I
said that -- that, "This story about Karen, since she's
claiming that she has a relationship with you, should be taken
off the market."
    And Mr. Trump said, "I don't normally -- I don't buy
stories because it always gets out."
    And then I said, "I still think you should buy the story."
    And Mr. Trump said to me, "I'll speak to Michael, and he'll
get back to you."
    Q And so, as you sit here today, you remember that
during that conversation, you said to President Trump: It is my
understanding that she doesn't want her story published?
    A (Pause). Yes. I did. I remember saying that.
    Q And you testified about that --
    A Yes.
    Q -- at this trial; right?
    A Yes.
    Q On April 23rd?
    A Yes.
    I just wanted to make sure and remember.
    Q Yeah. I appreciate it. Sometimes it takes another
question.
    A That's correct.
    Q I want to talk a little bit about Chatham Asset
Management; okay?
    Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
                            Senior Court Reporter
```

```
                                    Page 1371
A Okay.
Q There was later a lawsuit involving Chatham, relating to some of those events in the Summer of 2016 ; right?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
A Can you clarify about with respect to lawsuits?
Q IPayments sued Chatham Asset Management; correct?
A The former chairman of iPayment, the company. Not the company itself.
Q And you were named as a defendant in that lawsuit;
right?
A Yes.
Q And the allegations that are at issue in the lawsuit were going on in that Summer of 2016 ; correct?
A Yes.
Q And you talked about the issues of iPayments with Cohen; right?
A I did.
Q And you also tried to get Cohen a job at iPayments; right?
A No.
I can clarify that.
Q Please.
A Michael Cohen pitched -- he requested for me a
position at iPayment. He was looking to become the new
    Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
        Senior Court Reporter
```

```
president, the new chairman, because the former chairman was
terminated.
    Q Did you talk to the chairman of iPayments about that?
    A No.
    I spoke to Chatham about it. And they had no interest in
Michael Cohen.
    Q Do you recall telling the Federal Government that the
chairman of iPayments did not want Cohen to take Pecker's
place?
    MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
            MR. BOVE: Judge, can we have a quick sidebar?
            THE COURT: Yes.
            MR. BOVE: Thank you.
            (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held
        at sidebar:)
        MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.
            I don't mean to be dense. I just want to make
        sure I'm following the objection right now.
        I asked if he recalled saying that. He said no.
        My next plan was to refresh his recollection that
        that was said.
        THE COURT: What's your objection?
        MR. STEINGLASS: It's two-fold.
        One, I think that was an improper impeachment
        Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
        Senior Court Reporter
```

|  | Page 1373 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | technique. |
| 2 | Second of all, it's more, basically, a relevance |
| 3 | objection. |
| 4 | What is the relevance of the fact that Michael |
| 5 | Cohen tried to get a job, that there was lawsuits |
| 6 | involving companies that have nothing to do with this? |
| 7 | MR. BOVE: The relevance is that Cohen and |
| 8 | Mr. Pecker were working together personally, separate and |
| 9 | apart from what President Trump was doing. |
| 10 | THE COURT: I'll allow it. |
| 11 | MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge. |
| 12 | (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held |
| 13 | in open court:) |
| 14 | (Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter Lisa Kramsky |
| 15 | relieves Senior Court Reporter Laurie Eisenberg, and the |
| 16 | transcript continues on the next page.) |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |


|  | Page 1374 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ******* |
| 2 | (The following proceedings are continued from |
| 3 | previous page.) |
| 4 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 5 | The objection is overruled. |
| 6 | ******* |
| 7 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 8 | BY MR. BOVE: |
| 9 | Q So before that break, we were talking about iPayments; |
| 10 | right? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q And my question had been: Did you and Mr. Cohen |
| 13 | discuss Cohen getting a job at iPayments; right? |
| 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q And you did discuss that with Cohen; correct? |
| 16 | A I did. |
| 17 | Q And I think you said, before the break, that you did |
| 18 | not discuss Cohen getting a job with iPayments, directly with |
| 19 | iPayments; right? |
| 20 | A That's correct. |
| 21 | Q And I think you said before that sidebar that you had |
| 22 | only discussed that with Chatham Asset Management; right? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q But do you recall telling the Federal Government that |
| 25 | the Chairman of iPayments did not want Cohen to take Pecker's |



```
Q You understood that the natural consequence of that publication would be to put a little pressure on him; right?
A Michael Cohen never said that to me.
Q My question is whether you understood that publishing photographs like that, even if it wasn't going to be harmful, could put a little pressure on President Trump; right?
A Yes.
MR. BOVE: And, Mr. Bernik, could we take a look at People's 156 in evidence.
(Displayed.)
**********
Q And this is the Agreement between AMI and Ms. McDougal from August of 2016 ; right?
A That's correct.
Q And this Agreement looks a little bit different in terms of formatting from the one with Mr. Sajudin; right?
A Yes.
MR. BOVE: And, Mr. Bernik, can you please zoom in on Paragraph 3.
(Displayed.)
*******
Q And you were asked some questions by Mr. Steinglass about this provision of the Agreement; right?
Do you remember that?
A Yes.
```



```
    Q And it created real obligations by AMI; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And you didn't tell the Federal Prosecutors that this
was a disguise; correct?
            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
            MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, could you please zoom in on
    Paragraph 1.
            (Displayed.)
            **********
    Q And, so, do you see at the start of this paragraph,
there is a reference to two years from the effective date?
    A Yes.
    Q And, so, that's basically a 24-month period on this
part of the Agreement?
    A That's correct.
    Q And AMI purchased the rights to use Ms. McDougal's name
and likeness in 24 columns in Star Magazine, if I have that
right?
    A Yes.
    Q And you also purchased the rights for 24 columns using
Ms. McDougal's name and likeness in OK! Magazine; right?
    A Yes.
    Q Four posts per month in Radar Online?
    A Yes.
```

Q That's 96 columns over two years; right?
A That's correct.
MR. BOVE: And if you could zoom in, please, now on Paragraph 2.
(Displayed.)

Q This relates to magazine covers; right?
A Yes.
Q And so these are other things that AMI purchased from Ms. McDougal in connection with this agreement; right?

A Yes.
Q And these were real obligations on the part of AMI; correct?

A Yes, they were.
Q And in exchange for all of these things, the columns, the block posts, the magazine covers, and the story rights, AMI agreed to pay Ms. McDougal $\$ 150,000$; right?

A That's correct.
Q But during the negotiations, Ms. McDougal was not focused on cash; was she?

A I'm sorry, could you repeat that again.
Q Ms. McDougal was not focused on cash during the negotiations; correct?

A Not focused on?
Q Cash. Money. Not focused on --

A Money? The cash amount wasn't a primary portion of the Agreement.

Q What Ms. McDougal was to focus on was the provisions in Paragraphs 1 and 2; right?

A Oh, for her, yes.
Q Because, as you said earlier this morning, she was
looking to restart her career; is that correct?

A Yes, that's right.
Q And she had started part of her career with then Men's Fitness; right?

A Yes.

Q And which was part of, at this point, in 2016, an AMI publication; right?

A That's right.
Q And you, at that point, viewed AMI as making a good relaunching point for Ms. McDougal; correct?

A It was all part of this Agreement.
Q And there was actually a video conference, a presentation to Ms. McDougal about the types of things that AMI could do for her; correct?

A It was a video conference; correct.
Q And during that video conference, the presentation touched on the promotion -- the promotional opportunities that Ms. McDougal was looking for; correct?

A Yes.

Q And that was in the end of June of 2016; right?
A That's correct.
Q And during that video conference, there was no

```
discussion of a monetary payment; correct?
```

A That's correct.
Q And AMI told Ms. McDougal that her promotion in AMI
magazines would be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars;
correct?

A Yes.
Q And nobody was lying to her; right?
A No.
Q And, in fact, AMI's publications ended up running more than 65 stories in Ms. McDougal's name; right?

A Yes.
Q When AMI signed this agreement, the one that's on the screen, you believed it had a legitimate business purpose; correct?

A I did.
MR. BOVE: You can take that down.
Thank you.
Can we now take a look at People's 158, which is in
evidence.
(Displayed.)
**********

Q Do you recall talking to Mr. Steinglass about this


```
Account, Department, and Operating Unit?
    A Yes.
    Q There were people at AMI and the accounting department
who completed that information; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q And they did that based on whatever invoice
Mr. Davidson sent; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q You didn't put those codes yourself?
    A No, I did not.
    Q You trusted people to do it accurately; right?
    A I did.
    Q And that was AMI's standard operating procedure?
    A Yes.
                    MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, can we please take a look
at Government Exhibit 159, which is also in evidence.
                        (Displayed.)
                        **********
            Q You testified about this one yesterday also?
            A I did.
            Q And I think you said that it is a general ledger detail
for the $150,000 transaction with Mr. Davidson?
    A That's correct.
    Q And, basically, the data from the document that we just
looked at, People's 158, feeds into a general ledger entry like
```



A Yes, that's correct.
Q Because those are the types of details that are hard to
keep track of for someone at your level; right?

A Yes.
Q And you had a whole department who was focused on
keeping track of those details?

A That's correct.
Q They had standard operating procedures; right?
A Yes.
Q And you trusted their work?
A Yes.
MR. BOVE: Can we take a look at People's
Exhibit 160, please.
(Displayed.)
**********

MR. BOVE: I'm sorry. I think it's 161.
(Displayed.)
**********

MR. BOVE: Let me correct myself for one minute.
It's my fault.
People's Exhibit 160, Page 2.
Q You remember this from yesterday; right?
A Yes.
Q And there is some handwriting on this document. Do you see that?


A Yes.

Q And you were comfortable that they were following
procedures in 2016; right?

A Yes.
Q And there are no false entries in any of these records; are there?

A No.
MR. BOVE: You can take that down, please.
Q And if we go back now to People's 156 in evidence. This is the agreement with Ms. McDougal.
(Displayed.)
********

Q You testified that you consulted a campaign attorney about this agreement; right?

A Yes.
Q And you also said that you consulted AMI's general

```
counsel; correct?
```

A Yes.
Q And I think you testified on direct that you told Michael Cohen the agreement was, quote, "Bulletproof?"

A Yes.
Q And that is a term that you used to convey that there is no legal ramifications; right?

A That's correct.
Q That's what you said when -- that's what you meant when



```
networks to use attorneys as sources of information about their
clients?
    A I would say that this was a unique situation.
    Q Mr. Davidson was a unique situation; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And you are a sophisticated guy; right?
    A Yes.
    Q We can agree, you've had lawyers before; right?
    A Yes.
    Q We just talked about some of them; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And you had lawyers and you had meetings with the
Government; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And you also worked with lawyers in situations that
```

were less stressful?
A Yes.
Q On deals when you were making money; right?
A Right.
Q And, generally speaking, you expected your lawyers not
to provide information to third parties about what you discussed
with them; correct?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q You expected confidentiality from your attorneys;

```
correct?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q So you said that Mr. Davidson was the only situation
that AMI had where there was an attorney being used as a source;
right?
    A Not the only one. I don't know of other ones, but I'm
sure there have been.
    Q So you don't know if there were any others, other than
Mr. Davidson?
    A The only one that I know of was -- is Mr. Davidson.
    Q Mr. Davidson knew Michael Cohen too; right?
    A I found out that, yes, he did. I subsequently found
that out afterwards.
    Q When you say "afterwards," when did you learn that?
    A It was probably right, previously before we signed the
Karen McDougal Agreement. So probably it was around August 5th
or 6th.
    Q How did --
    A The Agreement was signed in June.
    Q I'm sorry?
    A No, I'm saying the first time I heard -- I heard Keith
Davidson's name was June 20th.
    The time -- to answer your question, the time that I heard
about that he knew Michael Cohen, I didn't know that until
```

```
around the end of July or early August.
    Q So, in June 2016, you learned that Dylan Howard was
using an attorney as a major source of information for National
Enquirer articles; correct?
    A I wouldn't classify him as a major attorney.
        (Laughter from the audience.)
    Q Exactly.
    What I am getting at is whether Mr. Davidson was a major
source for Dylan Howard?
    A We had hundreds of sources.
    He was one of many.
    Q You recall testifying in the Grand Jury with the
District Attorney; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q That was in 2023; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And just like in the Federal Grand Jury, you were under
oath; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q There was a court reporter there taking down your
questions and your answers; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And do you recall describing during your testimony
Mr. Davidson as one of your two major sources?
```

|  | Page 1393 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A One of two major sources for Dylan Howard. |
| 2 | Q So -- |
| 3 | A Not -- and Dylan Howard is one editor of fifty -- he's |
| 4 | the Editor-in-Chief, but there are fifty several other -- let me |
| 5 | put it this way, several other editors all have their own |
| 6 | sources. |
| 7 | I don't know, when you take it down to those levels, that |
| 8 | how many of them were attorneys, how many of them -- how many |
| 9 | times have they used that, you -- I don't know that, I only |
| 10 | heard that from Dylan. |
| 11 | Q I understand -- |
| 12 | A And that's what I was answering to. |
| 13 | Q I appreciate the clarification, and I think that's |
| 14 | fair. I'm not trying to stretch it. |
| 15 | A No, no, no. I'm just trying to explain it. |
| 16 | Q I appreciate that. |
| 17 | And so Davidson was one of Dylan Howard's major sources, |
| 18 | that's my point? |
| 19 | A That's correct. |
| 20 | Q And he was also friends with Cohen; correct? |
| 21 | A Yes. |
| 22 | Q And you didn't learn that, that Cohen-Davidson |
| 23 | connection until right before the Agreement was signed; right? |
| 24 | A That's correct. |
| 25 | Q And you don't know what Cohen and Davidson were working |

```
on the side; do you?
    A I don't.
                    MR. BOVE: Can we take a look at People's 161 in
    evidence, please.
        (Displayed.)
    Q This is that invoice that we've looked at a couple of
times; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And this is not an AMI record; is it?
    A No, it's not.
    Q And do you recall some questions on Tuesday about a
thumb drive?
    A Yes.
    Q Mr. Steinglass brought you a thumb drive and he asked
you questions about documents on the thumb drive; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And you said: "There are documents on this drive that
I've reviewed," correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And you said that these were all AMI records; correct?
            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q You testified on Tuesday that each document on the
thumb drive was -- it was part of the business of AMI to make
```

```
and keep these records; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q And that was a mistake with respect to this one; right?
            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
        THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q You just said this is not an AMI record; correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q This is one of the documents that Mr. Rotstein
prepared; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And he was not an employee when he prepared the
invoice; right?
    A No.
    Q And do you remember testifying yesterday that you saw
this document around the time that it was prepared?
    A Yes.
    Q And that was a mistake too; right?
    A Can you clarify that?
    Q You didn't actually see this document in 2016; did
you?
    A I saw the document when it -- when Rotstein was sending
it over for the billing to Cohen.
    Q In 2016?
    A I signed the -- I signed the original Agreement and
then subsequently the invoice was sent over so I would have seen
```

```
the invoice.
    Q Do you remember having a meeting in 2019 with the
District Attorney's office?
    A Yes.
    Q It was a long meeting; right?
    A Yes.
    Q There were many questions; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And there were many Prosecutors; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q It was a full room that day; right?
    A Yes.
    Q You had your lawyers there too; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And on the Prosecution side, do you remember that
somebody was typing?
    A Yes.
    Q Maybe more than one person; right?
    A I don't remember that. I remember one person.
    Q One person was typing a lot; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you recall that during that meeting, you told the
Prosecutors that: "The first time I saw this document was
probably in 2017 when we were going through the document
production for SDNY."
```

Do you recall that?
A Can I trouble you? Could I see that?
Q Yes.

MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, this is for the party's,
Mr. Pecker and the Court, please.
Defense A108.
(Shown to the witness.)
*******
Q And, so, I want to start just by orienting you to look at the top, just the date and the participants.
(Pause.)
**********

A Yes. I can see the top. I reviewed the top. MR. BOVE: And, now, if we could go to the page with Bates ending 061.

A Yes.
MR. BOVE: And zoom in on the top half, please. (Displayed.)

Q And do you see the question says: "Why was it called a

