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THE CLERK: This is The People of the State of New York against Donald J. Trump, SMZ 71911 of '24.

Appearances, starting with the People, please.
MR. STEINGLASS: For the People, ADA Joshua Steinglass, Susan Hoffinger, Matthew Colangelo, Christopher Conroy, Becky Mangold and Katherine Ellis.

Good morning everyone.
THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. BLANCHE: Good morning, your Honor.
Todd Blanche on behalf of President Donald J. Trump who is seated to my left. I am joined at counsel's table by Emil Bove, Susan Necheles and Stephen Weiss.

Good morning.
THE COURT: Good morning.
Good morning, Mr. Trump.
As you know, I asked the jury to come in a little bit later today, at ten o'clock, so that we could have our hearing on the Order to Show Cause which is identified as SMZ 71911 of '24.

I looked at the exhibits that were provided by both the People and the Defense. The People provided four exhibits, one for each one of those violations. The Defense provided a number of exhibits, I believe it was close to 500 pages in total, and also submitted a -- so, People, why don't we begin with you going through each of
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the violations, and explain to me why you believe that it constitutes a violation.

MR. CONROY: Sure, Judge.
Unless your Honor prefers it, I think that I will not play each of the video clips or even read the direct language. I will just talk about each of them, and I will let you know which one I am speaking about as I am speaking about it.

THE COURT: I agree you shouldn't play the video. You can give me the exact language and why you think it is a violation, you should do that.

MR. CONROY: Okay.
Judge, $I$ just want to start by saying the Defendant's complaining that this order restricting his extrajudicial statements in this case, was not intended to allow everyone to attack him but not to allow him to respond, and that's on page one of his memo.

The order was issued because of the Defendant's persistent and escalating rhetoric aimed at participants in this proceeding. And the order was intended to prevent the Defendant from attacking witnesses in this case and jurors in the case and others.

He has already been found by the Court to have violated the order nine times, and he has done it again here.
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With respect to the first violation, $I$ am going to talk about, this is, actually, the second violation on the Order to Show Cause that we handed up. It's Exhibit F in the April 25th Affirmation.

And I will just start by reading it, the Defendant said the following:

But this Judge said that I can't get away from the trial. You know, he is rushing the trial like crazy. Nobody has ever seen a thing like this.

That jury was picked so fast, 95 percent Democrats. The area is mostly all Democrat. You think of it as a, just a purely Democrat area. It is a very unfair situation, that $I$ can tell you.

This was just hours before he had a hearing here related to his previous violations.

He was on the media, and he used his platform there to criticize the seated jury in this case. There is no inference needed. It is not just any jurors, it is these jurors, in this case, sitting right in this room in a few minutes.

His contrived justification in his papers is that, well, the media was saying some of what I am saying. That's a little bit like his re-posting argument, except weaker.

The Defendant saying anything amplifies it and
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creates an air of menace that is substantially different from a media report. By talking about the jury at all, he places this process and this proceeding here in jeopardy.

That is what the order forbids, and he did it anyway.

I will move on to the second violation that we are alleging, and it is actually the fourth in the Order to Show Cause. It's Exhibit $H$ in the Affirmation that we filed on the 25 th.

That statement was made on the morning of the 25th. So, on his way down here for the hearing at some kind of a press event, I think at 49th and Fifth Avenues in Manhattan. And the Defendant was out, and there were reporters around who were asking him questions. I think that was all part of the plan.

And one of the questions, and I will read now the question, and then the defendant's statement.

The question was, what have you thought of David Pecker's testimony so far? When was the last time you spoke to him?

The defendant's answer was, he has been very nice. I mean, he has been -- David's been very nice, a nice guy. This is a classic carrot stick.

First of all, there is no question that there was
a witness in the proceeding because the witness was going

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter
to be testifying a hour or two after the Defendant made that statement.

As I said the other day, the Defendant knows what he is doing. He talks about the testifying witness, says nice things, does it in front of the cameras.

To be clear, he was asked other questions about this case and ignored them. So this was not just the Defendant responding to everything the reporters were asking him. He selectively responded to this question and not others.

The one he answered was about the witness who was testifying. It was deliberate, and it was calculating.

Pecker, be nice. Everyone is hearing this. I have a platform, and I will talk about you, so be nice.

What the defense counsel described as innocuous statements about Mr. Pecker on page five of their memo, is anything but. They are deliberate shots across the bow to everyone that may come to this courtroom to tell the truth about the Defendant and what he did.

Moving on to the third statement that I will talk about, which this time it is also the third statement in the Order to Show Cause, and it's Exhibit $G$ in the Affirmation that $I$ filed.

This is from an interview that the Defendant gave to a Pennsylvania TV station on the morning of Tuesday,

April 23rd. It didn't actually air until that evening, and the statement is as follows:

Well, Michael Cohen is a convicted liar, and he has got no credibility whatsoever. He was a lawyer and you rely on your lawyers. But Michael Cohen was a convicted lawyer. He was a lawyer for many people, not just me, and he got in trouble because of things outside of what he did for me.

Largely, it was essentially all because of what he did in terms of the campaign. I don't think there was anything wrong with that, with the charges that they made, but what he did is -- is he did some pretty bad things, I guess, with banking or whatever. If it was a personal thing to him.

David Pecker, $I$ don't know exactly what he's going to be testifying against but -- or about. He will be testifying today.

Again, no question this is related to this proceeding. The Defendant is talking about two witnesses, one of whom was on the stand at the time in the middle of testimony.

It's clearly willful, clearly knowing.
The Defendant thinks the rules should be different for him. I talked a bit about the impact of comments about a testifying witness, perhaps not on that
witness, but on other witnesses, it is an insidious thing.
I will talk a little bit more about Michael Cohen in a moment.

Moving to the -- and, again, in that statement he is talking both about Michael Cohen and his credibility, which is a theme here, and then about David Pecker who is the witness on the stand.

Finally, I will move on to the first statement in the Order to Show Cause, which is Exhibit E from the April 25th Affirmation. That was made also on April 22nd, earlier in the day than the statement $I$ just talked about.

And I know I said this the other day, that this statement was made right outside of these doors, the doors of this courtroom in the little pen that's set up where he speaks to the gathered media everyday.

He stood there for almost nine minutes and he talked about a prospective witness that was going to be in this courtroom at some date in the future, Michael Cohen.

What he said was, and it's two different
excerpts:
But, they called the payment to a lawyer a legal expense in the books. They didn't call it construction. They didn't say you are building a building. They called it a payment to a lawyer because, as you know, Cohen is a lawyer, represented a lot of people over the years.
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I am not the only one and wasn't very good in a lot of ways in terms of his representation, but he represented a lot of people.

But, he puts in an invoice, or whatever, a bill, and they pay, and they call it a legal expense. I got indicted for that.

Later the Defendant went on, quote, and when are they going to look at all the lines that Cohen did in the last trial?

He got caught lying in the last trial. He got caught lying, pure lying. And when are they going to look at that?

This and all of these are clearly related to this proceeding. They are clearly willful. The Defendant is talking about witnesses and the jury in this case, one right here outside the door, all during the trial.

This is the most critical time, the time the proceeding needs to be protected, where -- particularly where Defendant has demonstrated over time, and recently, his willingness to say and do anything he can to try to infect and disrupt this process. That's what the Defendant has tried to do and continues to try to do.

We understand the Court's concern about Michael Cohen, but in the statements at issue here, the Defendant wasn't responding to anything in particular. He talks
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about things Michael Cohen has said in the weeks and months before defendant's statements at issue here.

There is mention of TikToks more recently, and now, $I$ will talk about the exhibits, the 50 plus exhibits, 500 pages of documents that were filed with Defense papers.

But, there is nothing to indicate that the Defendant saw those statements when they were made. This order has only been in effect for four to five weeks, not months.

Michael Cohen is not a political opponent. Defendant's comments about Michael Cohen relate to issues at the heart of this proceeding and Michael Cohen's participation in the proceeding.

They don't relate to political policies or goals of the Defendant. The Defendant is doing everything he can to make this case and the proceeding about his politics. It's not. It's about his criminal conduct.

His statements are corrosive to this proceeding and to the fair administration of justice.

As your Honor knows, we just did this the other day. What we have to prove here is the existence of a lawful order expressing an ongoing mandate, which I submit is very clear here based on the Court's previous decision and other litigation on this very issue.

We have to show a violation of that order, and
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that's what we have just gone through. And we have to show that it is made with knowledge, and it is willful beyond a reasonable doubt.

I would remind the Court that on Monday, April 23rd, Mr. Blanche in court with the Defendant sitting right next to him, said the following about the defendant's knowledge of the order, and this is from the transcript on April 23rd, page 964, line 10 to 15:

There is, just to set the record very straight and clear, President Trump does, in fact, know what the Gag Order allows him to do and not allow him to do. And there was absolutely no willful violation of the Gag Order in the ten posts released by the campaign or what the People just discussed.

THE COURT: What was the page number on that?
MR. CONROY: Sorry. That was Page 964,
April 23rd, lines 10 to 15.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. CONROY: Again, the existence of a lawful
order, I don't think is at issue at all. There has been plenty of litigation on that. The Court issued the decision the other day.

Based on the comments themselves, the timing, and even for the one comment, the location, I submit that we have met our burden and established that the Defendant
willfully and knowingly violated the lawful order of this Court on each of the four occasions that I have just went through.

We are asking the Court, again, to impose the maximum, $\$ 1,000$ fine for each of the four violations.

Because each of these statements was made before the Court held the Defendant in contempt for violating this order nine previous times, and because we prefer to minimize disruptions to this proceeding, we are not yet seeking jail. But the Court's decision this past Tuesday will inform the approach we take to any future violations.

We are happy to answer any questions.
Thank you.
THE COURT: None at this time. Thank you.
Mr. Blanche.
MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, your Honor.
So, part my argument this morning does react to the Court's order on Tuesday, from April 30th. And while we disagree with the Court's order, to some context, we are guided this morning in what $I$ am going to say to the Court by what the Court said to us on Tuesday.

First, the purpose of the Gag Order, your Honor, is to restrict extrajudicial statements in order to protect the integrity of these proceedings by shielding those fearful of reprisal by the Defendant so that they may take
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part in these proceedings without concern.
And as $I$ will get to in a few minutes, your Honor, that concept alone is reason enough to deny the four that we are here about this morning.

And I know that the Court has stated repeatedly that the Gag Order, and your Honor's intention is not to allow unfettered attacks on President Trump, recognizing he is running for President, doing a campaign, every day, part of the campaign takes place outside of this courtroom, part of the campaign takes place in interviews, meetings with potential voters, whether there is press present and on the campaign trail, and your Honor said it again in the order on Tuesday.

And there is no dispute, I think, among anybody, the Court, or the government, that political attacks and responses to political attacks does not violate the Gag Order.

And I disagree with the People. I disagree that the time that we start looking at what President Trump is responding directly to is the day of the Gag Order.

Since, President Trump announced his candidacy to run for election this November in '22, almost two years ago, there have been multiple and repeated attacks on him from, among other people, Michael Cohen, and folks that Michael Cohen has on his podcast regularly.
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Again, to talk -- $I$ will get more into this in a minute from our exhibits, your Honor, to talk not only about these proceedings, and not only about Mr. Cohen's credibility, and not only attacking President Trump's credibility, but also attacking him running for President, the qualities he would bring as a leader of this nation and reflecting on the presidency four years ago.

THE COURT: If I can make a suggestion, Mr. Blanche.

My main concern is the conduct that took place after the Gag Order was implemented.

I looked at the exhibits that you provided. If you want to go through some of them, that's fine, but it's 500 pages.

MR. BLANCHE: I am not going through all of them, Judge, of course not.

THE COURT: Just, as you know, it's not going to weigh very heavily on my decision if you refer to exhibits a year ago or two years ago before the Gag Order was in place.

MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, it is not my intention to do that. We will get to that in a minute.

In response to the Court's Order on Tuesday, and in preparation for our hearing today, we are prepared to pass up some additional exhibits. And the only exhibits I
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am referring to today, $I$ believe, are recent, recent exhibits that bear on the four charged counts.

But, Judge, I -- I do think it's appropriate when the Court's considering whether there has been a willful violation of the Gag Order beyond a reasonable doubt, to keep in perspective beyond just the Gag Order, your Honor did that in reaching the conclusions.

That's what I am talking about today. That's it.
THE COURT: I am telling you what I am going to consider when I make my decision. You can do that.

MR. BLANCHE: Judge, last weekend -- last
weekend, President Trump's rival, President Biden, said in a public forum, he talked about this trial, and he talked about a witness that's going to be in this trial.

He mocked President Trump.
He said, Donald has had a few tough days lately. You might call it stormy weather.

Okay. President Trump can't respond to that in the way that he would want to because of this Gag Order.

Stormy weather, as everyone --
THE COURT: Where --
MR. BLANCHE: It's one of our exhibits, your Honor.

Stormy weather was an obvious reference to Stormy Daniels.
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THE COURT: You are saying that he can't respond to what President Biden said without saying Stormy, Stormy Daniels?

MR. BLANCHE: That's exactly what I am saying.
He cannot respond without saying Stormy Daniels, your Honor. He is not allowed to.

THE COURT: No, he is not allowed to refer to a foreseeable witness in the case. He is certainly allowed to respond to something said by President Biden. There is nothing in the Gag Order that says he can't.

MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, I am not saying that he is not allowed to respond to President Biden, but he is limited in what he can say. President Biden is not limited.

So, President Biden can make a reference to this trial and to a witness in this trial. President Trump can respond about certain parts of this trial and, your Honor, that's just my opening point. That that happened this past weekend to give context to the four statements which is the reason why we are here today.

In addition to the exhibits that were attached on Monday evening, your Honor, we are also going to hand up to the Court and the government shortly exhibits we will offer, and they are Exhibits, 61 through 126.

These exhibits are mostly tweets or re-tweets by

Michael Cohen recently, certain Mea Culpa Podcasts, recent ones, and I don't believe every one since the Gag Order, but recently, and then certain video transcripts from news programs regarding Mr. Pecker's testimony, the jury composition and Mr. Cohen himself.

And I am not going to go through all of them. I am going to highlight a few of them, before $I$ offer them up, and I also -- I have a thumb drive with all of them.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
(Whereupon, documents and a thumb drive were handed to the Court and the People.)

THE COURT: Is there a reason why this wasn't provided before when you submitted your answering papers?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
THE COURT: What's that?
MR. BLANCHE: The additional exhibits are in response, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, to Your Honor's order on Tuesday, because your Honor made plain in the order recognizing that there would be opportunity, and it may be necessary to allow -- to remove certain people from the Gag Order if they didn't need to be protected. That's the reason that we are coming at it late, your Honor.

So I am going to go in a little bit reverse order and talk about Mr. Pecker, the alleged violation regarding
statements about Mr. Pecker.
So, what President Trump said, David Pecker, I don't know exactly what he is going to be testifying about, but he will be testifying today.

So, that was a recording, as the government just said, on April 23rd, for a news show in Philadelphia. It aired about six o'clock that evening.

That was in response to a question from the interviewer saying, where is your concern level at this point regarding David Pecker's testimony and Michael Cohen, but focusing on David Pecker for now?

Where is your concern level?
President Trump sidestepped the question. He gave a very factual, truthful answer. It wasn't a warning. It wasn't a commentary on what Mr. Pecker had testified about, and, certainly, it was not a willful violation.

I mean, he is -- he is talking, as the Court knows from the testimony, about a man that he has known for decades. He is talking about a man who he was friends with for decades.

There is no threat. There is no threat in what President Trump said, and we cited ten. There are multiple articles. We cited ten of them in our papers, news articles that are going into excruciating details about Mr. Pecker's testimony.
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So, when you have President Trump in response to a question saying something completely neutral about the witnesses, there is -- that's not a willful violation of the Gag Order, when the intent of the Gag Order is to make sure that Mr. Pecker comes in here and testifies without fear of what President Trump has said or will say.

THE COURT: It's not just about Mr. Pecker. It's about what all the other witnesses who may come here see. If the witnesses were to see Mr. Trump speaking about Mr. Pecker, or even Mr. Cohen, it affects those witnesses as well.

And that's why, I understand your concern of Mr. Cohen, I expressed concerns about Mr. Cohen and Ms. Daniels in my decision and those are valid. I get it.

But it's not just about those individuals.
It's about what everybody else, the jurors, and all of the other witnesses see Mr. Trump saying or not saying about other witnesses, and that's a concern.

That does go to the integrity of the proceedings. MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, as applied to this case and this trial and what's happening behind us, that's the reasons why this Gag Order isn't fair.

THE COURT: When you say, behind us?
MR. BLANCHE: I am talking about the press and the fact that there is $24 / 7$ coverage of everything that's
happening in this courtroom and everything that the witnesses are saying.

And so, every time we whisper to our client, it's live-streamed over all sorts of social media outlets, every word the witnesses say, and so then you have President Trump who is asked a question.

Everybody is talking about it. What do you think of his testimony, and he doesn't say I think he is a liar. He better watch out.

He says something. He can't just say, no comment, repeatedly when he is running for President, and I appreciate the Court's concern, very much so.

And we are reacting to what your Honor wrote on Tuesday, but it's also appropriate to turn to what's happening with this trial.

THE COURT: What's happening in this trial is no surprise to anyone. I mean, the former President of the United States is on trial.

He is the leading candidate for the Republican Party right now. It's not surprising that we have press here. We have press in the overflow room. There are people throughout New York that are interested.

Everybody that came into this knew this would happen. We all suspected it. There are no surprises here.

So, I don't see how it would press on Mr. Trump
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if ten outlets are talking about Mr. Pecker.
MR. BLANCHE: Judge, the reason for the order -the reason for the order is to make sure that witnesses that are going to come in here and testify, are going to do so honestly and without fear of reprisal.

And my point in reflecting on the intense scrutiny of every word said by every witness, is that everybody can say whatever they want, except for President Trump.

THE COURT: They are not -- they are not defendants in this case. They are not subject to the Gag Order.

That's a very significant issue that you are overlooking. I don't have authority over the press.

I don't have authority over most of the people that are saying things.

I couldn't possibly extend a Gag Order to them. I just don't have that authority. So, I don't see the comparison.

I don't see the analogy between comparing your client, who is the Defendant, and who is subject to the Gag Order, with ten members of the press who wrote an article.

MR. BLANCHE: I am not asking your Honor for an
analogy. I am not comparing one to the other.
I am saying that when your Honor is considering
whether President Trump has willfully violated the Gag Order beyond a reasonable doubt, it makes sense, the Court has to look at what all the press and all the media and what Mr. Pecker was reading about his statements.

And so, when you look at what President Trump said about his statements, it does matter. It matters to the willfulness and it matters to whether the reason for the Gag Order is --

THE COURT: If I may, I would like to ask you a question, and this has to do with what you are talking about.

If we look at the first exhibit, I don't remember the exhibit letter, so $I$ will call it number one, when those statements were made, it was your client who went down to that open area and stood in front of the press and started to speak.

It wasn't the press that went to him. He went to the press. He didn't need to go in that direction. The door that he uses is to the right.

So you are telling me that, you know, the scrutiny is outrageous. Nobody forced your client to go stand where he did that day.

MR. BLANCHE: Judge, I agree with that, but two responses.

> One, there is a much different reason with
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respect to Mr. Cohen, which $I$ will get to in a minute.
And two, nobody is forcing him, but he is running for President. He has to be able to speak.

So, your Honor is right. He can walk out there and go right or he can walk out there and go left and make a statement which he is entitled to do and has to do, your Honor.

So we are not --
THE COURT: That's why he is being allowed to do that.

That's why that entire area has been set up the way that it is setup to ensure that your client, as a candidate for Presidency, has the opportunity to speak about absolutely anything he wants, including the District Attorney of New York County. But there are just some things he cannot talk about.

MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, I am going to talk about Mr. Cohen in a minute.

I want to address, briefly, the second Pecker statement, which is Exhibit H to the People's Affirmation.

And this statement is -- President Trump is asked the question, what have you thought of David Pecker's testimony so far?

When was the last time you spoke to him?
President Trump said, he has been very nice. I
mean, he has been -- David's been very nice, a nice guy.
And, again, he is responding to a question.
Mr. Pecker had been on the stand for two days at this point. The government says that that's threatening and a warning to witnesses that they need to be nice.

That's just not true. He is just responding to a question and saying he has been very nice.

Your Honor observed his testimony. There is no animosity between the two of them. There were no threatening or menacing statements.

Again, Mr. Pecker himself testified about their friendship and the relationship, and he would call him Donald and that he had a great relationship with President Trump over the years.

And we, again, put multiple articles in front of the Court, again, not to compare, or not to say that that alone gives President Trump the right to say something, but when the Court is considering whether the purpose of the Gag Order was frustrated by, he has been very nice. I mean, he has been -- David's been very nice, it does matter.

THE COURT: Just to save you time, I am not terribly concerned with that one.

I think that there are situations where comments like that could be of much greater concern.

At this moment, based on what $I$ saw and heard, $I$ am not terribly concerned.

MR. BLANCHE: I will stop with that. I will talk about Mr . Cohen and the Defendant.

Judge, there are two statements the government read. One was outside of the courtroom and one in response to an interview.

Again, the second one was on April 23rd. And, Judge, Mr. Cohen, and I am going to spend a few minutes on this because it's extremely important, in my view the most significant one, has been inviting and almost daring President Trump to respond to everything he has been saying.

Again, personal attacks on his character, mocking him for being on trial and also his candidacy for Presidency of the United States.

So I just want to put a few up on the screen.
THE COURT: Very quickly, please. I want you to make your argument.

MR. BLANCHE: Sure.
So, Exhibit 39, this goes to Mr. Cohen mocking President Trump on X .

If we can go to page two and then six and seven, just very quickly. We can -- if we can blow it up a little bit.

For the record, it has a photo of President Trump in an orange jumpsuit with a picture next to Nelson Mandela, and it's just long repost by Mr. Cohen criticizing President Trump.

And then we can turn to page six and page seven. And, again --

THE COURT: What was the date on that?
MR. BLANCHE: That date, your Honor, should be up at the top.

April 8th of this year, your Honor.
And then pages six and seven, it's more of the same. If we can focus on the date, please, at the top, April 14th.

And, again, keep messing with me Donald, and I won't send any money to your commissary, a comment by Mr . Cohen. And then something obnoxious.

And then on page seven, at the top with the date first, please.

And this is on April 16th, please don't forget about the witnesses. We also matter. Reposting a photo of President Trump.

Next, if we can turn to Exhibit 64, quickly, please. And this one, Mr. Cohen -- this one says, oh my, shits in pants. Keep whining and crying and violating the Gag Order you petulant Defendant.
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This was sent after the Gag Order was put in place.

Exhibit 67, please.
Again, from Mr. Cohen criticizing, again, your attacks on me stink of desperation. We are all hoping that you take the stand in your Defense, with a picture of President Trump in this courtroom. And, again, that is on April 22nd.

And then, finally, Exhibit 110.
Again, this is -- this is before the Gag Order, your Honor, April 4th. But, again, this is not necessarily Mr. Cohen criticizing President Trump about this trial, but about his business and his business ventures, your Honor.

So, again, there is a lot more. We picked four out of a hat. They are all in kind and all similar.

So, the response, and now we are here again on a violation of the Gag Order as it relates to Mr. Cohen, these are responses to repeated and consistent attacks by him against President Trump, his character, his viability as a candidate. And, as you can see, your Honor, it's also completely throughout the Mea Culpa Podcast and on TikTok.

There are repeated attacks on President Trump's candidacy for President by Mr. Cohen.

And if we can go to page -- Exhibit 63, excuse me, and page two, this is -- he is not just doing it to
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attack.
I mean, there are repeated reports and, indeed, they are true, that Mr . Cohen has been shopping television shows based upon, not only what he did for President Trump, but also what he has been doing here. And he is talking about that and advertising what he is trying to do.

And then, again, there is multiple examples of this in our exhibits.

If we can bring up page 37 -- Exhibit 37, page seven, this is an April 12th, political article quoting Mr. Cohen, talking extensively about President Trump's candidacy for President, criticizing him, as someone that should not be voted for.

On the same article next page it says, Donald does not know how to tell the truth. He lied so many times. He can't keep track of the lies.

And then just, very briefly, your Honor, and I hope the point has been made, but we --

THE COURT: You made your point. You made your point.

MR. BLANCHE: Well, okay.
But, I mean, on top of everything that I just put in, there is multiple examples of the Mea Culpa Podcast that are over the top, about his character, about his candidacy for President, including multiple interviews with
folks in this room, with reporters, who just blast President Trump from what he did as President, and what he would do if he is elected in November.

Multiple. I am not talking about one or two. I am talking multiple, in excess of ten, way in excess of ten.

Finally, as has been reported, because it's true, Mr. Cohen has started going on TikTok nightly and literally making money.

So, there is, apparently, a way you can make money with people doing things, while they are watching you on TikTok. He actively encourages folks to give him money. You can see that he has made money.

His TikTok repeatedly criticizes President Trump.
He said, as recently as April 29th, mocking and almost poking President Trump as it relates to the Gag Order, I am not the Defendant in a criminal matter, and I am not the subject of Judge Merchan's Gag Order. Donald is, right.

And that is after criticizing him extensively.
This is not a man that needs protection from the Gag Order. And when you look at what President Trump said about Michael Cohen out here, and then in response to the questions from the interviewer, he wasn't talking about his testimony at this trial.
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He was talking about his quality as a lawyer. He was talking about the fact that he was a convicted liar, that he had been prosecuted for lying.

THE COURT: Can I ask you to address the comments that were made about the jury?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes. That was my last.
So, the government read the statement that -- it was a 15-second statement out of an interview that was over 21-minutes long.

And this was right in the middle of the interview in response to a number of questions about -- at first about policy. And we can exclude the entire interview, but the policy, first about the types of questions that mattered to voters. But this trial matters to voters so, there was a question about this trial.

As you know, your Honor is very well aware, we very much believe that this is a political persecution and this is a political trial. And part of that belief and part of President Trump's belief is the location of this trial.

The fact that he is being tried in a jurisdiction that is over 90 or --

THE COURT: Did he violate the Gag Order?
That's all I want to know.
MR. BLANCHE: I am making an argument that he
didn't and laying the foundation.
THE COURT: So, I am not accepting your argument, which is why I am asking.

MR. BLANCHE: Absolutely, positively not.
THE COURT: He spoke about the jury, right?
MR. BLANCHE: Pardon me.
THE COURT: And he said that the jury was 95 percent Democrats. And that the jury had been rushed through. And the implication being that this is not a fair jury.

That's the implication that was given to anybody that heard that comment. This is not a fair jury.

MR. BLANCHE: The Gag Order specifically references, any prospective juror or any juror in this criminal proceeding.

So, he wasn't referencing juror number four is a Democrat or -- which by the way, the press has noted and the press has highlighted. And the press has put on the screens who is democrat and who is not registered.

Again, he is talking about, again, in a passing phrase about the overall proceedings being unfair and political. The jury --

THE COURT: Okay. It's ten after ten.
Is there anything you would like to say just to wrap it up?

MR. BLANCHE: Judge, again, we moved to the jury, and I am done with Mr. Cohen.

But Mr. Cohen, and the same things in our papers with respect to Ms. Daniels, where, when you go back, the Court goes back and looks at the purpose of the Gag Order, as opposed to just blindly looking at the statements that are made by President Trump, it's not violating.

I mean, the Constitutional limits that you put on the Gag Order, that your Honor put on the Gag Order, are for good reasons.

Because President Trump has to be able to talk extensively and to respond to questions in a way that don't violate the integrity of these proceedings.

And as we said today, Mr. Cohen should not be part of this Gag Order. He does not need to be protected.

The same is true for Ms. Daniels. She is not part of the four statements, but she is very similar, although not as voluminous, comments about President Trump personal, candidacy for Presidency and how he was president last time.

They are not people that need to be protected, and to the contrary, he has to be able to respond to those, Judge.

THE COURT: I understand your argument.
Thank you.
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Is there anything else on this point from either side?

MR. STEINGLASS: No.
THE COURT: Let's take five minutes before we bring the jury in.
(Short recess is taken.)
THE COURT: I think we can get the witness back on the stand, please.

COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.
(Whereupon, the witness entered the courtroom and was properly seated.) THE COURT: Good morning, sir. Welcome back.

I remind you that you are still under oath.
K E I T H D A V I D S O N, herein, called as a witness, being previously sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:

COURT OFFICER: All rise. Jury entering.
(Whereupon, the jury entered the courtroom and was properly seated.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.
THE CLERK: All parties, all jurors are present and properly seated. MR. STEINGLASS: Yes.

THE COURT: Good morning, jurors. Welcome back.

> K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q Thank you.
Good morning, Mr. Davidson.
A Good morning.
Q Since you got off the stand on Tuesday afternoon, have you and I discussed anything about the substance of your testimony?

A No.
Q When we broke on Tuesday afternoon, you were talking about some of the email exchanges back and forth between you and Michael Cohen towards the end of October 2016. Do you remember?

A Yes.
Q I am now showing you People's Exhibit 168. It's in evidence and being displayed to everyone. I will just ask that we blow it up, and I am going to ask you to focus on the portion of the message that appears to be from Dylan Howard.

Do you recognize that?
A Yes.
Q And what is the date of that email?
A October 26, 2016.
Q And the time?
A 8:23 p.m.
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Q Can you please read us the body of the email?
A Michael Keith.
Next paragraph, thank you for chatting with me
earlier.
Next paragraph, confirming agreement on -- and there are three bullet points, executed agreement hand-signed by Keith's client and returned via overnight for same day Fed Ex to Michael.

Next bullet point, change agreement to reflect the correct LLC.

And the final bullet point is, transfer funds on Thursday a.m. to be held in escrow until final -- sorry, until receipt of agreement.

Thank you both, Dylan.
Q And who is this email sent to by Dylan?
A It's sent to Michael Cohen and I.
Q What is your understanding of what this email was about?

A This email followed a conversation, a conference call, between Dylan and I with Michael Cohen. That conversation took place because there was difficulty in communications with Michael Cohen, and I -- and I had lost trust in what he was telling me.

And Dylan came in as the mediator and sort of mediated that meeting, and he followed up with this email.

```
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Q What was the reason for losing trust with Michael Cohen?

A I believed he was not telling me the truth.
Q About what?
A Delays, the delays in the funding.
Q Okay. I now want to show you Exhibit 285 in evidence, and I am going to blow it up, and ask you, is this another
email exchange between yourself and Michael Cohen?
A Yes.
Q And what is the subject line of the email?
A Wire on behalf of Essential Consultants LLC.
Q And what is the date of this email?
A October 27, 2016.
Q And does it appear as though, if you were going chronologically, it would start at the bottom and go up?

A Yes.
Q What is the time of the first email?
A 6:47 am.
Q And is this, to be clear, is this document produced by you and retrieved from your service in California?

A I don't know.
Q We can show you the Bates stamp and see if this helps you to answer the question.

A Yes, it was produced by me pursuant to subpoena.
Q Okay. So, now I am just going to ask you, what does
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the body of the first email in the chain from Michael Cohen to you say?

A Keith.
Next paragraph, kindly confirm that the wire received today, October 27, 2016, shall be held in your attorney's trust account until such time as directed for release by me in writing.

Next paragraph, additionally, please ensure that all paperwork contains the correct name of Essential Consultants LLC.

Next paragraph, I thank you in advance for your assistance and look forward to hearing from you later.

Next paragraph, your, Michael Cohen. Managing Member, Essential Consultants, LLC.

Q And did you respond?
A Yes.
Q At what time?
A 7:02 p.m.
Q And how did you respond?
A I confirmed that I will work in good faith, and that no funds shall be disbursed, unless and until he personally signs all necessary settlement paperwork, parentheses the form of which will match the prior agreement end parentheses. The settlement DOCs will name the correct corporation, parentheses, Essential Consultants LLC, end parentheses. Plaintiff's

```
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signature will be notarized and returned to you via Fed Ex.
Next paragraph, only after you receive the Fed Ex, I will disperse.

Next paragraph, fair.
Q So let me just ask you a quick question here.
The draft of this agreement, I believe you testified was exchanged between you and Michael Cohen back on

October 11th of 2016?
A The 10th or the 11th.
Q Okay. And that time was the entity that Michael Cohen was using to fund this deal called, Resolution Consultants?

A Yes.
Q And at some point between then and the final documents, did the entity name change?

A It did.
Q And what did it change to?
A Essential Consultants LLC.
(Whereupon, Principal Court Reporter, Susan
Pearce-Bates was relieved by Senior Court Reporter, Lisa Kramsky.)
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(The following proceedings are continued from the following page.)
********
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q I now want to pull back up Exhibit 176-A, which is in evidence, and display Page 12, Lines 536 to 537.
Is this a part of that long series of texts between yourself and Dylan Howard?
(Displayed.)
A Yes.
Q And are these two that we've blown up, what is the date on these texts?
A October 27th, 2016.
Q What do the texts say?
A From Dylan Howard to me: "Money wired I am told."
Q Did you have an understanding as to who told Dylan Howard that the funds had been wired?
A I -- I assumed that it was Michael Cohen. He was the only other one involved.
Q And what about your response?
A "Funds received."
Q And did you, in fact, receive these funds as a wire from Essential Consultants on October $27 t h, 2016$ into your escrow account?

```
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A Yes.

Q Turning to Page 13. Just to continue this text exchange.

What, if anything, did Mr. Howard say?
(Displayed.)

A "Unbelievable."
Q And you?
A "Was never really sure..."
Q And did Stormy Daniels have to re-sign the original

Settlement Agreement and the Side Letter Agreement now that the name of the entity that was funding the deal had been changed from Resolution Consultants to Essential Consultants?

A She did.

Q I'm now showing you what's in evidence as People's Exhibit 276.
(Displayed.)
Q Do you recognize these documents?
A Yes.
Q What are they?
A This looks to be the cover page, Page 1, of the confidential Settlement Agreement \& Mutual Release Assignment of copyright and Non-Disparagement Agreement between -- relating to Stormy Daniels.

Q And whom?

A Donald Trump.
```
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Q And were you involved in drafting these Agreements?
A Yes.
Q Did the Settlement Agreement, the ultimate Settlement Agreement payment amount remain \(\$ 130,000\) in this final version?

A It did.
MR. STEINGLASS: I want to display Page 3 and blow up Paragraph 3.1D.
(Displayed.)
Q And I am just going to ask you to read that aloud and then tell us what it means, please?
(Pause.)
A You said you wanted me to read it?
Q Yes, please.
A Aloud?
Q Please.
A Paragraph D: "PP shall not" -- plaintiff shall not -at any time from the date of this Agreement forward, comma, directly or indirectly disclose or disseminate any of the property or any confidential information, parenthesis, (including confirmation of the fact that it exists or ever existed and/or confirming any rumors as to any such existence), end parenthesis, to any party, as more fully provided herein.

Q Does it say "to any third party?"
A "Any third party."
Q Okay. And what does that mean?
```
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A That's essentially part of the nondisclosure aspect of the Agreement.

Q And I believe you told us yesterday, is "PP" the pseudonym Peggy Peterson for Stormy Daniels?

A Yes.

Q Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: I want to turn to Page 10 and blow up Paragraph 5.1.2.

This is on Page 9 of the Settlement Agreement. (Displayed.)

Q What -- I'm not going to ask you to read this whole thing out loud.

Can you just read it to yourself and let us know when you're done reading it.

The question I'm going to ask you is what it means?
A I'm familiar with it. I authored this paragraph.
Q Okay. So what does it mean?
A It's the Liquidated Damages Provision.
Q And does the Liquidated Damages Provision continue onto the next page?

A Yes.
Q Okay. I am just going to quickly show you that last page.
(Displayed.)
Q What was the -- what were the liquidated damages in
this case?

A The stated liquidated damages in this contract was \$1 million dollars.

Q And is that \(\$ 1\) million dollars per breach?
A Yes.

Q Was it unusual to have liquidated damages that were so much greater than the original payment under the NDA?

A I believe that this paragraph, the way that it was drafted, was unenforceable; yes.

Q You believe it was unenforceable; why?
A I -- because the Liquidated Damages Provision would have no relation to the damages caused if there was a breach.

The \(\$ 1\) million dollars -- there needs to be a rational relationship between the expected damages in the case of a breach of contract, and the Liquidated Damages Provision are included in contracts where the expected damages, were there to be a breach, would be difficult to ascertain.

And they should be reasonably related to the underlying amount of the contract.

And, here, a Liquidated Damages Provision of \(\$ 1\) million dollars, which was demanded by Michael Cohen, was so far in excess of the -- of the settlement amount of the contract that it really served no purpose.

Q And I believe you answered this, but who requested such large liquidated damages?
```
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A Michael Cohen.
Q Now, this paragraph that we have blown up refers to
"DD."
Can you remind us what the "DD" stands for again?
A It's a pseudonym for the defendant.
Q And is that a party to this Agreement?
A Yes.
Q And who is the person who DD refers to?
A Donald Trump.
Q Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: I now want to display Page 15.
(Displayed.)
Q And let me know if you need us to blow this up, but I just want to ask you: Who is accepting service on behalf of DD a/k/a David Dennison a/k/a Donald Trump.

A Essential Consultants, care of Michael Cohen, Esquire.
Q And turning to Page 17 of the exhibit. Is this the first page of the finalized Side Letter Agreement?
(Displayed.)
A Yes.
Q And is the name of -- the real name of David Dennison written in handwriting?

A Yes.
Q Whose handwriting is that?
A My handwriting.

Q Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can we just zoom in on that, please.
(Displayed.)
Q And what was the date that the Side Letter was entered into?

A I would have to look at the signature block.
Q Okay. What is the date that is written in the original paragraph of the Side Letter written agreement?

A October 28th, 2016.
Q Okay. Turning to the next page of the exhibit. Page 18.
(Displayed.)
Q And blowing up the second full paragraph. Can you please read that out loud?

A "It is further agreed, neither party shall keep a copy of this document, and that only Keith M. Davidson, Esquire and Michael D. Cohen, Esquire, counsel for the parties herein, shall maintain possession of it or access to this Side Letter Agreement.

And then in all caps: "FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBT," comma, "THE PARTIES HERETO AGREE AND CONFIRM THAT THIS SIDE LETTER AGREEMENT IS DEEMED," QUOTE, "'ATTORNEY'S EYES ONLY,'" END QUOTE.

Q And what did you understand that to mean?
A That this document was sensitive; that the parties --
```
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that neither party could maintain a copy of this Side Letter Agreement, and that only Michael Cohen and I could possess a fully executed copy of it.

Q And to be clear, is this the document that decodes, I guess, the Nondisclosure Agreement between Stormy Daniels and Donald Trump?

A The Settlement Agreement and Nondisclosure Agreement, yes, this is the Side Letter Agreement that decodes the underlying Settlement Agreement.

Q And I should clarify. When I say "decode," I mean provides the real names of the parties to the Settlement Agreement?

A True.

Q Okay. Turning to the bottom -- the next page. Oh, no, just the bottom of this page. And I will just ask you, who -if you signed the Agreement?

A I did sign the Agreement.
Q Silly question, but where?
A Above my name.
Q On the line above your name?

A Yes.

Q Who signed on behalf of Peggy Peterson a/k/a Stephanie Gregory Clifford a/k/a Stormy Daniels?

A She signed that herself.
Q And what was the date that she signed it?

A October 28th, 2016.

Q What was the date that you signed it?
A October 31st, 2016.

Q And did -- who signed on behalf of Essential
Consultants?

A Michael Cohen.
Q And what date did he sign?

A He wrote that he signed it on October 28th, 2016.

Q Did anyone ever -- well, let me ask you this, did you ever receive a version where there was a signature on the line for David Dennison's signature?

A I did not.

Q Turning to page 19, which is the last page of the exhibit.

What is this exhibit?

What is this?
(Displayed.)
A This is an Assignment \& Transfer of Copyright. It's an addendum to the Settlement Agreement.

Q And what does that mean?

A A -- copyrights are details of an ownership of some sort of intellectual property, and as a result of the underlying contract, it called for a transfer of copyright in any materials that Stephanie Clifford owned an interest in where she transferred that right to the other party in this Agreement.

\section*{K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass}

MR. STEINGLASS: And if you could blow up the bottom here.
(Displayed.)
Q Did Stormy Daniels sign the Agreement?
A She did.
Q Where?
A Above the line, her signature line, "PP."
Q And what name did she use to sign it?
A Stephanie Clifford.
Q Who signed the Agreement on behalf of David Dennison?
A Michael Cohen, Esquire.
Q And is that above the line -- is that the line that we have highlighted above the "DD"?

A Yes.
Q Now, did he also place the initials "EC" for Essential Consultants at the bottom of the page over the line for "DD"?

A Yes.
Q All right.
So, Mr. Davidson, how much money did you personally make for this deal?

A \(\quad \$ 10,000\).
Q Did there come a time when you disbursed the monies that you received in a wire from Michael Cohen on October 27th?

A Yes.
Q And do you remember how much you disbursed to Stormy
```
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Daniels, approximately?

A (Pause.) I fear that that invades attorney-client privilege.

I disbursed everything other than my attorney fees.
Q So let me ask you this, did you also, without invading attorney-client privilege, did you also disburse some of the money to Gina Rodriguez?

A I disbursed everything to -- pursuant to my client's directives, her net aspect of the settlement pursuant to her directive.

Q Okay. So directing your attention to November of 2016. Did there come a time when the Agreement between Karen McDougal and AMI became public?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember how that happened?
A Yes.

Q How?
A Well, I -- I should clarify.
Q Let me ask you that a different way. I don't want to ask you to invade any privilege.

Was there an article that was published in a particular publication?

A There was an article published in the Wall Street Journal that initially publicized the underlying contract between Karen McDougal and AMI.
```
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evidence.
(Displayed.)
Q It's in evidence so everybody can see it. Do you recognize this?

A I do.
Q Is this the Wall Street Journal article that you referenced that broke the story between -- about the deal between AMI and Karen McDougal?

A It is.
Q And what is the date of this article?
A November 4th, 2016.
Q After this article was published, or around the time the article was published, did you speak with Michael Cohen about it?

A I did.
Q Once or more than once?
A More than once.
Q What do you recall about those conversations?
A That he was very upset.
Q Can you elaborate?
A He was very upset that the article had been published. He was very upset about the timing of the article.

He wanted to know who the source of the article was; why someone would be the source of this type of an article.

He was very upset about the timing.
He stated that his boss was very upset.
And he threatened to sue Karen McDougal.
Q And when Michael Cohen said that "his boss was very upset," who did you understand that to mean?

A Donald Trump.
Q And when Michael Cohen complained about the timing of the article, what did you understand that to mean?

A That it was in close proximity to the Election of 2016.
Q As you sit here, do you remember the date of Election Day 2016?

A It may have been the 6th, I'm not sure.
Q Okay. What is your recollection about Karen McDougal's whereabouts at the time that this article was published?

If you can answer that without violating privilege?
A Yeah, I don't know that \(I\) have -- I don't know that I have an answer to that question.

Q Okay.
A I don't recall.
Q So now I want to direct your attention back to People's Exhibit 176A.
(Displayed.)
Q And this might refresh your recollection as to the date of Election Night.

From the context of this -- of the text exchange, can you
```
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tell, and keeping in mind that this is in London time, UTC time, can you tell -- does this refresh your recollection about when Election Day was in 2016?

A November 9th.
Q I'm just reminding you about the UTC time.
So I think you said you weren't a hundred percent familiar with the relationship between UTC Time and East Coast Time; is that true?

A I don't have a particular knowledge of it.
Q Okay. And does, in UTC time, was that text sent at approximately 3:00 in the morning?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And the first text in this exchange is from you; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And what did you say?
A "What have we done?"
Q What did you mean by that, Mr. Davidson?
A This was -- this is sort of gallows humor.
It was on Election Night as the results were coming in, and there was sort of a surprise amongst the broadcasters and others that Donald Trump was leading in the polls and that there was a growing sense that folks were about ready to call the election.

Q And you referred to it as "gallows humor."
```
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Can you explain that a little bit more?
What did you mean when you say: "What have we done?"

A I think that there was an understanding that this is a text between Dylan Howard and I, and that there was an understanding that our efforts may have in some way -- I should strike that.

That our activities may have in some way assisted the presidential campaign of Donald Trump.

Q And how did Dylan Howard respond to your text?
A "Oh my God."
Q After the election -- I should ask you the obvious question: Who won the election?

A Donald Trump.
Q After the election, did you continue to speak with Michael Cohen?

A I did.
Q Did -- well, did there come any times during the month or two that followed the election when the topic of the Stormy Daniels deal came up?

A Yes.

Q Can you tell the jury a little bit about that?
A Ummm, after the election, Michael Cohen called me fairly frequently.

And there was one particular day, it was on a weekend in mid-December, and this is the period of time after the election,
```
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but before Donald Trump had been sworn in as President, and it was -- I think it was on Saturday morning, and I was shopping for the holiday and I got a call from a very despondent and saddened Michael Cohen.

And I was at a department store -- which is kind of a whole another story because it was sort of strangely decorated -- and so the whole situation was very odd -- that he was calling me and I was in this strangely-decorated department store.

And it was a long phone call, and he had told me -- he was -- he was depressed and despondent and he said that -- he used very colorful language about that stage of his life.

Q You are quoting so you can repeat the language.
A He said something to the effect of: "Jesus Christ. Can you fucking believe I'm not going to Washington. After everything I've done for that fucking guy. I can't believe I'm not going to Washington. I've saved that guy's ass so many times, you don't even know."

Q And did --
A And then --
Q I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.
A And then he made reference to, he said, you know, I never even got paid -- he said: "That fucking guy is not even paying me the 130,000 back."

Q And what did you interpret that to mean, that last part?

A That -- that he was not getting repaid the 130,000 .
Q And do you remember when that conversation took place?
A It was some time in mid-December.
Q I'm going to show you privately a document.
MR. STEINGLASS: And, obviously, show counsel and the Court as well.
(Displayed only for the previously-described parties.)

Q And I'm going to ask you if this is a receipt from the store that you were shopping in from the time that you got the call from Michael Cohen?

A Yes.
Q And does that refresh your recollection as to the day you had this particular conversation with Michael Cohen?

A Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: And we can take that down. Thank
you.
Q What was that day?
A December 9th.
Q And I'm almost afraid to ask this question, but how was the store decorated?

A It was this store, I think, that has -- I don't know if it's even in still in business -- but it was a store called -well, it was a warehouse store, like a big box store, and it had -- it was decorated like Alice In Wonderland, and so you
```
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felt very small in it.

And there were these huge rabbits and a cat in the hat on the ceiling and things like that.

It was just a very odd feeling.

Q Okay. So going back to the period of time between the election and the inauguration, during that period did you communicate with Michael Cohen on multiple occasions?

A Yes.

Q Did you use phone, texts, encrypted apps, or all of the above?

A All of the above.

Q I am now showing you what's in evidence as People's Exhibit 286.

MR. STEINGLASS: And it can be shown to everyone. It's in evidence.
(Displayed.)
Q And I'm going to direct your attention, I guess, to early 2018 now.

Do you recognize this document?
A I do.

Q And can you explain to the jury what it is, please?

A I had received -- I had received a "comment call," which is when the press is about to publish an article.

And I had received a request for comment from the Wall Street Journal in 2018 and shortly before this email and they
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wanted a comment on -- on any interactions regarding Stormy Daniels and Donald Trump.

Q And so, just to clarify, you received an inquiry from the Wall Street Journal that led you to believe that they were getting ready to publish an article about the contact between Stormy Daniels and Donald Trump?

A Yes.
Q And this was how you responded?
A Yes.
Q And tell us how you responded, please. Just read it for us.

A "Nothing about the present day regurgitation of these rumors causes us to rethink our prior denial issued in 2011."

Q And did you write that to the Wall Street Journal reporter?

A I did.
Q On what day?
A January 10th, 2018.
Q And what did you mean when you said "Our prior denial issued in 2011"?

What was that a reference to?
A The cease and desist demand letter that was sent to TheDirty.com in 2011.

Q And did you forward your response to the Wall Street Journal reporter to anyone?

A To Michael Cohen. Yes, to Michael Cohen.

Q And why did you do that?
A Because we had a mutuality of interest at this period of time.

Q Can you explain that a little bit to the jury?
A Well, we had a fully executed Settlement Agreement and Confidentiality Agreement, and now the underlying matter that was the subject of that Settlement Agreement/Confidentiality Agreement was about to be published, and I think I had a contractual duty to let him know that something was about to be published.

And we had sort of -- we were acting in unison to address it.

Q Okay. So I want to now show you what has been privately -- what has been marked for identification as People's Exhibit --

MR. STEINGLASS: Privately, please, thank you.

Q What has been marked for identification as People's Exhibit 255.
(Displayed only to those previously-described.)
Q Do you recognize this exhibit?
A Yes.

Q What is it?

A I believe that these are -- it's a database of messaging between Michael Cohen and I.

Q And are these instant messages back and forth between yourself and Michael Cohen during this period in January and perhaps in February of 2018?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember sending and receiving these texts?
A For the most part, yes.
Q And do they pertain to your conversations with Michael
Cohen at -- at or around the time that the details of the Stormy

Daniels payoff became public?

A The Stormy Daniels settlement.
Q The Stormy Daniels settlement, yes?
A Yes.
Q And are they exact copies of your instant messages back and forth between Michael Cohen, to the best of your recollection?

A Yes.

Q And do the date and timestamps appear to be accurate, to the best of your recollection?

A Yes.

MR. STEINGLASS: I offer them into evidence. Or I
offer this exhibit into evidence.

MR. BOVE: No objection.

THE COURT: Accepted into evidence.
(So marked in evidence.)
```
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MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
And I am now displaying publicly People's Exhibit 255, starting on Page 1.

And I am going to ask that we blow up -- thank you -- lines 1 and 2.

Q And kind of the way we did with the Exhibit 176A, I'm just going to ask you to read some of these text back and forth and explain what they mean.

And give us the date when appropriate.
So starting with this top one. What is the date of these blown-up texts?

A January 10th, 2018.
Q And who is that first one from and who is it to?
A From me to Michael Cohen.
Q And what is the body of the texts or instant message?
A You know, when I look at this -- I think earlier I testified that that email that I sent to the Wall Street Journal, they called me for a comment.

Now that I read this, it makes me think that maybe they called her for comment and I responded on her behalf, for whatever that's worth.

Q Thank you for clarifying that.
A Thanks.
Q You can proceed, please.
A Okay. WSJ -- the Wall Street Journal -- called
```
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Stormy. She didn't answer.
They say they are running a story and have a deadline of tonight for her comment -- tonight for her to comment.

Q Thank you.
And how did Michael Cohen respond to that?
A Write a strong denial for her like you did before.
Q And what did you understand that to mean?
A Like, I understood that he wanted me to write a strong denial comment for her.

Q A denial of what?
A Everything.
Q Including the sexual encounter with Donald Trump?
A Yes.
Q So without revealing privileged communications, did you send a denial to Stormy Daniels for her to sign?

A I don't recall.
Q Okay. Take a look, please, at People's Exhibit 277 in evidence.
(Displayed.)

Q Do you recognize this document?
A I do.
Q What is it?
A This is a statement from Stormy Daniels dated January 10th, 2018.

Q And did you prepare this statement?

A I believe so.
Q Can you read it to us, please?
A "January 10th, 2018. To Whom it May Concern: I recently became aware that certain news outlets are alleging that I had a sexual and/or romantic affair with Donald Trump many, many, many years ago.

I am stating with complete clarity that this is absolutely false.

My involvement with Donald Trump was limited to a few public appearances and nothing more.

When I met Donald Trump, he was gracious, professional and a complete gentleman to me and everyone in my presence.

Rumors that I have received hush money from Donald Trump are completely false.

If indeed I did have a relationship with Donald Trump, trust me, you wouldn't be reading about it in the news, you would be reading about it in my book.

But the fact of the matter is, these stories are not true. Stormy Daniels.

Q How would you characterize, Mr. Davidson, the truthfulness of this statement?

A Well, I think that this is a tactic that is oftentimes used in the, oftentimes, the cat and mouse interactions between publicists and attorneys and the press and that an extremely strict, extremely strict reading of this denial would
technically be true.
Q Can you explain that? How is this technically true?
A Well, I think you have to go through it word by word, and it would -- if you did so, I think it would technically be true with an extremely fine reading of it.

Q So let me direct you to two parts in particular.
The first two sentences, when it states that she -- that Ms. Daniels was contacted by certain news outlets alleging that she had a sexual and/or romantic affair with Donald Trump, many, many, many years ago and then it states that that's absolutely false.

How is that technically correct?
A Well, I think you would have to hone in on the definition of romantic, sexual and affair.

Q Okay. Can you explain that?
A Well, I don't think that anyone had ever alleged that any interaction between she and Mr. Trump was romantic.

Q Okay. How about sexual?
A Well, that would be a sexual and/or romantic.
Q Okay. So let me just zoom out for a second and say, did you understand this statement to be cleverly misleading?

A I don't understand the question.
Q Did you understand, at the time that you wrote this letter, that Stormy Daniels had, in fact, had a sexual encounter with Donald Trump at some point?
```
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A That was my understanding.
Q Okay. So I want to direct your attention to the first line of the second paragraph: "Rumors that I received hush money from Donald Trump are completely false," okay.

A Yes.

Q How is that technically true?
A Well, it's really no different than our interaction a few minutes ago where you called it a payoff.

Q Okay.
A It wasn't a payoff and it wasn't hush money. It was consideration in a civil Settlement Agreement.

Q Can you just explain that a little bit more of what consideration is for, what you mean when you say a consideration?

A Well, I think, in the simplest of examples, a consideration is money or something of value that's exchanged in a contract.

I will pay you \(\$ 5\) if you mow my lawn. The \(\$ 5\) will be a consideration.

Q So do I understand you correctly to be saying that you don't think the term "hush money" accurately describes the exchange of money that -- the money that was paid to Stormy Daniels by Donald Trump?

A Can you please restate that.
Q Yeah. Do I understand you -- withdrawn.

Would you use the phrase "hush money" to describe the money that was paid to your client by Donald Trump?

A I would never use that word.
Q And what would be the word that you would use to
describe it?
A Consideration.
Q Okay.
I now want to ask you if you sent a copy of this document to Michael Cohen?

A I did.
Q All right. I now want to move on and show you more of what's in evidence as People's Exhibit 255.
(Displayed.)
Q Is that a series of text exchanges from January 2018 with Michael Cohen?

And particularly \(I\) want to direct your attention to Page 2, Entry 19.
```

                    (Displayed.)
    ```

Q And ask you what is being said and by whom and when?
A This is January 17th, 2018, from Michael Cohen to me.
"I have her tentatively scheduled for Hannity tonight. Call me after your trial."

Q Now, can you tell us what you understood that to mean, please, Mr. Davidson?

A I understood this to mean that he had her tentatively,
```
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"her," Stormy Daniels, tentatively scheduled to appear on the
television show Hannity that night.
Q Do you know for what purpose?
A No.
Q So you understood this to mean, to be saying -- for
Michael Cohen to be is stating that he had scheduled your client
to appear on Hannity that night?
A Yes.
Q And did your client actually appear on Hannity that
night?
A No.
Q Have you previously examined this text exchange?
A I have previously seen it.
Q Are there a series of texts about whether -- whether
or not she should appear and when on Hannity that followed this?

```
    A I think. And preceded it.
    But this was sort of in one of Michael Cohen's pants on fire
stages, where he was sort of frantically trying to address the
fact that Stormy's story had percolated into public consumption
and he -- he was frantic.
    I was in a trial and -- which is fairly all consuming -- and
it was just many, many, many phone calls and many, many text
messages with little regard for my schedule.

Q Did you have any understanding of how having your client appear on Hannity would help Michael Cohen? Why he was
```
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pushing for that?
A A few minutes ago, we discussed the -- Michael Cohen's request for me to write a strong denial the way that \(I\) did way back then.

And what he was referring to, I think, was the letter that I sent to The Dirty in 2011.

But there was no denial in the -- in the cease and desist demand that \(I\) sent to The Dirty in 2011. And that as a fact was just wrong.

And then \(I\) sent him the exhibit that we just looked at, which was sort of that carefully worded denial.

And I believe that he thought that her -- he, Michael Cohen, thought that Stormy going on Hannity, which -- would somehow help him and his client.

I believe that I -- I had an understanding that he believed that she would further deny the interaction.

Q Okay. Moving on to another text that \(I\) want to bring to your attention.

And this is the one beginning "Keith, the wise men," okay. What was the date that this text was sent and who was it sent from and who was it sent to?

A It was January 17th, 2018, from Michael Cohen to me.
Q And what does it say?
A "Keith, the wise men all believe the story is dying and don't think it's smart for her to do any interviews." Period.
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
"Let her do her thing, but no interviews at all with anyone."
Q And did you respond?
MR. STEINGLASS: I think we need to blow up one more text here.
(Displayed.)
A "100 percent." MR. STEINGLASS: Can we have them together, please.
(Displayed.)
Q Okay. Mr. Davidson, what did you understand Michael Cohen's text to mean when he said "The wise men all believe the story is dying and she shouldn't do any interviews"?

A Again, that this was sort of in one of his pants on fire stages and that he was running around planning things.

And then when he ran it up the flag pole or consulted someone or some group, whoever "wise men" are, that they didn't think that it was a good idea for her to actually appear on Hannity.

Q And, to your knowledge, did she appear on Hannity?
A She never appeared on Hannity, to my knowledge.
Q Okay. And just turning your attention to the next page, continuing this same exchange, how does -- after you say "100 percent," how does Michael Cohen respond?

A "Thanks, pal."
Q And does he send a follow-up text after that?
```
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A Yes.

Q And what does he say?

A "Just no interviews or statements unless through you."
Q And what did you understand that to mean?
A That it was his request that I manage the
communications for her.
Q "Her" being Stormy Daniels?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And how did you respond?
A "Got it."

Q Showing you some more of this exchange on Page 7, Lines 64 through 73.

And, again, I will just ask you to kind of walk us through who sends which texts when and what they mean.

Starting --

MR. STEINGLASS: And maybe we can zoom in a little
bit.
(Displayed.)
Q Starting with, "And she's 64."
A So you would just like me to read it?
Q Well, I would like you to tell us the date, who is it from, who is it to.

And then, yes, please read?
A Okay. January 24th, 2018, from me to Michael Cohen. "Spoke to her." Meaning Stormy. "Everything is as we
```
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discussed. She steadfastly refuses to speak about the past."

Q And what did Michael Cohen say?
A 1/25/2018: "We will see because it airs tonight."

Q And did he then send another text that same day?

A I think it might be the next day, the 26th.
Q Oh. It's a little small for me to read from here.

Thank you. The 26th. Yes, please?
A From Michael Cohen to me, "Why is she going on Kimmel
after the SOTU."

Q Do you have an understanding of what "S-O-T-U" meant?
A Yes.

Q What?
A State of the Union Address.

Q And does that particular text from Michael Cohen stand out to you for any reason?

A No.

Q Okay. How did you respond, if at all?
A I responded very shortly thereafter, "IDK" -- I don't
know -- "I was pissed. She said this is her shot. I'm not meeting with her this weekend to prep her."
"Prep her and" -- I would like to start over.
Q Sure.

A "IDK." I don't know. "I was pissed. She said this is her shot. I'm meeting with her this weekend to prep her and get the statement."