```
flat fee for advisory services by somebody named Walsh?"
```

A Yes.
Q And so that's a phrase from the invoice; right?
A Yes, it is.
Q And so at this part of the meeting you're being asked

```
about the invoice; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And do you see at the top of the page where you said:
"No, not in 2016. First time I saw this document was probably
in 2017, when we were going through the document production for
SDNY?"
    A Well, now seeing this, I clarified it too. This
statement is correct.
    Q The statement in 2019 is correct?
    A The statement in 2019 is correct.
    Q Thank you.
    A That was the first time.
    Q And just so the record is clear, the mistake that was
made is that you testified yesterday that you saw the invoice in
2016; right?
    A Yes. I made an error. I would have seen it when --
what it says here.
    MR. BOVE: We can take that down, please.
            And if we could bring up People's 180 in evidence.
                (Displayed.)
            **********
    Q And I'm -- this is the Wall Street Journal article that
we looked at earlier; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And it relates to Ms. McDougal; correct?
```





```
Ms. Daniels had not been paid; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And it's true, isn't it, that Keith Davidson is in the
middle once again?
    A Yes.
    Q Mr. Howard was using an attorney as a source, who was
providing information from his client to the National
Enquirer -- well, to Dylan Howard?
    A To Dylan Howard; that's correct.
    Q Not to AMI, because you had not authorized Dylan Howard
to be speaking with Davidson; correct?
        MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q I will break that up.
    You did not authorize Dylan Howard to speak to Keith
Davidson about Stormy Daniels; correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q So anything that Dylan Howard was doing with respect
to Stormy Daniels was unauthorized and outside of his
employment?
                MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
                    THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q When Mr. Howard came back to you on the Stormy Daniels
story, what he said was Michael Cohen has not paid Keith
Davidson; right?
```




| Page 1405 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A | Yes. |
| 2 | Q | And I think you said that on that day, January 6th, |
| 3 | 2017, you were let into President Trump's office? |  |
| 4 | A | Yes. |
| 5 |  | By Ms. Graff, Rhona Graff? |
| 6 | A | Yes. |
| 7 |  | And that when you walked in, President Trump was |
| 8 | sitting at his desk; right? |  |
| 9 | A | Yes. |
| 10 |  | And there was some people gathered around him; right? |
| 11 | A | Correct. |
| 12 |  | And what he said was -- they were discussing the Fort |
| 13 | Lauderdale shooting; right? |  |
| 14 | A | Yes. |
| 15 |  | And you heard some of that conversation; right? |
| 16 | A | Yes. |
| 17 |  | And some of the people who were -- who you said were |
| 18 | there that day, Reince Priebus? |  |
| 19 | A | Yes. |
| 20 | Q | He had been named the White House Chief of Staff in |
| 21 | about November of 2016; right? |  |
| 22 | A | Yes. |
| 23 |  | And you testified you saw Mike Pompeo standing around |
| 24 | President Trump's desk that day; right? |  |
| 25 | A | Yes. |



```
people were talking.
    Q And I think you said that there was a sort of a joke
made by President Trump about you knowing more about the
Fort Lauderdale situation than the other people in the room?
    A I don't think he was referring to Fort Lauderdale, it
was a joke just saying that I knew more about all of -- about
information; that's all he was referring to as a joke.
    Q Okay. And you know that following that meeting,
there were some issues between President Trump and Jim Comey;
right?
                            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
                    THE COURT: Sustained.
                    MR. BOVE: Your Honor, can we have a side bar,
    please?
                    THE COURT: Sure.
        (At Side Bar.)
    ******
            THE COURT: I want to hear what the objection is.
            MR. STEINGLASS: I'm finding it hard to see what
        the relevance is.
            MR. BOVE: I want to lay a foundation so I can
        ask -- can we do this out of the presence of the witness,
        Judge?
            THE COURT: Is it possible to slide over this way?
            THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, your Honor.
```

| 1 | MR. BOVE: I intend to lay a foundation, Judge, 1408 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | that Mr. Pecker was well aware of events surrounding |
| 3 | Mr. Comey. |
| 4 | He was well aware of the subsequent investigations |
| 5 | at issue and that connection with this investigation, |
| 6 | Mr. Comey made emphatically clear that on January 26 th, |
| 7 | 2017, was at Trump Tower with a classified briefing in an |
| 8 | individual meeting in a conference room and not at his desk |
| 9 | and that there was a very intense conversation. |
| 10 | And the point of that cross is to illustrate that |
| 11 | the witness has misremembered what he saw that day when he |
| 12 | talked about Jim Comey, because there was nothing to talk |
| 13 | about regarding Fort Lauderdale. |
| 14 | THE COURT: That's an awful lot of information to |
| 15 | bring out just to get to the point that he misremembered |
| 16 | something. |
| 17 | MR. BOVE: This witness is a critical witness, and |
| 18 | his memory -- |
| 19 | THE COURT: I think you are doing a good job with |
| 20 | his memory. |
| 21 | I don't think you need to go there. |
| 22 | (Side bar concluded.) |
| 23 | ******* |
| 24 | THE COURT: The objection is sustained. |
| 25 | MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, can we just take a look at |



THE COURT: Why can't you just asked the question. MR. BOVE: But $I$ want to make my point.

THE COURT: Just ask the question.
If he doesn't remember, then you can put that up,
all right.
MR. BOVE: All right. I understand. (Side bar concluded.)
*******

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BOVE:

Q So you recall being asked some questions about this meeting yesterday by Mr. Steinglass; right?

A Yes.
Q And when $I$ say "this meeting," I mean the meeting on January 6th of 2017; correct?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall that you testified that President
Trump said to you: "I want to thank you for handling the
McDougal situation."

Do you recall that?
A Yes.
Q And you said that yesterday; right?
A Yes.
Q And do you recall testifying -- and then you said:

```
"This is referring to President Trump;" right?
    A Yes.
    Q Quote, "I want to -- he also said, I want to thank you
for the doorman story, the doorman situation;" right?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you recall saying that yesterday?
    A I did.
    Q Was that another mistake?
    A No.
    Q And so do you believe that President Trump said that to
you, as you sit here right now?
    A Yes, I do.
    Q We talked a couple of times about meetings you had with
Federal Prosecutors on July 26th, 2018; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And we talked about the circumstances, there were
Federal Prosecutors and FBI agents; right?
    A Yes.
    Q And they told you it was important to tell the truth;
correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And you understood that not telling the truth could be
a crime; right?
    A Yes.
    Q It was serious business; right?
```



A I see July 31st there, at the bottom.
Q That's on the right side.
Do you see that's "date drafted."
On the left side you see "investigation on?"
A Oh. July $26 t h$.
Q And that was the date of the interview; right?
A This is the interview.
Q And this is the interview, you see your name in the top

```
left?
```

A Yes.
Q And do you recognize that address as the Federal

```
Prosecutor's address?
```

A Yes.
Q And so if you take a look at Page 20 of Defense Exhibit A101, please.

MR. BOVE: And zoom in on the top half when you
get there.
(Displayed.)

Q And so you were -- this is -- well, take a look and let me know when you've had a chance to read it.
(Pause.)
**********
Q Did you have a chance to look at it?
A You wanted to know if this is the meeting? Is that

```
what you were saying?
    Q Right. If you look at the top paragraph, you see that
this is a portion of the interview where you were discussing
that January 6th, }2017\mathrm{ meeting; right?
A Yes.
Q And take a look at the last paragraph on the screen.
Do you see that?
                                    (Pause.)
                                    *******
    Q And so I want to direct your attention to the paragraph
that says "Trump then asked Pecker."
    Do you see that?
    A Yes.
    Q And do you see the last sentence of that paragraph?
    A Now?
    Q Yes?
    A I was just saying, this is the FBI's interview; is that
correct?
    Is that what this is?
    Q This is the same document that -- the first page I just
showed you, the report of the July 26th, 2018 interview by
Federal Prosecutors and the FBI; right?
    A So the FBI -- these are the FBI notes?
    Q Yes.
    A Yes. So the FBI notes here -- what somebody is writing
```

```
down could be wrong.
    This is not -- I know what I testified to.
    Q Yesterday?
    A Yesterday.
    Q Uh-huh.
    A And I know what I remember. This is going back to
2018. I didn't recall back from -- what I'm saying here is
that--
    (Pause.)
    -- during the FBI investigation, I know what I said
yesterday happened, so I can't reconcile what the FBI interview
was -- if someone made a mistake or not.
    Q So you can't reconcile because what you said yesterday
is inconsistent with what's in this report; correct?
    A Yes, but I wouldn't be responsible for this report.
    Q I understand.
    And so are you suggesting that the FBI made a mistake
here?
    A I know what the truth is. I'm not -- I can't state
what the -- what's here, why this was written this way. I know
exactly what was said to me.
    Q And so your testimony yesterday is inconsistent with
what's written there?
    MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
    THE COURT: Overruled.
```

A Can you repeat what you want -- what you asked me again?

I'm sorry.
Q I'm just trying to make sure that $I$ understand it. And
I'm not trying to put you on the spot.

THE COURT: Maybe if you could rephrase the question.

MR. BOVE: Yes.
Q Your testimony yesterday is inconsistent with what's written in that report; right?

A Yes.
MR. BOVE: Judge, I have a couple more topics.
I don't know if there is a mid morning break
planned.
THE COURT: Sure. All right.
Jurors, let's go ahead and take our mid morning
recess.
I will see you in about 15 minutes. Can you step out.

THE COURT OFFICER: Leave your note pads on the chairs.

All rise.
(Jury exits.)
**********

THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat.

(Continued from the previous page.)
THE CLERK: Continued case on trial, People
versus Donald J. Trump. Parties are present.
THE COURT: Let's get the witness, please. COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.
(Whereupon, the witness entered the courtroom and was properly seated).

SERGEANT: All rise. Jury entering.
(Whereupon, the jury entered the courtroom and were properly seated.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.
THE CLERK: Case on trial continued, People
versus Donald J. Trump. All parties and jurors are present.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove.
MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.
CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOVE:
Q Mr. Pecker, I think you testified yesterday that in early 2018 FBI agents came to you?

A Yes.
Q Can you describe what happened?
A They came to my home. It was April 9th of 2018, and they gave me a search warrant, and they took my phone.

Q What time did they come?

| 1 |  | Page 1419 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | Around, I think was it like 8:00 in the morning. |
| 2 | Q | How many agents? |
| 3 | A | There was three. |
| 4 | Q | And you said they searched your house? |
| 5 | A | No. |
| 6 | Q | Just your phone? |
| 7 | A | Yes, just my phone. |
| 8 | Q | How many times did you meet with the agents after |
| 9 that? |  |  |
| 10 | A | I don't remember the exact number of times. |
| 11 | Q | But more than once, right? |
| 12 | A | Yes. |
| 13 | Q | And these were stressful meetings, right? |
| 14 | A | I was with my attorneys. I felt good. |
| 15 | Q | You wanted it over with though, correct? |
| 16 | A | Yes. |
| 17 | Q | And eventually AMI entered into a non-prosecution |
| 18 agreement with the Federal government, correct? |  |  |
| 19 | A | Yes, they did. |
| 20 | Q | And you testified a little bit about that yesterday, |
| 21 right? |  |  |
| 22 | A | I did. |
| 23 | Q | Mr. Bernik, if we can please bring up People's 182 |
| 24 which is in evidence. |  |  |
| 25 |  | This is the non-prosecution agreement, correct? |
|  |  | Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter |



A Yes.
Q At the time of that proposed deal you were still an AMI executive, right?

A Yes.
Q And just to clarify, when $I$ say, at the time of the proposed deal, I mean in September of 2018. Do I have that date, right?

A I don't remember the exact date that we were negotiating or that we had a proposed transaction with Hudson News.

Q Do you recall that you told the District Attorney's Office that the funds on that deal were in escrow at the time this agreement was entered into?

A That was in the -- that was -- the conversations with the District Attorney was in 2018.

Q One of them, correct, the meeting where we looked at the notes before the break, right?

A I was saying 2019 we had the meeting, yes.
Q And during that meeting, you told the District Attorney's Office that when this agreement was signed the funds were in escrow?

A For -- at 2018? I am a little bit confused here about the years.

Q Let me ask it this way, were the funds in escrow at the time this agreement was signed?

## Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

A $\quad$ No.
Q Were there negotiations ongoing?
A Yes.
Q And the deal was worth about a hundred million dollars, right?

A That was the proposed deal.
Q And you knew that to consummate that deal, to finalize
it, you had to clear up the investigation, correct?

A Yes. Yes, that's correct.
Q And that was ultimately written into the deal papers, that the investigations had to be resolved before the hundred million, approximately, could be taken out of escrow and a
transaction finalized, correct?

A That's correct.
Q So, in addition to the unpleasantness of sitting with the FBI, that put some pressure on the negotiations, right? MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer.
A From the timing standpoint, it would have added on to the -- to the stress of the transaction.

Q Meaning, if $I$ understood it right, that the Federal investigation had to get resolved before the deal could go through, correct?

A The -- the reason why $I$ am thinking is because the transaction could have closed subject to the investigation

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

```
being completed.
    Q The transaction could close subject to the
investigation being completed, and at that point, the funds
removed from escrow, right?
    A It would have closed.
    Q You said that it created a timing dimension to AMI's
negotiations with the Federal government?
    A It didn't have to. There was no pressure about
finalizing the agreement, this agreement and the transaction,
other than the transaction was subject to when that the deal
was going to be finalized.
    There was no drop dead date is what I am saying that
it had to be done by a certain time.
    Q Understood. And it created a little pressure on the
negotiations, correct?
    A Price -- it wasn't a -- there wasn't price pressure on
it.
    Q Well, AMI's assets are worth less to Hudson News Group
if AMI is subject to a Federal investigation, correct?
    A To Hudson News it was -- the Federal investigation is
not going to reduce the earnings of the company, the earnings
of those magazines.
    Q If that investigation is resolved in a way that's
favorable to AMI, right?
    A I would say just resolved.
```