Q What statement were you trying to get?

A He had asked -- at this moment in time, I was in a very difficult situation and \(I\) think Stormy was in a very difficult situation.

She had that lengthy Settlement Agreement, which called for penalties if she breached the non-disparagement, she would have to give back any profits that she made.

She would have to return the consideration, the 130,000 , and she may have to pay, if it was enforceable, the liquidated damage clause.

And so we have Cohen saying -- and what I understood him saying -- let her do her thing, just don't talk about the past.

And Stormy saying, I, you know, this was her shot. She wanted to -- she wanted to talk about her life and reinvigorate her career.

So this was a conversation about Stormy Daniels going on the Late Night Show with Jimmy Kimmel.

Q Okay. So continue onto the next page, Page 8, entries 74 to 75.

Again, \(I\) will just ask you to give us, the same way you have been doing, the date, and who is texting who and what is being said?

A This is a text from Michael to me on January 30th, 2018, "It is out."

MR. STEINGLASS: Can we just blow this up a
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little bit more or zoom in a little bit more.
(Displayed.)
Q And what are these series of -- you don't have to read every single one of these, what are these texts about and did you already tell us the date of these?

A January 30th.
Q So what are you texting about at this point?
A Apparently, there was a news article that had been published. I was receiving hundreds of phone calls at my office.

Q Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: Let's scroll down a little bit. (Displayed.)

Q Do you see the texts that is -- it looks like it's on January 30th, 2018, at 5:49:59 p.m.?

A Yes.
Q And who is that from?
A From me to Michael Cohen.
Q And what is the body of the text?
A "She is stating that she authorized it and she released it of her own volition."

Q And what did you understand that to mean or what did you mean when you wrote that, I should say?

A That's the -- Michael Cohen had requested yet another statement from Stormy Daniels and that on the day of -- that she
```
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was appearing on Jimmy Kimmel -- and he wanted to know whether or not she was going to release it.

Q Okay. I want to show you Page 9, just to continue this, of the same exhibit, lines 86 through 87.

And, again, I would just ask you to tell us who is texting who when and what it means?

A This is January 30th, 2018, from me to Michael Cohen. Quote: "She's good for now... but it's a shit load of work."

Q But what did you mean by that? What was a lot of work?

A Just this case had begun to eat up a lot of time.
Q And how did Michael Cohen respond?
A "I'm sorry but thank you."
Q And so you just referenced another statement. Did you, in fact, prepare another denial for her to sign immediately prior to her appearance on Jimmy Kimmel?

A There was another statement that was prepared and released.

Q Okay. Let me show you People's Exhibit 278. This is in evidence.

MR. STEINGLASS: I will ask that we blow it up a little bit.

Q And I will ask you, is this the statement of denial from January 30th, 2018?

A Yes.
```
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Q And did -- withdrawn.

Who typed this document?

A I did.

Q And where were you when you did that?

A I was in the Marilyn Monroe Suite at the Roosevelt
Hotel in Hollywood, California.
Q And who else was present?

A There were make-up artists. To my recollection, there were make-up artists and hair dressers.

There was the -- Gina Rodriguez was there; her then boyfriend Anthony was there.

Stormy was there.
I was there.
I think that's it.
Q And where in relation did -- withdrawn.

Did you say why you were in that room in the hotel? What
was happening?
Why was hair and make up there?
A The -- the Roosevelt Hotel is a classic, old Hollywood place on Hollywood Boulevard where they have the Hollywood Walk of Fame and the stars.

And it's right next to where Kimmel films.

And the Jimmy Kimmel Show had put Stormy up at the Roosevelt
Hotel and specifically requested that suite.
And I think she was preparing to go on Kimmel that night.

Q Okay. Can you read for us the statement.
A "To Whom it May Concern:"
Next paragraph.
"Over the past few weeks, I have been asked countless times to comment on reports of an alleged sexual relationship that \(I\) had with Donald Trump many, many, many years ago."

Next paragraph.
"The fact of the matter is that each party to this alleged affair denied its existence in 2006, 2011, 2016, 2017 and now again in 2018."
"I am not denying this affair because \(I\) was paid 'hush money' as has been reported in overseas owned tabloids. I am denying this affair because it never happened." Period.

Next paragraph.
"I will have no further comment on this matter." Period.
"Please feel free to check me out on Instagram at @TheStormyDaniels."

Excuse me, "@TheStormyDaniels."
Q Mr. Davidson, how would you characterize truthfulness of this statement?

A I think it's technically true.
Q Can you explain that?

Can you explain how it's true that it says an alleged sexual relationship, which basically denies them having a sexual relationship; is that right?

A Yes.

Q And how is that -- how is that technically true?
A Because I don't think that anyone had ever alleged that there was a relationship between Stormy Daniels and Donald Trump.

I believe their relationship is an ongoing interaction.
Q And it also makes a reference -- withdrawn.

It denies that Stormy Daniels was paid hush money.

If I asked you to explain that, would you give basically the same answer that you gave in connection with the denial from January 10th of 2018?

A I would.

Q Okay. I want to go back to your exchange with Michael Cohen on People's Exhibit 255.

Directing your attention, in particular, to Page 9, starting with Entries 88 to 97.
(Displayed.)
Q Starting with the top. Can you give us the time, please, and the date.

A The date is -- they are all January 31st, 2018. It starts at 12:21 a.m., from Michael Cohen to me.

Q And is that 12:21 a.m. UTC minus 5?

A I don't know.

Q Does it say UTC minus 5?
A It does.
```
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Q Okay. But you don't know what that means; is that
right?
A Well, I could figure it out, but.

Q Well, I don't want you to guess --
A All right.
Q -- if you're not sure?
A I don't know.

Q Okay. So what did the -- who is the first text from in this particular exchange?

A "She just denied the letter." This is from Michael Cohen to me.
(Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter Laurie Eisenberg relieved Senior Court Reporter Lisa Kramsky as the official court reporter.)

Q Okay.
And what did you understand it to mean?
A Well, I took it to mean that he was watching Stormy Daniels on Kimmel, and that he was reporting to me what was being broadcast.

Q So, who do you understand "she" to be in reference to?
A Stormy Daniels.
Q What is the next text in this chain, from whom to whom?

A From Michael Cohen to me: "Claiming it's not her signature."

Q Keep going, please.
A "You said she did it in front of you."
Q I should just ask, this series of texts that's up on the screen, are these sent within fairly rapid succession, all within a five-minute window?

A Yes.
Q And I believe you testified that you understood this to be happening while Michael Cohen was watching Stormy Daniels appearing on the Kimmel show; correct?

A Yes.
Q So, what do you understand it to mean when Michael Cohen said to you, "You said she did it in front of you"?

A Um, that he was repeating something I had previously told him, which is that that most recent statement was signed
```
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in front of me.
Q The one that was signed in the Roosevelt Hotel?
A That's right.
Q So, then did you respond to Michael Cohen?
A Yes.
Q And what did you say?
A "She did." Period. "Impossible. She posted it on her own Twitter page."

Q How did Michael Cohen respond?
A "They showed her signature and she claimed it was not hers on Kimmel."

Q Did you respond in any way?
A "WTF."
Q I hate to ask, what does that mean?
A It's sort of an -- it's a signal of exasperation of: What the fuck.

I didn't watch Kimmel, so I was getting all this information, but \(I\) wasn't watching the show.

Q Got it.
Scrolling down to Page 11, Lines 112 to 113.
I should ask before I blow this up, in the interim, is there some back and forth about Stormy Daniels' appearance on Kimmel?

A Yes.
Q So, now, going to Lines 112 and 113 on Page 11, I'm
```
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going to ask you what time this text was sent and by whom?
A January 31, 2018, at 1:30 UTC, from Michael to me:
"Please tell Gina to ensure she responds the same as your statement tomorrow when she does The View." That television show. "This is not a comedy show!" Exclamation point.

Q What did you understand that to mean?
A That Michael was upset about what he understood was Stormy denying that she had signed the statement.

Q Before we move on, I believe you testified this was UTC.

But, does it actually say UTC minus five?
A Yes.

Q Shortly thereafter, did you respond to Michael Cohen?
A Yes.

Q What did you say?

A "Gina is ticked off at Stormy because Stormy made her look like a liar. Gina says she is going to have a long talk with Stormy on the plane to New York tomorrow. She assured me that this will get handled."

Apparently, they were going to New York to film The View.
Q What were you saying to Michael Cohen here? What did you mean?

A Well, again, like I mentioned earlier, we're trying to thread a needle and hold off allegations of breach and all the penalties that would come with that, where -- where Cohen
would -- would -- you know, file an arbitration or sue Stormy, and that would be a whole 'nother disaster. So, we're trying to placate him while also trying to meet Stormy's desires.

Q And without getting into any privileged communications between yourself and Stormy Daniels, did Michael Cohen threaten a lawsuit against Stormy Daniels?

A Many times.
Q Can you tell us, basically, what he said about that?
A He would -- I mean, he can be a very aggressive guy. Aggressive in his pursuits to protect his client.

And he would, often times, you know, make legal threats, say that he would bankrupt her and, um, "Rain legal hell down upon her," um, and, "Don't fuck with us. You don't know who you're fucking with," things like that.

Q And what did you -- if you had an understanding, what did you understand Michael Cohen to be attempting to get you to do?

A I don't understand your question.
Q Okay.
Regarding Stormy Daniels' story, did you have an understanding about what Michael Cohen wanted you to do regarding Stormy Daniels and her story?

A Well, he wants to hear her deny her story to protect his client.

Q That's what I was asking.

Okay.
Going back to this -- excuse me one second.
Going back to People's 255, your text exchange with Michael Cohen, and turning to Page 12, Lines 122 to 123. I'm sorry. 122 to 133.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
MR. STEINGLASS: I'll just ask you to blow it up a little bit.

Q You don't have to read every single one of these, but could you read them to yourself and tell us a little bit about what's happening here?

A No.
Q You want me to keep going?
MR. STEINGLASS: Let's scroll down a little bit
more.
(Whereupon, the exhibit scrolls on the screens.)
Q Let me stop right there for a second and direct you to the text that appears to be on February 13, 2018, at 10:30 PM, UTC minus five time.

Okay?
A Okay.
Q It says Michael Cohen appeared to text you a particular email address.

A Yes.
Q Whose email address does he text you?

A Christopher Cuomo.
Q Who did you understand Christopher Cuomo to be?
A He's a news broadcaster, then with CNN.
Q Okay.
Scrolling down a little bit.
Did you see the text that's sent about 11:55 PM from
Michael Cohen?
A Yes. Yes.
Q What is he saying?
A The first one is: "Yes."
The second one is: "Can you send me the statement."
Q And did you respond to that within a little less than an hour or so?

A Yes.
Q And what did you say?
A "I am sending you this draft because it is truthful. What do you think? I represented Stephanie Clifford in the Michael Cohen, slash, Stephanie Clifford transaction. I read today that Michael Cohen reports that the source of the \(\$ 130,000\) paid to Ms. Clifford was from his own personal funds. Period. That assertion is in complete harmony with what he informed me of at the time of the transaction."

Q And did Michael Cohen respond?
A Yes.
Q What did he say?

A "Perfect. Send to Cuomo."
Q What's going on here, Mr. Davidson?
A Uh, I don't know. I think that he was under some fire, um, and wanted validation or corroboration that the 130,000 was, in fact, paid from him and not paid from anyone else.

Q And did he ask you to write a statement to that effect to send to Christopher Cuomo?

A Yes.
Q And did you share it with Michael Cohen before sending it to Christopher Cuomo?

A I did.
Q And did you, ultimately, send it to Christopher Cuomo?
A I did. I recall that I did. I believe I did.
Q How would you characterize the truthfulness of this statement?

A I believe it's truthful.
Q Did you -- you told us yesterday that you believe that the ultimate source of the funds was Donald Trump; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q So, how do you reconcile those two -- how do you reconcile that with the statement?

A The going back and forth in the days before that this Stormy Daniels/Michael Cohen deal was consummated in October 2016; and if you recall, there was a period where he
said, Fuck it. I'll just do it myself." That's what I was referring to in the statement.

Q So, the statement does not undermine your belief that the ultimate source of the funds was Mike -- was Donald Trump?

A At the time of the transaction.
Q Can you just clarify that for a second?
A At the time of the transaction, Michael Cohen told me -- as the statement said, at the time of the transaction, Michael Cohen told me, "Fuck it. I'll just do it myself."

Q Okay. So -- all right. I understand.
Thank you.
Um, my next question is, did you -- directing your attention, I guess, to early April of 2018, did you go on CNN and say that Michael Cohen used his own funds to pay Stormy Daniels?

A I believe so.
Q And why did you say that?
A Because I understood that he did.
Q Based on the same statement that he made at the time of the transaction?

A And even later on, that December 9th conversation that I had with him at the department store where he said that he had not been reimbursed.

Q Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: Um, one more moment, please.
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A No. Not at all.
MR. STEINGLASS: No further questions.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Let's go ahead and take our morning recess, jurors.

Step out, and I'll see you in about ten minutes COURT OFFICER: All rise.
(Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors are excused.)
(Whereupon, the witness is excused.)
(Whereupon, a recess is taken.)

THE COURT: We can get the witness.
COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.
(Whereupon, the witness, Keith Davidson, having been previously duly sworn and/or affirmed, resumes the witness stand and testifies as follows:)

COURT OFFICER: All rise.
Jury entering.
(Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors are present and properly seated.)

THE CLERK: Case on trial continued.

Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
Senior Court Reporter
\(\square\)

All jurors are present and properly seated. THE COURT: Counsel, will you stipulate that the jurors are present.

MR. STEINGLASS: I'm sorry.
Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: Mr. Bove.
MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BOVE:

Q Good morning, Mr. Davidson.
A Good morning.
Q Barely good morning.
My name is Emil Bove, and I represent President Trump, who's here on my left.

A Nice to meet you.
Q It's nice to meet you, too.
You've never met President Trump; correct?
A Never.
Q And Tuesday was the first time that you've been in the same room as him; right?

A That's true.
Q You've never spoken to President Trump?
A Never.
Q You have no first-hand knowledge of the business
records of The Trump Organization; right?
A Only those that I received.

Q Well, you received some records from Michael Cohen; correct?

A Emails and such.

Q In fact, everything that you know about President Trump came from either TV or Michael Cohen; right?

A No.

Q Much of what you testified to today with respect to your beliefs about Mr. Trump came from Mr. Cohen; right?

A I have -- I have had no personal interactions with Donald Trump. And either it came from my clients, Michael Cohen, and from some other source, but certainly not from him.

Q I would like to focus on 2016.

A All right.
Q In that period, you had a strong professional
```

relationship with Dylan Howard; right?

```

A Yes.

Q And a close personal relationship, also; right?

Friends?

A Fair.

Q I think you said you'd known him for over a decade;
right?
A Yes.

Q How did you guys meet?

A I'm not sure.
Q Was it in connection with your work?
A I believe so.
Q And in 2016, you were talking to Mr. Howard just about every day; right?

A I would think. Several times a week.
Q And on the professional side of things, Mr. Howard helped you get business from AMI; right?

A Yes.
Q You got a couple of matters from AMI; right?
A Limited, yes.
Q One was an employment claim by a reporter; right?
A I think so.
I seem to recall there was a California matter. They were being sued, and \(I\) was being consulted on that.

Q And there was an entertainment deal with film rights AMI decided not to move forward on?

A That's right.
Q Would it surprise you to learn that Mr. Howard considered you to be a major source of information?

A Yes.
Q And that surprises you, notwithstanding the near-daily
contact in 2016?
A Correct.
Q And is part of the reason for your surprise is that
    you're an attorney; right?

A Yes.
Q And you're not suggesting that you were providing client confidences to Dylan Howard; right?

A Not at all.
Q And then, one of the things you talked about on Tuesday and today, I think, was your representation of Karen McDougal; correct?

A Yes.

Q If I understood it correctly, Ms. McDougal did not want to publish an article about the claims that have been discussed here; right?

A True.
Q And you testified in the Grand Jury in this case; right?

A I did.
Q At the District Attorney's Office; correct?
A Yes.
Q They were the ones asking the questions; right?
A Fair.
Q And that was in 2023?
A I -- I can't recall.
Q It was within the last 18 months?
A Roughly.
Q In there, you testified that Miss McDougal never
really wanted to tell her story to the public; right?
A Yes.
Q And I think you said on Tuesday that she had three goals; right?

A Yes.
Q One goal was to rejuvenate her career; right?
A True.
Q And that was your understanding in 2016; correct?
A That's true.
Q And Ms. McDougal had had a real career up to that point; is that right?

A She certainly had had a real career prior to, yes.
Q She had been on magazine covers; correct?
A More than that. Yeah. She had -- she had a very healthy career.

Q And that included not just on the Playboy part, but also in the fitness industry; right?

A I believe so.
Q And so, by "rejuvenate", there was -- at the time, in 2016, when you say "rejuvenate", there was ongoing value in her image and likeness; right?

A Yes.
Q And I think you said that one of the other goals was to make money; right?

A Yes.

Q And I want to talk about this, more about this a little later.

That wasn't just her goal, but it was also the goal of some of the people around her?

A That's fair.
Q And the third goal was the one we were talking about, to avoid having to tell her story; correct?

A True.

Q And Ms. McDougal has been clear about that publicly; right?

A That's my understanding.
Q She said that on -- in an interview with Anderson Cooper?

A Yes.
Q And you have described the deal that she got with AMI as her "dream deal"; right?

A I think she described it as her "dream deal".
Q And that's consistent with your interactions with her; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you don't think -- tell me if this is wrong. You did not discuss the McDougal AMI deal with Michael Cohen until after it was closed; right?

A Yes. That is true.
Q And I think -- sorry to cut you off.

I think you said on Tuesday that you reached out to him afterwards as a professional courtesy?

A Yes.

Q But he wasn't involved in any negotiations; correct?
A Not that I'm aware of.

Q Let's focus on Cohen a little bit.
I think you said you encountered him for the first time in 2011?

A True.

Q And that was in connection with this kind of blog post on The Dirty?

A True.

Q The Dirty was a web post at the time that focused on gossip?

A Fair.

Q And there was a post with the general substance of the same allegations that Stormy Daniels made subsequently, in 2016; right?

A Yes.

Q And at that time, 2011, Gina Rodriguez was Stormy Daniels' manager?

A Yes.

Q She told you that she wanted to get the story taken down?

A That's true.

Q And you described Ms. Rodriguez as sort of a story broker?

A That's part of what she does, yes.
Q And part of her business, I think you said, was in monetizing stories?

A That's true.
Q Monetizing news?
A Yes.
Q And in 2011, you had already been working with
Ms. Rodriguez for a while; right?
A Yes.
Q And, so, you served as a conduit to help get this story down?

A I was asked. I was, in essence, retained to use my best efforts to get that blog taken down, yes.

Q And you said, "in essence, retained".
You were, in fact, retained by Stormy Daniels in connection with that engagement; right?

A Yes.
Q And that engagement, the attorney-client engagement was not committed to writing; was it?

A It was not.
Q And there's nothing wrong with that; is there?
A There is not.
Q That's an ethical practice, to have an attorney-client
relationship without an Engagement Letter; right?
A Yes.
Q Now, focusing on Ms. Rodriguez for a minute.
Is it fair to say that you've had a reciprocal referral relationship with Gina Rodriguez?

A I think that's fair.
Q She sends you some business?
A Yes.
Q Some clients?
A Yes.
Q And vice-versa; you send her some clients; right?
A I think less so, but perhaps.
Q Reciprocal, but a little bit one-sided?
A I don't know.
Q You're still fairly close with Ms. Rodriguez; right?
A Somewhat.
Q I mean, you actually tried to represent her in connection with this investigation; right?

A Well, I didn't try to.
She was contacted by the District Attorney's Office. They wanted her to come in and give a statement. And I returned the call on her behalf as my client.

Q The reason I used the word "try" is that you were instructed by the District Attorney's Office that they viewed that as a conflict because of your status as a witness; right?

A Well, I took issue with that, but yes.
Q You didn't necessarily agree, but that was the instruction?

A I don't agree with the word "instruction".
That was their --
Q Position?
A -- position. That was their position.
Q My point here was, the relationship with Rodriguez and you was close enough in 2023 that she still looked at you as someone that she still trusted to be her counsel?

A True.
Q And in 2011, the way that this worked, as I understand it, is that you sent a Cease and Desist Letter to The Dirty?

A Yes.
Q And at some point around this time, the blog post got picked up by the New York Daily News; correct?

A Correct.
Q The story started to get out there a little bit; right?

A That's right. Yes. It was republished or repurposed by other elements.

Q So, the news had been disseminated; right?
A Yes.
Q And you also worked to have the Daily News take down their internet article reflecting Ms. Daniels' allegations;
correct?
A I believe so.
Q And in connection with that effort, you working to get the story from the Daily News down, you were also acting as Ms. Daniels' attorney; right?

A Yes.
Q Still no Retainer Agreement; right?
A Correct.
Q Did you ever have an Engagement Letter with
Ms. Daniels?
A Yes.
Q Was that in 2016?
A Yes.
Q Now let's focus a little bit on that 2016 engagement.
You had an Engagement Letter for providing legal services to Ms. Daniels; right?

A Yes.
Q And I think you described reaching a settlement; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you've used during your testimony litigation terms like "plaintiff" and "defendant" to describe the parties to that Settlement Agreement; right?

A Yes.
Q So, from your perspective, it is true, is it not, that
you're providing Ms. Daniels legal services with regard to the Agreement that led to the payment of \(\$ 130,000 ?\)

A Yes.

Q You talked a little bit today about the Side Letter to the Agreement in 2016.

A Yes.

Q Remember that?

A (Nods).
Q I think the word "decoded" was used; right?
A Yes.

Q These acronyms, Peggy Peterson and David Dennison;
right?
A Yes.

Q That was something you had used in the past; right?

A Yes.

Q That was your idea; right?
A No. No. It's not my idea.

It's widely used with these types of agreements.
Q You talked a little bit, today, about a December 9th, 2016 conversation with Michael Cohen; right?

A Yes.

Q And I think you said he sounded disheartened; correct?
A I -- yes.
Q And at other times, do you recall having described that conversation in terms of you left the talk in concern for
his physical safety, his wellbeing, that's how bad he sounded?
A I thought he was gonna kill himself.
Q And the concern on that call was that he understood he wasn't going to get a position in President Trump's Administration; right?

A Yes.
Q And he had at times, in conversation with you, referenced potentially being President Trump's Chief of Staff; right?

A Amongst others.
Q Amongst others. Right.
He also mentioned potentially being the Attorney General of the United States; right?

A That's true.
Q In this call at the Wonderland Warehouse, he was conveying to you that's not going to happen; and he was, very very upset about it; correct?

A That's true.
Q Now, I would like to take a step back and talk about, sort of, how you've interacted with law enforcement during the course of this investigation.

Okay?
A Fair.
Q It started out in 2018, with some meetings with Federal Prosecutors; right?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall how many meetings?
A I do.
Q How many?
A Three.
Q And that was in 2018; right?
A Yes.
Q And you were asked during those meetings about your interactions with Stormy Daniels; right?

A Yes.
Q And with Karen McDougal; correct?
A Yes.
Q And in those meetings, the attorney-client privilege did not come up as much; right?

A I don't -- I don't know how to answer that question.
Q You've invoked the privilege in your testimony at this trial several times; correct?

A A few times, yes.
Q And you've also invoked it with meetings with the District Attorney that we'll talk about in a little bit; right?

A Yes.
Q And my question is, do you recall invoking the privilege during those three meetings with the Federal Prosecutors in 2018?

A Yes.

Q And then, at some point, you started to meet with the District Attorney's Office; right?

A Yes.
Q And that was several years later, correct; time went by?

A True.
Q Do you remember when the first meeting was?
A Not particularly.
Q Does 2021 sound about right?
A I don't recall.
Q And do you recall if the first meeting was actually remote, I think by Zoom?

A Yes.
Q And the main person asking the questions during that meeting was Mark Pomerantz; do you recall that?

A I do.
Q Do you recall, at some point in the meeting, Mr. Pomerantz said to you: "You've -- You're obviously concerned about making statements" --

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BOVE: May we approach?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held at sidebar:)

THE COURT: Let me hear the objection.
MR. STEINGLASS: Well, since \(I\) don't know what he's going to ask, it's a little hard for me to object.

But, I don't think he could possibly be getting into what Mark Pomerantz said to him, especially because it sounded like he was getting into Mark Pomerantz's impression of something the witness was saying, which is something -- prosecutor's perceptions of witnesses' perceptions -- is something you precluded in other contexts.

So, I didn't want the question to be asked on the record.

THE COURT: What were you going to ask?
MR. BOVE: I was going to ask -- I'm summarizing whether he recalled Mr. Pomerantz saying he was choosing his words carefully because there was extortion inferred.

The reason I'm asking that question is because of the effect on the witness' state of mind in connection with his subsequent interactions with the Government, because the way that that meeting ended was he was instructed to get an attorney.

There was then a conversation that I would like to probe, where he -- and I don't have to use Mr. Pomerantz's name if that's offensive. I am happy to take that out.

But, lawyers -- a member of the District Attorney's Office said: We're not looking at him for extortion.

THE COURT: We're not looking at who?
MR. BOVE: Mr. Davidson.
So, there's a benefit.
It's not, sort of, the automatic benefit that attaches to the Grand Jury proceedings.

MR. STEINGLASS: So, let me see if I understand this correctly.

What Mr. Bove is trying to elicit, one prosecutor expressed a view that seemed to suggest that that prosecutor believed that Mr. Davidson's conduct approached extortion, but then a subsequent person said, We're not looking at you for extortion, so the internal -MR. BOVE: The same prosecutor.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court:)

THE COURT: Objection sustained. MR. BOVE: May I continue?

THE COURT: Yes.
CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOVE:
Q You said something this morning along the lines of

Michael Cohen could be an "aggressive" guy; right?
A Yes.

Q I think that was your word, "aggressive"?
A That's my opinion now. I think that was my word.

Q And you can be aggressive, too; can't you?

A I don't know.
Q You don't know?
A I suppose.

Q What does the word "extortion" mean to you?
A Extortion is the -- it's the obtaining of property by
threat of fear or force.

Q Compelling an action by force or coercion.
How's that?

A (Shrugs).

Q Is that accurate?
A Sure.

Q And that can be a State or Federal crime; right?

A True.

Q And as you sit here today, it's your belief, is it not, that the statute of limitations on any extortion crimes has run?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained as to form.

Please be more specific.
Q As you sit here today, is it your belief that any
exposure that you have to State or Federal extortion crimes is excluded by the statute of limitations?

A I have no opinion.
Q You're an attorney, and you have not thought about that prior to your testimony?

A I have not.

Q When you were negotiating on behalf of Ms. McDougal and on behalf of Stormy Daniels, one of your concerns was on staying on the right side of the line with respect to extortion; correct?

A I suppose.
Q I mean, that's something any attorney would naturally want to be doing in a negotiation like this; right?

You were making a demand.
A Well, \(I\) don't know what any attorney making a demand.
That's, I suppose, fair.
Q But, in your mind, you were concerned about avoiding creating evidence of extortion; correct?

A Not particularly.
Q Well, one of the issues that you had to be sensitive about was not to threaten that the payment needed to be made prior to the election; correct?

A I don't recall that.
Q You were concerned about linking those two issues -payment, election -- were concerned in written communications;
right?
A That was not my concern.
Q Do you recall being asked about this issue in meetings in 2023 by the District Attorney's Office?

A I do not.
Q Do you recall a meeting where you indicated that you could not recall whether the thought of election as a deadline for getting stuff done had come up?

A You're asking me --
Q Do you remember saying that?
A I remember saying I do not recall.
Q And it's your testimony that you -- even today, you don't remember whether or not you were concerned about linking the election in these payments?

A Correct.
Q You said on Tuesday that in the timeframe 2015 to 2017, your focus was on, I think you said, media cases; right?

A Somewhat.
Q And you also testified that you agreed with Mr. Steinglass, that those cases frequently involved Non-Disclosure Agreements; do you remember that?

A Fair.
Q And in terms of media practices and the types of work that you were doing in 2015 through 2017, there's nothing out of the ordinary about a NDA agreement; correct?

A That's fair.
Q They're used all the time; right?
A Fair.
Q In many different contexts; right?
A Agreed.
Q They are enforceable; right?
A True.
Q They're litigated sometimes; correct?
A Agreed.
Q They are upheld often; right?
A Agreed.
Q And so, there's nothing strange to you about the fact that your practice involved NDA's in 2015 through 2017; right?

A Correct.
Q As far as you know, that's during the time of the media lawsuits during that period?

A As far as \(I\) know.
Q In 2016, you were pretty well-versed in getting right up to the line without committing extortion; right?

A I don't understand your question.
Q My question is, that you had had several
representations that involved situations where you were making demands on third-parties on behalf of your clients; right?

A True.
Q And you were asking for money and other benefits in
those representations; correct?
A True.
Q And you knew you had to be careful so as to not violate the law prohibiting extortion; right?

A True.
Q And in 2016, you had, in fact, familiarized yourself with the law of extortion based on very specific experience; right?

A No.
Q Isn't it a fact that in connection with events in 2012, you were investigated by State and Federal authorities for committing extortion against Terry Bollea, Hulk Hogan?

A That's true.
Q And in connection with that investigation, did you or did you not familiarize yourself with the extortion offenses that were applicable in Florida and under Federal Law at the time?

A That's fair.
Q And so, getting back to my question, by 2016, you had, in fact, familiarized yourself with where that line was; right?

A I had familiarized myself with the law. I'm a lawyer.
Q And you did everything that you could to get as close to that line as possible in these negotiations without crossing it; right?

A I did everything I could to make sure that my
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activities were lawful.
Q And that included not making overt threats connected to the 2016 election; didn't it?

A Threats to who?
Q To Michael Cohen.
A No.
Q No?
You made no threats to Michael Cohen relating to the 2016 election; is that the answer that you give?

A I made no threats to anyone.
Q You never linked these negotations to the 2016
election with anyone; is that your testimony?
A That's fair.
Q In 2010, you represented a woman named Dawn Holland; right?

A Yes.
Q And Dawn Holland leaked information about the treatment of Lindsay Lohan at a rehab facility; correct?

A It was reported that that's what she did.
Q And you had connections as TMZ at the time; right?
A True.
Q You still do; right?
A No. Well, perhaps.
Q Perhaps.
You helped Ms. Holland get that information posted at TMZ;
right?
A No.
Q TMZ posted information relating to this incident with Ms. Lohan, including aspects of her confidential patient file from the facility; right?

A I don't know.
Q It's your testimony that you don't even know what I'm talking about?

A No. I'm answering your question.
Q So, I just asked, did TMZ post information from Ms. Lohan's confidential patient file?

A I don't know.
Q You helped Ms. Holland get paid in connection with what \(I\) just described; didn't you?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
A I helped Ms. Holland get paid?
Q Correct. That's the question.
A I don't recall.
Q You don't recall that TMZ paid Ms. Holland \(\$ 10,000\) around this time?

A I don't recall.
Q She was your client; right?
A At some point, yes.
Q Is it your testimony that she was not your client in
connection with the incident \(I\) just described?
A No.
Q So, she was your client in connection with the
incident I just described; correct?
A Well, you're describing a few different incidents.
I don't know what you're recalling -- what you're referring to.

Q What I am referring to is the posting of information regarding Ms. Lohan on TMZ, and that information related to her treatment at a rehab facility.

A I don't recall that.
Q And you don't recall Ms. Holland getting paid \$10,000 by TMZ?

A I don't recall that.
Q Do you know who Tila Tequila is?
A \(\quad\) do.
Q And in 2010, you took steps to broker -- steps to broker a deal of a sex tape involving her; correct?

A I believe so.
Q And you were working on that -- what should I call it -- "engagement" -- with a man named Kevin Black?

A Yes.
Q And at the time, he was sort of known as a sex tape broker; is that right?

A I think that's fair.

Q Is that how he was making his living in 2010?
A I don't know.
Q You just said it was "fair" to characterize him as that, but you're not sure if that was how he was making his living?

A That's correct.
Q Is there a distinction?
A Yes.
Q In connection with the Tila Tequila tape, you
represented the client; right?
A Client?
Q That's my question.
A I don't recall.
Q You don't recall representing Francis Hall?
A I do not.
Q Do you recall that Mr. Hall, who also goes by Francis Thien, threatened Ms. Tequila that if she didn't pay him \(\$ 75,000\), the tape would be published?

A I don't recall that.
Q You don't recall at the time of that transaction, you were on a 90-day Bar suspension?

A I don't recall that.
Q You know who Charlie Sheen is; right?
A I do.
Q And you've represented some clients who you helped get
paid by Charlie Sheen; right?
A I've represented several clients who had claims against Charlie Sheen.

Q And who you extracted sums of money from Charlie Sheen on behalf of; correct?

A There was no extraction.
Q You took steps to cause Mr. Sheen to pay; correct?
A We asserted that there was tortious activity committed and valid settlements that were executed.

Q And one of those settlements involved a client named Karen Montgomery; right?

A Yes.
Q And she was your client in 2011; correct?
A I don't recall the year.
Q Do you recall that Mr. Black referred her to you?
A I do recall that.
Q And do you recall that you entered into an Engagement Letter with her that required a 60 percent contingency fee?

A I don't recall that.
Q Do you recall that she had recently been under the influence of methamphetamine at the time you got her to sign the Engagement Letter?

A No, I don't recall that.
Q You don't recall she was barely completing sentences when you got her to sign the letter?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q In connection with that representation, Charlie Sheen paid \$2 million; right?

A I have no -- I'm not gonna answer that question.
Q You're -- \(\$ 2\) million was paid to your client; correct?
A I don't recall.
Q Is it fair to say that your memory seems a little fuzzy around some of these issues?

A I've had over 1500 clients in my career.
You're asking me about events that took place many, many years ago.

Q A \(\$ 2\) million payment is a typical payout for you on one of these cases, so much so that you don't remember it; is that your testimony?

A I don't remember a settlement from 13 years ago.
Q What about Capri Anderson? Do you remember her?
A I do remember her.
Q And do you remember extracting another settlement from Mr. Sheen while representing her?

A Again, it was no extraction.
Q You got Mr. Sheen to pay; correct?
A Assuming arguendo that he did pay and there was a Settlement Agreement, that settlement would be confidential, and I would not discuss it here.

Q Look. We're both lawyers. I'm not here to play lawyer games with you.

I'm just here to ask questions and get straight answers. MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Q I'm not asking you to assume anything.
I'm asking what you remember.
All right?
Can you answer?
A In answer to what?
Q I'm not asking you to assume anything.
I'm just asking for truthful answers.
Okay?
A You're getting truthful answers, sir.
Q So, when I ask a question, I'm not asking you to assume arguendo; alright. I'm just asking for what you remember.

A I'm not going to discuss confidential matters.
Q Well, that's a different answer; isn't it?
Now you're invoking the privilege.
A No, I'm not invoking the privilege.
And if you're not here to play legal games, then don't say "extract".

Q Do you remember Mr. Sheen paying your client, Capri Anderson?

A I'm not going to discuss that. MR. BOVE: Judge, I ask that the witness be instructed to answer the question. THE COURT: Please approach. (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held at sidebar:)

THE COURT: So, this is a sensitive area here. I think we need to establish, first, that he's definitely not asserting any kind of privilege.

MR. BOVE: Okay.
THE COURT: Once he says he's not asserting
privilege, you can ask him the question again.
If he refuses to answer, you can ask me for help. MR. BOVE: Yes.

Thank you.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court:)

Q So, I want to focus on your representation of Capri Anderson; okay?

A Fair.
Q My question is, was there a settlement between Ms. Anderson and Mr. Sheen in connection with that representation?

A I'm not going to answer that.
Q When you say "that", you're not invoking a privilege;
correct?
A I'm not going to answer that question based on privilege and confidentiality.

Q And what privilege are you invoking?
A The attorney-client privilege.
Q So, what I'm asking for is details about
communications between you and your client and a third-party, Mr. Sheen, and maybe his representatives, maybe not.

Do you understand my point?
A No.
Q Is it your position that those types of communications are privileged in an adversarial negotiation context?

A Yes.
MR. BOVE: Your Honor, I ask that the witness be instructed to answer the question.

THE COURT: You can ask him another question. He's asserting privilege.

Q Let's focus on 2012.
Okay?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall that Gawker ran a clip from a purported sex tape regarding Hulk Hogan that year?

A I do.
Q Do you recall that, prior to that post, still images from one of the images appeared on The Dirty; right?

A Yes.
Q That same website that in 2011 had the post about Ms. Daniels' allegations; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you used your connections at The Dirty to help get the Hulk Hogan stills posted; right?

A No.
Q You had nothing to do with that?
A Nothing to do with it.
Q And at some point in 2012, you reached out to Hulk Hogan's representatives; right?

A Yes.
Q And you indicated to them that the Gawker post was a, quote, shot across the bow; right?

A I don't recall that.
Q Do you recall that during the negotiations of Mr. Hogan's representatives, you said, "I'm an expert at doing this type of thing"?

A I don't recall that.
Q Do you recall discussing this issue, the conversations that you had with Mr. Hogan's representatives, with Michael Cohen?

A I do not.
MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, if we could bring up
People's Exhibit 255 in evidence and go to -- this can be
for everybody.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
MR. BOVE: If you go to the page of Bates number ending 214573.

If we could zoom in, please, on row 53 I think it
is.
Q Now, I think you said this morning these are messages between you and Mr. Cohen; right?

A Yes.
Q So, does this refresh your recollection that in January 2018, you were communicating with Mr. Hogan [sic] about your prior dispute with Hulk Hogan and communication regarding that?

A I was communicating with Michael Cohen about Hulk
Hogan.
Q Right.
You were communicating with Michael Cohen about Hulk Hogan?
A Yes.
Q So, this communication refreshes you?
A Yes.
MR. BOVE: We can take that down.
Q I want to go back to focusing on October 2012, and you had reached out to Hulk Hogan's representatives regarding this Gawker post and the sex tapes; right?

A Yes.

Q At that time, you were acting as an attorney; correct?
A Yes.
Q You had clients; right?
A Yes.
Q Who possessed the tapes; right?
A Yes.
Q And you said to Hulk Hogan's representatives, did you not, "We got a lot of people, they get caught on tape. They're not all celebrities. We have family men that are gay, and they want to keep their gay identity undercover, so we approach them, too."

Do you remember saying that?
A I do not.
Q Do you remember demanding a million dollars?
A I do not.
Q You made a monetary demand to Hulk Hogan's representatives in order to not publish these tapes; correct?

A No.
Q Did you ask for money?
A There was a monetary demand made.
Q Was it for purchase, so that Hulk Hogan could purchase the tapes, the right to the tapes?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall that the National Enquirer published information relating to these tapes in 2015?
K. Davidson - Cross/Bove

A No.
(Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter Theresa Magniccari relieves Senior Court Reporter Laurie Eisenberg, and the transcript continues on the following page.)

Whereupon, the proceedings are continued from previous page:)

MR. BOVE: This is just for parties and the witness and the Court. If we can take a look at Defense Exhibit F27. If we can go to Page 2, please.
(Displayed.)
CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. BOVE:
Q. Take a look at that and let me know when you are done.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you have a chance to take a look?
A. Yes.
Q. Does this refresh your recollection that the National

Enquirer ran stories about the tapes in the summer of 2015?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recall that Dylan Howard had a byline on one of those articles?
A. I do not.
Q. Can you take a look at Defense \(F 27\), please, and see if that refreshes your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. So Dylan Howard did, in fact, have a byline on articles relating to the Hulk Hogan tapes, right?
A. In this article, yes.
Q. And that's because you referred this information to him, correct?
A. No, that's not.
Q. It is just happenstance?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know?
A. No, I don't know if it's happenstance.
Q. Did you or did you not provide information to Dylan Howard so he could break the story about the content of one of the tapes?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did us cause information to be disclosed to Dylan Howard so he could publish an article in the National Enquirer about the content of one of these tapes?
A. I did not.
Q. And there was an FBI investigation relating to this, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You practiced criminal law in the beginning of your career?
A. True.
Q. State and Federal?
A. Yes.
Q. So you understand, do you not, that the FBI needs
enough information to actually predicate a criminal investigation?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. The FBI ran a sting operation targeting your meetings with Hulk Hogan's representatives, correct?
A. They had an investigation, yes.
Q. When I say "sting operation," you know what I mean, right?
A. Not technically.
Q. They set up a meeting where someone was recording what you were saying in connection with the negotiations?
A. Yes.
Q. That was at a hotel, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the FBI was sitting a couple of doors down, correct?
A. I don't know. They were in close proximity.
Q. They were in close proximity monitoring the situation, right?
A. I presume so.
Q. You know that this was also investigated by local authorities, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that there was a report issued relating to the two
investigations, and the local authorities?
A. There was a report issued.
Q. Do you recall that?
A. (No response.)

MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, this is for the Court and the parties and the witness.
Q. If you can take a look at Defense \(F\) 35, please.

I'm going to hand you a copy so you could flip through. Have you had a chance to look at that?
A. It's 31 pages. I have looked at that.
Q. My question is: Does that refresh your recollection that the Tampa Police Department issued a report relating to the investigation that we have been talking about?
A. I didn't -- yes.
Q. Do you recall that in that report the Tampa Police

Department indicated that the operation --

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. You can put the document to the side.

Thank you.
The Tampa Police Department referenced concerns about extortion in connection with this investigation, correct?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.

THE COURT: I will allow it.

You can answer it.
A. They conducted an investigation, yes.
Q. An investigation relating to extortion, right?
A. I believe so.
Q. And there were conclusions about concerns relating to extortion; just yes or no?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. And you were not ultimately charged, right?
A. True.
Q. But that experience gave you familiarity with extortion law, correct?
A. Perhaps. I -- I don't know.
Q. Do you know who Gabriel Rueda is?
A. Yes.
Q. And he had a dispute with CBS and Manny Pacquiao?
A. Dispute is loosely used.
Q. He felt that he was owed a finder's fee relating to one of Mr. Pacquiao's fights, right?
A. Yes.
Q. A big fight?
A. Yes.
Q. With Floyd Mayweather?
A. Yes.
Q. You tried to convince Mr. Rueda to settle that dispute, right?
A. I offered him a settlement.
Q. He felt he was owed millions and millions and millions of dollars, right?
A. A hundred million dollars.
Q. One hundred million dollars?
A. Yes.
Q. You offered him \(\$ 50,000\), correct?
A. No.
Q. You made a settlement offer to him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it involved a sum of money that was much less than 100 million dollars?
A. It was far less than 100 million dollars.
Q. On June 25, 2015, you told Mr. Rueda he was dealing with powerful people who did not care if Rueda got hurt, right?
A. I never ever said that. I did not say that.
Q. You also threatened he would not be able to find work in California if he did not accept your settlement, correct?
A. That's false.
Q. Now, I want to get back to the clients that you talked about in this case.
A. Fair.
Q. Let start with Ms. McDougal. I think you said that your attorney-client relationship started in June 2016, right?
A. I believe so.
Q. By that time, there was someone else leaking
information publically about this alleged relationship between Ms. McDougal and President Trump, right?
A. I don't know about that, about leaking. Ms. McDougal had a friend, and when your client was ascending in the polls, one of Ms. McDougal's former friends attempted to publicize Ms. McDougal's interactions with your client.
Q. That is Gary Stevens, right?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you remember telling the District Attorney's office that Ms. McDougal had a friend who was trying to publish a story without her consent?
A. Telling whom?
Q. That there was a friend of Ms. McDougal's who was trying to publish a story without her consent?
A. Who did I say that to?
Q. The District Attorney's office.
A. Yes.
Q. At the time, you said that you knew who you were talking about, right?
A. I don't know if \(I\) ever heard that name Stevens.
Q. I think you testified on direct that your fee in connection with the representation of Ms. McDougal is 45 percent; is that right?
A. I believe so.
Q. You testified on direct that Jay Grdina had introduced you to Ms. McDougal; is that right?
A. No.
Q. You knew Ms. McDougal for a while, but Jay came to you about this particular representation?
A. Yes.
Q. Jay Grdina had been a client of yourself?
A. Yes.
Q. Jay has a brother, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Named James?
A. Yes.
Q. If I call him James, you know who I am talking about?
A. I do.
Q. So James was married to McDougal, correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. There was sort of a referral chain for how you became involved in 2016?
A. Yes.
Q. And you mentioned somebody named John Crawford; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you said he provided security at a meeting or two?
A. He was, I think, a retired police officer from Phoenix.
Q. He also owns some UPS stores in Phoenix?
A. True. That's my understanding, that he owned UPS stores.

MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, can we please take a look at People's 279 in evidence. This can be for everybody.

Can we zoom in on the email, please.
(Displayed.)
Q. So I think we looked at this on Tuesday. This is you submitting a proposed Engagement Letter to Ms. McDougal, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see the BCC line?
A. Yes.
Q. That JG, is that Jay Grdina?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you include him on the BCC line?
A. I don't know.
Q. And this document was never executed, right?
A. I don't know if there was a Retainer Agreement that was executed
Q. Do you know if it's the one that is attached to the email or a different letter?
A. I don't know.
Q. You said you got a subpoena at some point from the District Attorney's office?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you search your files for the signed version of this letter?
A. I believe so.
Q. And is it fair to say you did not find one?
A. I provided whatever was located.
Q. My point is: There was nothing wrong in terms of your relationship with Ms. McDougal that it wasn't signed?
A. It was my recollection that I had a fully executed -excuse me -- a Retention Agreement with Ms. McDougal.

MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, can we take a look at

Paragraph 4.2 and the subparagraphs.
(Displayed.)
Q. I am focused on Paragraph 4.2, where it seems to indicate that the fee contemplated in this letter was 35 percent.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall a subsequent negotiation that increased your fee to 45 percent?
A. I don't recall that conversation.
Q. And now the difference between these two numbers, 35 and 45 percent, on the \(\$ 150,000\) payment, is 10 percent, about 15 grand, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And some of the fee that you were paid was split, correct?
A. No.
Q. So is it your testimony that Jay Grdina made nothing in connection with the payment of the \(\$ 150,000 ?\)
A. He was compensated.
Q. Out of the legal fees, correct?
A. No.
Q. What about John Crawford?
A. He was compensated as well.
Q. He was compensated out of your fee? Yes or no?
A. No.
Q. You know -- do you know that the California Ethnics

Rules prohibit non-attorneys from being paid out of legal fees, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You have been disciplined on that basis, correct?
A. No.
Q. So we'll go back to the first page of the email.

Can you see it?

That is dated June 15, 2016?
A. Yes.
Q. This was sent right around the time that you went to Phoenix to meet with Ms. McDougal, Mr. Grdina, and Mr. Crawford, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Before the meeting, you had already talked to Dylan Howard, right?
A. I don't recall.

MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernik, if we can take a look at People's 176A.

I would like to go to the page with the text messages on June 7, 2016.

Zoom in on the rows beginning 11-111.
(Displayed.)
Q. Have you had a chance to take a look?
A. Yes.
Q. These are messages dated June 7, 2016, between you and Dylan Howard?
A. Yes.
Q. In these message, you indicated, "I have a block buster Trump story."

Do you see that on the top?
A. Yes.
Q. You were reaching out to Dylan Howard to tell him about Ms. McDougal's allegations, correct?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. You were reaching out to Mr. Howard to get him interested in the potential story, right?
A. I think that's fair.
Q. And it would make -- it would make you look better when you went to Phoenix to be able to say, "I have already got the National Enquirer interested in this," correct?
A. I don't know about that.
Q. It did not help you gain trust with the client to be able to say that you had already generated interest in the potential story; is that your testimony?
A. No, that's not my testimony.
Q. So it was helpful to you to be able to say to Karen McDougal and Jay Grdina in mid June of 2016 , you had already communicated with the National Enquirer, right?
A. Maybe, or maybe not. Perhaps.
Q. And this is one of the ways your relationship with Dylan Howard benefited your law practice, right?
A. I don't see that the two are related.
Q. You testified on Tuesday about a meeting that you had with Ms. McDougal in Los Angeles.

Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you showed some text messages. We eventually got to the point where you remembered that the meeting was on June 20, 2016?
A. I believe so.
Q. Mr. Howard travelled to Los Angeles for the meeting, right?
A. Yes.
Q. At the meeting was also Ms. McDougal?
A. Yes.
Q. Jay Grdina?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Crawford, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the purpose of that meeting was for Dylan Howard to sort of vet Ms. McDougal's story, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew he was going to take the information and his observations and report back to AMI's leadership, right?
A. To David Pecker.
Q. To Mr. Pecker, the top of the totem pole of AMI?
A. Yes.
Q. You were informed, were you not, the next day, AMI was not interested?
A. Yes, I was informed at that time they were not interested.
Q. I think we saw a text message where Mr. Howard wrote to you that AMI was "immovable."

Do you remember that?
A. Vaguely.
Q. And the issue was, one of them, that AMI felt Ms. McDougal had not provided enough corroborating information,
right?
A. Yes.
Q. Meaning, evidence to back up her story, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is why shortly thereafter you texted Mr.

Howard, you said, "Ms. McDougal found her Blackberry," right?
A. But he asked her to locate additional documents and, so, yes.
Q. It was in response to that request you wrote to Mr. Howard shortly after the meeting, "She found her Blackberry?"
A. Correct.
Q. There were efforts made to take information off that Blackberry, right?
A. I don't know about that.
Q. The Blackberry ended not moving the needle for AMI in terms of corroboration, correct?
A. I don't know.
Q. There was no conversation that you were a party to where AMI said, "Oh, great, now that we know the Blackberry exists, let's move forward with the story," right?
A. I never had that conversation.
Q. In this same month, June 2016 , things had broke down enough that you sent a message to Mr. Howard indicating you were drafting a Declination Letter.

Do you remember that?
A. I don't recall that.

MR. BOVE: If we can take a look at Government

Exhibit 176A, Page 3.

Zoom in on 1115 and 56.
(Displayed.)

THE WITNESS: Yes. Okay.
Q. Does this refresh your recollection that you told Mr .

Howard in June 2016 that you were drafting a Declination Letter?
A. Yes.
Q. You were, correct?
A. I don't recall. I -- I don't recall.
Q. At this point, Ms. McDougal started to negotiate with
other companies, right?
A. I don't know.

THE COURT: Is this a good time to stop?
MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Jurors, we'll start back up at 2:15.

Do not discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else.

Pleas keep an open mind as to the defendant's guilt or innocence.

Please do not form or express an opinion as to the defendant's guilt or incense.

Enjoy your lunch.
(Jury leaving courtroom.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Thank you, sir.
You may step down.
(Witness leaving courtroom.)
THE COURT: Mr. Bove, I am not rushing you at all.
I want to get a sense of how much more you have.
MR. BOVE: I will make some adjustments at the
lunch break. I expect it's under an hour.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Enjoy your lunch.
(Whereupon, the Court took a luncheon recess.)
*****
\(\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{S}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}\).

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Is there anything that we need to discuss before we bring the witness out?

MS. NECHELES: There is one issue, if I could have a few minutes to discuss.

I wanted to raise an issue about the Gag Order and just some clarification before we start.

If I could hand up some articles here, and give a copy.

Thank you.
Your Honor, I just handed up a stack of newspaper
articles by legal commentators and others.
People like, the first one is entitled "Trump's New York Prosecution is a Bogus Case by Bogus Prosecutors."

And these articles are by a number of legal commentators, including Jonathan Turley and Andrew McCarthy.

These articles are all articles which President Trump would like to post on his Truth, but they all discuss this case. They discuss witnesses who have testified. They discuss what the aspects of the case are.

They're very critical of this case. They're important for his election campaign. They're talking about the kinds of issues that he has been raising.

But he has some concerns because they do mention witnesses. They mention the prosecutors in this case by name.

We think they are perfectly fine, but we think there is some ambiguity in the Gag Order.

So we're asking for your Honor to take a look at them so that he knows he is not violating the Gag Order when he posts this.

THE COURT: People?

MR. STEINGLASS: Judge, first of all, we've just been handed this stack. If anything, we need to go through them.

But it seems odd that they're asking the Court for sort of an advanced ruling on these kinds of things.

I think the Gag Order is very specific.

So I guess my first request would be to have sometime to look at it.

We don't want to be in this position either. If they're talking about witnesses in the case, people that the defendant is not supposed to be talking about based on the Gag Order -- I understand and fully respect that there is a political campaign going on. There is also a criminal case going on in this courtroom. That's what the Order is seeking to protect. I think we need to really be careful with this situation.

THE COURT: I appreciate what you are bringing to my attention, Ms. Necheles.

I'm not going to give advanced rulings. I'm not going to be in a position of looking at posts and determining in advance whether you should or should post these on Truth Social as part of your official campaign website.

There is no ambiguity in the Order. The Appellate Division has already weighed in on that.

We'll see where it goes from there.

At this point, this Court and the higher court have found there is nothing wrong with the Gag Order.

I think the best advice you can give your client is to do without, steer clear.

MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, I hear what you are saying. I heard what the Appellate Court has ruled. I think they're ruling in the abstract. I believe there is ambiguity.

THE COURT: I am not going to argue with you. If you have an issue, take it up to the Appellate Division. Take it up to the Court of Appeals. I am not revisiting my Order. I am not going to.

MS. NECHELES: What we're seeking a clarification on, when the witnesses have testified, or when there is an analysis of the case and it mentions witnesses, or it mentions that the prosecutors made certain arguments in this Court, or the prosecutors were appointed by a certain justice, these are people who are analyzing the case and talking about it being a political hit. That is what President Trump wants to be arguing at its core.

And I, frankly, don't know whether that violates the Gag Order.

THE COURT: I am not going to give you an advanced ruling on this.

Let's get the witness.

I think, when it doubt, steer clear. That's all I can say.
(Witness entering courtroom.)
        ***
        THE COURT: Good afternoon sir.
        Let's get the jury.
        THE CLERK: Do all parties stipulate that all
        jurors are present and properly seated?
        MR. STEINGLASS: Yes.
        MR. BOVE: Yes.
        THE COURT: Good afternoon, jurors.
        MR. BOVE: May I?
        THE COURT: Yes.
CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOVE:
    Q. Mr. Davidson, I would like to talk a little bit more
    about the 2011 blog post.
    You have testified a little bit about a woman named
Gina Rodriguez, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Who you said was Stormy Daniels' manager for a long period of time, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Perhaps on and off at times?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. But in 2011, Gina Rodriguez was Stormy Daniels' manager, correct?
```

A. That's my understanding.
Q. And you referenced at times that Gina Rodriguez had a boyfriend that was involved in some of these things, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And his name was Anthony Kotsev?
A. Yes.
Q. Am I pronouncing that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it a fact that Mr . Kotsev actually wrote the blog post that was put on "The Dirty" in 2011?
A. I don't know. He was an employee of The Dirty.
Q. You don't recall saying that to the Government?
A. I recall that.
Q. The Dirty was owned, in part, by James Grdina, right?
A. I don't think so.
Q. He worked there, correct?
A. James Grdina?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know.
Q. And James Grdina is Karen McDougal's ex-husband, right?
A. Yes.
Q. James Grdina and Jay Grdina are brothers, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Jay Grdina brokered your connection to Ms. McDougal in that representation?
A. Yes.
Q. And is also connected to Gina Rodriguez, right?
A. Jay?
Q. Jay, right
A. I don't think so.
Q. So it's your testimony that Jay Grdina has never worked with Gina Rodriguez?
A. I don't know.
Q. So let's focus then on that 2011 representation of Stormy Daniels.
A. Yes.
Q. The reason that you were able to get that blog post taken down is because Gina Rodriguez's boyfriend had written it, correct?
A. I don't know who wrote it, but I don't think they were dating at the time.
Q. It's your testimony that Gina Rodriguez did not -- was not involved with Anthony Kotsev in 2011?
A. I don't know if she was. I don't think she would have needed me, she would have called her boyfriend.
Q. You used this network of connections to get the blog post taken down, correct?
A. In addition to the Cease and Desist.
Q. You practiced law for a long time, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You won cases in court?
A. Yes.
Q. This Cease and Desist Letter was not one of your greatest litigation victories?
A. It was a form letter.
Q. It was a form letter created in that context because you had connections to The Dirty?
A. I certainly followed the Cease and Desist up with a phone call.
Q. Isn't it a fact that the reason that $M s$. Daniels and Ms. Rodriguez wanted that blog post taken down, they were trying to negotiate a better deal with In Touch magazine?
A. That's a fact that I learned later, yes.
Q. They were using you in connection with them?
A. I don't understand your question. They were using my efforts to create an exclusive opportunity with a different publication.
Q. And that exclusive opportunity was more valuable to Ms.

Daniels', right?
A. Yes.
Q. They were using you to make more money, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you testified about some public statements that Ms. Daniels made in January 2018, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. At around this time Larry Flynt offered to indemnify Stormy Daniels in connection with any litigation arising out of the settlement agreement, correct?
A. There were others. I was not involved. It's my understanding there were other terms as well.
Q. But one of the terms, if there was going to be litigation relating to the Settlement Agreement that you helped to negotiate, he would indemnify her?
A. Yes.
Q. Indemnify means he would be paying her legal bills, correct?
A. True.
Q. You testified this morning about some stress that you perceived Ms. Daniels to be going through in January 2018 relating to this agreement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, she had this opportunity to have her legal fees paid if she wanted to fight the agreement, right?
A. Yes. But you can -- even if someone is going to pay your legal bills, it's still an obstruction in your life. Yes.
Q. From your perspective, this Settlement Agreement was a valid legal document, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You had negotiated it, right?
A. True.
Q. It had legal terms, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was certainly consistent with your beliefs about your ethnical obligations, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't do anything wrong in connection with that agreement, right?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. I want to talk a little bit about your relationship with Michael Cohen.
A. Yes.
Q. You continued to work with him after the Stormy Daniels settlement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. On other matters?
A. Not with him. But $I$ continued to certainly speak with him, correspond with him. He was opposing counsel on another matter
Q. And he sent you some business, right?
A. He sent me work.
Q. He sent you a client?
A. He sent me a non-paying client.
Q. So it's not as if the experience with him was so horrific that you ceased interacting with him, correct?
A. No, our relationship changed over time.
Q. And, in 2018, had you heard the name Summer Zervos?
A. I believe so.
Q. Did you discuss Summer Zervos with Mr. Cohen?
A. I can't recall.
Q. What about Justin Best?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the client he was talking about, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So this is a situation where Mr. Cohen referred you a client?
A. Yes.
Q. And you accepted that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Because you were continuing to work together, correct?
A. No.
Q. You were continuing to interact professionally, right?
A. That's fair.
Q. And you also had a client named Shera Bechard?
A. I had a client named Shera Bechard.
Q. She retained you in about November 2017 , correct?
A. I'm not sure of the date.
Q. Late 2017, give or take?
A. I would have to look. That doesn't strike me as wrong.
Q. And she had made allegations about a sexual
relationship with a man named Elliott Broidy?
A. I think that's been publically reported.
Q. Just so I understand the privilege analysis, if
something from your perspective -- if something is publically reported, you are comfortable reporting privileged conversations about it?
A. No.
Q. You are aware of the public reports about Ms. Bechard's allegations?
A. I was aware of the public reporting of her allegations.
Q. She was your client?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Cohen represented Mr. Broidy?
A. Ultimately.
Q. There was a Settlement Agreement, correct?
A. True.
Q. This Settlement Agreement was legal work for you, right?
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. You were practicing law when you negotiated the agreement?
A. True.
Q. So was Mr. Cohen, as far you could tell?
A. True.
Q. It resolved in a contract?
A. True.
Q. It probably had terms like the ones you negotiated on behalf of Ms. Daniels, correct?
A. I would imagine.
Q. Maybe with one notable exception, that the dollar figure was a lot higher right?
A. I don't recall.
Q. You don't recall that the settlement was for 1.6 million dollars to be paid in installments?
A. I don't recall.
Q. As you sit here today, you don't recall events from 2018; is that your testimony?
A. I don't recall specific dollar amounts in a settlement agreement from six some odd years ago.
Q. Even after this settlement between Ms. Bechard and Mr. Broidy, you continued to communicate with Mr. Cohen, right?
A. I believe so.
Q. Well, I mean, you know -- so we looked at the text messages, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You remember this morning, correct?
A. Yes, I remember this morning.
Q. The text messages from January 2018, right?
A. Yes.
Q. They continued in February 2018, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And March 2018, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In the context of those discussions, did you ever talk to Mr. Cohen about Stormy Daniels having "settler's remorse?"
A. I may have.
Q. And do you recall in that conversation also using the word "leverage?"
A. No.
Q. Is leverage a word that you used in conversations with Mr. Cohen?
A. I may have.
Q. And you did, in fact, in March of 2018, correct?
A. Use the word "leverage?"
Q. In a conversation with Michael Cohen about Stormy Daniels?
A. I don't know.
Q. During meetings with the District Attorney's office, they asked you questions about whether Mr. Cohen had ever recorded your conversations, correct?
A. I don't recall if it was -- what agencies. It came up at some point in an interview.
Q. And I think you said, did you not, "Yeah, I was under the impression that he did record some of these talks?"
A. Certainly, I recall a few conversations when $I$ was speaking with Mr. Cohen when his conversations were odd, and
that led me to believe that $I$ was being recorded.
Q. I think you said the reason they seemed odd to you, he was talking in a linear fashion?
A. Yes. Because, ordinarily, he was sort of all over the place. In these particular calls, it was a very structured conversation which really wasn't his personality.
Q. Less pants on fire, more straightforward?
A. Maybe a little bit more self-serving.
Q. Do you recall saying to Michael Cohen on March 7, 2018, "Sometimes people get settler's remorse, you know, and other times people think that, hey, I need to resolve this case before a date certain because this is when I have the most?"
A. No.