```
admitted to a campaign violation? Do you remember saying that?
    A Yes.
    Q And that was just another mistake, right?
        MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
        THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q That wasn't accurate, correct?
        THE COURT: You can answer.
    A Can you repeat the question, again, please?
    Q I am going to back up on it. So you testified
yesterday, did you not, we admitted to a campaign violation?
    A Yes.
    Q And when you said that yesterday, you were referring
to this agreement, weren't you?
    A Yes.
    Q And this agreement is the entire agreement between AMI
and the Federal government, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And there is no violation in this agreement, correct?
    A In this agreement, no.
    Q That's why it's called a, non-prosecution agreement,
right?
    A Yes.
    Q Because if everybody does what they are supposed to do
under this agreement nobody is getting prosecuted?
    A Yes.
```

Q And Mr. Bernik, if we can zoom in on the first full paragraph, please, and highlight the phrase, will not
criminally prosecute American Media Inc.
Do you see that, Mr. Pecker?
A Yes, I do.
Q And you were the Chairman and CEO and President of AMI
at the time this agreement was executed, right?
A Yes.
Q And this is the main benefit to the AMI agreement,
correct?
A Yes.
Q The Federal government will not prosecute AMI, right?
A Yes.
Q So there is no admission in this agreement of any kind
of campaign violation by AMI, right.
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled. If you know.
You can answer if you know.
A Could you we repeat that again?
Q Yes. There is no admission by AMI in this agreement
of a campaign violation, correct?
A No.
Q And if we can zoom out, please, Mr. Bernik.
Mr. Pecker, just to be clear, you were on the Board of
Directors at the time this agreement was signed?

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

A Yes, I was.
Q If we can zoom into the bottom part of the first paragraph.

Could you just read that for us, Mr. Pecker?
A AMI accepts and acknowledges as true the facts set forth in the statement of facts. Counsel for AMI hereby
represents and warrants that the Board of Directors has
authorized counsel to enter into this agreement.

Q So, as the CEO of AMI, you reviewed this agreement, right?

A Yes.
Q And also in your capacity as a member of the Board of Directors you reviewed this agreement, correct?

A Yes.
Q And I don't want to get into the substance of communications with attorneys, but you consulted attorneys about this agreement, right?

A Yes.
Q And you looked at it carefully, correct?
A Yes.
Q And now, Mr. Bernik, if you can zoom in on the carry-over paragraph on the second page. And so, this language refers to the time period of the agreement, right?

A Yes.

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA
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Q And so, this agreement is still active, correct?
A It was signed in September of '18. So, it -- the agreement was for three years.

Q Well, do you see the second entry that, the date on which all prosecutions arising out of the conduct described in
the opening paragraph of this agreement are final?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.

Q What is your understanding of what that means?
A I am not sure I understand what I am being asked.
Q My question is, what is your understanding of what the language that's highlighted on the screen means?

A Don't I have to look at one first?
Q That's fine. Yes, I can and hand you a copy.
A It says for a period of three years from the start of this agreement.

And it says, the date on which all prosecution arising out of the conduct described in the opening paragraph of the agreement are final. I don't understand.

Q Do you remember yesterday answering questions about the provisions in the U.S. Code by Mr. Steinglass?

A Yes.
Q And those were hard questions because you weren't sure what those provisions meant, right?

A Yes.

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

```
    Q I am not going to make this a law school exam either.
I am sorry. Let's look at -- Mr. Bernik, if you can zoom in on
the next paragraph on the page.
    Can you read to yourself that first sentence?
    A That the agreement can be resigned?
    Q Do you see the phrase, false, incomplete or misleading
testimony or information?
    A Yeah.
    Q So, basically, this paragraph gives the Federal
government some options if they determine that AMI, or its
representatives, have given false, incomplete or misleading
testimony or information, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q If we can zoom in on the bottom paragraph of this
page. So that first sentence refers to the period from the
date of the agreement until November 6, 2018. Do you see that?
    A Yes, I do.
    Q There was, basically, a period of time where the
parties agreed to keep the agreement to some extent secret?
    A Yes, that's correct.
    Q And the purpose of this provision was to give AMI an
opportunity to coordinate credit coverage arising -- relating
to the announcement of this agreement, right?
    A When you say, credit coverage.
    Q To negotiate with financial institutions.
```
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```
    A You -- you mean about notifying them?
    Q Well, do you remember?
    A Well, that's the thing. When you -- I am a little
confused when you say about credit coverage.
    Q Let's look to the next page, and please zoom in on the
text.
    Do you see the reference to AMI's underwriters,
auditors or insurers for the limited purpose of negotiations
regarding credit decisions?
    A Yes, it was -- it was -- it advised them of the
agreement.
    Q To give AMI an opportunity to protect itself
financially when this was announced, right?
    A Yes.
    Q And as CEO of AMI, did that happen? Did AMI make
those communications and notifications?
    A Yes, we did.
    Q You notified insurers and underwriters, correct?
    A Yeah.
    Q And those notifications provided a copy of this
agreement, right?
    A I wouldn't know if the agreement was shared with them.
    Q But the substance of the agreement was disclosed,
right?
    A Yes.
```
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```
Q And in connection with those disclosures, it was
represented to the financial institutions that the agreement
was factually accurate, right?
    A Yes.
    Q Because you know from your experience that in order
for the financial institutions to make credit decisions they
need to have the complete information about the issue, right?
    A That's correct.
    Q And so, you testified yesterday about a statement of
facts attached to this agreement, right?
    A Yes.
    Q And if we can take a look at the next page, please.
    And this is that statement of facts, right?
    A Yes.
    Q And it was incorporated into the agreement, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q It was something that you approved as the CEO of AMI,
right?
    A Yes.
    Q And it was something that as a member of the Board of
Directors you reviewed and approved as indicated in the
agreement itself, right?
```

    A Yes.
    Q Can we zoom in on paragraph three, please?
            Now, you testified earlier this morning about the
    ```
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```
August 2015 meeting. Do you remember that testimony?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember that you confirmed that during the August 2015 meeting there was no discussion on catch and kill, correct?
```

A Yes.
Q And during the August 2015 meeting there was no discussion of a financial component to any agreement with President Trump and Michael Cohen, correct?

A There was a discussion about that I was going to be the eyes and ears of the campaign. And there was a discussion that I would be notifying Michael Cohen of any women that were in the process of or going to be selling stories. And I would notify Cohen that they would be available, and they would either have to buy them or take them off the market or kill them in some manner.

Q Are you testifying now that there was a discussion of the kill agreement?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
A I said, sell a story.
Q I would like to go back for a moment to the October 2019 meeting that we discussed a few times today, the meeting you had at the District Attorney's Office.

A Yes.

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

Q Do you recall that this provision of the agreement was discussed during that meeting?

A The August '15, the August meeting you are saying?
Q Let me back up and ask a better question.
Do you recall that paragraph three of the agreement that's on the screen was discussed during the October 2019 meeting?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall that your attorneys told the District Attorney's Office in your presence --

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection, Judge. Objection.
THE COURT: Approach.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the record.)

MR. STEINGLASS: So, he is trying to impeach the witness by what the attorney told the DA's Office. I think that's totally improper.

MR. BOVE: Judge, first of all, the attorneys are his agents, speaking in his presence, on his behalf in a meeting. And just the fact that he is aware of what they said on this issue, they said to the District Attorney's Office, this provision is inaccurate.

So, it's -- in addition, I will lay a foundation that no one reported this to the Federal government. That they had taken the position with the District Attorney's

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

Office that the Federal non-prosecution agreement was inaccurate.

He has already said that he verified that it was accurate. So, their decision not to inform the Federal authorities converted a significant benefit to Mr. Pecker.

So, on both those grounds these are entirely appropriate. It happened in front of the witness. He is aware of --

THE COURT: And it is completely admissible.
MR. STEINGLASS: I will say two things to that:
Number one, it's unbelievably confusing. I am not sure what sense the jury will make of that.

Number two, I am not sure what the relevance of this is other than, you know, we have confirmed that the attorney was mistaken in this recollection.

THE COURT: The issue as $I$ am hearing you describe it is that $I$ am confused. And if I am confused, I imagine that the jury is going to be confused.

So, if you can get to this in some other way, I will allow you to; but the way to go about it, I don't think this helps us to get to it.

MR. BOVE: What I would ask permission to do, Judge, is finish the question that $I$ was asking which is whether at the October 2019 meeting his attorneys told the prosecutors that the agreement was inaccurate.

THE COURT: And leave it at that.
MR. BOVE: No. Then I would confirm that to his knowledge that it was never conveyed to the Federal government.

THE COURT: You can finish your argument. Go ahead.

MR. BOVE: It is a very significant benefit conferred on him by the District Attorney's Office and it's -- and, please, I think you know, this is the first cross-examination as a defense lawyer I have ever done.

Please do not hold my shortcomings in the way I am forming questions against President Trump. This is right at the core of what we are doing to impeach Mr. Pecker.

THE COURT: Two things: One, you are doing a very good job.

Two, that you may be doing a bad job in your opinion is of no consequence.

Whoever the defendant is, whatever the position the defendant is running for and whoever represents him, you are all being well-compensated to come here and do a great job. To tell me not to hold it against your youth suggests that $I$ shouldn't enforce the rules of evidence and I am not going to do that.

I will allow you to ask those two questions and
that's it. Beyond that, it will just get confusing.
MR. BOVE: So I don't overstep, I can ask if he is aware that his attorneys argued in this meeting that the agreement was inaccurate?

THE COURT: Now, are you saying that he was
there?

MR. BOVE: Yes, and I would ask permission, if he doesn't remember, to refresh him.

THE COURT: Just ask him, and then follow up with the second question.

MR. BOVE: That to his knowledge this was never conveyed to SDNY?

THE COURT: Yes, and leave it at that. MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the following occurred in open court.)

BY MR. BOVE:

Q Thank you. Mr. Pecker, so before the side-bar we were talking about the October 2019 meeting, right?

A Yes.
Q And I think we can put the non-prosecution agreement back on the screen, please.

And I think before the side-bar you said that this provision, paragraph three, was discussed during that meeting, right?
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A Yes.
Q And your lawyers were there, right?
A Yes.

Q Some of the same lawyers here in the courtroom today, correct?

A Yes.

Q During that conversation about paragraph three, do you recall that your attorneys said to the District Attorney's
Office that part of paragraph three is, quote, wrong and
inaccurate? Do you remember that?

A No.

Q Mr. Bernik, if we can show just the parties and Mr. Pecker and the Court Defendant's A108. Let's start with the first page just to get oriented.

Do you see that these are the notes from the October
25th?

A Yes.
Q And you testified earlier about somebody in the meeting typing everything down, right?

A Yes.
Q And if we can now look at the page ending 047.
A Yes.
Q And if we zoom in on the first half, please. And I want you to read this and then let me know when you are done and I have a question or two.
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And does that refresh your recollection that paragraph three of the non-prosecution agreement was discussed in this
meeting?

A Yes.
Q You can see that at the top, right?
A Yes.
Q And the next entry is a statement by one of your

```
attorneys, correct?
```

A Yes.
Q And does that refresh your recollection that the attorney said in response to a question about paragraph three, I think that may be inaccurate. I think that came up with the Feds. I have never heard Pecker say that?

Does that refresh your recollection that that was said during the meeting?

A No. And I would like to clarify it, if I can.
Q Okay.
A The only wording here is the word, purchasing, selling stories.

Q Meaning?
A Meaning my -- the testimony that $I$ gave, and what $I$ said was, I offered at that meeting that being the eyes and ears and hearing any stories that are there, I would offer -that women would be selling them and $I$ would be offering them to Michael Cohen. That's what I said.
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So, the selling here and purchasing, basically, are synonymous. Somebody has to buy them.

Q Does that -- my question is a little more straightforward. I appreciate the clarification.

My question is, in response to a question from a prosecutor about the provision in the non-prosecution
agreement, did your attorney say, I think that may be
inaccurate, $I$ think that came up with the Feds, I have never
heard Pecker say that?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
A Yes.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
A I am sorry.
Q There was a dispute in that meeting about some of the language in the agreement, right?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled. He can answer.
A Yes, it was just the one word.
Q We can agree that words are important, right?
A Yes, that selling and purchasing is the same. Somebody is selling, somebody has to buy them.

Q That's not what your lawyers said to the prosecutors, is it?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
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|  | Page 1440 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | THE COURT: Sustained. |
| 2 | Q And as far as you know, after that October 2019 |
| 3 | meeting, the District Attorney's Office did not tell the |
| 4 | Federal government that their agreement was inaccurate, |
| 5 | correct? |
| 6 | MR. STEINGLASS: Objection. |
| 7 | THE COURT: Sustained. |
| 8 | Q And you testified on Thursday that you received a |
| 9 | letter from the Federal Election Commission in 2018? |
| 10 | A That's correct. |
| 11 | Q And you said that you spoke to Michael Cohen about the |
| 12 | letter? |
| 13 | A I did. |
| 14 | Q And you said that during that conversation Michael |
| 15 | Cohen told you that President Trump had Jeff Sessions, quote, |
| 16 | in his pocket, do you remember that? |
| 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q Are you positive that Michael Cohen said that? |
| 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | Q And in thinking back in time to early 2018, you knew |
| 21 | that wasn't right? |
| 22 | A That's why I said to Michael Cohen, I was very |
| 23 | concerned and worried. |
| 24 | Q You were concerned because Michael Cohen had said |
| 25 | something to you that wasn't true? |
|  | Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter |

A That's correct.
Q Because President Trump did not have Jeff Sessions in
his pocket, correct?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q And, in fact, this was an example of one time that
came to form your view that Michael Cohen is prone to
exaggeration?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer?
A I am sorry. Could you say that again?
Q Based on your experience, Michael Cohen is prone to
exaggeration?
A Yes.
Q You could not trust everything he said?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
MR. STEINGLASS: Could we be heard at side-bar.
THE COURT: Sure.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the
record.)
MR. STEINGLASS: Sorry, Judge. I am not trying
to be difficult.
This is opinion testimony of a witness of the
credibility of another witness who hasn't testified yet.

That is not proper. To attack a witness' credibility -- a witness' credibility is being attacked for bad acts or reputation for peacefulness, truthfulness in the community by another witness. The witness is not permitted to offer the opinion of another witness.

MR. BOVE: The witness has been able to testify and give his opinion here today about President Trump's statements or admissions. The statements of Michael Cohen --

THE COURT: To the extent that you are asking him his opinion, I am not going to -- you need to move on. If you want to impeach Michael Cohen, that is not the right way to do it. All right. MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the following occurred in open court.)

BY MR. BOVE:
Q You testified yesterday that the FEC investigation actually ended in sort of an agreement with AMI, right?

A Yes.
Q And I think you referred to that as a conciliation agreement, correct?

A Yes.
Q And that was entered into in May of 2021 , if $I$ am remembering that right?
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A It was 2021, May or June.
Q And you read that conciliation agreement at the time it was entered into, correct?

A At that time $I$ was not part of the company anymore.
Q I understand. You left in 2020, correct?
A That's correct.
Q You were still interested in this investigation,

```
weren't you?
```

A Yes.
Q Part of that was because you still had equity in AMI,
right?

A Yes.
Q And you also provided consulting services to AMI?
A Yes.
Q What type of consulting services were you providing to AMI in 2021?

A Just any questions from the President on the tabloid, on the celebrity magazines and the magazine issues.

Q And for those reasons, among others, you reviewed the conciliation agreement, right?

A Yes.
Q And you testified yesterday, did you not, that the conciliation agreement involved an admission by AMI to a campaign violation?

A Yes.

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA
> Principal Court Reporter

Q That wasn't accurate, was it?
A Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Withdrawn.
A Yes, it was.
Q Sir, it's -- you reviewed the agreement in 2021. Have you reviewed it more recently?

A I re -- I reviewed it in 2021, yes.
Q Have you reviewed it more recently?
A More recently, yes? I reviewed it.
Q In connection with preparing for your testimony,
right?

A Yes.
Q Mr. Bernik, if we can take a look at Defense marked for identification A131, please, and turn to page two. This is a conciliation agreement, right?

A Yes.
Q And if we can look at page seven, please, Mr. Bernik. And I would like to zoom in, if we could, to the paragraph with the Roman numeral entry five, sub one and two.