MR. BOVE: If we can bring up for the parties, the Court and the witness, Defense Exhibit F15-AT.

There is also a set of headphones on the bench.
I think the way this works, there is a dial in the middle.
I'm told, if you put the volume up above two,
there's a risk of catastrophic damage to your ears.

Thank you.
Q. So we're going to play Defense Exhibit F158A over the headphones.

I'm going to ask you to listen to see if it refreshes your recollection about whether you said what $I$ just said.
A. Are you playing it?
Q. I think it might help, that's the receiver, whatever you call this, it should come on.

Any luck?
A. If you could restart it.
(Whereupon, witness was given headphones to listen to audio recording.)

MR. BOVE: Restart it, please.
(Whereupon, audio recording was played for the witness and the Court only.)

THE WITNESS: Is this the beginning?
THE COURT: Play it one more time.
MR. BOVE: Start it from the beginning.
(Whereupon, the witness and the Court listened to audio recording.)

MR. BOVE: Stop it.
Q. So, Mr. Davidson, it continues. We're going to go back to it.

That was your voice?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that refresh your recollection that you said to Mr. Cohen, "Sometimes people get settler's remorse, you know, and other times people think, hey, I need to resolve this case before a date certain because this is when $I$ have the most."

What you just listened to, does it refresh your recollection that you said that?
A. Yes.
Q. You were talking about Stormy Daniels here, correct?
A. Probably.
Q. Just yes or no; were you talking about Stormy Daniels
with Michael Cohen on March 7, 2018?
MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.

If you could answer yes or no.
A. It certainly appears to be, yes.
Q. And do you see the reference to "before a date
certain?"
A. Yes.
Q. That's something you said to Mr. Cohen in March 2018, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is a comment that you were attributing in substance to Ms. Daniels, correct?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. I am asking you: What was going on in your head at the time?
A. What time?
Q. When you had said these things.
A. This is 2018; yes? I don't know what time you are referring to.
Q. When you said what is written on the page, were you
referring in substance to something that Ms. Daniels had conveyed to you?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. And when you use -- do you see where it says
"hypothetically speaking?"
A. Yes.
Q. That was a code, right?
A. No.
Q. Because you were using the word "hypothetical," so you could sit in a chair like this and say, "I'm not sure if $I$ was talking about Stormy Daniels?"
A. No.
Q. Do you recall saying during the same conversation with Mr. Cohen, "Well, if things don't turn out the way that you thought they were going to turn out, and now you're realizing you have a lot more leverage, you tried to settle it twice"
A. Can I see the transcript?
Q. Yes.
A. Thank you.

MR. BOVE: So we're going to bring up Defense Exhibit F15-AT again.
(Displayed.)
Q. I want to do whatever I can to refresh your recollection.

Is the transcript sufficient?
A. That's fine. Thanks.
Q. Does looking at the transcript refresh your recollection that you had said that to Mr. Cohen in March of 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. And you use the word "leverage," correct?
A. Yes
Q. And that was Ms. Daniels' goal, was it not, to create leverage over President Trump?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall saying during that same conversation, "If someone like Larry Flynt or someone else comes in and says, I will give you 1 million dollars, but first you got to get out of the agreement, hypothetically speaking."

Do you recall saying that to Mr. Cohen on March 7, 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. That was a reference to Larry Flynt?
A. Yes.
Q. Who made the offer to Ms. Daniels, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that refresh your recollection that this entire conversation is about Ms. Daniels?
A. Yes. But $I$ think you are grossly mistaken about it.
Q. There is no question pending.

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
I would ask that the witness be allowed to answer. THE COURT: You can go ahead and answer the question.
A. I think you are grossly mistaken about the date. This is years after the settlement, and this is talking about a potential breach, where Larry Flynt had offered to give Ms. Daniels 1 million dollars plus indemnify her from any legal costs because she wanted to get out of the Settlement Agreement that she had entered into two years before.
Q. Which is shorthand for "settler's remorse," correct, which was your phrase?
A. That's true.
Q. Now, at some point, Ms. Daniels got new counsel, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Michael Avenatti?
A. True.
Q. And Gina Rodriguez continued to work with Ms. Daniels in that timeframe, right?
A. For a period.
Q. So for some period of time Ms. Daniels' legal representation was Mr. Avennati, assisted in that agent capacity that we talked about by Gina Rodriguez?
A. For some period of time.
Q. And, certainly, that was the case in, let's say, the
second-third of 2018?
A. I don't know. It's my recollection that Miss

Rodriguez's tenure did not last for very long once Mr. Avennati came in.
Q. Do you recall saying to Michael Cohen, "Avennati has really driven a wedge, a serious between Stormy and Gina. Avennati is leaning on Gina, saying, you know, basically, we know we're lying. We know we're full of shit in the media. We know that she was never threatened in Las Vegas. We know all these things."

Do you recall saying that to Mr. Cohen?
A. That sounds like something I recall.
Q. Yes or no; do you recall saying that to Mr. Cohen?
A. I don't doubt I said that. I don't have a specific recollection of that quote.
Q. That's fair.

MR. BOVE: We'll listen it. You can put the headphones back on, please.

I am going to ask Mr. Bernik to play Defense F17C,
which corresponds to the transcript.
(Whereupon, the witness, using the headphones,
played the audio recording.)
Q. Does that refresh your recollection that you did say those things to Michael Cohen on April 4th of 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. That was your voice on Defense Exhibit F17C?
A. Yes.
Q. In that same timeframe, April 2018, you did some public interviews, right?
A. Yes.
Q. I believe CNN?
A. I believe so.
Q. You talked with Michael Cohen about the questions and answers during the interviews, right?
A. Can you rephrase your question, please?
Q. Did you speak to Michael Cohen about your CNN interviews?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall saying this to Michael Cohen about one of the interviews:
"The $\$ 130,000$, was there ever any indication that the money was coming from --"

Answer is "No."
"Was there ever any indication that Michael Cohen needed authority from Donald Trump before he made that payment?"

And I said: "No, it was never discussed."

Do you recall saying that to Michael Cohen?
A. Vaguely.
Q. Go back to the headphones.
A. It's fine.
Q. I appreciate it.

MR. BOVE: Let me state it for the record. We're
now going to play Defense F17A, with the corresponding transcript is dash 18.
(Whereupon, audio recording was played for the witness and Court only.)
A. I think the wrong transcript is up.
(Displayed.)
Q. Please stop that there.

Does that refresh your recollection that you said to

Mr. Cohen: "Was there ever any indication that Michael Cohen needed authority from Donald Trump before he made that payment?

And I said, No, it was never discussed."

You said that, right?
A. That's true.
Q. You also in that conversation with Michael Cohen said
"And why would an attorney have ever asked opposing counsel what kind of conversations they had with their client."

You said that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you believed that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the same way you invoked the privilege here, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Michael Cohen didn't breach any privilege in talking to you about the Stormy Daniels negotiations, did he?
A. Not that I am aware of.
Q. And in that conversation later, did you or did you not say: "Look, it's the truth, Michael, you know that, but I think that you and I both want the truth out there?"
A. Yes.
Q. You said that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. In this timeframe, around the time of the CNN interviews, April 2018, do you recall speaking with Michael Cohen about Gina Rodriguez and Mr. Kotsev?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall saying to Mr. Cohen, "Gina Rodriguez's boyfriend goes out in the media and tells the story that Stormy Daniels, you know, in the weeks prior to the election was basically yelling and screaming and calling me a pussy."

Do you recall saying that to Mr. Cohen?
A. I don't.

MR. BOVE: So if we could bring up the transcript on the screen, please. Defense Exhibit F17-ET, and play the corresponding audio, Defense F17E, please.
(Whereupon, the witness, using the headphones, played audio.)
Q. Does that refresh your recollection that you said that
to Michael Cohen around the time of the CNN interview?
A. I don't know what date the CNN interview was, but $I$ said it on April 4th.
Q. Do you recall also saying to Mr. Cohen, "I wouldn't be the least bit surprised if he comes out and says, you know what, Stormy Daniels, she wanted this money more than you could ever imagine. I remember hearing her on the phone saying: You fucking, Keith Davidson, you better settle this God damn story because if he loses this election, and he is going to lose, if he loses this election, we all lose all fucking leverage. This case is worth zero."

Do you recall saying that to Mr. Cohen?
A. I do.
Q. Do you remember at the beginning of my questions when $I$ asked about whether the election was used as a leverage point in connection with the Stormy Daniels negotiations?
A. I do.
Q. I would like you to take a look at the agreement that you negotiated on behalf of Ms. Daniels. People's 26 in evidence.

This could be for everyone.

From your perspective, this is a legal document?
A. Yes.
Q. The type of Settlement Agreement that you've negotiated many times over the course of your career, correct?
A. That's fair.
Q. You've negotiated nondisclosure provisions?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did that here on behalf of Stormy Daniels as an attorney, correct?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. There isn't fake language designed to hide something, right?
A. I don't know. It's a very long document. It's not
fake language.
Q. It has copyright provisions, right?
A. A Transfer of Copyright.
Q. I don't know what that means, honestly.

It's a serious legal part of this agreement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So if we can take a look at Bates ending 021.

This is the Copyright Transfer, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You have used similar documents like this before, right?
A. Yes.
Q. In the course of your practice on behalf of other clients, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You did that here because you were trying to help Ms.

Daniels negotiate an agreement, right?
A. This was the agreement, yes.
Q. And these are valid terms from your perspective, right?
A. Yes.
Q. As is the rest of the agreement?
A. I believe so.

MR. BOVE: If we could look at the Bates ending 020, please.
(Displayed.)
Q. This is the signature page, right?
A. Yes.

MR. BOVE: And can we zoom in on the signature, please.
(Displayed.)
Q. And I think you said Mr. Cohen signed at the bottom, right?
A. Yes.
Q. There is an Esquire by his name?
A. Yes.
Q. From your perspective, he signed this agreement as an attorney, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. There is a blank for David Dennison?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't know one way or the other what happened with
this agreement after you sent it to Michael Cohen?
A. I do not.
Q. It's unsigned here, correct?
A. True.

MR. BOVE: If we can take that down and look at Baits 017.
(Displayed.)
Q. This is another signature page, correct?
A. What was the last page, Page 15?
Q. We'll back up one page, please.
A. It's just a continuation of the signature block.
Q. Look at 017 -- 016. This is the end part of the main agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, go back to the signature page, 017.
A. It's blank here as well in the DD space, right?
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the initials for David Dennison?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a practice that you used before, using initials in the main body of the agreement?
A. It's common.
Q. You even used it with Hulk Hogan, right?
A. I believe so.
Q. This is unsigned, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't know one way or the other whether it was signed by DD?
A. By DD; yes.

MR. BOVE: I have nothing.
Any redirect?
MR. STEINGLASS: Can $I$ have five minutes?
THE COURT: Are you asking for five minutes?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes.
THE COURT: All right, jurors, let's take five minutes.
(Jury leaving court courtroom.)
THE COURT: You may be seated.
Thank you, sir.
You can step down.
(Witness leaving courtroom.)
***
(Recess.)
(T. Magniccari relieved by
L. Eisenberg as Court Reporter.)
(Whereupon, a recess is taken.)
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~+~$

COURT OFFICER: Come to Order. Part 59 is back in session.

THE COURT: Mr. Steinglass, are you ready?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, Judge.
Thank you for the opportunity.
THE COURT: Let's get the witness, please.
COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.
(Whereupon, the witness, Keith Davidson, having
been previously duly sworn and/or affirmed, resumes the witness stand.)

COURT OFFICER: Jury entering.
(Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors are present and properly seated.)

THE CLERK: Case on trial continues.
All parties are present.
Appearances remain the same.
Jury is present and properly seated.
THE COURT: Mr. Steinglass.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
Thank you for that, as well.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q Hello, Mr. Davidson.

A Hello.
Q On cross-examination, Mr. Bove asked you several questions about a recorded conversation that you had with Michael Cohen on April 4th of 2018.

Do you remember that?
A Yes.
Q And, at the time, as of April 4th of 2018, had Stormy Daniels hired Michael Avenatti?

A I believe so.
Q And was Michael Avenatti suing you and Michael Cohen at the time --

A Yes.
Q -- that you had this conversation with Michael Cohen?
A Yes.
Q Would you like me to put or hand you copies of some of the transcript segments that Mr. Bove showed you?

A Yes, please.
Q I'm going to hand you Defendant's F17-CT and
Defendant's F17-ET.
MS. HOFFINGER: AT.
MR. STEINGLASS: Dash ET.
(Whereupon, the documents are shown to the
defense and then shown to the witness.)
THE WITNESS: Thanks.
Q You have them?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
So, let's start with F17-CT.
Mr. Bove asked you if you said to Michael Cohen: "And now that Avenatti has really driven a wedge, a serious wedge in between Stormy and Gina, Avenatti is leaning on Gina and saying, you know, basically we're lying, we know we're full of shit in the media, we know that she was never threatened in Las Vegas, we know all these things."

What did you mean when you said that?
A I meant that, uh, that Avenatti was trying to, uh, persuade Gina's testimony.

Q So, were you in any way acknowledging that you were lying?

A No.
Q Were you in any way acknowledging that Stormy Daniels was never threatened in Las Vegas?

A No.
Q Is it your belief that -- or is it your meaning that when you said that, you were talking about the things that Avenatti was going to allege or was alleging?

A That's correct.
Q Similarly, Mr. Bove showed you, or read you, or played for you, or all of the above, a portion of the same call and gave you the transcript F17-ET.

Can you take a look at that one, please?
A Yes.
Q And he asked you if you said: "I wouldn't be the least bit surprised if he comes out and says" -- let me just stop myself for one second to ask, who is "he" in that?

A Anthony Kotsev.
Q Okay.
"I wouldn't be surprised if he comes out and says: You know what, Stormy Daniels, she wanted this money more than you could ever imagine. I remember hearing her on the phone saying, you, fucking Keith Davidson, you better settle this goddamn story because if he loses this election, and he's going to lose, if he loses this election, then we lose all fucking leverage and this case is worth zero."

Mr. Bove asked you if you were discussing the Stormy Daniels case when you said these things to Michael Cohen?

A Yes.
Q Are you at all saying that Stormy Daniels said those things?

A It was my understanding at the time that -- that this was April 4th, and that Anthony Kotsev was about to give a media interview, in sum and substance, in alignment with this text.

Q Just to be very clear, you were not telling Michael Cohen that Stormy Daniels was talking about the election and
how she's gonna lose her leverage after the election; it was your understanding that those were things that Anthony Kotsev was going to say?

A Correct.
Q You testified on direct examination that you had an opportunity to review documents and exhibits that were contained on a thumb drive.

Do you remember that?
A Yes.
Q Did you have a chance to listen to another recorded conversation from October 16, 2017 between yourself and Michael Cohen that has been marked for identification as People's Exhibit 265?

A Yes.
Q Do you know who made that recording?
A Michael Cohen surreptitiously made the recording.
Q When you say "surreptitiously", did that mean you did not know you were being recorded?

A I did not know $I$ was being recorded.
Q Does that fairly and accurately depict a conversation that you had with Michael Cohen on October 16, 2017 ?

A Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: I offer it into evidence.
MR. BOVE: No objection.
THE COURT: Accepted into evidence.
(Whereupon, the exhibit is received in evidence.)
Q Similarly, did you also have the opportunity to review what has been marked for identification as People's Exhibit 267?

A Yes.
Q Is that a transcript of the recorded phone conversation that we just admitted as People's Exhibit 265?

A Yes.
Q Have you compared the transcript to the recording
itself?
A I have.
Q Is it accurate?
A Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: I offer that into evidence.
MR. BOVE: Can $I$ have one moment to confer with
Mr. Steinglass?
THE COURT: Yes.
(Whereupon, Counsel confer.)
MR. BOVE: No objection.
Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: People's 267 is accepted into evidence.
(Whereupon, the exhibit is received in evidence.)
MR. STEINGLASS: What I would like to do, please,
is display People's 267, Pages 10 to 11, while I'm playing
a portion of 265 , from 11 minutes and 13 seconds into the call through 13 minutes and 33 seconds into the call.

And we can display this to everyone, please.
(Whereupon, the audio exhibit is played in open court and the exhibit is shown on the screens.)

Q So, the portions of that tape that are attributed to
"Keith", is that your voice?
A Yes.
Q And the portions of the tape that are attributed to "Michael", is that Michael Cohen's voice?

A Yes.
Q I want to blow up a particular paragraph here at the top of Page 11.

Do you see the paragraph we're blowing up?
A Yes.
Q When Mr. Cohen said to you, "I can't even tell you how many times he said to me," who did you understand "he" to be a reference to?

A Mr. Trump.
Q And what did you understand, "I hate the fact that we did it," attributed to Mr. Trump, to be a reference to?

A I attributed that to be a quote from Mr. Trump.
Q About what? "Did" what?
A The Stormy Daniels settlement.
MR. STEINGLASS: One minute, please.

## K. Davidson - Recross/Bove

(Whereupon, the People confer.)
MR. STEINGLASS: No further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Bove, anything else?
MR. BOVE: Yes, please.
RECROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOVE:
Q Mr. Davidson, you don't know the day of that recording; do you?

A Not offhand.
Q And, so, when you're interpreting words of Michael Cohen, without understanding the date, you don't know what conversations had taken place by that time between you and Mr. Cohen; do you?

A I don't understand your question.
Q You have no frame of reference for when that was said in the context of all the other events that you testified about today; right?

A No, I have a pretty good understanding of the context.
Q My question is not the date, sir.
You don't know when the conversation occurred, as you sit here; do you?

A Not offhand.
Q And you were asked questions by Mr. Steinglass about the recordings that you and I discussed; right?

A Yes.
Q And those are recordings that had your voice; correct?
A True.
Q And Mr. Cohen's voice; correct?
A True.
Q And the transcripts were accurate, and you followed along with those; right?

A Yes.
MR. BOVE: The defense offers F15-A and the corresponding transcript, F17-A and the corresponding transcript, F17-C and the corresponding transcript, F17-E and the corresponding transcript.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. STEINGLASS: No objection.
THE COURT: Accepted into evidence.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned Defense Exhibits are received in evidence.)

MR. BOVE: Mr. Bernick, let's start with F15-AT on the screen. This is in evidence, so the jury can see it.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
MR. BOVE: And you can play the corresponding call, please.
(Whereupon, an audio exhibit plays in open court.)

## K. Davidson - Recross/Bove

MR. BOVE: Now I'd like to publish to the jury F17-CT, that's the transcript, and play the corresponding audio, F17-C.
(Whereupon, the exhibit is shown on the screens and the audio exhibit plays in open court.)

MR. BOVE: Now, if we could please publish F17-AT.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.) MR. BOVE: And please play the corresponding audio.
(Whereupon, an audio exhibit is played in open court.)

MR. BOVE: If we can, please, now publish the last Defense Exhibit, F17-ET.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
MR. BOVE: Zoom in on the text, please, and then play the corresponding audio.
(Whereupon, an audio exhibit is played.)
Q Am I understanding you correctly in saying that you believe that statements that Stormy Daniels made to you about using the election as leverage are subject to attorney-client privilege?

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q The agreement that you signed in connection with the

Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR
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Stormy Daniels settlement used the initials DD; right?

A Yes.
Q That was in a decoded Side Letter, was in connection with President Trump; correct?

A Yes.

Q A man you've never talked to; correct?

A Correct.

MR. STEINGLASS: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.

Q And a man you've never been in the same room with before Tuesday; is that correct?

A Yes.

MR. BOVE: I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. STEINGLASS: No thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: You can step down.
(Whereupon, the witness is excused.)

THE COURT: People, call your next witness.
MR. CONROY: At this time, the People call Doug

Daus.

COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.

```
D O U G L A S
D A U S, 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: Douglas Daus. D-A-U-S.
COURT OFFICER: Your county of residence?
THE WITNESS: Westchester County.
THE COURT: Good afternoon.
You may inquire.
MR. CONROY: Thank you, Judge.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. CONROY:
Q Where do you work?
A I work for the New York County District Attorney's Office.

Q How long have you worked in the District Attorney's Office?

A It will be ten years in July.
Q Where do you work in the DA's Office?
A HTAU. High Technology Analysis Unit.
Q What does HTAU do?
A Process all types of digital evidence that comes through our Lab to this Office. We take extractions from this type of evidence and produce reports for them.

Q How long have you worked at HTAU?
A It will be ten years in July.
Q Can you tell us a little bit about your educational background?

A I have a degree in psychology.
I've been in this field a number of -- 20 years. I have a number of industry standards, as well.

Q Can you tell us about some of your certifications?
A Certainly. One is a CCME, a Cellebrite Certified Mobile Examiner. Another one would be a Certified Computer Examiner.

Q Where did you receive that training?
A That training has been over the years that I've been accompanied with this type of job. It comes from the company itself. For Cellebrite, the other certification happens to be an internal body of trainees and trainers.

Q Can you tell us about your experience in the field and your work history?

A Certainly. So, before the ten years here, I worked two years for Guidance Software. It was a company that created EnCase. It's software that does forensics.

Two years prior to that, I was embedded in the military in Iraq, doing the same type of work here.

Q When were you in Iraq?
A From April -- end of April '09 to when we closed, in November of 2011.

Q And what were you doing over there?
A Same type of work here.
Q What's your current role in HTAU?

A I'm a Supervising Computer Forensic Analyst.
Q Can you just give a brief description of what computer and phone forensics means?

A It means that when we get a device that is a computer or phone, we then process that device. At that moment, we take a digital copy of the entire evidence, preserve it, and then work with that copy to perform an analysis of those devices.

Q Can you describe your day-to-day responsibilities as a supervising analyst in HTAU?

A Besides the daily supervision of the Lab, keeping up with technology, software, hardware, I am also an analyst. So, any type of cases that come my way, I may also perform the extractions and produce reports for them.

Q What kinds of devices do you analyze on a day-to-day basis?

A Cell phones, primarily. It could be computers, as well, thumb drives, iCloud accounts. Actually, anything that would contain digital media.

Q In the time you've been in HTAU, about how many devices have you analyzed?

A Here, as of today, 3,392.
Q Approximately?
A Approximately.
Q How many of those are phones?
A Anywhere from 80 to 90 percent are phones.

Q So, thousands of phones?
A Yes.
Q Does HTAU have a standard intake procedure for when the Unit receives digital evidence?

A We do.
Q Can you describe that intake procedure that HTAU uses?
A So, once an intake email is set up from the attorneys to our Department, typically, devices will come either pursuant to a Search Warrant or a Consent Form. Those devices then come to our office. We will examine them, take pictures of them, label them, keep records of those licenses, and then produce Chain of Custody Forms, and then begin the extractions and analysis.

Q Would it be routine to -- for the person doing intake to know what authority HTAU has to do the search of the device?

A We don't do any devices without such.
Q That's where you mentioned Search Warrant or Consent?
A That is correct.
Q Briefly, what is a Search Warrant?
A A Search Warrant is authority from a judge that signs, that allows us to examine the devices obtained for our Search Warrant.

Q What is Consent?
A Consent, just simply, the owner of the device consents to the examination of the device.

Q Once the intake has been done, what happens to the device?

A Once the intake is done, it is assigned an analyst. In this case, it would have been me. We then look at the Search Warrant or Consent Form, make sure all the numbers are correct, and then proceed with the extraction of devices.

Q Would it be fair to say that the person who does the intake is not always the person that does the analysis of a particular device?

A Not always, that's correct.
Q Have you, yourself, extracted data from and performed analysis on smart phones, including Apple iPhones?

A Yes, I have.
Q Can you tell us a little bit more about the extraction process, specifically for a cell phone?

A Depending upon whether it's an Android or an Apple iPhone, we then take it into a particular room. If we have a PIN code to it, then we'll proceed with the extraction of the device.

Q When you say, "If we have a PIN code," what do you mean?

A In Consents, we are usually provided the PIN code.
Q You mean the password?
A That is correct.
Q What types of tools or programs do you use to extract
data from smart phones or cell phones?
A As mentioned before, Cellebrite is one of them. Graykey is another one.

Q What do those tools do when they're extracting information from the phone? What does it extract?

A It extracts the entire content of the device and puts it in a format that's readable by the format itself.

Q When you say "content of the device", is that data?
A That is all the data on those devices.
Q How do you read that data once its been extracted?
A We use, again, the software called Cellebrite to then take the contents of those devices and put it into a meaningful format.

Q Once it's in that format, what kinds of things can you look at from the extraction?

A Anything that you would normally see on the device, your call history, your contacts, your text messages, videos, pictures and such.

Q In that process, is any of the data on the phone changed in any way?

A We're dealing with a live phone, so perhaps some things in the background like software. But, for all intents and purposes, things do not change.

Q Can -- withdrawn.
What kinds of data, specifically, can be extracted from a
smart phone?
A Um, text messages, all types of software, call history, log files, anything that is normally on a phone.

Q Can you get contact lists?
A You can.
Q Pictures?
A Pictures.
Q Calendar entries?
A Calendar entries.
Q Audio recordings?
A Audios.
Q Can you pull the phone number associated with the smart phone?

A Absolutely.
Q The user name?
A The user name.
Q Can you get emails?
A You can.
Q And can you get downloaded apps?
A Yes, you may.
Q Can you also get something called metadata?
A You can.
Q Can you tell us a little about what metadata is?
A Simply, metadata is data about data.
To give an analogy, let's say you look at a book. Before
you open it up, you may see the title of it, maybe the author, but you don't know who published it, who wrote it and when it was done. You would simply open up the book cover, and that's the information that would be considered metadata.

Q How is that metadata on the phone created?
A It's created by the year and/or the operating system itself and applications.

Q And does that depend on what kind of metadata it is?
A It just depends on the artifact.
Q As part of your work in HTAU, were you assigned to an investigation involving Donald Trump?

A I was.
Q Were you assigned to two devices to analyze as part of that investigation?

A Yes, I was.
Q What kinds of devices?
A There are two iPhones. The first one is a iPhone 6s, and the second one is an iPhone 7.

Q Did you understand the authority that HTAU had to be in possession and look at those two phones?

A As mentioned before, it was a Consent.
Q And whose Consent, if you know?
A The Consent was Michael Cohen.
Q And do you know whose phones those were?
A They were Michael Cohen's.

Q Did one of the phones that you received have a gold case?

A It did.
Q Was that the 6s?
A That was.
Q Did you assign an identifier to that phone to use within HTAU?

A I did.
Q What was the identifier?
A $\quad C P-0001$.
"CP" stands for cell phone.
Q Is that sort of a standard practice in a particular case, you would name any phone CP-001 through any phones?

A That's correct.
Q Is that okay if I call that "CP1" going forward?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall the last four digits of the phone number for that phone?

A 0114 .
Q Did you note the serial number of that phone?
A I did.
I don't recall it.
Q Is there something that could refresh your recollection?

A Notes would, yes.

MR. CONROY: Just for the parties and the Court and the witness, could we display those notes?

THE COURT: Is there an identification of it?
Mark it for identification.
MR. CONROY: We could mark that as People's -just one moment, Judge.
(Whereupon, the People confer.)
MR. CONROY: If we could mark that as People's 511-A.

THE COURT: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the exhibit is shown on the witness'
screen and on the parties' screens.)
Q Mr. Daus, take a look at that.
Does that refresh your memory what the serial number for the phone is?

A Yes, it does.
Q Tell us what it was.
A Delta, November, Papa, Quebec, Charlie, Zero, Hotel, One, Golf, Ralph, Yellow, and Three.

Q And if $I$ may to put that into the regular alphabet, is that DNPQCOH1GRY3?

A That is correct.
Q Did the other phone that you received have a black case?

A It did.

Q Was that the iPhone 7?
A It was.
Q Was an identifier assigned to this phone?
A It was.
Q What was that?
A CP-0002.
Q Is that okay if I refer to that as "CP2" going
forward?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember the last four digits of the phone number for that phone?

A 6866 .
Q Again, do you remember the serial number for that phone?

A I do not.
MR. CONROY: If we could pull up what I would deem marked People's 15 -- People's 511-B, just for the parties and the witness.
(Whereupon, the exhibit is shown on the witness' screen and on the parties' screens.)

Q Take a look at that, and tell us fit refreshes your recollection.

A It does.
Q What was the serial number?
A F18T2PHHG7K.

Q Thank you.
MR. CONROY: You can take that down.
Q When you received the phones to forensically examine, do you recall if CP1 and CP2 were powered on or powered off?

A They were off.
Q Did each of these two devices go through the intake process, as you just described for us?

A Yes, they did.
Q Did you do the intake yourself?
A I did not.
Q Once you were assigned the phones, what did you do with them?

A Once I received the phones, I kind of mentioned before, I take them to what's called our F Room, our Faraday Room. F-A-R-A-D-A-Y. It's a room that separates the room from outside sources so there's no interference.

We'll then plug that into a device, hardware device, and then proceed, after given the passcode, to extract the data from the device.

Q Once you did all of that, did you end up with a full forensic extraction on each of the data on CP1 and CP2?

A It was a full extraction.
Q We talked a little about this. In layman's terms, could you explain for the members of the jury what "full forensic extraction" means?

A It's just an extraction from the beginning of the storage device to the end of it, meaning it captures all the data.

MR. CONROY: If I could hand the witness a thumb drive that contains People's Exhibits 246 to 266.
(Whereupon, the thumb drive is given to the witness.)

Q Mr. Daus, before testifying here today, did you have a chance to review each of these exhibits that are marked as People's 246 to 266 on the thumb drive?

A I did.
Q Is that the same thumb drive that you reviewed?
A Yes, it is.
Q How do you know that?
A I dated it and initialed it after examining it.
Q Are all of the exhibits on the thumb drive, except for People's 248 which we'll come back to, an exact copy of portions of data forensically extracted from either CP1 or CP2?

A Yes, they are.
MR. CONROY: This thumb drive, for the record, I will note, contains People's 255 and People's 266, which are already in evidence.

One moment.
(Whereupon, the People confer.)
MR. CONROY: I'm sorry. It's 255 and 265, which
are both already in evidence.
Q Mr. Daus, when you reviewed those exhibits, did you see redactions in many of the exhibits?

A Yes, I did.
Q Did you, as you were looking at the exhibit on the thumb drive, look at both an unredacted and redacted copy of each of the exhibits?

A Yes, I did.
Q Where there were redactions, were the exhibits, but for the redactions, the same as the corresponding exhibit without redactions?

A Yes, they were.
Q What kinds of information was redacted on the exhibits that you were looking at with redactions?

A The parties' names.
Q Was it, primarily, personal identifying information, names, email addresses, phone numbers, that kind of thing?

A Yes, it was.
Q Did you review each of these exhibits, except for Exhibit 248, against the data that you forensically extracted from either CP1 or CP2, depending which it came from, to make sure that each of the exhibits contained exact copies of the portions of data that you extracted from each of the phones?

A Yes, I did.
Q Other than People's 248, do People's Exhibits 246 to

266 contain exact copies of data extracted from CP1 or CP2? A Yes, they do.

MR. CONROY: Judge, at this time I'd like to offer as -- into evidence People's 246, 247, 249 to 254, 256 to 264 , and 266.

THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. BOVE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Accepted into evidence.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned exhibits are received in evidence.)

Q Now, I want to, first, talk about the group exhibits, numbers 249 to 251, 255, which was already in evidence, 257 to 260, and 262.

Are each of those Cellebrite reports created from the extraction that you did on CP1?

A Yes, they are.
Q And are they all text messages with Michael Cohen as one of the parties; and with respect to each of the exhibits, are different parties corresponding with Michael Cohen?

A Yes, they are.
Q I would like to pull up an example just to go through what a report looks like.

MR. CONROY: You can pull this up for everybody. You can pull up People's 259.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)

Q If you look at those, who are those texts between?
A The parties would be the owner of the phone, Michael Cohen, and Hope Hicks.

Q And can you tell us the last four digits of Hope Hicks' phone number?

A 0226 .
Q Now, could you just tell us a little bit about each of the columns that's blown up there?

First of all, is this format what you would see in one of the Cellebrite Reports that you were talking about earlier?

A Yes, it is.
Q So, this was data extracted from the phone and then put into a Cellebrite Report?

A That's correct.
Q Can you tell us about each of the columns, the header columns on this exhibit?

A Certainly.
The first one is self-explanatory, the date, your next column is the time, then the parties. The description is the content of the message. And the source is just what particular artifact it came from, being the native messaging app.

Q Okay.
That's sort of where the data lived on the phone?
A Yes.
Q When you say "description", that's the body of the
text?
A That's correct.
Q I want to talk a little bit about the time here.
In your work, have you become familiar with different time zones and how timestamps work on different phones and other devices?

A Yes, I have.
Q Are you familiar with UTC?
A Yes.
Q What is UTC?
A Universal Time Coordinated. Basically stands for the old way of weighing time. GMT, Greenwich Mean Time.

We're on an Earth with 24 Time Zones, so one place starts with zero. There are a few zones that go around. New York here, we're either two different times, depending upon when it changes twice a year. So, it would be UTC minus 4 or UTC minus 5.

Q Meaning, if the time up there says 7:09:12 P.M. UTC minus 4 , what Time Zone is that time in?

A So, it's already converted to Eastern Standard Time, so it's 7:09 PM.

Q And you mentioned the time change either being UTC minus 4 or UTC minus 5.

Does that relate to Daylight Saving Time?
A Yes, it does.

MR. CONROY: If we could now pull up People's 263 in evidence.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q Is this a report of contacts from CP1?
A Yes, it is.
Q How many contacts were in -- on CP1?
A $\quad 39,745$.
Q Is that unusual?
A That is unusual.
Q In what way?
A I've not seen contacts, that many being on a phone.
Q What would be a more -- what would be an average
number of contacts that you would see when you do this kind of examination of a phone?

A Maybe hundreds.
Q Hundreds.
Maybe thousands?
A Thousands. A thousand, at the most.
Q Can we pull up a few examples of the contacts from the phone?

First, could we pull up -- this is three pages of contacts that were on CP1 for David Pecker.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q Is that what that is?
A Yes.

Q Could we next pull up -- is this two pages of contacts for Hope Hicks?

MR. CONROY: The next one.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
A Yes, it is.
Q Could we also look -- is this the next 12 pages of
contacts for Allen Weisselberg?
A Yes, it is.
Q And, finally, could we pull up -- is this three pages of contacts for Donald Trump?

A Yes, it is.
Q New, if you recall, was this all the pages of accounts for Donald Trump?

A No.
Q Do you remember how many pages of contacts for Donald Trump were on CP1?

A I think there were ten.
Q We're not gonna pull up additional pages, but did the contacts on CP1 also include contacts for Dylan Howard?

A Yes.
Q Keith Davidson?
A Yes.
Q Keith Schiller?
A Yes.
Q Melania Trump?

A Yes.
Q Rhona Graff?
A Yes.
Q Jay Sekulow?
A Yes.
Q Larry Rosen?
A Yes.
Q Daniel Rotstein?
A Yes.
Q And Gary Farro?
A Yes.
MR. CONROY: Could we now quickly pull up what's in evidence as People's 264?
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q Is this the contacts from CP2?
A It is.
Q How many contacts were on this phone?
A 385.
Q Is that more what you're used to seeing?
A Yes.
MR. CONROY: If we could next pull up People's 256.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q Is this an example of emails that were pulled off of CP1?

A They are.
Q I, again, just want to kind of walk through for the jury the different columns that we see in -- is it okay if I call this a Cellebrite Report?

A Yes, you can.
Q Can you walk us through the headers of the columns and explain a little bit about what the information is in each column?

A Certainly.
There's the date, the time, which is also in -- posted by the date, the party, between the two parties sending and receiving emails, the description, and the source, just saying that it's from emails.

Q Who are the parties on this?
A From Patty to Michael Cohen.
Q What's Patty's email, the end of her email address?
A That's @Delaneycorporate.com.
Q Thanks.
MR. CONROY: If we could next pull up what's in evidence as People's 253. (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screen.)

Q Taking a look at People's 253, is this a photograph that you pulled up from CP1?

A It is.
Q Do you know who that is in that photograph?

A I do.
Q Who is that?
A That's Michael Cohen.
Q Have you ever met Michael Cohen?
A I haven't.
Q Sorry?
A I have not.
Sorry.
Q How do you know that that's him?
A I watch a lot of news.
Q And do you know, can you tell from looking at that, where that photograph was taken?

A Looks like the White House.
MR. CONROY: If we could now pull up what's in evidence as People's 252.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
MR. CONROY: And if you could blow that up a little bit.

Thank you.
Q Mr. Daus, what is this?
A This is, as mentioned before, the metadata about that picture.
(Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter Lisa Kramsky
relieves Senior Court Reporter Laurie Eisenberg, and the transcript continues on the following page.)
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A Yes, it is.

Q Again, a Cellebrite report?
A That's correct.

Q So this was extracted, this is part of your forensic extraction of the phone?

A Yes, it is.
Q What -- can you tell us again the date, and sort of walk us through the columns?

A As mentioned before, so date, time, and description, February 8th, 2017, at 4:30 p.m., Of a calendar event.

The description is called "Meeting with POTUS."
And, again, up there, can you tell us about the time zone, you see UTC minus five. Can you tell us what time zone this is in?

A Eastern Standard Time. This is before the time changes in March.

This is February, so that's why it's minus five.
MR. CONROY: Could we now look at People's 261 in evidence.
(Displayed.)
Q What is this report?
A It's another report of a call log from the What's App application that existed on the device.

Q What is a call log?
A A call log is just a log that identifies when calls
were made.

Q And you said it was from an app called "What's App?"

A That's correct.

Q What is What's App?
A What's App is an app, an encrypted app that users use to communicate with each other.

Q And you said -- what is an encrypted app?

A It just means that the conversation between you and the next party is encrypted.

It can't be intercepted and/or vetted.
Q What's App is an example of that type of an app?
A It's an example.
Q Did you find other encrypted apps on either CP1 and/or CP 2 ?

A I did.

Q Which ones did you find, if you remember?

A Telegram and Signal.
Q Now, if you recall, was People's 265, which is in evidence and was already in evidence, an audio recording that you extracted from CP2?

A Yes, it was.

MR. CONROY: Could we pull up what's in evidence as

People's 266.

And if you could blow that up a little bit.
(Displayed.)
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Q What is People's 266?

A This is the information about the recording.
Q Is this the metadata for that recording?

A It is.

Q And what's the title of that recording?
A The title was labeled "Keith Davidson October 16th, 2017."

Q And was that recording made, if you know, on October 16th, 2017?

A It was.

Q And how do you know that?
A Based upon the application called "Voice Memos," how it names the file itself and keeps track of the timestamp, that is embedded within the file.

Q And do we see that same date in some of the other columns?

A Yes, we do.

Q Including in the timestamp date column?
A That is correct.
Q And also the timestamp time column?

A Yes.

Q And, again, that's all metadata forensically extracted from CP2?

A That is correct.

Q Now, can we look at People's 247.
(Displayed.)

MR. CONROY: And if we could blow that up a little bit.
(Displayed.)
Q Is this the metadata for this audio recording?
A It is.
Q And can you walk us through the columns here and walk us through the title and what kind of file this is and the date and time it's created?

A The title is entitled "New Recording 3," which indicates that there are two previous recordings on the voice memo app on the iPhone.

It's just an audio recording; it's on the app, which is the audio recording software.

It gives the date and timestamp of September 6th, 2016 at approximately 10:56:42 a.m. in the morning, Eastern Standard Time, with a duration of two minutes and 51 seconds.

The Link is just the name of the file again.
And the end is just the source.
Every file has a source path where it exists on the device.
Q Now, People's 246 is an audio file. It's not a recording that you were able to forensically extract from CP1; right?

A That is correct.

Q Did you have a chance to listen to People's 246? A I did.

MR. CONROY: And if we could just for the parties and the Judge take a look at what's marked or what's in evidence as People's 248.
(Displayed on the screen for the previouslymentioned parties.)
*******

MR. CONROY: I'm sorry. What had been marked for identification as People's 248.

Q Mr. Daus, do you recognize what that is?
A $\quad$ do.
Q What is that?
A That's a transcript of that aforementioned audio.
Q Is it a transcript of approximately 46 seconds of the audio file that is People's Exhibit 246?

A Yes, it is.
Q Is that recording longer than 46 seconds?
A It is.
Q So this is a transcript just of the last 46 seconds of that recording?

A That's correct.
Q Did you have an opportunity to compare that transcript to the last 46 seconds of that recording as you were listening to it?

A I have.

Q Is the transcript a fair and accurate rendering of the words that you hear, what you listened to, the last 46 seconds in People's 246?

A To the best of my ability.
MR. CONROY: At this point I would offer People's 248 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. BOVE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Accepted into evidence.
(So marked in evidence.)
*********

MR. CONROY: If we could now click People's 248 or,
actually, can you pull that down for a minute.

And if we could play People's 246 and then stop it
when we get to 46 seconds from the end and then $I$ will ask to put the transcript up on the screens.
(Audio playing.)
MR. CONROY: Can we pull up the transcript.
(Displayed.)

MR. CONROY: And if we can play the last
46 seconds.
(Audio playing.)
Q And just so the record is clear, the metadata that we just looked at, that was People's 247 , is the date and time that
that recording was created; is that right?

A It is.

MR. CONROY: One moment.
(Pause.)

MR. CONROY: Thank you, Judge.
Nothing further.
THE COURT: Any cross?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge, thank you.

May I inquire?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BOVE:

Q Is it Mr. Daus?

Am I saying that right?

A That's correct.

Q My name is Emil Bove. I represent President Trump.
It sounded like, to me, like you started your career in forensics in Iraq?

A I didn't start it in Iraq, but before that actually.
Q You did some work over there. And I think you said that that work is similar to what you are doing for the District Attorney's office?

A That's correct.

Q But there are some differences; right?
A Yeah.
Q And, to me, one of the differences breaks down to the difference between Intel collection and the presentation of evidence in criminal cases; correct?

A Sure.
Q Do you know what I mean by "Intel collection?"
A A collection of things that are important for national security.

Q Right.
And in Iraq you were doing that, essentially, on a battlefield more or less; right?

A In a lab, yes.
Q And it was important to get information to parties who could use it as quickly as possible; right?

A Absolutely.
Q That is, in that setting, in the Intel setting, that's probably the top priority?

A I would say.
Q And it's not necessarily a top priority in connection with a criminal investigation; right?

A I do the same thing on every case.
Q Well, the integrity of the data matters more in a criminal case than on a battlefield; doesn't it?

A I would say so, sure.

Q Because different rights are at stake?

A Certainly.
Q And so things that you might be able to do more quickly outside the United States requires more caution in the United States; right?

A Yes.
Q And that's the distinction that I'm trying to touch on.

There are some procedures that you follow here in the US
that are just different than what you were doing outside the US?

A That's correct.

Q And you work in a Department now that -- how do you say the acronym, HTAU?

A HTAU.

Q Which is basically a multimillion dollar cyber lab; right?

A Yes.

Q Funded in part by the District Attorney's Office and some others?

A That is correct.

Q And it sounded to me like you are basically, when you are doing these phone reviews, you are operating in a secure environment?