A I have page six of eight.
Q We will work on that.
I think -- is this A131.
A Yes.
Q There we go.
Sir, take a look at the language that is zoomed in on

```
the screen. And I want to see if that refreshes your
recollection that AMI entered into this agreement with no
admission as to the merit of the commission's -- no admission
as to the merit of the commission's legal conclusions?
    A Yes.
    Q That's different from an admission, right?
    A Yes.
    Q One of the other reasons that you were following this
FEC investigation was that you were actually a party at one
point, right?
    A Yes.
    Q And you and AMI had counsel, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And the FEC was also accusing of you of a campaign
finance violation, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And you certainly did not admit to a campaign finance
violation in connection with anything that you described during
your testimony, right?
    A No.
    Q And that conciliation agreement that we just talked
about with AMI, you were not part of that, right?
    A That was the company.
    Q Right. You didn't work at the company anymore,
correct?
```
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```
of the reason that you had not committed a campaign finance
```

    violation, correct?
    A Can you repeat that again, please?
    Q You were represented by counsel in the FEC
    investigation, right?
A Yes.
Q And so was AMI, right?
A Yes.
Q And it was the same lawyers, correct?
A Yes.
Q And they were making arguments on your behalf, right?
A Yes.
Q And also on behalf of AMI, correct?
A That's correct.
Q And they were arguing to the FEC that you had not
committed a campaign finance violation, correct?
A Yes.
Q And you believed in 2021 that that was true, correct?
A Yeah.
Q And that's why you authorized your lawyers to make
those arguments to the Federal regulatory agency, right?
A Yes.
Q And you submitted a sworn declaration under penalty of
perjury describing the facts, correct?
A Yes.

```
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```

Q And in that declaration you asserted to the FEC, under penalty of perjury, that you sought legal advise relating to the August 2016 agreement with Karen McDougal, correct?

A Yes.
Q And your lawyers relied on that sworn declaration to argue to the $F E C$ that there was no violation, right?

A Yes.
Q And you were familiar with the argument that they were making, correct?

A Yes.
Q This was important to you, right?
A Yes.
Q Similar to the situation with the FBI?
A Correct.
Q And we have talked a lot about that the October 2019 meeting with the District Attorney's Office, right?

A Yes.
Q And after that meeting, your hope was that at least the criminal proceedings were over, correct?

A Yes, I thought it was over.
Q And you wanted this civil regulatory investigation to get resolved also, right?

A Yes.
Q You were focused on it, correct?
And you believed that what your lawyers were saying to

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

```
the FEC was true, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And you are aware that one of the things that your
lawyers argued to the FEC was that the Washington Post had
suppressed information relating to Paula Jones in connection
with the 1996 election, correct?
            MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
            THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q You were answering questions yesterday about some
boxes relating to President Trump. Do you remember those
questions, sir?
    A Yes.
    Q And I think what you said was that there was a request
from Michael Cohen to get access to these boxes so that he
could look at what was inside of them, correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q There was some suggestion by Michael Cohen that he was
concerned about what would happen if you left AMI, right?
    A Yes.
    Q And he wasn't -- I am just trying to make sure what I
thought you were saying, what your understanding was, okay?
    He was not suggesting to you that this was a near term
media problem, right? He was just concerned about your Time
Magazine job applications?
    A If you can clarify that. What you are asking?
```



```
    Q And you believe they were worthless?
    A They were worthless.
    Q You have an agreement with the District Attorney's
Office, right?
    A Yes.
    Q That's an agreement that you entered into in October
of 2019, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And what's your understanding of your obligations
under that agreement?
    A To be truthful on everything that I testify to on the
questions that are given to me by any agency.
    Q And at this trial all sides asked you a lot of
questions, right?
    A Yes.
    Q Some harder than others?
    A Yes.
    Q And you understand that, ultimately, they will decide
whether or not they think you were truthful, right?
    A I have been truthful to the best of my recollection.
    Q And, ultimately, they will decide whether you complied
with the agreement, right?
    A Yes.
        MR. BOVE: Nothing further, judge.
        THE COURT: Thank you.
```
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|  | Page 1452 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | People, any redirect? |
| 2 | MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, Judge. |
| 3 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 4 | BY MR. STEINGLASS: |
| 5 | Q Good afternoon, Mr. Pecker. |
| 6 | A Good afternoon. |
| 7 | Q I want to show you People's 161 in evidence. |
| 8 | We can show it to everybody. It's in evidence. |
| 9 | Do you remember being asked about this by Mr. Bove on |
| 10 | cross-examination? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q This is an invoice that you testified was prepared by |
| 13 | Daniel Rotstein? |
| 14 | A Yes, that's correct. |
| 15 | Q And he asked you whether you were mistaken when you |
| 16 | testified yesterday that this document was made and kept by |
| 17 | AMI, correct? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | Q When AMI gets an invoice, even from a third-party, do |
| 20 | they keep it as part of their business records? |
| 21 | A Yes, they do. |
| 22 | Q And is it kept by AMI to justify expenditures? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 25 | Q So were you mistaken about anything when you testified earlier in this trial that this document was made and kept or |
|  | Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter |





```
counsel, did you ever inform Mr. Stracher that you intended to
transfer Karen McDougal's life rights to Michael Cohen?
    A No.
    Q Did you ever tell him that Michael Cohen promised to
reimburse you for most or all of the money that you had paid to
Karen McDougal?
    A No, I never did.
    Q Was there a retainer agreement signed by AMI and the
outside counsel?
    A In --
    Q Do I need to clarify that a little bit?
    A Yes, please.
    Q You testified that prior to the signing of the
contract with Karen McDougal, that it was your understanding
that AMI's general counsel reached out to election counsel to
have them review, the outside counsel, to have them review the
Karen McDougal contract?
    A That's correct.
    Q Was there a retainer agreement completed in connection
with retaining such outside counsel?
    A Yes.
    Q Privately, can we please show the witness Bates
stamped AM/NYDA 74.23 and 4. Do you see that?
    A Yes, I do.
    Q What day was the retainer agreement signed between AMI
```
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and outside counsel?
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A August 5, 2016.
Q What is the name of the attorney, the outside
attorney, who worked on this matter?

A Chris Murray.
Q Did Mr. Murray bill AMI for the work that he did
reviewing the contract between $A M I$ and Karen McDougal?

A Yes, he did.
Q As you sit here, I think I asked you this on Tuesday, do you know how much time was billed for his reviewing of the contract?

A Less than an hour.
Q Okay. Let me show you privately, and just for the attorneys, Judge, AM/NYDA 74.25 through 34.

Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.

Q Is this a series of bills from Mr. Murray to AMI for work done in 2016?

A Yes, it was.
Q And I am just going to scroll through all the pages in this exhibit and ask you to keep your eyes out to see if there are any bills for services rendered in the months June, July, August?

A Yes, there were.
Q So I want to direct your attention to page eight. Do
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```
you see a bill for services rendered on August 3rd of 2016?
    A Yes.
    Q And does that refresh your recollection which -- well,
does that refresh your recollection as to how many hours AMI
was billed in connection with outside counsel's review of the
Karen McDougal contract?
    A It was a half an hour.
    Q Half an hour. I am showing you what's in evidence as
People's Exhibit 156, and this can be shown to everyone.
    There is the contract that AMI signed with Karen
McDougal, is that right?
```

    A That's correct.
    Q And you were asked extensively about this on
    cross-examination, is that right?
A Yes.
Q Just to remind us, what is the effective date of this
contract?
A August 5th.
Q Does this contract mention anything about Mr. Trump
reimbursing you, this contract that was reviewed by outside
counsel?
A $\quad$ No.
Q Does it mention Michael Cohen's name at all?
A No, it does not.
Q Does the contract mention anything about the plan to
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```
reassign Karen McDougal's life rights to either Mr. Trump or
Mr. Cohen?
    A No, it does not.
    Q Does the contract mention anything about your
agreement to help Mr. Trump's campaign that you reached at the
August 2015 meeting at Trump Tower?
    A No, it does not.
    Q Does it mention anything about your agreement to
undertake certain actions at the request of the campaign?
    A No, it does not.
    Q Do the contract even mention the word, campaign?
    A No.
    Q Very recently Mr. Bove asked you a series of questions
about the FEC investigation into the conduct by AMI. Do you
remember those questions?
    A Yes.
    Q And your original position in that case when the -- he
asked you a lot of questions I should say, about your original
position after the FEC filed a complaint, is that right?
    A Yes.
    Q And your initial response was to deny culpability, is
that correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q Subsequently, you entered into a conciliation
agreement you testified about, correct?
```





```
rights to Mr. Cohen for a sum of money, correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q What was the sum of money that you were selling her
life rights for?
    A $125,000.
    Q And, in fact, I believe you testified that you only
entered into the agreement with Karen McDougal in the first
place because Mr. Cohen had promised to reimburse you?
    A Yes, that's correct.
    Q So, prior to -- withdrawn.
        You testified on direct, I can show it to you if you
like, there was an agreement, a transfer agreement where you
were -- had signed and Michael Cohen had signed, and this was
the process of transferring the life rights. Do you remember
that document?
    A Yes, I do.
    Q And you went so far as to sign the document?
    A I did.
    Q After that, but before money actually exchanged hands,
did you communicate with your general counsel, Cameron
Stracher, again?
    A I did.
    Q And I do not want to ask you about any privileged
questions about what you discussed with Cameron Stracher, but
based on that conversation with Cameron Stracher, what became
```

```
of your plan to transfer Karen McDougal's life rights to Donald
Trump?
    A I after -- after that conversation, I called up
Michael Cohen and told him that the deal was off and to rip up
the agreement.
    Q Can we please show the witness 154, People's 154.
And, actually, you can show it to everyone. It's in evidence,
I am sorry.
    Do you remember Mr. Bove asking you a series of
questions about this document on cross-examination?
    A Yes.
    Q And he asked you whether this was a standard AMI
document?
    A Yes.
    Q And you said that it was, correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q It's a fairly standard source agreement intended to
kind of lock up a source?
    A That's correct.
    Q That's something AMI does a lot?
    A All the time.
    Q This agreement was amended by People's 155, is that
    right? Can you show People's 155?
    A Yes.
    Q And it is one of the amendments that this -- that
```
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```
People's 155 changed People's 154 was by extending the
exclusivity period from 90 days to in perpetuity?
    A That is correct.
    Q Whose idea was it to do that?
    A That was my conversation with Michael Cohen.
    Q Is it standard operating procedure for AMI to be
consulting with the presidential - with a presidential
candidate's fixer about amendments to a source agreement?
    A No.
    Q Who -- withdrawn.
        Another amendment that was made to the original source
agreement with Dino Sajudin was to add a 1 million-dollar
liquidated damages clause?
    A That's correct.
    Q Is a $1 million liquidated damages clause on a
30,000-dollar source agreement standard operating procedure?
    A No.
    Q Why did you amend the agreement to add a 1
million-dollar liquidated damages clause?
    A That was at Michael Cohen's request.
    Q Is it standard operating procedure to have a
presidential candidate's campaign person weighing in on what
terms of a contract ought to be amended?
    A No.
    Q Speaking of Michael Cohen, you testified on both
```
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```
direct examination and again on cross-examination that Michael
Cohen told you that he did not work for the campaign, is that
correct?
    A Yes.
    Q He was paid by the Trump Organization, not by the
campaign, is that correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Now, despite the fact that he did not officially work
for the campaign, were you aware of the activities that he
engaged in on behalf of the campaign?
    A Yes, I was.
    Q Who invited you to Mr. Trump's announcement that he
was running for President in the first place?
    A Michael Cohen.
    Q Did you ever see Michael Cohen go on television to
talk about Mr. Trump's campaign talking points?
    A Yes. I have.
    Q I am sorry.
    A Yes, I did.
    Q Did you ever know Michael Cohen to work his press
contacts on behalf of the campaign?
    A Yes.
    Q Did you ever receive an invite to a campaign fund
raiser that Michael Cohen participated in on behalf of
Mr. Trump?
```
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A That's correct.
Q I don't want to make you do the math on the spot here, but what was the approximate average of those payments?

A The largest one was $\$ 20,000$. Then the other ones would be anywhere from 500 to $\$ 2,000$.

Q Did you spend anything like the $\$ 150,000$ to suppress any story in connection with the Arnold Schwarzenegger campaign?

A No.
Q I believe you also testified that Arnold Schwarzenegger was the front man for some of your fitness line magazines, is that right?

A That's correct.
Q Why did you spend money, and when I say you, I mean AMI, why did AMI spend money to silence Mr. Schwarzenegger's accusers?

A Mr. Schwarzenegger was critical to the body building industry, as well as the supplement industry, as wells the two leading publications Us Muscle Fitness and Flex that we just acquired in the Weider acquisition.

Q So, do I understand that to mean that you were, at least in part, motivated by your desire to protect your own brand value?

A It was mutually beneficial.
Q Your arrangement with Mr. Schwarzenegger?
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```
adversaries that corresponded to those adversaries polling
numbers?
    A No.
    Q Mr. Bove elicited from you that a lot of the articles,
the negative attack articles, against Marco Rubio and Ted Cruz
were recycled I believe was the term that he used?
    A Yes.
    Q Notwithstanding the fact that they were recycled at
the time that AMI reprinted them, was AMI doing that because
those candidates were surging in the polls against Mr. Trump?
    A Yes.
    Q And was that done in coordination with Mr. Trump's
campaign?
    A Yes.
    Q You testified on cross-examination that even before
your arrangement in August of 2015, that you were friends with
Mr. Trump?
    A Yes.
    Q And because you were friends, you didn't run negative
stories about him even before this arrangement, is that
correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q And I believe you told Mr. Bove that you did that for
several of your friends?
```

    A Yes.
    Q Prior to the August of 2015 meeting in Trump Tower, did AMI ever agree to publish stories attacking Mr. Trump's political opponents?

A No.
Q Prior to the August 2015 meeting in Trump Tower, did AMI ever agree to be the eyes and ears of Mr. Trump's campaign?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Prior to that meeting, did you ever agree to use your
network of sources to actively seek out potentially damaging
stories, to report them to Mr. Trump so that he could prevent
their publication?

A No.
Q You were asked a lot about this by Mr. Bove on cross-examination. Let's be very clear here.

At that meeting, what is your understanding of what you agreed to with respect to -- withdrawn.

Let me come at this a different way.
Did you ever, specifically, use the term, catch and kill, in that meeting?

A No, I did not.
Q What was your understanding about the part of the agreement that involved money?

A It was my understanding that $I$ would use the company's sources, geared toward any information that would be coming out on Mr. Trump, or the campaign relating to, specifically, women
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who would be selling their stories similar to what I experienced with Schwarzenegger 13 years ago.

So I notified -- it is my understanding I would for those stories that come up, I would speak to Michael Cohen, and tell him that these are the stories that are going to be for sale. That if we don't buy them, somebody else will.

And that Michael Cohen would handle, buy them or try to make sure to get -- that they don't ever get published. That was my understanding from that meeting.

Q You testified on both direct and cross-examination that certain parts of your arrangement with Mr. Trump's campaign were mutually beneficial, is that right?

A Yes.
Q For example, I believe you told us on direct examination, and told Mr. Bove again on cross-examination, that stories praising Mr. Trump sold magazines, is that right?

A Yes.
Q And how would you describe the overlap between your readership and Mr. Trump's political base?

A Basically, the research that the company did over the years -- based on research that the company did over the years, there was no question that the celebrity audience, the tabloid audience or the other celebrity magazines, Stars, Weekly, all loved reading positive stories about Donald Trump.

And when he announced his presidency or going from The
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Apprentice to running for President of the United States, he -our sales increased, news stand sales increased, as well as any comments that were made by Mr. Trump about negative comments about his opponents were not -- when we published them, the sales also increased.

So, it was a -- that's clear enough.
Q So, if $I$ understand you correctly, running stories that praised Mr. Trump appealed to your readership?

A Yes, they did.
Q And so, that aspect of the agreement that you reached at Trump Tower was mutually beneficial, is that correct?

A Yes, yes.
Q Now, you testified a moment ago that the primary purpose for entering into the non-disclosure agreement with Karen McDougal was to acquire her life rights to help the campaign, is that right?

A Yes.
Q And I believe you told us, and it was in the document that we showed you, you never had any intention of publishing her story?

A No, we weren't going to publish her story.
Q Mr. Bove asked you, wouldn't that story have sold magazines?

Well, let me ask you the question.
Had you published a story about a Playboy model having
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a year-long sexual affair, while he was married, with a
presidential candidate, would that have sold magazines do you
think?
A Yes.
Q That would be like National Enquirer gold?
A Yes.
Q But at the time that you entered into that agreement,
you had zero intention of publishing that story?
A That's correct.
Q And despite the fact that publishing that story would
have helped your bottom line, you killed the story because it
helped the candidate, Donald Trump?
A Yes.
THE COURT: Is this a good time to break?
MR. STEINGLASS: Sure.
THE COURT: Jurors, we will stop now for our
lunch break.
I remind you of all the admonitions, including do
not discuss this case either amongst yourselves or with
anyone else.
Please continue to keep an open mind.
Do not form or express an opinion about the
defendant's guilt or innocence until all the evidence is in
and I have given you my final instructions on the law.
Enjoy your lunch.
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| Page 1477 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | THE CLERK: Continued case on trial, Donald J. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Trump. All parties are present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | THE COURT: Good afternoon. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Is there anything we need to cover before we bring |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | out Mr. Pecker? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | MR. STEINGLASS: I don't believe so. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | THE COURT: Let's get the witness. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | (Witness entering courtroom.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | *** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | THE COURT: I remind you that you are still under |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | oath. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | (Jury entering.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | *** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | THE COURT: Please be seated. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | versus Donald J. Trump. All parties and all jurors are |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | THE COURT: Good afternoon. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Mr. Steinglass. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you, Judge. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | CONTINUED REDIRECT EXAMINATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | BY MR. STEINGLASS: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Pecker. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | A. Good afternoon. |  |  |  |  |  |

Q. I am not going to try to keep you here too much longer.

You testified on cross-examination that the National Enquirer's circulation was around 350,000 in 2016; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Does that count all the people who see the headlines while on line at the supermarket or at Walmart or at other places where its sold?
A. That is only the paid circulation for the newsstand and the subscribers.
Q. You testified earlier that catch and kill was not a phrase that you would use to describe your deal with Mr. Trump during that meeting; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And Mr. Bove -- I apologize for the pronunciation -earlier Mr. Bove got you to say on cross-examination that you first heard that name from the Federal Prosecutors; is that right?
A. Yes. (Displayed.)
Q. I want to show you People's 180 again. We can show everybody, it's in evidence.

This is the Wall Street Journal that both myself and Mr. Bove showed you during questioning several times; is that