A Yes, sir.
Q I have seen pictures. It looks like a vault; right?

A Yes, sir.

Q There are some parts of this that are a SCIF?
A Sure. There are no signals coming out, so it would be a SCIF.

Q And I'm guessing no windows and it has heavy doors; right?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q And that is to prevent the devices that you are working on from being manipulated while you are working on it; correct?

A Yes. That's absolutely correct.
Q And the director of HTAU is Steve Moran; right?
A He is.
Q And I think I've seen him say publicly that there is a real concern that investigative targets can manipulate data and their devices remotely?

A Yes.
MR. CONROY: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You can answer.
A Yes.
Q You agree with Mr. Moran; right?
A $\quad$ do.
Q And so here in New York, one of the top priorities for the analysis and the forensics that you are conducting is
maintaining the integrity of the data?
A Absolutely.
Q And it's important to maintain that integrity, because it ultimately goes to the reliability and the evidence that you present in a criminal trial setting like this; right?

A Yes.
Q That goes to how much weight the jury should put on it?

A That's correct.

Q Evidence that has been subject to a risk of manipulation is less reliable; isn't it?

A Certainly.
Q That's a basic principle of the forensic certifications that you described; right?

A That is correct.

Q And so, in your field, there are processes and procedures that are designed to maintain the integrity of the data?

A Yes, there are.
Q So let's talk a little bit more about the different steps in the process.

Let's start with device collection, which I think is the first step; right?

A That is correct.
Q It sometimes called the "acquisition phase?"

A That's correct.
Q Meaning how does law enforcement get the device that you ultimately search; right?

A That's correct.
Q And that could happen in a lot of ways; right?
A Yes.
Q Law enforcement can collect a device at a crime scene; right?

A That's correct.
Q Execute a search warrant, seize a device, and bring it to you; right?

A Yes.
Q Issue a subpoena and collect a device and bring it to you; right?

A That's correct.
Q Or in this case, a device was delivered to you with an authorization from Michael Cohen; right?

That's how it was acquired, the two devices were acquired?
A Yes, it was.
Q And if you got to pick from the kinds of just pure forensics, the best case scenario would be that once acquired, the device goes immediately in the vault; right?

A That's correct.
Q It is immediately secured, to be kept away from radio waves; right?

A Yes.
Q And that -- I don't want to sound crazy, but that's radio waves that we are talking about, the internet we're talking about, phone signals; right?

A Phone signals, yeah.
Q So if you got to pick the top priority it would be, let's get the phone or phones in the vault; right?

A Yes.
Q That can't always happen; right?
A It can't.
Q It can be your priority, but there are other people involved in the investigation; right?

A That's correct.
Q They have other priorities; correct?
A That is absolutely correct.
Q And so sometimes there is a lag time?
A There is.
Q Some delays in getting the device in the vault?
A Yes.
Q Some delays in getting the device protected from manipulation?

A That's correct.
Q There are interim measures in your field for sort of protecting the device while it's in that transit process; right?

A That's correct.

Q I think you mentioned -- did you mention a Faraday room?

A Faraday room, yes.

Q But there's also a Faraday bag?
A There is.

Q So sometimes you can get the device, throw it in the bag and it's protected from the radio signals; right?

A Yes.

Q You can do it immediately?

A You can do it immediately.

Q And that is the soundest way to do a device acquisition; correct?

A The soundest way.

Q One of the considerations here in the acquisition phase is chain of custody; right?

A Yes.

Q And you know what that means?
A Yep.

Q Chain of custody is the process by which who handles the device is tracked; right?

A That's correct.

Q Who acquired it; right?

A Yes.

Q Who brought it --

A Who brought it.

Q -- back to your office; right?

A That is correct.

Q Who participated in the intake process; right?

A Yes.

Q And now there are two sides of that, somebody brings the device and somebody accepts it, right, and so those are links in the chain?

A Links in the chain.

Q The more secure the chain of custody, the more reliable the evidence; right?

A One could ascertain.

Q But you believe that? I mean, you have been practicing this for a long time; right?

A Certainly.

Q And you believe that to be true; don't you?

A Certainly.

Q That is correct?

A That is correct.

Q And a break in the chain of custody, it presents a risk; right?

A It could be.

Q It could be a big risk; it could be a little one, but it creates a risk and I'm not trying to quantify it right now?

A That's correct.

Q But that's a basic principle of forensic analysis; correct?

A A basic principle.
Q If there was a gap in -- of who was handling the evidence at a certain time, that's an open question; right?

A Yes, it is.
Q Once the device is acquired and we get it into the vault, we get it into that room, the next stage is to actually look -- extract the data; right?

A Yes, it is.
Q And there are a couple of ways -- well, there are a few ways to do that; right?

A Yes.

Q One is manual extraction?

A Uh-huh.

Q Which is not really an extraction at all, it's just looking at what's on the phone physically; right?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q Basically taking screen shots of what you can see in the phone as, like, I would look at my own phone as I was using it; right?

A That's correct.

Q And there is equipment for that that can help you take better pictures, but you really are ultimately just taking
pictures of what's on the screen?
A Yes.
Q And this is, would you say, the least sophisticated way
to acquire data from an electronic device?
A The less sophisticated.
Q And so you can't access metadata in a meaningful way;
correct?
A No, you can't.
Q And you can't recover items deleted by the user; right?
A You cannot
Q You can't look at the coding of specific files, like an
image that you see on a phone; right?
A $\quad$ No.
Q So there are other ways to do this; correct?
A There are.
Q And another one is a logical extraction?
A Uh-huh.
Q And so for a logical extraction, you are pulling the
data off of the device, sort of in the same format that it looks
-- the same way Windows looks, right, a folder, a hierarchical
formation; right?
A Files, yes.
Q What was that?
A Files.
Q I didn't hear you?

A Files. Files. Folders.
Q Right. And this is, again, similar -- if you are looking at a logical extraction, it's similar to the way that you might look at the way you operate your PC from a Windows environment?

A The same.
Q And so in that way, say you connect the phone to a piece of equipment in your lab; right?

A That's correct.
Q And you pull the data off the phone; correct?
A Yes.
Q And it brings the data on in this file folder structure?

A It does.
Q And is one of the drawbacks to this logical extraction that it doesn't look at the unallocated space; right?

A That's correct.
Q The unallocated space is where -- I'm going to use layman's terms and you will fix it up for me -- it's where the deleted stuff goes to reside?

A An artifact, yes.
Q And an artifact is a piece of data of one of these items that you are examining; right?

A Yes.
Q And when you do a logical extraction, one of the
drawbacks is you can't tell what the user deleted or has not deleted; isn't that right?

A Correct.
Q Yes, it just pulls out the information that was present at the time that it was acquired?

A That's correct.
Q And there is a better way?
A Yes, a better way.

Q A physical acquisition?
A Yes, a physical acquisition in some ways is more of an older approach for Apple iPhones.

It's a full file system.
Q And in a full file system, you are basically pulling a forensic image of the whole memory chip?

A Yeah, the whole memory chip; that's correct.
Q And you -- and it's a process that you connect the phone to a piece of equipment that you have and it pulls the data out, and there is a giant -- depending on how much metadata is on the phone, a giant file; right?

A That's correct.
Q And when it gets onto that equipment, it's ones and zeroes; right?

A That's correct.
Q And so you need something to parse the data?
A You do.

Q Parsing the data means converting ones and zeroes into the types of things that you and I are used to looking at; right?

A Yes.

Q And so pictures, right, we looked at that picture of Michael Cohen at the podium; right?

A That's correct.

Q That came onto your machine as ones and zeroes and then you had some equipment that converted it so that you could see what the picture looked like?

A Yes.

Q Same thing with the phone logs; right?
A It's in the format on the phone, yes.
Q It's pulled out as ones and zeroes parsed on your machine, ultimately generates these reports that we are looking at in evidence; right?

A It does.

Q When you are working with these -- just a back up for one minute, so we just talked about three methods: Manual, logical, physical.

You did all of those on both of these phones; right?
A I did a full file system on the phone, that's it.

Q You also -- someone from your staff did a manual review; correct?

A When I turned -- when I got the device, I simply
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plugged it into the device, pulled the extraction and then put it away into evidence.

Q So there were other people from HTAU who worked on the phone and did searches?

A There is. They are part of the investigative team, but not at HTAU.

Q So it -- and I am just trying to understand process-wise.

Is it possible that someone outside of HTAU did manual searches on these device?

A Whoever had the phone before, some other agency, if that's what you are asking.

Q Well, the FBI searched both of these phones before you did; right?

A I heard that they did.
Q You know that they did; correct?
A I heard that they did, yes.
Q And we are going to talk about that.
But what $I$ want to focus on right now is just what happened when the phones were acquired at the District Attorney's office; okay.

A (Nods head.)

Q Let's talk a little bit about the file, the BIN file, the image that's pulled off?

A It's called the zip file.

Q The zip file, that's pulled off of the extraction. When a file is that big and it's pulled off in that way, there is some risk that the data can degrade; is that correct?

A So once the data is pulled off, it's then hashed or checks are done, which means that entire file gets a very unique number that says this is the hash that contains all these contents. If anything was affected, that hash file would change.

Q Thank you. That's right where I was going.
So the hash value associated with the particular giant zip file is like a digital fingerprint; right?

A It's a digital fingerprint.
Q Maybe even more detailed like a DNA for us; right?

A Sure.

Q If you trust the hash system you are using, if one of those files with ones or zeroes changes, it's a different hash value; correct?

A That's correct.

Q And this is a way to check an ongoing basis the integrity of the data that you are working with; right?

A Absolutely.
Q And it's a way to ensure that over points in time during the acquisition and review process that the data itself has not been manipulated; right?

A Each time you look at it, it hashes or verifies it,
each time you look at it.

Q That is an automatic process; right?
A It's automatic.

Q Just the check mark, yes, the hashes match; correct?
A That's correct.

Q And that's because these hashes, if you are really being secure about it, they are very, very long sets of numbers and letters; right?

A Yes, they are.
Q You don't want to spend a lot of time checking those numbers and letters one by one; right?

A You do not.

Q The computer does it for you. But it's as if, say, fingerprints that match. If the hash is the same, these are the same two types of -- this is the same file; right?

A That's correct.

Q And so you testified today about some of the artifacts that you extracted from two phones that were acquired from Michael Cohen; right?

A Yes, I did.
Q And these artifacts are segments of a much broader set of data that was pulled off of each phone; correct?

A They are just segments.
Q That's because you are able to, once the data is parsed, you can use the program to select what the pieces of it
are that you want to highlight; right?

A You can.

Q About so we have certain excerpts, but not the whole phone; correct?

A That's correct.

Q You pulled certain excerpts that you were instructed to pull by the Prosecutors; right?

A Of course.
Q And you don't know, do you, why they picked certain things and not others?

A I'm not part of the investigative team.
Q And you are not a part of the investigative team, and there are also situations where the evidence raises questions, but they are not your questions to answer; right?

A That's correct.

Q And so just as an example, we played, I'm sorry, not
"we," the Government played a recording from September 6th of 2016, that was the metadata associated with that file; right?

Do you remember that?
A Yes, it was.

Q And there was a transcript associated with that and we put that up on the screen and as we listened, the audio cuts off; right?

A Towards the end, yeah.
Q And you don't have firsthand knowledge of why it cuts
off; right?

A I don't. I mean, I heard a phone call was coming in, that's all I know.

Q So somebody gave you some instructions --
A That's correct.

Q -- about why the phone was cut off; right?
A Yes.

Q But, as a result, you know that that wasn't the whole conversation; correct?

A That's correct.

Q And you don't know what was going on before or after; right?

A I do not.

Q And you were instructed, were you not, to check the phone itself, the physical device, to see if there was incoming or outgoing calls on it, around the time of that recording?

A Look at -- I wasn't instructed, per say, to look at the calls coming in at that time.

Q You -- at one point you prepared a report, did you not, of all incoming and outgoing calls on CP1, the device from which that recording was extracted?

A Yes, those reports were pulled after.

Q And you found a call around the time of the recording on the physical device; correct?

A I wasn't specifically asked to look at that.

Q But you do know that the recording cuts off. And you don't know what happened after that; right?

A Just that it cut off.

Q And you don't know what was going on before that?
A That's correct.
Q I want to now get back to the actual acquisition process for these two devices.

These came to HTAU on January 23rd of 2023; right?

A They did come to our Office, yes.
Q And I'm being a little imprecise. There are two
iPhones; right?
A That's right.
Q If I say CP1 and CP2, you will know what I mean?
A I will.
Q And at the time these phones came to HTAU, is it your testimony that you were not provided with the copies that the FBI had seized?

A Yeah, I did not receive those.
Q You did not have access to the data that the FBI seized from these devices in 2018; did you?

A I did not.

Q And you did not ask for that data; did you?
A I did not.

Q And you didn't ask any questions about what the FBI had done to the devices in 2018; correct?

A That is correct.

Q And there -- this acquisition process, there are so many different ways to do it, some of the acquisition processes are more invasive than others; right?

A Yes.

Q Well --

A Manually looking at a device is invasive.

Q And so, just to clarify, when $I$ was using the term
"manual" earlier, I mean, taking some pictures on the top of the phone?
(Indicating.)

A That's correct.

Q There are also really invasive methods, other types of methods; right?

A Right.

Q Rip the phone apart; right?

A For Androids, not for Apple iPhones.

Q And that's a specific situation where you really can't do a second search; right?

A That's correct.

Q And in addition to there being acquisition processes that are particularly invasive, there is room for user error in the acquisition process; right?

A Sure.

Q And so if somebody makes a mistake at one point in the
acquisition, that can affect the data; correct?
A It could.
Q And that is why, for example, you are in these Faraday
rooms; right?

A Uh-huh. That's correct.

Q That's why you received a lot of training; right?
A That's correct.

Q And there is at least, at least a risk that a prior acquisition and extraction could impact the data that you looked at in 2023; isn't there?

A That's correct.

Q And you didn't talk to the FBI about the methods they used; did you?

A I did not.

Q And as far as you know, nobody at this table did?

A As far as I know.

Q It's an open question?

A That it is.

THE COURT: Is this a good time?

MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Jurors, we are going to stop here. Call it a day.

Before you leave, and before I give you the
required admonitions, I did want you to know that it was brought to my attention that one of your fellow jurors has
an important appointment tomorrow in the later afternoon so we will have to break a little bit early tomorrow, about a quarter to four.

I just want to let you know now so you can plan ahead.

Jurors, I ask you to, please, not talk amongst yourselves or with anyone else about anything related to the case.

Please continue to keep an open mind.
Do not form or express an opinion about the defendant's guilt or innocence until all of the evidence is in and $I$ have given you my final instructions on the law and you begin your deliberations.

Do not 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 this trial.

Report directly to me any incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any person improperly to influence you or any member of the jury.

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

And do not use any program or electronic device to search for and view any location discussed in the testimony.

Do not read, view or listen to any accounts or discussions of the case, that includes the reading or the listening to the reading of any transcripts of the trial or the reading of any posts on any court site.

Please do not communicate with anyone about the case by any means, including by telephone, text messages, email, or the internet.

Again, do not attempt to research any fact, issue or law related to the case.

And, please, do not Google or otherwise search for any information about the case or the law, which applies to the case, or the people involved in the case.

Thank you.
Have a good night.

And I will see you tomorrow.

THE COURT OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury exits.)

THE COURT: You may be seated.
You may step down.
(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: So as you just heard, one of the jurors has to leave a little bit early tomorrow.

So we will break between a quarter to 4 and

4 o'clock.

Whoever is at the podium, let me know if you are at a natural breaking point.

Is there anything else that we need to go over?
MR. STEINGLASS: No. Thank you.
THE COURT: Defense?

MR. BOVE: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.

Have a good night.
(Matter adjourned to Friday, May 3rd, 2024 at 9:30
a.m.)
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| 1944:15 | 1889:6,7,9,14 | breach 1845:4 | brought 2016:25 | 1971:24 |
| 1945:9 | 1903:22 | 1845:12,15,17 | 2017:1 | 1975:2,2 |
| 1946:12,21 | 1904:14 | 1882:24 | 2030:25 | 1977:23 |
| 1947:11 | 1905:5,11,16 | 1959:7 1963:1 | building | 1979:18,19 |
| blow 1827:24 | 1905:21,24 | breached 1873:6 | 1810:23,23 | 1985:17 |
| 1836:18 | 1918:2,10,14 | break 1925:10 | bullet 1837:6,9 | 1986:2 |
| 1838:7 1843:6 | 1919:14 | 1940:8 | 1837:11 | 1988:15 |
| 1844:8 | 1920:24 | 2017:20 | burden 1813:25 | 2000:4 |
| 1846:13 | 1921:3,21 | 2031:2 | business 1803:5 | 2003:22,24,25 |
| 1850:1 1862:4 | 1924:3,8 | 2032:25 | 1829:13,13 | 2027:2,23 |
| 1870:3 | 1927:5 1932:4 | breaking 2033:3 | 1857:23 | 2030:22 |
| 1873:25 | 1933:11 | breaks 2010:3 | 1889:25 | called 1810:21 |
| 1875:21 | 1935:5 1939:2 | brief 1982:2 | 1891:8 1896:4 | 1810:23 |
| 1881:21 | 1939:16 | briefly 1825:19 | 1897:7 | 1835:16 |
| 1884:7 | 1940:5,7 | 1830:17 | 1949:19 | 1840:11 |
| 1975:12 | 1944:8,10,13 | 1983:19 | buster 1935:16 | 1849:23 |
| 2001:17 | 1954:14 | bring 1816:6 | byline 1924:18 | 1855:22 |
| 2002:23 | 1955:7,12,15 | 1830:9 1835:5 | 1924:24 | 1857:23 |
| 2004:24 | 1957:20 | 1869:17 | C | 1862:18,20,25 |
| 2006:3 | 1960:17 | 1920:24 | C | 1866:8 1873:5 |
| blowing 1847:14 | 1962:2 | 1940:17 | C 1803:11 | 1946:20 |
| 1975:14 | 1963:20 | 1954:14 | calculating | 1985:11 |
| blown 1841:12 | 1966:8,13 | 1957:20 | 1808:12 | 1986:21 |
| 1846:2 1995:8 | 1967:6 1968:7 | 1963:20 | calendar 1986:8 | 1991:14 |
| blown-up | 1970:2,16 | 2014:10,13 | 1986:9 | 2003:11 |
| 1862:11 | 1971:4,23 | bringing | 2002:25 | 2004:2 |
| body 1837:1 | 1972:15 | 1942:14 | 2003:10 | 2005:12 |
| 1839:1 | 1973:24 | brings 2017:6 | California | 2013:25 |
| 1862:15 | 1974:15,19 | 2020:12 | 1838:20 | 2023:25 |
| 1874:19 | 1976:4,5,7 | broadcast | 1876:6 | calling 1856:7 |
| 1967:23 | 1977:9,18,22 | 1880:5 | 1891:14 | 1963:17 |
| 1981:12 | 1978:1,6,9,13 | broadcaster | 1929:18 | calls 1868:22 |
| 1995:25 | 1978:16 | 1885:3 | 1934:13 | 1874:9 1954:5 |
| Bogus 1941:3,3 | 1979:13 | broadcasters | call 1810:22 | 2003:25 |
| Bollea 1910:12 | 1994:7 2008:9 | 1854:21 | 1811:5 | 2027:16,18,20 |
| book 1864:17 | 2009:8,11,14 | broader 2025:21 | 1817:17 | cameras 1808:5 |
| 1986:25 | 2009:18 | Broidy 1950:25 | 1824:13 | campaign |
| 1987:3 | 2030:20 | 1951:12 | 1826:12 | 1809:10 |
| books 1810:22 | 2033:7 | 1952:15 | 1837:19 | 1813:13 |
| boss 1853:2,4 | bow 1808:17 | broke 1836:11 | 1854:23 | 1815:8,9,10,12 |
| bottom 1838:15 | 1920:14 | 1852:8 | 1856:3,9 | 1855:8 |
| 1848:14,15 | box 1857:24 | 1938:22 | 1857:11 | 1941:12 |
| 1850:2,16 | boyfriend | broker 1896:2 | 1858:22 | 1942:10,19 |
| 1966:16 | 1876:11 | 1913:17,18,24 | 1867:21 | candidacy |
| Boulevard | 1945:3 | brokered | 1897:22 | 1815:21 |
| 1876:20 | 1946:13,20 | 1945:24 | 1901:3,15 | 1827:15 |


| 1829:23 | 1955:22 | 1981:5,11 | 1840:14,16 | cited 1820:22,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1830:12,25 | 1959:25 | 1985:2,11 | 1985:23 | civil 1866:11 |
| 1834:19 | 1964:11 | 1994:14 | 1996:22 | claim 1891:12 |
| candidate | 1969:16 | 1995:10,13 | 2024:8 | claimed 1881:10 |
| 1822:19 | 1972:14,16 | 2000:4 2003:2 | changed | Claiming |
| 1825:13 | 1984:4 1988:2 | Centre 1803:8 | 1842:11 | 1880:10 |
| 1829:20 | 1988:13 | certain 1818:17 | 1949:25 | claims 1892:11 |
| capacity | 1989:24 | 1819:1,3,21 | 1985:20 | 1915:2 |
| 1959:22 | 2010:22,24 | 1864:4 1865:8 | changes 1996:16 | clarification |
| Capri 1916:17 | 2014:16,21 | 1943:14,15 | 2003:15 | 1940:21 |
| 1917:24 | 2031:8 2032:2 | 1954:12 | 2024:16 | 1943:11 |
| 1918:18 | 2032:6,9,11,12 | 1955:23 | character | clarify 1848:10 |
| caps 1847:21 | 2032:12 | 1956:11 | 1827:14 | 1851:18 |
| captures 1992:2 | cases 1908:17,20 | 2018:6 2026:3 | 1829:19 | 1859:3 1887:6 |
| care 1846:16 | 1916:14 | 2026:6,9 | 1830:24 | 2029:8 |
| 1929:15 | 1947:1 | certainly 1818:8 | characterize | clarifying |
| career 1873:15 | 1982:12 | 1820:16 | 1864:20 | 1862:22 |
| 1893:6,10,12 | 2010:5 | 1890:13 | 1877:19 | clarity 1864:7 |
| 1893:15 | cat 1858:2 | 1893:12 | 1886:14 | classic 1807:23 |
| 1916:10 | 1864:23 | 1947:8 1949:3 | 1914:3 | 1876:19 |
| 1925:21 | catastrophic | 1949:16 | CHARGE | clause 1873:10 |
| 1964:25 | 1954:19 | 1953:24 | 1803:4 | clear 1808:6 |
| 2009:19 | caught 1811:10 | 1956:9 | charged 1817:2 | 1812:23 |
| careful 1910:3 | 1811:11 | 1959:25 | 1928:8 | 1813:10 |
| 1942:13 | 1922:8 | 1981:5,15 | charges 1809:11 | 1838:19 |
| carefully | cause 1804:18 | 1995:17 | Charlie 1914:23 | 1848:4 1894:9 |
| 1869:11 | 1806:3 1807:8 | 2000:9 2011:2 | 1915:1,3,4 | 1943:2,24 |
| 1904:16 | 1808:22 | 2013:12 | 1916:3 | 1972:24 |
| carrot 1807:23 | 1810:9 1915:7 | 2017:15,17 | 1989:18 | 2008:24 |
| case 1805:15,21 | 1925:13 | certification | chatting 1837:3 | clearly 1809:22 |
| 1805:22 | caused 1845:12 | 1981:11 | check 1877:16 | 1809:22 |
| 1806:17,19 | causes 1859:13 | certifications | 2024:19 | 1811:13,14 |
| 1808:7 | caution 2011:4 | 1981:4 | 2025:4 | clerk 1804:1 |
| 1811:15 | CBS 1928:15 | 2013:13 | 2027:14 | 1835:22 |
| 1812:16 | CCME 1981:5 | Certified 1981:5 | checking | 1888:25 |
| 1818:8 | cease 1859:22 | 1981:6 | 2025:10 | 1944:5 |
| 1821:20 | 1869:7 | chain 1839:1 | checks 2024:5 | 1969:16 |
| 1823:11 | 1898:13 | 1880:8 | Chief 1901:8 | 1979:23 |
| 1845:1,14 | 1946:23 | 1931:17 | chip 2021:14,15 | cleverly 1865:21 |
| 1875:11 | 1947:3,8 | 1983:12 | choosing | click 2008:13 |
| 1888:25 | ceased 1949:24 | 2016:16,20 | 1904:15 | client 1822:3 |
| 1892:14 | ceiling 1858:3 | 2017:8,9,10,20 | Christ 1856:13 | 1823:21 |
| 1929:21 | celebrities | chair 1957:10 | Christopher | 1824:14,21 |
| 1939:18 | 1922:9 | chance 1924:11 | 1803:16 | 1825:12 |
| 1941:3,9,10,11 | cell 1982:16 | 1927:9 | 1804:5 1885:1 | 1837:7 1867:2 |
| 1941:15 | 1984:15 | 1935:11 | 1885:2 1886:7 | 1868:6,9,25 |
| 1942:7,11 | 1985:1 | 1973:10 | 1886:10,12 | 1869:14 |
| 1943:13,16 | 1988:11 | 1992:9 2007:1 | chronologically | 1883:10,24 |
| 1954:11 | Cellebrite | change 1837:9 | 1838:15 | 1892:4 |


| 1897:22 | coercion | 1879:11 | 2001:3,4 | 1980:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1912:23,25 | 1906:12 | 1880:10,19,23 | 2014:17 | 1981:10 |
| 1913:3 | Cohen 1809:3,5 | 1881:4,9 | 2022:6 | comfortable |
| 1914:10,11 | 1810:2,5,18,24 | 1882:13,21,25 | 2025:19 | 1951:4 |
| 1915:10,13 | 1811:8,24 | 1883:5,16,21 | Cohen's 1812:12 | coming 1819:23 |
| 1916:6 | 1812:1,10,11 | 1884:4,22 | 1816:3 | 1854:20 |
| 1917:24 | 1815:24,25 | 1885:7,18,19 | 1868:17 | 1961:17 |
| 1919:7 1930:5 | 1819:1,5 | 1885:23 | 1869:2 | 2012:3 2027:2 |
| 1930:7 1931:7 | 1820:10 | 1886:9,24 | 1870:11 | 2027:18 |
| 1936:5 1943:1 | 1821:10,13,13 | 1887:7,9,14 | 1975:10 | comma 1843:17 |
| 1949:21,22 | 1825:1,18 | 1890:3,7,10,13 | 1977:4 | 1847:21 |
| 1950:7,10,18 | 1827:4,9,21 | 1894:22 | 1987:25 | comment |
| 1950:19 | 1828:3,16,23 | 1895:6 | Colangelo | 1813:24 |
| 1951:10 | 1829:4,12,17 | 1900:20 | 1803:15 | 1822:11 |
| 1962:18 | 1829:23 | 1906:1 1911:5 | 1804:5 | 1828:15 |
| client's 1851:8 | 1830:3,11 | 1911:8 | collect 2014:7,13 | 1833:12 |
| clients 1890:12 | 1831:8,23 | 1920:22 | collection | 1858:22,24 |
| 1897:9,11 | 1834:2,3,14 | 1921:8,14,17 | 2010:4,7,8 | 1859:1 |
| 1909:23 | 1836:13 | 1949:10 | 2013:22 | 1862:18,20 |
| 1914:25 | 1837:16,20,22 | 1950:3,9 | colorful 1856:11 | 1863:3,3,9 |
| 1915:2 | 1838:2,8 | 1951:12,22 | column 1995:19 | 1877:5,15 |
| 1916:10 | 1839:1,13 | 1952:15 | 2000:8 | 1956:16 |
| 1922:3 | 1840:7,10 | 1953:4,10,14 | 2005:18,20 | commentary |
| 1929:20 | 1841:19 | 1953:18,25 | columns 1995:8 | 1820:15 |
| 1965:23 | 1845:21 | 1954:9 | 1995:15,16 | commentators |
| Clifford 1848:23 | 1846:1,16 | 1955:21 | 2000:3,6 | 1941:1,5 |
| 1849:24 | 1847:18 | 1956:5,13 | 2002:9 2003:8 | comments |
| 1850:9 | 1848:2 1849:6 | 1957:14 | 2005:16 | 1809:25 |
| 1885:17,18,20 | 1850:11,23 | 1958:3,15 | 2006:8 | 1812:11 |
| clip 1919:21 | 1852:14 | 1960:5,11,13 | come 1804:16 | 1813:23 |
| clips 1805:5 | 1853:4,7 | 1960:24 | 1808:18 | 1826:24 |
| close 1804:24 | 1855:15,22 | 1961:8,11,14 | 1821:8 1823:4 | 1832:4 |
| 1853:9 | 1856:4 | 1961:19,22 | 1850:22 | 1834:18 |
| 1890:19 | 1857:11,14 | 1962:11,11,16 | 1851:12 | commissary |
| 1897:15 | 1858:7 1860:1 | 1963:1,12,14 | 1855:17 | 1828:15 |
| 1898:9 | 1860:1,25 | 1963:18 | 1882:25 | committed |
| 1910:22 | 1861:2,8,14 | 1964:1,4,12 | 1897:21 | 1896:21 |