```
use the phrase "catch and kill" during your direct testimony in
this case, did you?
```

A. No, I never did.
Q. In response to Mr. Bove's question this morning, you testified that you wanted nothing to do this Stormy Daniels'
deal; is that right?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. What did you tell Dylan Howard about your willingness to pay for another story involving Mr. Trump?
A. I said to Michael Cohen: After paying for the doorman story and the Karen McDougal story, I wasn't going to buy anything further and I wasn't a bank.
Q. And what did you tell Dylan Howard about it when he first reached out to you, I think you said you were having dinner with your wife on Saturday night?
A. Yes.
Q. When he first reached out to you about the story, what did you tell him? What did you tell Dylan Howard?
A. I told Dylan Howard that there is no possible way $I$ would buy the story for $\$ 120,000$, and I didn't want to have anything to do with a porn star.
Q. And I want to -- withdrawn. Now, you told us a moment ago that you also spoke to Michael Cohen about it?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you reach out to Michael Cohen when you learned that Stormy Daniels had a story involving sexual infidelity with Mr. Trump?
A. Based on our mutual agreement back in August 2015, any stories concerning Mr. Trump that would be very embarrassing, I would want to communicate that with Michael Cohen right away. If he heard it from somebody else, he would go
ballistic.
Q. Who is "he?"
A. If Michael Cohen heard the story, that he heard it from someone else. I was referring to Michael Cohen.
Q. And so when you -- withdrawn. When you reached out to Michael Cohen, it was, as you just said, to notify him, as you had promised to do in that August 2015 meeting?
A. That's correct.
Q. When you told Mr. Bove that you wanted nothing to do with it, you weren't going to print it; is that correct?
A. Print it or buy it or be associated with it.
Q. You weren't going to print it, you weren't going to pay for it, you weren't going to be associated?
A. Correct.
Q. You were still going to fulfill your obligation to tell Michael Cohen about it so that the campaign would squash it?
A. Yes.

```
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Q. I believe you testified on direct examination that
sometime later Dylan Howard came back to you because Michael
Cohen hadn't delivered on his promise to pay Stormy Daniels off;
is that right?
A. That's correct. That's correct.
Q. And he asked you to reach out to Michael Cohen?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. I believe you testified on direct examination that you, Michael Cohen and Dylan Howard had a three-way call on October 25, 2016, regarding Stormy Daniels; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you remind the jury, please, what you discussed on that call?
```

A. We called Michael Cohen on the Signal. We being Dylan Howard and myself. And Dylan made a presentation to Michael Cohen. He was very aggressive over the phone and told Michael: "These two sources are very important to me. If you don't pay them, you're ruining my reputation. You promised to wire the money two times and you never did." Then Michael Cohen said to me I should buy it. I said to Michael Cohen: "Absolutely not. I am not paying for the story. I told you a number of times, I don't want to be involved with it. My suggestion to you is, you should buy the story," you being Michael Cohen, "should buy the story, because if you don't, and as Dylan just said to us over
the phone, it's going to be sold to another media outlet. The Boss is going to be very, very angry with you."
Q. So when you are referring to "The Boss," telling Michael Cohen that The Boss would be very angry with him if he let the story go, who did you mean when you referred to "The Boss?"
A. Donald Trump.
Q. Mr. Bove asked you several times about two interviews that you gave to the FBI on July 26 and one on August 2, 2016; do you remember him asking you repeatedly about those, the interviews?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Is it fair to say some topics were discussed on one day and some topics were discussed on the other day and some topics were discussed on both days?
A. That's correct.
Q. You did not take notes during those interviews personally, did you?
A. No, I did not.
Q. The notes Mr. Bove shown you were taken by FBI agents?
A. That's correct.
Q. At one point Mr. Bove showed you a single line in the July 26, 2016 -- 2018 interview, in which an FBI agent wrote in reference to the January 6, 2017 meeting at Trump Tower, "that Mr. Trump did not express any gratitude towards you?"

|  | Page 1484 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. | Yes. |
| 2 | Q. | Is that correct? |
| 3 | A. | Yes. |
| 4 | Q. | Do you remember him showing you that? |
| 5 | A. | Yes, I do. |
| 6 | Q. | You said, "I didn't say that, he got it wrong?" |
| 7 | A. | That's correct. |
| 8 | Q. | You told Mr. Bove that you have always consistently |
| 9 | said t | Mr. Trump thanked you at that meeting; is that |
| 10 | correc |  |
| 11 | A. | Yes. |
| 12 | Q. | Do you know how many pages long those interview notes |
| 13 | are? |  |
| 14 | A. | Not off the top of my head. I am sorry. |
| 15 | Q. | I guess that is not a fair question. I am sorry. |
| 16 |  | Let me show you the FBI notes from the August 2nd of |
| 17 | 2018 i | erview that Mr. Bove also showed you. |
| 18 |  | Okay. |
| 19 |  | Specifically, I want to show you Page 6 . |
| 20 | A. | Okay. |
| 21 |  | So this was literally a week after the interview in |
|  | which | ur testimony is that the FBI erroneously recorded the |
| 23 | fact t | you said that Mr. Trump did not thank you? |
| 24 | A. | Yes. |
| 25 | Q. | And one week later, did you not tell the FBI, "In |

January 2017, Pecker visited Trump in Trump's office at Trump Tower. At that time Trump told Pecker, in sum and substance, that he, Trump, wanted to thank him, Pecker, for handling the Karen and doorman stories because it would have been very
damaging to him."

Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So did you, in fact, tell the FBI that the defendant thanked you for both the Karen McDougal story and the Dino Sajudin story?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Was that the truth then?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the truth now?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe that you have ever been inconsistent about this point?
A. No.
Q. I want to show you testimony from the Grand Jury, the Federal Grand Jury in this case that Mr. Bove also referred to. Do you remember him asking you about that?
A. Yes.
Q. There was testimony given on August 13, 2018; do you remember giving that testimony on that date?
A. Yes.


```
doorman story. He said he was very grateful and both these
stories could have been very, very damaging."
    Were you asked those questions and did you give those
answers?
    A. Yes.
    Q. That was in 2018 in the Federal Grand Jury?
    A. In the Federal Grand Jury.
    Q. The questioning goes on -- excuse me one second.
        Skipping to line 19.
        Were you asked the following questions and did you give
the following answers:
    "QUESTION: And I believe you testified that Former
President Trump said that the McDougal story and the doorman
story could have been damaging; is that correct?
    "ANSWER: That's correct.
    "QUESTION: What did you understand Mr. Trump to mean
by damaging?
    "ANSWER: I believe he was referring to that it would
be very damaging to his campaign and his election."
    Did you give those answers -- were you asked those
questions and did you give those answers?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Was that the truth then?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Is that truth now?
```



|  | you to say anything other than the truth? Page 1489 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. Absolutely not. |
| 3 | Q. Now, you testified on cross-examination that you spoke |
| 4 | several times with members of the New York County District |
| 5 | Attorney's office over the last few months; is that right? |
| 6 | A. That's correct. |
| 7 | Q. And, in fact, Mr. Bove asked you in particular if |
| 8 | you met with some of the Assistant District Attorneys sitting |
| 9 | here? |
| 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | Q. Including myself? |
| 12 | A. That's correct. |
| 13 | Q. Mr. Bove asked you whether we decide when you fulfilled |
| 14 | your obligation to testify truthfully; is that right? |
| 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | Q. Mr. Pecker, did anyone from the New York County |
| 17 | District Attorney's office ever suggest to you that they wanted |
| 18 | you to do anything other than tell the truth? |
| 19 | A. Absolutely not. |
| 20 | Q. What did we tell you? |
| 21 | A. I was told to be truthful on any questions that were |
| 22 | asked of me, only be truthful. |
| 23 | MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you very much, Mr. Pecker. |
| 24 | THE COURT: Mr. Bove. |
| 25 | MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge. |

```
RECROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOVE:
    Q. Mr. Pecker, before lunch you were asked some questions
by Mr. Steinglass about "attack ads;" do you recall those
questions?
    A. Yes, I do.
    Q. The National Enquirer didn't run any attack ads
relating to President Trump's opponents, correct?
    A. Can you define for me that, what the headlines were?
    Q. There were headlines, but not attack ads?
    A. That's correct.
    Q. We talked about some of those headlines this morning,
right?
    A. We did.
    Q. Do you remember that before lunch Mr. Steinglass
referred to Michael Cohen as a "fixer?"
    A. Yes.
    Q. And you said repeatedly during your testimony that Mr.
Cohen told you he was President Trump's personal attorney?
    A. Yes, he did.
    Q. You know from your experience that private attorneys
can hold fund raisers for campaigns without being a part of the
campaign, right?
    A. Yes.
    Q. That type of fund raiser doesn't make a private
```

|  | Page 1491 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. Y | Yes. |
| 3 | Q. A | And you were asked some questions by Mr. Steinglass |
| 4 | just now a | and before lunch about Karen McDougal, right? |
| 5 | A. $Y$ | Yes. |
| 6 | Q. A | And I think before lunch Mr. Steinglass referred to Ms. |
| 7 | McDougal's | 's story as National Enquirer gold, right? |
| 8 | A. $\quad Y$ | Yes. |
| 9 | Q. D | Do you remember that phrase? |
| 10 | A. I | I do. |
| 11 | Q. A | And you were very clear on cross-examination that Ms. |
| 12 | McDougal d | did not want to publish that story, right? |
| 13 | A. T | That is correct. |
| 14 | Q. S | She wanted to promote her name and her brand, correct? |
| 15 | A. Y | Yes. |
| 16 | $\text { Q. } \quad S$ | She was a legitimate celebrity at the time, right? |
| 17 | A. L | Let me say this; did she meet the celebrity category at |
| 18 | that time? | ? No. |
| 19 | Q. S | She was a leading fitness model, correct? |
| 20 | A. S | She was a leading fitness model. |
| 21 | Q. I | I think you testified on cross-examination this morning |
|  | that she w | was one of the first women ever on the cover of Men's |
| 23 | Fitness ma | magazine? |
| 24 | A. T | That's correct. That was in 1999. I also mentioned |
| 25 | that was p | prior to my ownership, prior to the ownership. |


Q. And the FEC actually decided to take no further action against you personally, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And I just want to make sure I understand. In 2016, you didn't think you were doing anything wrong, did you?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. And in 2021, you submitted a Declaration to the FEC

```
that said that, more or less, correct?
```

A. Yes.
Q. And I would like you to take a look at that
Declaration. It's not in evidence. It's Defense Exhibit A132.
MR. BOVE: I can hand one up.
THE COURT: Thank you.
A. Yes.
Q. Have you had a chance to take a look?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. That is your signature on the bottom left?
A. Yes.
Q. It's dated May 6, correct?
A. May 6, that's correct.
Q. This is a copy of the Declaration that you submitted to the FEC?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. BOVE: Your Honor, defense offers Defense A132.

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Please approach.
(Whereupon, proceedings were held at sidebar:)
MR. STEINGLASS: First of all, if he is putting in this as a prior inconsistent statement, the witness has already acknowledged the inconsistency.

You don't get to prove up an a prior inconsistent statement with extrinsic evidence once the witness has acknowledged the inconsistency.

Also, we haven't gotten notice of this exhibit.
MR. BOVE: This is being offered in response to the redirect.

THE COURT: Assuming it's an inconsistency, if it's conceded, that is the end of it. That is the end of it.
(Whereupon, the following occurred in open court:)
THE COURT: Objection sustained.
CONTINUED RECROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOVE:
Q. Mr. Pecker, at the end of your testimony yesterday, you told a story about an Anthrax incident at AMI?
A. That's correct.
Q. You said that President Trump was one of the first people to reach out to you to see if you were doing okay?
A. Yes.
Q. That is one of the reasons that you had and still have a long friendship with him?
A. That's correct.
Q. You know that he cares about people?
A. I do.
Q. And he cares about his family, right?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And you believe that, right?
A. Of course I do.
Q. And so you understand that the types of stories that we were talking about during your testimony today in 2016 , those were actually things that were stressful to him and his family, correct?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. BOVE: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
You can step down.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Witness excused.)
***

THE COURT: People, your next witness, please.
MS. HOFFINGER: The People call Rhona Graff.

A. No, I'm not.
Q. Were you previously employed?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. For what company were you previously employed?
A. The Trump Organization.
Q. And how many years did you work for the Trump
Organization?
A. Thirty-four years.
Q. And approximately when did you start working for the Trump Organization?
A. I believe it was October of 1987.
Q. When, approximately, did you stop working for the Trump Organization?
A. In April of 2021.
Q. What were your titles at the Trump Organization?
A. When I initially started, $I$ was an executive assistant. And then over the years it evolved into senior executive.

Then I eventually became assistant to the president and senior vice-president.
Q. Who was the president of the Trump Organization at that time during the 34 years that you worked there?
A. Donald J. Trump.
Q. What was your understanding about who owned the Trump Organization companies during those 34 years that you worked
there?
A. Donald J. Trump.
Q. And who did you work directly for at the Trump Organization?
A. Mr. Trump.
Q. Now, did you work out of the offices of the Trump Organization at Trump Tower here in New York?
A. That's correct.
Q. And where was your office located in Trump Tower?
A. Well, the address was 725 Fifth Avenue, and my office was on the 26 th floor.
Q. Where was your office or your desk in relation to Mr. Trump's office?
A. Well, over time it changed. You know, initially when I started, I sat outside his office. There are a few desks out there.

When I was promoted to a senior position, I had my own office, which was right next door to his office.
Q. During approximately the years of 2015 to 2017, was there an executive team of assistants who worked to support Mr. Trump's work at the Trump Organization?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. When you were senior vice-president, were you the most senior person in that group of executive assistants who supported his work?


```
Trump's calendar for the most part?
    A. For the most part it was me.
    Q. Now, as Mr. Trump's executive assistant at the Trump
Organization, was one of your duties and responsibilities also
entering and maintaining Mr. Trump's contacts in the Trump
Organization's computer system?
    A. That is correct.
    Q. Did you input Mr. Trump's contacts into a computer
program at the Trump Organization also called Outlook?
    A. Yes, I did.
    Q. Now, did Mr. Trump's contacts include information such
as phone numbers and addresses for people in his life that he
wanted to be able to contact?
    A. That is correct.
    Q. And did you enter Mr. Trump's contacts into that
computer system at the Trump Organization from about as early as
2004?
    A. I believe that is correct.
    Q. As Mr. Trump's executive assistant at the Trump
Organization, was one of your duties and responsibilities also
to send and receive emails related to Mr. Trump's work and his
business?
```

    A. Yes, I did.
    Q. And did you do that using a Trump Organization email
    address?

A. I dated and initialled it.
Q. Are do those exhibits, at least some of them, contain

```
redactions of some personal information?
```

A. Yes, they did.
Q. Did you also review and compare the same exhibits without the redactions?
A. Yes.
Q. Were those two sets of exhibits the same except for the

```
redactions?
```

A. Yes.
Q. Do those exhibits that $I$ just mentioned include emails to and from you and an individual named Madeleine Westerhout in the year 2017 using your Trump.org email address?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it also contain Mr. Trump's contacts -- some of Mr. Trump's contacts from the Trump Organization Outlook computer system for Karen McDougal and Stormy Daniels?
A. Yes.
Q. And do those exhibits also include some calendar entries from the Trump Organization Outlook computer system from January of 2017?
A. That is correct.
Q. And I am going to direct your attention now to the emails, which are People's Exhibits 68, 69, 69B, 70, 71, 73, 75 and 76 for identification.

| 1 | Page 1503 <br> Do you recognize those emails as emails that you sent |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | or received from Madeleine Westerhout during the dates and times |
| 3 | reflected on those emails? |
| 4 | A. Are they supposed to show up on the screen? |
| 5 | Q. Not yet. |
| 6 | They're the ones that you reviewed? |
| 7 | A. Yes, correct. |
| 8 | Q. Who was Madeleine Westerhout? |
| 9 | A. She was Mr. Trump's assistant, executive assistant when |
| 10 | he went to the White House. |
| 11 | Q. That was her job at the time of these emails in 2017? |
| 12 | A. That is my understanding. |
| 13 | Q. And did you send to and receive from Ms. Westerhout |
| 14 | these emails as part of the regular course of your work at the |
| 15 | Trump Organization for Mr. Trump? |
| 16 | A. Yes, I did. |
| 17 | Q. And did you send and receive those using your Trump |
| 18 | Organization email address? |
| 19 | A. Correct. |
| 20 | Q. And was it part of the regular course of your work at |
| 21 | the Trump Organization for you to send and receive those |
| 22 | emails? |
| 23 | A. Yes, it was. |
| 24 | Q. And were you under a business duty to do so accurately? |
| 25 | A. I was. |

Q. Now, during the year 2017, were you aware that the Trump Organization maintained a server that hosted its emails?
A. Yes.
Q. Do those servers capture information associated with emails, including the "to," the "from," "the date," and the
"time sent?"
A. Yes, they did.
Q. Was that information generally accurately contained in the header of each of the emails?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Did you expect that information to be accurately recorded in the email system in the Trump Organization?
A. Yes.
Q. Were those emails and their headers captured and maintained on the Trump Organization server in the ordinary course of business of the Trump Organization?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. And do the emails that you reviewed contained in these exhibits to be the standard Trump Organization email format, including the headers "to," "from," "date," and "time sent?"
A. Yes.
Q. Now, with respect to the exhibits, People's Exhibits 82 and 83 for identification, which of those contacts did you recognize those to be Mr. Trump's contact for Karen McDougal and Stormy Daniels that were entered into and maintained in the

```
Trump Organization Outlook computer system?
    A. Yes, I did.
    Q. And, now, I just want to direct your attention to
the last exhibit, which is People's Exhibit 85 for
identification.
    Did you recognize those to be calendar entries for Mr.
Trump for various dates between January 16th and January 19th
of 2017, that were entered into and maintained in the Trump
Organization Outlook computer system?
    A. Yes, I did.
    Q. And for each of these various types of records that we
just discussed that you reviewed, emails, contacts and calendar
entries, were each of those generated in the regular and
ordinary course of business of the Trump Organization?
    A. Yes, that is correct. Yes.
    Q. Was it part of the business of the Trump Organization
to make and keep each of those records?
    A. Yes, it was.
    Q. Were those entries in those records made at or close to
the time of the transactions or events to which they relate?
    A. Yes, they were.
    Q. Were the person or persons who made those records under
a business duty to do so accurately?
    A. Yes.
        MS. HOFFINGER: At this time, your Honor, I offer
```

| 1 | into evidence People's Exhibits 68, 69, $\begin{array}{r}\text { P9, } 1506\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 75, 76, 82 and 83 and 85. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Any objection? |
| 4 | MS. NECHELES: No objection. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Those exhibits are accepted into |
| 6 | evidence. |
| 7 | (Whereupon, Exhibits 68, 69, 69B, 70, 71, 73, 75, |
| 8 | $76,82,83$ and 85 were received into evidence.) |
| 9 | MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 10 | I can take the thumb drive back. |
| 11 | MS. HOFFINGER: Can we now put up, which is in |
| 12 | evidence, I would like to see People's Exhibit 82. That |
| 13 | will come up on your screen. |
| 14 | (Displayed.) |
| 15 | Q. So showing you People's Exhibit 82. Can you please |
| 16 | explain to the jury what this is? |
| 17 | A. It's an entry in contacts for Karen McDougal and it |
| 18 | lists her -- it's redacted, but it lists her business phone |
| 19 | number, business address, and email address, and then there is a |
| 20 | notation for an old address. |
| 21 | Q. So is there a total of two physical addresses listed? |
| 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | Q. And a cell phone number and an email address? |
| 24 | A. Correct. |
| 25 | Q. Did you create this contact for Karen McDougal in the |

```
Trump Organization's computer system for Mr. Trump?
    A. I believe I did.
        MS. HOFFINGER: You can take that down now.
        Can we please show for everyone People's Exhibit
        83, also in evidence.
        (Displayed.)
    Q. Can you please tell the jury what that is on your
screen?
    A. It's an entry in our contact system for Stormy, Stormy
Daniels. I believe it contains her mobile phone number.
    Q. And did you -- you said you understand this to be a
contact for Stormy Daniels; is that right?
    A. Correct.
    Q. Did you create this contact for Stormy Daniels in the
Trump Organization's computer system for Mr. Trump?
    A. I believe I did.
        MS. HOFFINGER: You can take that down now.
        Thank you.
    Q. Now, did you on one occasion see Stormy Daniels
physically waiting in the reception area of the offices of Trump
Tower?
    A. I have a vague recollection of seeing her in the
reception area on the 26th floor.
    Q. And did you see her at that time, prior to Mr. Trump
running for president, beginning in 2015?
```

```
                                    Page 1508
A. To the best of my recollection, yes.
Q. And when you saw her at Trump Tower, did you know at that time that she was an adult film actress?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Now, I am going to ask you to take a look at -MS. HOFFINGER: Please put up for everyone
People's Exhibit 85 in evidence.
(Displayed.)
Q. Can you tell us what this is?
A. It's an entry in the electronic appointment calendar, dated January 17, 2017, at 1 p.m.
Q. I apologize.
Is this Page 1?
Without blowing it up, let me ask you a general
question about this exhibit, there are a number of calendar entries in this exhibit?
A. Correct.
Q. Are these documents contained in this exhibit calendar entries for Mr. Trump from approximately the dates of January 16th to January 19th of 2017?
A. Correct.
MS. HOFFINGER: If we could please put up Page 6. (Displayed.)
Q. Can you tell us what this document reflects?
A. It's a notation in the Trump Organization appointment
```

```
calendar, the executive folder, for a Teleprompter practice
session on the 25th floor of Trump Tower, on January 16, 2017,
at 10 a.m.
    Q. And does this show that Mr. Trump was working at Trump
Tower on January 16, 2017?
    A. I believe it reflects that.
    MS. HOFFINGER: Can we just put up Page 10 of the
        same exhibit, please.
        Blow it up.
        (Displayed.)
```

    Q. Can you tell us what this reflects?
    A. It reflects an appointment that was scheduled with
    Ainsley Earhardt from Fox \& Friends, taking place on the 25th
floor at Trump Tower, on January 17 2017, at 9 a.m.
Q. Do you believe you entered this calendar entry in the
Trump calendar?
A. Yes.
Q. Does this show that Donald Trump was working at Trump
Tower on January 17, 2017?
A. It should reflect that.
MS. HOFFINGER: Can we show Page 1.
(Displayed.)
Q. What does this document show?
A. It's another entry in the appointment calendar for a
Teleprompter practice session on the 25 th floor in Trump Tower,

```
on January 17, 2017, at 1 p.m.
    Q. This also shows Mr. Trump was working at Trump Tower on
January 17, 2017?
    A. Correct.
        MS. HOFFINGER: Can we show Page 5, please.
        (Displayed.)
    Q. What does this calendar entry show?
    A. This reflects an appointment made for a Michael Allen
per Hope Hicks for a photo shoot for the Washington Post. That
was to take place on the 25th floor lobby area of Trump Tower.
And the date was January 17, 2017, at 12:30.
    Q. Do you know who Hope Hicks is?
    A. Yes, I do.
    Q. Who was she?
    A. She was the communications person for the campaign.
    Q. Does this calendar entry also show that Mr. Trump was
working at Trump Tower on January 17, 2017?
    A. Yes, it does.
        MS. HOFFINGER: Can we show Page 2, please.
        (Displayed.)
    Q. What does this calendar entry show?
    A. It refers to another Teleprompter practice session on
the 25th floor conference room, at Trump Tower, on January 18,
2017, at 1 p.m.
    Q. Does this show that Mr. Trump was still working at
```

Trump Tower during the day on January 17, 2017?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. What does this calendar entry show?
A. This denotes the time that Mr. Trump was departing
Trump Tower in route to LaGuardia Airport on January 19, 2017,
at 12:30.
MS. HOFFINGER: Can we show Page 4, please.
(Displayed.)
Q. Okay.
A. That denotes the anticipated wheels up time from
LaGuardia to D.C. Airport in Washington. That is for
January 19, 2017, at 1 p.m.
Q. Was January 19, 2017, the day before Mr. Trump's
inauguration in Washington D.C. on January 20 of 2017 ?
A. I believe it was.

MS. HOFFINGER: Nothing further.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. NECHELES:
Q. Good afternoon. How are you today?
A. Good afternoon.
Q. You were asked on direct examination about working for
President Trump, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You worked for President Trump for 34 years; is that



Obviously, he entered into the television realm when The Apprentice started. Sports. You know. In many areas.

Q A lot of licensing deals?
A Licensing deals, right, once The Apprentice came along. The Licensing Division became a big part of the company.

Q Lots of speaking engagements?
A Correct.
Q Political fundraisers?
A Correct.
Q And you helped with all those things; right?
A I did.
Q Your discussions with President Trump, were they solely about business?

A Ninety-nine point nine percent of the time.
Q Did you discuss things other than business? Your
family?

A On occasion.
On occasion, he would ask me, "How is your family doing?"
Sometimes, if it was a long day in the office, I appreciated it, he poked his head in and would say, "Go home to your family." It was very thoughtful of him.

I didn't always go because I wouldn't get up and leave, but I thought it was a nice extra touch that he would think to do that.

Q Did President Trump invite you and your husband to his

```
inauguration?
    A Yes, he did.
    Q Did he arrange for you to sit up close?
    A I was on the platform.
    I don't think I was that close. I don't think I deserved to
be that close, frankly; but it was an honor to be on the
platform.
    Q That was a special place to be sitting?
    A I'd say it was a pretty unique, memorable experience.
    Q Now, you were asked on direct examination right now
about Stormy Daniels; correct?
    A Right.
    Q Am I correct that part of your job duties was to work
with the producers of the TV show The Apprentice?
    A That was one of the things that I did, yes.
    Q And President Trump was actively involved in producing
The Apprentice; correct?
    A I'd say he was fairly hands-on, yes.
    Q It was a very popular television show; right?
    A At the time, it was probably "the" most popular
television show.
    Q Am I correct that it brought many people to Trump
Tower?
    A There was a lot of interest, you know, globally,
nationally, internationally, about The Apprentice.
```


other casts members, they would bring in well-known people, really well-known people to join the cast.

Q Celebrity Apprentice began in 2007 ; is that correct?
A I believe so.
Q And during that time period, President Trump would talk constantly about what celebrities would be good to cast on that show; right?

A I think he took a good interest in it.
Q He would talk about that with you; right?
A With me and many of the other people in the office.
Q And you understood that he wanted celebrities who were colorful or interesting people to be on that show; right?

A I think that's a smart casting choice, yes.
Q That's what he would talk about; right?
A He would when we were talking about casting, yes.
Q He wanted people who were controversial sometimes;
right?
A Some maybe more than others.
Q That was because President Trump believed about having controversial people --

MS. HOFFINGER: I'm going to object at this time.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MS. HOFFINGER: Can we approach?
THE COURT: Yes.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held

|  | Page 1518 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | at sidebar:) |
| 2 | MS. HOFFINGER: This is going way beyond the |
| 3 | scope of the direct. I let it go for a little while, but |
| 4 | this is the basis of my objection. |
| 5 | THE COURT: I agree. |
| 6 | MS. NECHELES: She asked about Stormy Daniels |
| 7 | coming up. |
| 8 | Stormy Daniels came up there because she was |
| 9 | being cast. |
| 10 | MS. HOFFINGER: So, ask him the question. |
| 11 | THE COURT: One second. |
| 12 | MS. NECHELES: To get to that, I have to explain |
| 13 | President Trump was very involved in that. |
| 14 | Our whole defense or a lot of our defense in |
| 15 | this case is he was involved with Stormy Daniels over |
| 16 | The Apprentice. |
| 17 | She knows directly about that. |
| 18 | They asked on direct about Stormy Daniels coming |
| 19 | up to the office and being in the cast. That's why they |
| 20 | called her. |
| 21 | THE COURT: They asked a couple of questions |
| 22 | about that. |
| 23 | You're going really far afield. |
| 24 | Why don't you ask -- |
| 25 | MS. NECHELES: I have to talk about The |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |

Apprentice so they understand.
THE COURT: Get to it.
MS. NECHELES: Can I have a little latitude?
THE COURT: I think you already had a little
latitude.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held
in open court:)
Q Am I correct, you would often hear President Trump talking on the phone with people who were interested in being on The Apprentice?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q Well, his office was right next to yours; right?
A Well, I could not hear. There was a big wall behind us, and I couldn't hear him on the phone unless it was very loud.

Q Okay.
But, you heard discussions about, him discussing about people being on The Apprentice; right?

A He would vocalize sometimes people that he was interested in to members of the staff, you know, and I would overhear it.

I don't recall him saying directly to me, but it was discussed.

Q Am I correct that prior to Stormy Daniels coming up to
the office at Trump Tower, you recall hearing President Trump discuss whether Stormy Daniels would be a good contestant?

A I vaguely recall hearing him say that she was one of the people that may be an interesting contestant on the show.

Q Okay.
And the prosecutor just referred to her, I think, as an "adult film actress"; correct?

A Uh, yes.
Q And you understood that to mean that she was, colloquially speaking, a porn star; right?

A I'd say that's a good synonym for it.
Q And you knew she was a porn star because you had heard discussions about her; right?

A Yes.
Q And you had heard President Trump say that he thought she would be an interesting addition to The Apprentice; correct?

A I can't recall a specific instance when $I$ heard it.
It was part of the office chatter.
Q And when Stormy Daniels showed up to Trump Tower to meet President Trump, you understood that she was there to discuss being cast for The Apprentice; correct?

A I assumed that.
Q And I understand your assumption was based on the discussions you had heard, the office chatter; right?


```
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            MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor.
            THE COURT: Overruled. Overruled.
    A It happened on occasion. It would depend what was
going on at the moment and how important the checks were that
needed to be signed.
    Q Okay.
    But, you would often see him on the phone when he was
signing checks?
    A I believe it happened. It wasn't unusual.
    Q And he would also sign checks when he was meeting with
other people; right?
                    MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
                    THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q One of the exhibits is People's Exhibit 70; am I
correct?
                    MS. NECHELES: If you could pull that up.
                (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
    Q Page 1 is a memo.
    You see that in front of you?
    A Yes, I do.
            MS. NECHELES: Can we look at Page 2 also?
                (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
    Q It's a newspaper article; right?
    A Correct.
    Q Madeleine Westerhout -- who is Madeleine Westerhout?
```




```
    Q You're just here testifying to the truth; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q And the only reason your legal fees are being paid is
because --
                    MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor.
                    THE COURT: Sustained.
                    MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
                    I have no further questions.
                    THE COURT: Anything else?
                    MS. HOFFINGER: Nothing, your Honor.
                    THE COURT: You may step down.
                Please approach.
                MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, may we approach?
                    Oh.
                            (Whereupon, the witness is excused from the
    stand.)
            MR. TRUMP: (To the witness as she leaves the
    well area) Are you okay?
            (Whereupon, the witness exits the courtroom.)
            THE COURT: Please approach.
            (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held
    at sidebar:)
            THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Blanche?
            MR. BLANCHE: My request is, after the next
    witness, before cross, if we could have a brief break.
```

| 1 | Page 1526 <br> We didn't know this witness was testifying, and |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | our printer in the back broke. My understanding is they're |
| 3 | trying to fix it. If it's not fixed, I'll just need to |
| 4 | pull stuff up on my iPad. |
| 5 | THE COURT: This is actually -- this is the best |
| 6 | time to take a break, right now. We'll take about a |
| 7 | ten-minute break right now. |
| 8 | Who is your next witness? |
| 9 | MS. HOFFINGER: Mr. Farro. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 11 | (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held |
| 12 | in open court:) |
| 13 | THE COURT: Jurors, we're going to take our |
| 14 | recess. |
| 15 | You can step out. |
| 16 | (Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors |
| 17 | are excused.) |
| 18 | THE COURT: Let's take 15 minutes. |
| 19 | MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you. |
| 20 | (Whereupon, a recess is taken.) |
| 21 | ************************************* |
| 22 | THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People v. |
| 23 | Donald J. Trump. |
| 24 | All parties are present. |
| 25 | THE COURT: Call your next witness. |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |

MS. MANGOLD: The People call Gary Farro.
MR. STEINGLASS: The jury is not here, though.
THE COURT: Actually, hold on.
Let's let the jury come.
Thank you.
COURT OFFICER: All rise.

Jury entering.
(Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors
are present and properly seated.)
THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People v.
Donald J. Trump.
All parties and all jurors are present.
THE COURT: People, call your next witness.
MS. MANGOLD: The People call Gary Farro. COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.
(Whereupon, the witness takes the witness stand.)
G A R Y F A R R O, having first been duly sworn and/or affirmed by the court clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

COURT OFFICER: State your full name, spelling your last name.

THE WITNESS: Gary Farro. $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{O}$.
COURT OFFICER: Your county of residence.
THE WITNESS: I live in Monmouth County, New Jersey.

```
                                    Page 1528
            THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Farro.
                MS. MANGOLD: May I inquire?
                THE COURT: You may inquire.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MANGOLD:
    Q Good afternoon, Mr. Farro.
    A Good afternoon.
    Q I'm going to ask you to speak into the microphone and
slowly so the court reporter can take down what you're saying.
    Where do you work?
    A I work at Flagstar Bank.
    Q What do you do there?
    A I am a Client Adviser, also a Managing Group Director,
Managing Director, Executive Manager.
    Q Are you here to testify voluntarily or complying with
a subpoena?
    A Voluntarily.
    Q Are you sure?
    A Well, I did receive a subpoena after.
    Q Are you represented by counsel?
    A I am.
    Q Are they here today?
    A Yes, they are.
    Q Can you tell everybody about your educational
background?
```

|  | Page 1529 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A Sure. |
| 2 | I attended Monmouth University, received a Bachelor's in |
| 3 | finance. And I've also attended Executive Education Programs at |
| 4 | The Wharton School. |
| 5 | Q And what did you do after you graduated? |
| 6 | A After I graduated, I worked at a wire house, which is |
| 7 | an investment firm, doing brokerage, and then went into banking |
| 8 | shortly thereafter. |
| 9 | Q Where did you work in banking? |
| 10 | A I started off working for a bank which was called |
| 11 | First Union Bank. They later became Wachovia Bank. Then, when |
| 12 | they were purchased by Wells Fargo Bank, I left and went to |
| 13 | First Republic. I spent 15 years at First Republic, until last |
| 14 | year's demise. And then, last year, went to Flagstar Bank. |
| 15 | Q One step at a time. |
| 16 | When did you join First Republic? |
| 17 | A In March of 2008. |
| 18 | Q Did you say you worked there for 15 years? |
| 19 | A That's right. |
| 20 | Q What titles did you hold at First Republic? |
| 21 | A I started as a Relationship Manager. Moved on to a |
| 22 | Senior Relationship Manager. Then I moved on to an Executive |
| 23 | Managing Director -- excuse me -- Senior Managing Director, and |
|  | then an Executive Managing Director. |
| 25 | Q What was your title in 2016? |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |



```
must do when opening a new bank account for a client?
    A Yes, there is.
    Q Does the bank also have policies and practices around
opening a new bank account?
    A Yes, we do.
    Q Maybe it sounds like a silly question, but when folks
open a bank account and they put information on the bank forms,
does the bank actually look at that information?
    A Yes, we do.
    Q And why do they look at that information?
    A Well, depending on what the information is, it will
help us determine if it's a bank account we want to open or not
open.
    Q Is that information also reviewed to ensure compliance
with various laws and regulations?
    A Yes, it is.
    Q And does the bank take any steps to actually verify
the information that their clients put on bank account
paperwork?
    A I was not sure what was done in the back office.
    I'm front.
    Certainly, if somebody stands out immediately -- for
instance, sending currency to another sanctioned country as a
regular practice, it would be shot down.
    But, we have a BSA Compliance Team that does further
```

```
information on that.
    Q For people who may not be more familiar with the
alphabet soup of bank compliance, can you describe what BSA
means?
    A Sure.
    Bank Secrecy Act. It's the method of protecting the bank
and making sure we're not doing transactions or opening any
types of account that could present not only reputational risk
to the institution, but also be against the law.
    Q So, it's a law that sets forth a number of
requirements that the bank has to follow?
    A That's correct.
    Q How about AML?
    A AML is anti-money-laundering.
    It's another form of oversight to ensure that clients
aren't using an account to filter money through.
    Q I think you referenced something that you referred to
as "the back office".
    What is the back office?
    A So, a bank has three lines of defense.
    The first would be your client-facing employees, which
would be, you know, people like myself, as well as individuals
who work in the offices on the ground level, where you would do
your typical transaction.
    The next would be your BSA/AML Compliance Team.
```

Above that would be Audit.
Q So, there were multiple different departments within the bank, in other words, checking to make sure that every account and transaction complied with the law?

A That's correct.
Q And turning now, specifically, to banking transactions -- take a minute if you need water.

A I'm good.
Q Were there certain types of transactions that required more review by the bank?

A Yes.
Q Can you give us some examples?
A A wire is something that is -- requires multiple layers of review.

Account opening requires multiple layers of review.
Q And how about types of transactions with particular types of people?

A Yes.
Q Was one of the types of transactions that requires more review a transaction with a political candidate?

A Yes.
Q And did First Republic Bank also require more review for transactions involving the media industry?

A Um, not necessarily the media industry.
But, if it was something that could pose reputational risk,

```
then that would be determined -- that's above my pay grade.
That would be determined by our second level of support.
    Q Were there any transactions that the bank did not
process at all?
    A Yes.
    Q Can you give us some examples?
    A Any transaction that would be going to a sanctioned
country. Any transaction that would be going to someone who
would be considered on a person of interest list, potential
terrorist, something along those lines. We would not process
that transaction.
```

    Then there's also lines of business that we just decide as
    an institution that we will not do business with.
Q Can you give some examples of those?
A We didn't do gambling. We wouldn't do anything in the
adult entertainment. We wouldn't do anything that involved
check cashing.
Those are a couple of examples.
Q Can you describe what you mean when you say "adult
entertainment"?
A Porno. Um, I guess you would consider them strip
clubs, or anything along those lines.
Q So, the bank wouldn't do business in the adult film
industry, in other words?
A No.


Q So, it's a corporation without any business operations?

A Uh-huh.
Q All right.
Now, focusing on the 2016 time period, I think you said you were a Senior Managing Director at that time?

A Yes.
Q What were some of your responsibilities as a Senior Managing Director?

A As a Senior Managing Director, I led a team of people who did the same job as me, Relationship Managers, as well as manage my own book of business, of clients. I would be working with clients on their day-to-day money management needs, which would include checking, savings, money market, CDs, as well as their lending needs, mortgages, lines of credit, etcetera. As well as doing their investment management.

Q Was that part of First Republic Bank's private bank?
A Well, First Republic Bank is a unique entity in that it only is a private bank. There is no real retail.

Although there is branches on the ground level, it was focused more on working with affluent and high-net-worth individuals.

Q Can you just explain at a very high level the difference between private banking and retail banking?

A A retail banking relationship would be someone who,

```
essentially, walks into the branch, does most of the
transactions themselves, and does not really look for too much
advice except outside a mortgage.
    A private banking relationship is when you're assigned to
someone who is a Relationship Manager who would, essentially,
help you and be your point of contact for all things that you
need.
    Q Were most of your clients, were all of your clients
high-net-worth individuals?
    A No.
    Actually, the good thing about working for First Republic
is we never set a barrier to entry.
    Most private banks have a minimum barrier to entry, which
would be you have to have a certain amount in liquid assets at
the firm.
    We never set any barrier of entry. So I had a very wide
range of clients of various different levels of wealth.
    Q About how many clients would you say you worked with
while you were at First Republic Bank?
    A Before I left, I had about eighteen hundred.
    Q You got to experience the full range of clients in
terms of wealth and industries?
    A That's correct.
    Q In general, in your experience, would you say that
high-net-worth clients have more interaction with the banking
```

```
industry than retail clients?
    A Well, private banking clients tend to do more with the
individual. They see us as a center of influence and utilize us
for more of our services, whether it be on the banking --
day-to-day banking side, lenders side, investment managing
side. So, by way of having that singular point of contact, it
makes their lives a little easier for typically-very-busy
people, so they want that one point of contact.
    Q Despite being busy people, would you say that wealthy
people are generally more familiar with the banking system?
    A Depends on -- if I could speak on that for many of my
clients, I would say yes.
    I would not say "all".
    Q I think you said you had clients in a number of
different industries. Would that include the real estate
industry?
    A Yes.
    Q About how many clients did you have that worked in the
real estate industry?
    A It's hard to say, but those who are fully focused in
the real estate industry would probably be in the 20 or 30
range.
    Q In general, were real estate clients more familiar
with the banking system than an average client?
    A I would say so, because they did a fair amount of
```

```
borrowing on the buildings or whatever they were purchasing, so
they learned the banking system a little bit more.
    Q Did you have any clients that were lawyers?
    A Yes.
    Q And based on your work at the bank, are you able to
tell the difference between the different type of bank accounts
maintained by lawyers?
    A Yes.
    Q Now, I think you said earlier that you oversaw client
relationships.
    Can you describe a little bit more what that means?
    Are you filling out paperwork day to day for the clients?
    A No.
    I have a team that works behind me.
    I would make suggestions on what types of accounts to open
or in many cases, you know, it would be lending that I would
get more involved with, lending and wealth management.
    But, I had a team of people that worked under me that would
handle the day-to-day paperwork, and I handled the
transactions.
    Q So, you handled the relationships?
    A Yes.
    Q So, clients would work with you, and you reached out
to other folks in the bank in order to get their needs met?
    A Yes.
```

Q Do you know someone named Michael Cohen?
A Yes, I do.
Q How do you know him?
A Michael Cohen was assigned to me after a colleague left as a client in 2015.

Q Do you know how long Michael Cohen had been a client of the bank when he was assigned to you in 2015?

A I do not know exactly.
Q Had he been a client of the bank for some time by the time you took over the client relationship?

A Definitely a couple of years or so. I'm not sure exactly how much time, though.

Q Do you know why you were selected to take over the Michael Cohen relationship?

A I can only tell you what $I$ was told, um, that $I$ was selected because of my knowledge and my ability to handle, um, individuals that may be a little challenging.

Q How long did you work with Michael Cohen?
A Um, from 2015 until I believe it was 2018 or '19. I'm not exactly sure of the end date.

Q And in those several years where you worked with him, did you have frequent interactions with him?

A Not frequent. No.
Michael did a lot of his own business. And, frankly, I didn't find him that difficult. He did a lot of his own

```
business by walking across the street. We had an office that
opened right across the street from his office. So, he would do
his day-to-day stuff there.
    But, anything he did need, he called me, and it was always
something that was urgent.
    Q Where was Mr. Cohen's office?
    A It was in the Trump Tower.
    Q Do you know where that is?
    A I think it's Fifth Avenue and -- in Midtown.
    Q You said that there's a First Republic Bank branch
close to that office?
    A Yeah. 56th and Madison.
    Q And Mr. Cohen would frequently go to that branch in
person?
    A Yes.
    Q What was Mr. Cohen's profession?
    A He was a lawyer or is a lawyer. I'm not sure.
    Q And what company did he work for?
    A The Trump Organization.
    Q Do you know if he worked for anybody in particular at
The Trump Organization?
    A Um, only what he had told me, that he worked for, um,
former-President Donald Trump.
    Q Did he talk about that frequently?
    A Yes.
```




| 1 | Before testifying today, did you have an opportunity to 154 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | review files marked for identification as People's Exhibits 361 |
| 3 | through 364 and 366 through 379? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q Do those files contain First Republic Bank emails, |
| 6 | banking documents, and client account records? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q Were all of those records kept and maintained by First |
| 9 | Republic Bank for the purpose of evidencing or reflecting the |
| 10 | activity of the bank? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q Did you look at two sets of documents with those file |
| 13 | names, one with redactions and one without redactions? |
| 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q And aside from the redactions, are those two versions |
| 16 | identical? |
| 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q And was the information that was redacted personal |
| 19 | identifying information? |
| 20 | A Can you explain the question, please? |
| 21 | Q Sure. |
| 22 | Was the people's personal phone numbers, email addresses |
| 23 | and the like -- |
| 24 | A Yes. Because it's documentation. Yes. |
| 25 | Q -- redacted. |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |
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Q Are the types of emails included the same types of emails that were routinely generated as part of the first order of business at First Republic Bank?

A Yes.
Q Do any of the emails contained reflect personal or non-business related activity?

A No.
Q Now, and I think you said you also saw First Republic
Bank banking records in those files; is that right?

A That's right.
Q Did that include account forms, bank account statements and wire transfer forms?

A Yes, in addition to KYC forms as well.
Q And can you just explain what you mean by KYC forms?
A KYC is "Know Your Customer." It's a way in which -that we can help identify that the customer is, in fact, who they say they are.

Q And is KYC something that's in place as a result of a law that banks are required to follow?

A Yes.
Q Were the types of bank account records that you looked at, the type of records that are routinely generated and relied upon by the bank?

A Yes.
Q Did First Republic create and maintain the bank records

```
in the regular course of its business?
    A Yes.
    Q Was it the regular course of the business of First
Republic to create and maintain these bank account records?
    A Yes.
    Q Were the entries in the records made at or around the
time of the recorded events or transactions?
    A Yes.
    Q Were the people who made the entries in the records
under a business duty to do so accurately?
    A Yes.
    Q And the last category, would you say that there were
also client account records within the files marked for
identification?
    A There are.
    Q Were the types of client account records included, the
types of business records that were routinely provided by
clients to the bank as part of the bank's business?
    A Yes.
    Q Were they the types of business records that the bank
routinely collected, reviewed and maintained in the regular
course of its business?
    A Yes, they are.
    Q Was it the regular course of business to collect,
review and maintain these types of records?
```



| 1 | Q | Is this a First Republic Bank email? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A | Yes, it is. |
| 3 |  | MS. MANGOLD: And can we blow up the top portion |
| 4 | with | the words, "there you can." |
| 5 | Q | Is that easier to read? |
| 6 | A | It is. |
| 7 | Q | All right. What date was this email sent? |
| 8 | A | This email was sent on 10/11/2016. |
| 9 | Q | And who was it sent to? |
| 10 | A | It's sent to me. |
| 11 | Q | And who was it sent from? |
| 12 | A | It was sent from Liz Rappaport, who is my assistant. |
| 13 | Q | And did she go by any other names? |
| 14 | A | Lizzie. |
| 15 | Q | What's the subject of the email? |
| 16 | A | "Missed call from Michael Cohen." |
| 17 | Q | And can you read the text of the email without the |
| 18 | phone num | mber information, please. |
| 19 | A | Sure. "Michael Cohen just called for you. I let him |
| 20 | know that | you were out of the office and were unavailable." |
| 21 | "He | asked that you please return his call as soon as you are |
| 22 | available | at 3212 or on his cell 0114." |
| 23 |  | MS. MANGOLD: And can we pull up People's Exhibit |
| 24 | 362 | in evidence. |
| 25 |  | (Displayed.) |


|  | Page 1552 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ********** |  |
| 2 |  | MS. MANGOLD: And pull up the top portion of that |
| 3 | email. |  |
| 4 | Q | Is this a First Republic Bank email? |
| 5 | A | Yes, it is. |
| 6 | Q | What date was this sent? |
| 7 | A | On 10/13/2016. |
| 8 | Q | And who was it sent from? |
| 9 | A | It was sent from Elizabeth Rappaport to me. |
| 10 | Q | And what is the subject of this email? |
| 11 | A | "Missed call, Michael Cohen, Regarding: Important." |
| 12 | Q | And can you read the content of the email to the jury? |
| 13 | A | "Please return Michael Cohen's call when you are |
| 14 | available | today regarding an important matter." |
| 15 | Q | Do you recall what these two emails related to? |
| 16 | A | Yes, I do. |
| 17 | Q | And did you ultimately connect with Mr. Cohen in |
| 18 | response | to these messages? |
| 19 | A | I spoke to him briefly after that, yes. |
| 20 | Q | Can you describe that call for the jury? |
| 21 | A | Sure. I gave him a call, and he had mentioned that he |
| 22 | wanted to | open a new LLC account, so I referred him to my team. |
| 23 | Q | When you say "LLC account," what does that mean? |
| 24 | A | That's a Limited Liability Company. |
| 25 | Q | And does that mean that Michael Cohen had a Limited |

```
Liability Company for which he wanted to open an account?
    A That's correct.
    Q Did he say anything else about the account or the LLC
at that time?
    A Oh, he said it was an account for real estate.
    MS. MANGOLD: Can we take those down and pull up
    People's Exhibit 363 now in evidence.
        (Displayed.)
        **********
    Q Is this another First Republic Bank email?
    A Yes, it is.
    Q All right.
                    MS. MANGOLD: Now, I would like to pull up the
        date and time on the bottom email in the chain on the first
        page.
                (Displayed.)
            *******
    Q What date and time was this sent?
    A Thursday, October 13, 2016, at 9:23 Eastern Standard
Time.
            MS. MANGOLD: Can we also pull up the date and time
        of the top email.
        (Displayed.)
    Q Now, traditionally the top email is a later email in
```

the chain; right?
A It is the later email in the chain, yes.
Q And what is the date and time stamp on the top email in this chain?

A $10 / 13 / 2016,7: 48 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. What they failed to notice there is that's Pacific time.

Q Yeah, can you explain how you sent an email before the email that you received?

A Well, I am not in the business of being in Back to the Future, so this was definitely the way that it's pulled through our server in San Francisco so that would be the time in Pacific.

Q So the bottom email on the chain is in Eastern Standard Time and the top email on the chain is in Pacific time?

A That's correct.
Q And is it going to be the case for the rest of the files in -- and emails in the exhibits that we just talked about, that the top email chain only is going to be in Pacific time?

A That's correct. The most recent email or the last email would be the Pacific time; everything below it would be in Eastern Time.

Q All right. Turning now to the top email in the chain. You said this is an email from you? (Displayed.)

A This is an email from me to one of my team members, Olivia Cassin.

And this was after the phone call with Michael Cohen, and he mentioned that he needs an account opened for Michael Cohen immediately and he wants no address on checks.

Q Was it unusual for Mr. Cohen to request something get done immediately?

A It was not.
Q And it said in the email he wants no address on the checks.

Is that unusual?
A Not really for an LLC account, because most people who are employed by someone else do not use that business address for an LLC account, and they don't want to share their home addresses for reasons of being anonymous.

Q Turning now to the bottom email.
Is this an email from Mr. Cohen to you? (Displayed.)

A Yes, it is.
Q And are there attachments to the email?
A I can't tell by looking at this.
Q If you look at the top most --
A Oh, yes, yes, there is, based upon the -- there is an attachment, a PDF attached to it.

| 1 | Page 1556 <br> MS. MANGOLD: Can we flip to the second and third |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | page of the PDF. |
| 3 | (Displayed.) |
| 4 | ********** |
| 5 | Q Can you see those? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q What type of document is this? |
| 8 | A This is a document that is provided by the IRS that |
| 9 | gives an Employee Identification Number for a new account, a new |
| 10 | business that's being opened. |
| 11 | MS. MANGOLD: Can we zoom in on the top left where |
| 12 | it shows the address line. |
| 13 | (Displayed.) |
| 14 | ******* |
| 15 | Q What does it say there? |
| 16 | A "Resolution Consultants LLC. Michael Cohen, sole |
| 17 | member." |
| 18 | Q Do you have an understanding of what Resolution |
| 19 | Consultants LLC was? |
| 20 | A It was -- my understanding was it was a real estate |
| 21 | consulting company. |
| 22 | Q And was that the LLC that Mr. Cohen referred to in the |
| 23 | phone call to you earlier in that day? |
| 24 | A That's correct. |
| 25 | Q And was he calling to set up an account for this |



```
    Q Would you refer to this as an Entity Formation
Document?
    A Yeah, that's what it is, it's an Entity Formation DOC.
    Q Okay. Let's go one page forward. And how about this,
what is this particular document?
            (Displayed.)
            *******
    A So this is the Certificate of Formation, so this goes
with the prior document.
    And this is the establishment of Resolution Consultants
LLC.
    Q And who signed the Resolution Consultants Certificate
of Formation document?
    A Michael Cohen.
    Q All right.
                            MS. MANGOLD: Let's take that down.
    And can we pull up People's Exhibit 364 in evidence?
        (Displayed.)
    Q Is this another First Republic Bank email?
    A Yes, it is.
    Q And what's the date of this email?
    A The date on this email is 10/13/2016.
    Q And what's the time stamp here?
    A 8:43 a.m.
```




A Any business account would require this document. MS. MANGOLD: And can we look now at the top third of the page, at the box that says "account name and address."
(Displayed.)

Q What entity is this an account opening document for?
A Resolution Consultants LLC.
Q And directing you now to the bottom row of that same
box where it says, "Type of Business."

What does it say in type of business?
A "Management consulting including $H R$ and marketing."
Q For people who may not know, what is management consulting?

A Management consulting is pretty encompassing.
It would be work that you are consulting on for a number of different types of businesses.

In this case, through my understanding through conversations with Michael, it was for real estate.

Q And it says "including HR."
Do you know -- do you have an understanding of what "HR" means there?

A Human resources.
I could expand on that, if you would like.
It's each account that you open has a NAICS code.

| 1 | Q I'm sorry, are you referring to the numbers to the left |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | of the word "management consulting?" |
| 3 | A Yeah, the 541611. |
| 4 | Q And you said that it's called a NAICS code? |
| 5 | A It's called a NAICS, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{S}$, code. |
| 6 | Q And what is a NAICS code? |
| 7 | A It identifies the type of business, so you have to |
| 8 | choose one of those codes. |
| 9 | So that's why it says: "Including HR and marketing." |
| 10 | It's not as though we thought that he would be in HR and |
| 11 | marketing, it's just a general category. |
| 12 | Q When you say you have to choose one of those codes, who |
| 13 | is the person that filled in this information? |
| 14 | A Well, it wouldn't be me. |
| 15 | It would be -- we would ask the client what their line of |
| 16 | business is, and then we would identify what would be the most |
| 17 | appropriate code. |
| 18 | Q So is the information in these forms provided by |
| 19 | Mr. Cohen? |
| 20 | A Yes. |
| 21 | Q Turning now to the middle portion of that same page. |
| 22 | (Displayed.) |
| 23 | ********** |
| 24 | Q To the sentence labeled "Number 4." |
| 25 | Does it provide you who the authorized signers on the |

```
account will be?
    A Yes, the only one is Michael Cohen.
    Q Okay. Turning now to the next page. Is there a
signature on this page?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you recognize that signature?
    A Yes, Michael Cohen's.
    Q And what's the date?
    A 10/13/2016.
    Q Going one page forward.
    What type of document is this?
    A So this is the Addendum. It's an Agreement to open an
accounts and services.
    And this is the information that we would gather on each of
the signers.
    In this case there is only one signer, so this is completed
by Michael.
    Q This is another required account opening document?
    A Correct.
    Q And what does it list as the account name?
    A Resolution Consultants LLC.
    Q And is this document also signed?
    A Yes, it is.
    Q And whose signature is that?
    A Michael Cohen's.
```





```
Q And how long after the Resolution Consultants account opening day was this?
A \(\quad 13\) days, I believe.
Q And, again, it's sent at 6:34 a.m. in the time stamp.
Does that mean that it was 9:34 a.m. in New York time?
A Yes, it does.
Q Who is the email to and from?
A It's from my assistant, Elizabeth Rappaport to myself.
Q And what does the email say?
A "Please return Michael Cohen's call at 3212."
Q Did you return Mr. Cohen's call in response to this
email?
```

A I did.
Q And can you tell the jury what happened on that call?
A He had stated that he was changing course and no longer wanted to open Resolution Consultants and wanted to open a new account.

Q Did he tell you what the new account would be for?
A The same. For real estate.
Q And did he express any type of urgency in opening the account?

A Every time Michael Cohen spoke to me, he gave a sense of urgency.

Q And this is one of those times?
A This is one of those times.



```
system at the bank; right?
    A He input the information at the bank as he spoke with
Mr. Cohen.
    He doesn't -- he didn't just --
    Q He didn't just make up the information?
    A He didn't just make up the information. We don't do
that.
    It was information that was given to him.
    Q And that information was given to him by Mr. Cohen?
    A Yes.
    Q Looking now towards the bottom of the first page where
it says document type provided.
            (Displayed.)
        A Uh-huh.
    Q Can you explain what this is to the jury?
    A This is the articles or Certificate of
Incorporation/Formation. Very similar to the ones that we
looked at earlier.
    Q What was the date of formation for Essential
Consultants LLC?
    A 10/17/2016.
    Q Turning now to the next page.
        (Displayed.)
            *******
```

| 1 | Q And looking at the questions towards the top third of |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the page. |
| 3 | In the form does it say -- does this have the same question |
| 4 | that we saw in the Resolution Consultants form? |
| 5 | It says: "Is the entity associated with political |
| 6 | fundraising or political action committee." |
| 7 | A Yes. This is just the digital form of what was |
| 8 | provided earlier, which would be the hard copy. |
| 9 | Q What's the answer to the political fundraising question |
| 10 | on the form? |
| 11 | A Is "No." |
| 12 | Q Now, turning to the business narrative portion in the |
| 13 | middle of the page. |
| 14 | What business narrative is provided for Essential |
| 15 | Consultants LLC? |
| 16 | A It's Michael Cohen is opening Essential Consultants LLC |
| 17 | as a real estate consulting company to collect fees for |
| 18 | investment consulting work he does for real estate deals. |
| 19 | Q And is that consistent with the description of the LLC |
| 20 | that he provided to you on the call earlier that day? |
| 21 | A Yes, it is. |
| 22 | Q Do you have an understanding of how it came to be that |
| 23 | DeWitt Hutchins was the one filling out this information when |
| 24 | Mr. Cohen called you? |
| 25 | A Yes, I do. |


|  | Page 1572 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q How did that come about? |
| 2 | A Well, when Mr. Cohen called me, I was on a golf course, |
| 3 | that's very cliché for a banker, I know, but I was on golf |
| 4 | course on a day off and essentially it was easier for him to |
| 5 | walk across the street to open an account as then it would be |
| 6 | for me to make a series of phone calls to get someone to reach |
| 7 | out to him. |
| 8 | MS. MANGOLD: Your Honor, I'm at a natural stopping |
| 9 | point now. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Sure. |
| 11 | Can you approach for a minute. |
| 12 | MS. MANGOLD: Sure. |
| 13 | (At Sidebar.) |
| 14 | ****** |
| 15 | THE COURT: I was just wondering how much more you |
| 16 | have with this witness? |
| 17 | MS. MANGOLD: Probably an hour or so. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Okay. Do you have that much cross? |
| 19 | MR. BLANCHE: It won't be as long as the direct. |
| 20 | THE COURT: All right. So we will call it a day. |
| 21 | MS. MANGOLD: Thank you. |
| 22 | MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you. |
| 23 | (Sidebar concluded.) |
| 24 | ****** |
| 25 | THE COURT: All right. Jurors, we are going to go |

ahead and stop at this time and call it a week.
Jurors, please remember what I asked of you, to remember my admonitions:

Do not discuss this case either among yourselves or anyone else.

You may tell the people with whom you live and your employer that you are a juror, and give them information about when you will be required to be in court, but you may not talk with them or anyone else about anything related to the case.

Do not, at any time during the trial, request, accept, agree to accept or discuss with any person, the receipt or acceptance of any payment or benefit in return for supplying any information concerning the trial.

You must promptly report directly to me any incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any person improperly to influence you or any members of the jury.

Do not visit or view any of the locations discussed in the testimony.

And you must not use internet maps, Google Earth or any other program or device to search for or view any locations discussed in the testimony.

Do not read, view or listen to any accounts or discussions of the case reported by newspapers, television,


```
G. Farro - Direct/Mangold
```