| 1926:18,19 | 1862:14 | 1966:16 | 1902:14 | 1915:8 |
| closed 1894:23 | 1863:5 1867:9 | 1967:2 1970:4 | 1908:8 1955:2 | committing |
| 1981:21 | 1867:15,20 | 1970:10,13 | 1969:3 | 1909:19 |
| CNN 1885:3 | 1868:6,25 | 1971:4 | 1982:12 | 1910:12 |
| 1887:13 | 1869:12,22 | 1972:16,25 | 1983:8,9 | common |
| 1961:6,11 | 1870:23 | 1973:12,16,21 | 1992:17 | 1967:24 |
| 1963:10 | 1871:24 | 1975:16 | 2028:9 | communicate |
| 1964:1,2 | 1872:2,8,14 | 1976:12,14 | comedy 1882:5 | 1858:7 |
| Coast 1854:7 | 1873:11 | 1987:23 | comes 1821:5 | 1952:15 |
| code 1957:7 | 1874:18,24 | 1994:17,19 | 1958:12 | 2004:6 2032:5 |
| 1984:18,20,22 | 1875:7,12 | 1995:3 | 1964:5 1972:4 | communicated |
| coding 2019:11 | 1878:14,21 | 2000:15 | 1972:8 | 1936:11 |


| communicating | concept 1815:3 | 1917:18 | 1813:16,19 | 1805:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1921:11,14,17 | concern 1811:23 | confidentiality | 1979:19 | Constitutional |
| communication | 1815:1 | 1860:7 1919:3 | 1980:7,9 | 1834:8 |
| 1921:12,19 | 1816:10 | confirm 1839:4 | 1989:1,5,8 | construction |
| communicatio... | 1820:9,12 | 1847:22 | 1990:16 | 1810:22 |
| 1837:21 | 1821:12,18 | confirmation | 1991:2 1992:4 | Consultants |
| 1863:14 | 1822:12 | 1843:20 | 1992:20,25 | 1838:11 |
| 1871:6 1883:4 | 1826:25 | confirmed | 1994:3,23 | 1839:9,14,25 |
| 1907:25 | 1864:3 1877:2 | 1839:20 | 1997:1 1998:3 | 1840:11,17 |
| 1919:7,11 | 1900:25 | confirming | 1999:12,21 | 1841:24 |
| companies | 1901:3 1908:2 | 1837:5 | 2000:19 | 1842:12,12 |
| 1939:13 | 2012:15 | 1843:21 | 2001:14,17 | 1846:16 |
| company | concerned | conflict 1897:25 | 2002:5,21 | 1849:5 |
| 1981:10,16 | 1826:23 | connect 2020:7 | 2003:18 | 1850:16 |
| compare | 1827:2 | 2021:16 | 2004:22 | consulted |
| 1826:16 | 1903:19 | connected | 2006:3 2007:3 | 1870:15 |
| 2007:23 | 1907:17,24,25 | 1911:2 1946:2 | 2007:9 2008:6 | 1891:15 |
| compared | 1908:13 | connection | 2008:13,19,21 | consuming |
| 1974:9 | concerning | 1878:10 | 2009:3,5 | 1868:21 |
| comparing | 2031:16 | 1891:2 | 2012:18 | consummated |
| 1823:20,24 | concerns | 1895:10 | consent 1930:12 | 1886:24 |
| comparison | 1821:13 | 1896:17 | 1930:15 | consumption |
| 1823:19 | 1907:8 | 1897:18 | 1983:9,17,23 | 1868:19 |
| Compelling | 1927:21 | 1899:3 | 1983:24 | contact 1859:5 |
| 1906:12 | 1928:4 | 1904:18 | 1984:5 | 1891:23 |
| compensated | 1941:14 | 1910:10,14 | 1987:21,22,23 | 1986:4 |
| 1934:6,10,11 | conclusions | 1912:13 | consents | contacted |
| complained | 1817:7 1928:4 | 1913:1,3 | 1983:24 | 1865:8 |
| 1853:7 | conduct 1812:17 | 1914:9 1916:3 | 1984:22 | 1897:20 |
| complaining | 1816:10 | 1918:22 | consider | contacts |
| 1805:14 | 1905:13 | 1926:12 | 1817:10 | 1985:17 |
| complete 1864:7 | conducted | 1927:22 | consideration | 1997:4,6,11,13 |
| 1864:12 | 1928:1 | 1930:23 | 1866:11,13,14 | 1997:19,21 |
| 1885:21 | conducting | 1934:5 | 1866:16,19 | 1998:1,7,10,15 |
| completely | 2012:25 | 1945:24 | 1867:6 1873:8 | 1998:19,19 |
| 1821:2 | conduit 1896:12 | 1947:14 | considerations | 1999:15,17 |
| 1829:21 | confer 1888:1 | 1948:2 1949:6 | 2016:15 | contain 1982:18 |
| 1864:14 | 1974:15,18 | 1964:16 | considered | 1994:1 |
| 1866:4 | 1976:1 1989:7 | 1978:25 | 1891:20 | contained |
| completing | 1992:24 | 1979:3 | 1987:4 | 1973:7 |
| 1915:24 | conference | 2010:20 | considering | 1993:22 |
| composition | 1837:19 | connections | 1817:4 | contains 1839:9 |
| 1819:5 | confidences | 1911:20 | 1823:25 | 1992:5,21 |
| computer | 1892:4 | 1920:5 | 1826:18 | 2024:6 |
| 1981:6 1982:1 | confidential | 1946:21 | consistent | contemplated |
| 1982:2,4 | 1842:21 | 1947:7 | 1829:18 | 1933:15 |
| 2025:13 | 1843:19 | Conroy 1803:16 | 1894:18 | contempt |
| computers | 1912:4,11 | 1804:6 1805:3 | 1949:3 | 1814:7 |
| 1982:16 | 1916:24 | 1805:12 | constitutes | content 1925:10 |
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| 1925:15 | 1866:17 | 1832:2 | 1909:8,14 | 1995:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1985:6,8 | 1951:24 | convince | 1910:1 | 1996:2 2003:3 |
| 1995:20 | contracts | 1928:24 | 1911:18 | 2004:3 |
| contents | 1845:16 | Cooper 1894:13 | 1912:18 | 2005:19,24 |
| 1985:12 | contractual | Coordinated | 1913:4,18 | 2006:25 |
| 2024:7 | 1860:10 | 1996:11 | 1914:6 1915:5 | 2007:22 |
| context 1814:19 | contrary | copies 1861:13 | 1915:7,13 | 2009:17,25 |
| 1818:19 | 1834:22 | 1970:15 | 1916:6,22 | 2010:5 |
| 1853:25 | contrived | 1993:22 | 1919:1 1920:3 | 2011:11,20 |
| 1919:12 | 1806:21 | 1994:1 | 1922:1,17 | 2012:7,10,11 |
| 1947:6 1953:3 | conversation | 2028:16 | 1925:3,18 | 2013:9,15,24 |
| 1976:17,19 | 1837:19,20 | copy 1847:16 | 1926:6,17,23 | 2014:1,4,9,15 |
| contexts | 1857:2,14 | 1848:1,3 | 1927:22 | 2014:23 |
| 1904:10 | 1873:16 | 1867:8 1927:8 | 1928:11 | 2015:13,14,15 |
| 1909:4 | 1887:21 | 1940:23 | 1929:7,18 | 2015:22 |
| contingency | 1900:20,25 | 1982:6,7 | 1931:9,15 | 2016:1,13,22 |
| 1915:18 | 1901:7 | 1992:17 | 1934:2,7,16,17 | 2017:3,18,19 |
| continuation | 1904:22 | 1993:6 | 1934:25 | 2018:1,3,19,23 |
| 1967:12 | 1933:21 | 2002:25 | 1935:21 | 2019:7,14 |
| continue 1842:2 | 1938:18,21 | copyright | 1936:3 1937:6 | 2020:9,10,17 |
| 1844:19 | 1953:6,14 | 1842:22 | 1938:3,11,16 | 2021:3,6,15,20 |
| 1855:14 | 1954:6 | 1849:18,23 | 1939:10 | 2021:23 |
| 1873:18 | 1957:13 | 1965:11,12,17 | 1944:25 | 2022:7,24 |
| 1875:3 | 1958:11,23 | copyrights | 1945:16 | 2023:16 |
| 1905:21 | 1962:16 | 1849:21 | 1946:14,22 | 2024:3,17,18 |
| 2031:9 | 1963:4 1970:3 | core 1943:18 | 1947:24 | 2025:4,5,16,22 |
| continued | 1970:13 | corporation | 1948:3,11 | 2026:4,5,15 |
| 1841:1,4 | 1973:11,20 | 1839:24 | 1949:24 | 2027:5,9,10,24 |
| 1888:25 | 1974:7 | correct 1837:10 | 1950:14,20 | 2028:5,25 |
| 1905:23 | 1976:21 | 1839:9,24 | 1951:14 | 2029:1,12,20 |
| 1924:1,7 | 2004:8 2027:9 | 1854:14 | 1952:2,20 | 2030:1,5,7,11 |
| 1944:12 | conversations | 1865:12 | 1953:1,12,19 | correctly |
| 1949:12,16 | 1852:19 | 1880:20 | 1956:2,17 | 1866:20 |
| 1952:15,24 | 1861:7 | 1886:19 | 1958:6 | 1892:10 |
| 1959:18 | 1920:20 | 1889:18 | 1959:11 | 1905:10 |
| 2002:1,4 | 1951:4 1953:9 | 1890:4 | 1962:24 | 1978:19 |
| continues | 1953:19,24,25 | 1891:24 | 1964:25 | correspond |
| 1811:22 | 1962:18 | 1892:8,17 | 1965:5 | 1949:17 |
| 1923:4 | 1976:13 | 1893:8,13 | 1966:22 | corresponding |
| 1955:16 | converted | 1894:7,19 | 1967:4,9 | 1962:3 |
| 1969:16 | 1996:20 | 1895:4 | 1968:2 | 1963:22 |
| 2001:25 | 2022:9 | 1898:16,17 | 1971:22 | 1977:10,10,11 |
| continuing | converting | 1899:1,8,19 | 1973:4 1977:2 | 1977:12,22 |
| 1870:22 | 2022:1 | 1900:22 | 1977:4 1979:4 | 1978:2,9,17 |
| 1950:14,16 | conveyed 1957:2 | 1901:17 | 1979:6,7,11 | 1993:10 |
| contract 1845:2 | conveying | 1902:11,17 | 1983:18 | 1994:19 |
| 1845:15,19,22 | 1901:16 | 1903:4 | 1984:5,10,24 | corresponds |
| 1849:23 | convicted | 1907:10,18,22 | 1988:14 | 1960:20 |
| 1851:24 | 1809:3,5 | 1908:15,25 | 1989:22 | corroborating |


| 1937:25 | 1824:2,9 | 1973:25 | 1992:18 | 1833:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| corroboration | 1825:9 | 1974:17,21 | 1993:21 | 1925:20 |
| 1886:4 | 1826:16,18,22 | 1975:5 1976:3 | 1994:1,15 | 1926:1 |
| 1938:16 | 1827:18 | 1977:13,15,25 | 1997:4,6,22 | 1942:11 |
| corrosive | 1828:7 | 1978:5,12,24 | 1998:16,19 | 2010:5,21,24 |
| 1812:18 | 1830:19 | 1979:9,14,16 | 1999:25 | 2013:5 |
| costs 1959:9 | 1832:4,23 | 1979:18,21,23 | 2000:23 | critical 1811:17 |
| counsel 1808:15 | 1833:2,5,7,23 | 1979:25 | 2004:13 | 1941:11 |
| 1847:18 | 1834:5,24 | 1980:3,5 | 2006:23 | criticize 1806:17 |
| 1857:5 1889:2 | 1835:4,7,9,12 | 1989:1,3,10 | 2027:20 | criticizes |
| 1898:10 | 1835:18,21,25 | 1994:6,8 | 2028:13 | 1831:14 |
| 1949:17 | 1840:18,19 | 2001:23,24 | CP2 1990:7 | criticizing |
| 1959:14 | 1857:6 | 2008:8,10 | 1991:4,21 | 1828:3 1829:4 |
| 1962:17 | 1861:23 | 2009:7,10 | 1992:18 | 1829:12 |
| 1974:18 | 1879:12,13,14 | 2012:19 | 1993:21 | 1830:12 |
| counsel's | 1888:6,10,16 | 2030:19,21 | 1994:1 | 1831:20 |
| 1804:11 | 1888:17,21 | 2032:4,16,19 | 1999:15 | cross 1924:7 |
| countless 1877:4 | 1889:2,6 | 2032:23 | 2004:14,20 | 1944:12 |
| counts 1817:2 | 1903:21,23 | 2033:6,8 | 2005:23 | 2009:7 |
| county 1803:1 | 1904:1,13 | Court's 1811:23 | 2028:13 | cross-examina... |
| 1803:13 | 1905:4,17,19 | 1812:23 | Crawford | 1889:8 |
| 1825:15 | 1905:20,22 | 1814:10,18,19 | 1931:20 | 1905:23 |
| 1980:3,4,11 | 1906:23 | 1816:23 | 1934:9,24 | 1970:2 |
| couple 1891:10 | 1912:16 | 1817:4 | 1937:6 | 2009:13 |
| 1926:16 | 1916:2 1917:5 | 1822:12 | crazy 1806:8 | crossing 1910:23 |
| 2018:12 | 1918:4,7,11,17 | courtesy 1895:2 | 2015:2 | crying 1828:24 |
| course 1816:16 | 1919:16 | courtroom | create 1947:16 | CSR 1803:23,24 |
| 1901:21 | 1923:2,3 | 1808:18 | 1958:8 | Culpa 1819:1 |
| 1964:25 | 1924:4 1926:4 | 1810:14,18 | created 1947:6 | 1829:21 |
| 1965:22 | 1927:5,18,24 | 1815:9 1822:1 | 1981:16 | 1830:23 |
| 2026:8 | 1928:7 | 1827:6 1829:7 | 1987:5,6 | Cuomo 1885:1,2 |
| court 1803:1,10 | 1939:15,17 | 1835:11,19 | 1994:14 | 1886:1,7,10,12 |
| 1803:23 | 1940:1,5,9,11 | 1939:25 | 2002:10,18 | current 1981:25 |
| 1804:8,14 | 1940:15 | 1940:4 | 2006:10 | custody 1983:12 |
| 1805:9,23 | 1941:22 | 1942:11 | 2009:1 | 2016:16,20 |
| 1813:4,5,15,18 | 1942:1,14,24 | 1944:1 | creates 1807:1 | 2017:10,20 |
| 1813:21 | 1942:24 | 1968:14,18 | 2017:24 | cut 1894:25 |
| 1814:2,4,7,14 | 1943:4,7,9,15 | cover 1842:20 | creating | 2027:6 2028:3 |
| 1814:20,21 | 1943:21 | 1987:3 | 1907:18 | cuts 2026:22,25 |
| 1815:5,15 | 1944:3,9,11 | coverage | credibility | 2028:1 |
| 1816:8,17 | 1947:1 | 1821:25 | 1809:4 1810:5 | cyber 2011:15 |
| 1817:9,21 | 1954:15 | covers 1893:13 | 1816:4,5 |  |
| 1818:1,7,23 | 1955:9,11,13 | CP 1988:11 | crime 1906:17 | D |
| 1819:9,12,13 | 1956:7 1959:3 | CP-0001 | 2014:7 | D 1835:15,15 |
| 1819:16 | 1962:6 | 1988:10 | crimes 1906:20 | 1843:16 |
| 1820:17 | 1968:10,12,14 | CP-0002 1990:6 | 1907:1 | 1847:18 |
| 1821:7,23 | 1968:15,23 | CP-001 1988:13 | criminal 1803:1 | 1979:22,22 |
| 1822:16 | 1969:3,5,8,9 | CP1 1988:15 | 1812:17 | D-A-U-S 1980:2 |
| 1823:10 | 1969:13,20 | 1991:4,21 | 1831:17 | DA's 1980:16 |
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| 1899:4 | 1964:6,16,19 | 1838:12 | 1937:13 | day-to-day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982:10 | 1965:4 1966:1 | 1841:12 | 1966:24 | 1982:8,14 |
| damage 1873:10 | 1970:8 | 1843:17 | 1967:20 | Daylight |
| 1954:19 | 1971:16 | 1847:5,8 | 1997:22 | 1996:24 |
| damages | 1972:9,16,18 | 1848:25 | David's 1807:22 | days 1817:16 |
| 1844:18,19,25 | 1972:25 | 1849:2,7 | 1826:1,20 | 1826:3 |
| 1845:2,6,11,12 | 1975:24 | 1852:11 | Davidson | 1886:23 |
| 1845:14,15,16 | 1978:20 | 1853:10,23 | 1836:5 | DD 1846:3,4,8 |
| 1845:20,25 | 1979:1 | 1861:17 | 1847:17 | 1846:14 |
| damn 1964:8 | Daniels' 1881:22 | 1862:9,10 | 1850:19 | 1850:13,16 |
| Daniel 1999:8 | 1883:20 | 1869:20 | 1854:18 | 1967:17 |
| Daniels 1817:25 | 1895:21 | 1871:21 | 1864:20 | 1968:5,6 |
| 1818:3,5 | 1898:25 | 1873:21 | 1867:24 | 1979:1 |
| 1821:13 | 1899:5 1920:3 | 1874:5 | 1870:10 | deadline 1863:2 |
| 1834:4,16 | 1944:19,24 | 1878:19,20 | 1877:19 | 1908:7 |
| 1842:9,23 | 1947:19 | 1950:21 | 1886:2 1888:2 | deal 1840:11 |
| 1844:4 1848:5 | 1958:8 | 1954:12 | 1888:18 | 1842:11 |
| 1848:23 | 1959:21 | 1955:23 | 1889:11 | 1850:20 |
| 1850:4 1851:1 | Daniels/Michael | 1956:10 | 1905:5 | 1852:8 |
| 1855:19 | 1886:24 | 1959:5 1964:2 | 1944:14 | 1855:19 |
| 1859:2,6 | daring 1827:11 | 1976:12,20 | 1955:16 | 1886:24 |
| 1861:9,10,11 | dash 1962:4 | 1995:18 | 1964:8 | 1891:16 |
| 1863:15,23 | 1970:21 | 2000:10,11 | 1969:10,25 | 1894:15,16,17 |
| 1864:19 | data 1984:11 | 2003:7,9 | 1972:11 | 1894:22 |
| 1865:8,24 | 1985:1,8,9,10 | 2005:15,18 | 1976:8 | 1913:18 |
| 1866:23 | 1985:19,25 | 2006:9,16 | 1998:21 | 1947:12 |
| 1868:1 1871:7 | 1986:24,24 | 2008:25 | 2005:6 | dealing 1929:14 |
| 1873:16 | 1991:18,21 | dated 1863:23 | Davidson's | 1985:21 |
| 1874:25 | 1992:3,18 | 1934:21 | 1905:13 | decade 1890:22 |
| 1878:4,8 | 1993:20,23 | 1935:13 | Dawn 1911:14 | decades 1820:19 |
| 1880:4,7,19 | 1994:1 | 1992:15 | 1911:17 | 1820:20 |
| 1883:5,6,22 | 1995:12,23 | dates 2002:15 | day 1808:3 | December |
| 1887:15 | 2010:23 | dating 1946:16 | 1810:11,12 | 1857:19 |
| 1895:17 | 2012:15 | Daus 1979:20 | 1812:21 | 1887:21 |
| 1896:17 | 2013:1,18 | 1980:2 | 1813:22 | 1900:19 |
| 1899:10,16 | 2018:10 | 1989:13 | 1815:8,20 | decided 1891:17 |
| 1900:1 1902:9 | 2019:4,19 | 1992:8 1993:2 | 1824:22 | decision 1812:23 |
| 1907:8 | 2020:10,12,22 | 2001:20 | 1837:7 | 1813:22 |
| 1946:10 | 2021:18,24 | 2007:11 | 1853:11 | 1814:10 |
| 1947:10,24 | 2022:1 2024:3 | 2009:15 | 1854:3 | 1816:18 |
| 1948:2,14 | 2024:4,20,23 | David 1807:18 | 1855:24 | 1817:10 |
| 1949:12 | 2025:22,24 | 1809:15 | 1857:13,18 | 1821:14 |
| 1952:2 1953:4 | 2028:19,22 | 1810:6 1820:2 | 1859:12,17 | Declination |
| 1953:15 | 2030:1,9 | 1820:10,11 | 1872:4,5 | 1938:24 |
| 1956:2,4,17 | database | 1825:22 | 1874:25 | 1939:8 |
| 1957:1,11 | 1860:24 | 1846:15,21 | 1891:5 | decode 1848:10 |
| 1958:20,23 | date 1810:18 | 1849:11 | 1937:16 | decoded 1900:9 |
| 1959:8,14,18 | 1828:7,8,12,17 | 1850:10 | 1976:8 | 1979:3 |
| 1963:2,16 | 1836:22 | 1900:11 | 2030:22 | decodes 1848:4 |


| 1848:8 | 1977:9,16 | denied 1877:9 | 1866:21 | 1984:6 1985:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| decorated | 1978:14 | 1879:10 | describing | 1985:12 |
| 1856:6 | 2033:6 | denies 1877:24 | 1913:5 | 1987:13,16 |
| 1857:21,25 | definitely | 1878:8 | description | 1991:6 1996:6 |
| deem 1990:16 | 1918:9 | Dennison | 1982:2 | 2012:8,16 |
| DEEMED | definition | 1846:15,21 | 1995:19,25 | 2014:18 |
| 1847:23 | 1865:14 | 1850:10 | 2000:12 | 2028:7,20,25 |
| defendant | degrade 2024:3 | 1900:11 | 2003:9,11 | dial 1954:17 |
| 1803:6,21 | degree 1803:6 | 1966:24 | designed 1965:7 | difference |
| 1805:21 | 1981:1 | 1967:20 | 2013:17 | 1933:22 |
| 1806:6,25 | Delaneycorpo... | Dennison's | desires 1883:3 | 2010:4 |
| 1807:13 | 2000:17 | 1849:11 | desist 1859:22 | differences |
| 1808:1,3,8,19 | delays 1838:5,5 | deny 1815:3 | 1869:7 | 2010:1,3 |
| 1808:24 | 2015:18,20 | 1869:16 | 1898:13 | different 1807:1 |
| 1809:19,23 | deleted 2019:9 | 1883:23 | 1946:23 | 1809:24 |
| 1811:7,14,19 | 2020:20 | denying 1877:11 | 1947:3,8 | 1810:19 |
| 1811:21,24 | 2021:1,2 | 1877:13 | desperation | 1824:25 |
| 1812:7,15,15 | deliberate | 1882:8 | 1829:5 | 1851:19 |
| 1813:5,25 | 1808:12,17 | department | despondent | 1866:7 1909:4 |
| 1814:7,25 | deliberations | 1856:5,8 | 1856:3,10 | 1913:5 |
| 1823:21 | 2031:13 | 1887:22 | detailed 2024:13 | 1917:19 |
| 1827:4 | delivered | 1927:12,16,21 | details 1820:24 | 1932:22 |
| 1828:25 | 2014:16 | 1983:8 | 1849:21 | 1947:16 |
| 1831:17 | Delta 1989:18 | 2011:12 | 1861:8 1919:6 | 1994:19 |
| 1846:5 | demand 1859:22 | depend 1987:8 | determining | 1996:4,5,15 |
| 1899:22 | 1869:8 | depending | 1942:18 | 2000:3 2011:1 |
| 1942:8 | 1907:14,15 | 1984:16 | device 1982:4,5 | 2011:9 |
| defendant's | 1922:16,20 | 1993:21 | 1983:15,24,25 | 2013:20 |
| 1805:14,18 | demanded | 1996:15 | 1984:2,9,19 | 2024:16 |
| 1807:17,21 | 1845:21 | 2021:18 | 1985:6,8,16 | 2029:3 |
| 1812:2,11 | demanding | depends 1987:9 | 1991:17,17,19 | difficult 1845:17 |
| 1813:6 | 1922:14 | depict 1973:20 | 1992:2 | 1873:3,3 |
| 1939:20,23 | demands | depressed | 2003:23 | difficulty |
| 1970:18,19 | 1909:23 | 1856:10 | 2006:21 | 1837:21 |
| 2031:11 | democrat | describe 1867:1 | 2013:22 | digital 1980:19 |
| defendants | 1806:11,12 | 1867:5 | 2014:2,7,10,13 | 1982:6,18 |
| 1823:11 | 1833:17,19 | 1899:22 | 2014:16,22 | 1983:4 |
| defense 1804:21 | Democrats | 1982:8 1983:6 | 2015:18,20,24 | 2024:11,12 |
| 1804:23 | 1806:11 | described | 2016:7,12,21 | digits 1988:17 |
| 1808:15 | 1833:8 | 1808:15 | 2017:7 2018:8 | 1990:10 |
| 1812:5 1829:6 | demonstrated | 1894:15,17 | 2019:4,19 | 1995:4 |
| 1924:4,21 | 1811:19 | 1896:1 | 2022:25 | direct 1805:5 |
| 1927:7 | denial 1859:13 | 1899:18 | 2023:1,10 | 1836:2 1841:4 |
| 1954:15,21 | 1859:19 | 1900:24 | 2027:15,20,24 | 1853:20 |
| 1957:20 | 1863:6,9,10,15 | 1912:14 | 2029:7 | 1858:17 |
| 1960:19 | 1864:25 | 1913:1,4 | 2031:23 | 1865:6 1866:2 |
| 1961:1 1962:3 | 1869:3,7,11 | 1991:7 | devices 1982:7 | 1867:16 |
| 1963:21,22 | 1875:15,23 | 2013:14 | 1982:14,20 | 1884:17 |
| 1970:23 | 1878:10 | describes | 1983:8,9,16,21 | 1930:22 |


| 1931:1 1973:5 | 1836:8 1869:2 | 2003:20 | 1932:18 | 1855:8,13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980:8 2002:4 | 1872:1 | 2004:25 | 1948:22 | 1856:1 1859:2 |
| directed 1839:6 | 1892:12 | 2006:1,5 | 1964:22 | 1859:6 |
| directing | 1961:21 | 2007:6 | 1965:9 | 1863:12 |
| 1851:11 | 1962:13 | 2008:20 | documents | 1864:5,9,11,13 |
| 1878:15 | 1976:25 | displaying | 1812:5 | 1864:15 |
| 1887:12 | 2031:21,24 | 1862:2 | 1819:11 | 1865:9,25 |
| direction | discussing | dispute 1815:14 | 1840:14 | 1866:4,23 |
| 1824:18 | 1920:20 | 1921:12 | 1842:17 | 1867:2 1877:6 |
| directive | 1972:15 | 1928:15,16,24 | 1938:7 | 1878:4 |
| 1851:10 | discussions | disrupt 1811:21 | 1965:19 | 1886:18 |
| directives | 1953:3 2032:2 | disruptions | 1970:22 | 1887:4 |
| 1851:9 | disheartened | 1814:9 | 1973:6 | 1890:12 |
| directly 1815:20 | 1900:22 | disseminate | doing 1808:4 | 1961:20 |
| 1843:18 | disperse 1840:3 | 1843:18 | 1812:15 | 1962:12 |
| 2031:18 | display 1841:7 | disseminated | 1815:8 | 1987:11 |
| director 2012:12 | 1843:6 | 1898:22 | 1829:25 | 1998:10,13,15 |
| Dirty 1869:6,8 | 1846:11 | distinction | 1830:5 | door 1811:16 |
| 1895:11,13 | 1974:25 | 1914:7 2011:7 | 1831:11 | 1824:19 |
| 1898:13 | 1975:3 1989:2 | District 1803:13 | 1873:21 | doors 1810:13 |
| 1919:25 | displayed | 1803:17 | 1907:13 | 1810:13 |
| 1920:5 | 1836:17 | 1825:14 | 1908:24 | 1926:16 |
| 1945:10,11,14 | 1841:10 | 1892:17 | 1920:17 | 2012:5 |
| 1947:7 | 1842:5,16 | 1897:20,24 | 1981:19,23 | doubt 1813:3 |
| disagree | 1843:8 | 1902:20 | 1983:14 | 1817:5 1824:2 |
| 1814:19 | 1844:10,24 | 1903:2 1905:1 | 2009:23 | 1847:21 |
| 1815:18,18 | 1846:12,19 | 1908:4 | 2010:11 | 1943:24 |
| disaster 1883:2 | 1847:4,13 | 1930:10,17 | 2011:9,22 | 1960:14 |
| disburse 1851:6 | 1849:17 | 1932:25 | dollar 1952:4,12 | Doug 1979:19 |
| disbursed | 1850:3 1852:3 | 1953:17 | 2011:15 | Douglas 1980:2 |
| 1839:21 | 1853:22 | 1980:11,13 | dollars 1845:3,4 | downloaded |
| 1850:22,25 | 1857:7 | 2009:23 | 1845:13,21 | 1986:19 |
| 1851:4,8 | 1858:16 | 2011:18 | 1922:14 | draft 1840:6 |
| disciplined | 1860:20 | 2023:20 | 1929:3,4,5,12 | 1885:16 |
| 1934:17 | 1863:19 | Division | 1929:13 | drafted 1845:9 |
| disclose 1843:18 | 1867:13,18 | 1942:22 | 1952:8 | drafting 1843:1 |
| disclosed | 1870:5,9 | 1943:8 | 1958:13 | 1938:24 |
| 1925:13 | 1871:18 | DNA 2024:13 | 1959:8 | 1939:8 |
| discuss 1894:22 | 1874:2,13 | DNPQC0H1G... | Donald 1803:5 | drawbacks |
| 1916:25 | 1878:17 | 1989:21 | 1804:2,10 | 2020:15 |
| 1917:18 | 1924:6 1932:7 | DOCs 1839:24 | 1817:16 | 2021:1 |
| 1918:1 | 1933:13 | document | 1826:13 | dream 1894:16 |
| 1939:18 | 1935:10 | 1838:19 | 1828:14 | 1894:17 |
| 1940:16,19 | 1939:5 | 1847:17,25 | 1830:14 | dressers 1876:9 |
| 1941:8,9,10 | 1957:22 | 1848:4 1857:4 | 1831:18 | drive 1819:8,11 |
| 1950:3 | 1962:8 | 1858:19 | 1842:25 | 1973:7 1992:5 |
| 2031:14 | 1966:10,15 | 1863:20 | 1846:9,15 | 1992:6,10,12 |
| discussed | 1967:8 | 1867:8 1876:2 | 1848:6 1853:6 | 1992:16,20 |
| 1813:14 | 2002:24 | 1927:19 | 1854:22 | 1993:6 |


| driven 1960:6 | effect 1812:8 | email 1836:12 | engagement | 2018:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1971:5 | 1856:13 | 1836:22 | 1896:18,20,20 | 2020:8 |
| drives 1982:17 | 1886:6 | 1837:1,15,17 | 1897:1 1899:9 | 2021:17,21 |
| duly 1888:19 | 1904:18 | 1837:19,25 | 1899:14,15 | 2022:9 |
| 1969:11 | effort 1899:3 | 1838:8,10,12 | 1913:21 | error 2029:22 |
| 1979:22 | efforts 1855:5 | 1838:17 | 1915:17,22 | escalating |
| duration | 1896:15 | 1839:1 | 1932:9 | 1805:19 |
| 2006:18 | 1938:12 | 1858:25 | Enjoy 1939:24 | escrow 1837:12 |
| duty 1860:10 | 1947:16 | 1862:17 | 1940:10 | 1841:25 |
| dying 1869:24 | Eisenberg | 1884:23,25 | Enquirer | especially |
| 1870:12 | 1803:24 | 1932:6,22 | 1922:24 | 1904:5 |
| Dylan 1836:19 | 1879:12 | 1934:19 | 1924:14 | ESQ 1803:12,14 |
| 1837:14,15,20 | 1923:4 | 1983:7 | 1925:14 | 1803:15,15,16 |
| 1837:24 | 1968:23 | 1993:17 | 1936:3,11 | 1803:16,17,19 |
| 1841:9,16,17 | 2001:24 | 2000:16,16 | ensure 1825:12 | 1803:19,20,21 |
| 1855:4,9 | either 1835:1 | 2032:7 | 1839:8 1882:3 | Esquire 1846:16 |
| 1890:17 | 1890:7,12 | emails 1890:5 | 2024:22 | 1847:17,18 |
| 1892:4 | 1942:6 1983:8 | 1986:17 | entered 1835:10 | 1850:11 |
| 1924:18,24 | 1992:18 | 1999:24 | 1835:19 | 1966:19 |
| 1925:9,13 | 1993:21 | 2000:12,13 | 1847:5 | essence 1896:14 |
| 1935:2,14,20 | 1996:15,22 | embedded | 1915:17 | 1896:16 |
| 1936:14 | 2004:13 | 1981:18 | 1959:10 | Essential |
| 1937:8 | elaborate | 2005:14 | entering 1835:9 | 1838:11 |
| 1998:19 | 1852:21 | Emil 1803:19 | 1835:18 | 1839:9,14,25 |
| E | elected 1831:3 | 1804:12 | 1888:17,22 | 1840:17 |
| E | election 1815:22 | 1889:14 | 1944:1 1969:9 | 1841:24 |
| E 1803:9,9,11,11 | 1853:9,10,24 | 2009:18 | 1969:13 | 1842:12 |
| 1810:9 | 1854:3,20,24 | employee | 1979:21 | 1846:16 |
| 1835:15 | 1855:11,12,14 | 1945:11 | entertainment | 1849:4 |
| earlier 1810:11 | 1855:18,22,25 | employment | 1891:16 | 1850:15 |
| 1837:4 | 1858:6 | 1891:12 | entire 1825:11 | essentially |
| 1862:16 | 1907:22,25 | EnCase 1981:17 | 1832:12 | 1809:9 1844:1 |
| 1882:23 | 1908:7,14 | encounter | 1958:22 | 2010:11 |
| 1995:10 | 1911:3,9,12 | 1863:12 | 1982:6 1985:6 | establish 1918:8 |
| 2029:9 | 1941:12 | 1865:24 | 2024:5 | established |
| early 1858:18 | 1963:16 | encountered | entitled 1825:6 | 1813:25 |
| 1887:13 | 1964:9,10,15 | 1895:7 | 1941:2 | ET 1970:21 |
| 2031:2 | 1972:12,13,25 | encourages | 2006:11 | ethical 1896:25 |
| 2032:24 | 1973:1 | 1831:12 | entity 1840:10 | ethnical 1949:4 |
| ears 1954:19 | 1978:21 | encrypted | 1840:14 | Ethnics 1934:13 |
| Earth 1996:13 | electronic | 1858:9 2004:5 | 1842:11 | evening 1809:1 |
| East 1854:7 | 2019:4 | 2004:7,9,13 | entries 1873:18 | 1818:22 |
| Eastern 1996:20 | 2031:23 | ended 1904:20 | 1878:16 | 1820:7 |
| 2003:15 | elements | 1938:15 | 1986:8,9 | event 1807:12 |
| 2006:17 | 1898:21 | enforceable | Entry 1867:17 | 2003:10 |
| eat 1875:11 | elicit 1905:11 | 1873:9 1909:6 | environment | events 1910:10 |
| EC 1850:15 | Elliott 1950:25 | enforcement | 2011:23 | 1916:11 |
| educational | Ellis 1803:17 | 1901:20 | 2020:5 | 1952:10 |
| 1980:24 | 1804:6 | 2014:2,7 | equipment | 1976:17 |


| eventually | 2026:13 | excerpts | 1827:21 | 1816:25,25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1936:20 | 2031:11 | 1810:20 | 1828:22 | 1817:2,22 |
| everybody | Ex 1837:7 | 2026:3,6 | 1829:3,9,24 | 1818:21,23,24 |
| 1821:16 | 1840:1,2 | excess 1831:5,5 | 1830:9 | 1818:25 |
| 1822:7,23 | ex-husband | 1845:22 | 1836:16 | 1819:17 |
| 1823:8 1852:4 | 1945:20 | exchange 1838:8 | 1838:6 1841:6 | 1830:8 1973:6 |
| 1921:1 1932:5 | exact 1805:10 | 1842:3 | 1842:15 | 1977:16 |
| 1994:23 | 1861:13 | 1853:25 | 1846:17 | 1992:5,9,16 |
| everyday | 1992:17 | 1854:13 | 1847:11 | 1993:2,3,7,9 |
| 1810:15 | 1993:22 | 1866:22 | 1849:14,15 | 1993:13,19,22 |
| evidence | 1994:1 | 1868:12 | 1853:21 | 1993:25 |
| 1836:17 | exactly 1809:15 | 1870:22 | 1858:13 | 1994:9,11,18 |
| 1838:6 1841:7 | 1818:4 1820:3 | 1871:11 | 1860:16,19,21 | existed 1843:21 |
| 1842:14 | examination | 1878:13 | 1861:21 | 2002:16 |
| 1852:2,4 | 1836:2 1841:4 | 1879:9 1884:3 | 1862:3,6 | 2003:23 |
| 1858:12,15 | 1924:7 | exchanged | 1863:17 | existence |
| 1861:20,21,23 | 1944:12 | 1840:7 | 1867:12 | 1812:21 |
| 1861:24 | 1969:23 | 1866:16 | 1869:10 | 1813:19 |
| 1863:18 | 1973:5 1976:6 | exchanges | 1875:4,19 | 1843:21 |
| 1867:12 | 1980:8 | 1836:12 | 1878:14 | 1877:9 |
| 1875:20 | 1983:25 | 1867:14 | 1884:6,16 | exists 1843:20 |
| 1907:18 | 1997:14 | Exclamation | 1920:25 | 1938:20 |
| 1920:25 | 2002:4 | 1882:5 | 1921:2 1924:5 | 2006:21 |
| 1932:5 1938:3 | examine | exclude 1832:12 | 1939:3 | exits 2032:17 |
| 1964:20 | 1983:10,21 | excluded 1907:2 | 1954:15,21 | expect 1940:8 |
| 1973:23,25 | 1991:3 | exclusive | 1957:21 | expected |
| 1974:1,14,22 | examined | 1947:16,18 | 1961:1 | 1845:14,16 |
| 1974:23 | 1835:17 | excruciating | 1963:21 | expense 1810:22 |
| 1977:15,17,19 | 1868:12 | 1820:24 | 1973:13 | 1811:5 |
| 1980:19,21 | 1979:23 | excuse 1829:24 | 1974:1,4,7,23 | experience |
| 1982:6 1983:4 | Examiner | 1877:18 | 1975:4,5 | 1910:7 |
| 1992:22 | 1981:6,7 | 1884:2 | 1977:21,24 | 1928:10 |
| 1993:1 1994:4 | examining | 1933:10 | 1978:4,5,8,11 | 1949:23 |
| 1994:8,10,12 | 1992:15 | excused 1888:12 | 1978:14,15,18 | 1981:13 |
| 1997:2 | 2020:23 | 1888:13 | 1989:11 | expert 1920:17 |
| 1999:13 | example | 1979:17 | 1990:19 | explain 1805:1 |
| 2000:20 | 1994:21 | 2032:21 | 1993:5,10,20 | 1855:1 |
| 2001:15 | 1999:24 | Execute 2014:10 | 1994:25 | 1858:21 |
| 2002:22 | 2004:11,12 | executed 1837:6 | 1995:16 | 1860:5 1862:8 |
| 2003:19 | 2026:16 | 1848:3 1860:6 | 1997:3,23 | 1865:2,15 |
| 2004:19,19,22 | 2030:3 | 1915:9 | 1998:4 | 1866:12 |
| 2007:5 2008:7 | examples 1830:7 | 1932:18,20 | 1999:14,23 | 1877:22,23 |
| 2008:10,11 | 1830:23 | 1933:9 | 2000:21 | 1878:9 |
| 2010:5 2013:4 | 1866:15 | exhibit 1806:3 | 2001:16 | 1991:24 |
| 2013:10 | 1997:19 | 1807:8 | 2007:16 | 2000:7 2002:8 |
| 2017:11 | exasperation | 1808:22 | exhibits 1804:20 | exposure 1907:1 |
| 2018:6 | 1881:15 | 1810:9 | 1804:22,23 | express 1939:22 |
| 2022:16 | exception | 1824:12,13 | 1812:4,4 | 2031:10 |
| 2023:2 | 1952:4 | 1825:20 | 1816:2,12,18 | expressed |


| 1821:13 | 2019:16,18 | 1913:10 | fairly 1855:23 | 1884:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1905:12 | 2020:3,15,25 | fact 1813:10 | 1868:21 | 1952:24 |
| expressing | 2023:1 2024:1 | 1821:25 | 1880:15 | 2002:12 |
| 1812:22 | 2030:9 | 1832:2,21 | 1897:15 | 2003:10,17 |
| extend 1823:17 | extractions | 1841:23 | 1973:20 | Fed 1837:7 |
| extensively | 1980:20 | 1843:20 | faith 1839:20 | 1840:1,2 |
| 1830:11 | 1982:13 | 1864:18 | fake 1965:7,10 | Federal 1901:25 |
| 1831:20 | 1983:12 | 1865:24 | false 1864:8,14 | 1902:23 |
| 1834:12 | extracts 1985:6 | 1868:19 | 1865:11 | 1906:17 |
| extortion | extrajudicial | 1869:8 | 1866:4 | 1907:1 |
| 1904:16 | 1805:15 | 1875:15 | 1929:19 | 1910:11,16 |
| 1905:3,14,15 | 1814:23 | 1877:8 1886:5 | FALSIFYING | 1925:23 |
| 1906:9,10,20 | extremely | 1890:6 | 1803:5 | fee 1915:18 |
| 1907:1,10,18 | 1827:10 | 1896:17 | Fame 1876:21 | 1928:17 |
| 1909:19 | 1864:24,25 | 1909:12 | familiar 1844:16 | 1930:22 |
| 1910:4,7,12,15 | 1865:5 | 1910:6,10,20 | 1854:6 1996:4 | 1933:15,20 |
| 1927:22 | EYES 1847:23 | 1924:24 | 1996:8 | 1934:1,11 |
| 1928:2,5,10 |  | 1945:9 | familiarity | feel 1877:16 |
| extract 1917:23 | F | 1947:10,13 | 1928:10 | feeling 1858:4 |
| 1984:25 | F 1803:9 1806:3 | 1948:17 | familiarize | fees 1851:4 |
| 1985:5 | 1991:14 | 1953:12 | 1910:15 | 1934:7,14 |
| 1991:18 | F-A-R-A-D-A... | 1975:20 | familiarized | 1948:18 |
| 2006:23 | 1991:15 | 2032:8 | 1910:6,20,21 | fellow 2030:25 |
| 2018:10 | F15-A 1977:9 | factual 1820:14 | family 1922:9 | felt 1858:1 |
| extracted 1915:4 | F15-AT 1954:15 | fair 1812:19 | far 1807:19 | 1928:17 |
| 1984:11 | 1957:21 | 1821:22 | 1825:23 | 1929:2 |
| 1985:10,25 | 1977:18 | 1833:9,12 | 1845:21 | 1937:24 |
| 1992:18 | F158A 1954:21 | 1840:4 | 1909:15,17 | field 1981:2,13 |
| 1993:20,23 | F17-A 1977:10 | 1890:21 | 1929:13 | 2013:16 |
| 1994:1 | F17-AT 1978:7 | 1892:20 | 1951:22 | 2015:23 |
| 1995:12 | F17-C 1977:11 | 1894:5 | 2030:15,16 | Fifth 1807:12 |
| 2003:4 | 1978:3 | 1895:15 | Faraday | fight 1928:20 |
| 2004:20 | F17-CT 1970:18 | 1897:4,6 | 1991:14 | 1948:18 |
| 2005:22 | 1971:3 1978:2 | 1901:23 | 2016:2,4,5 | fights 1928:18 |
| 2025:18 | F17-E 1977:11 | 1907:16 | 2030:3 | figure 1879:3 |
| 2027:21 | F17-ET 1963:21 | 1908:22 | Farro 1999:10 | 1952:5 |
| extracting | 1970:19 | 1909:1,3 | fashion 1954:3 | file 1883:1 |
| 1916:19 | 1971:25 | 1910:18 | fast 1806:10 | 1912:4,11 |
| 1985:4 | 1978:14 | 1911:13 | FBI 1925:17,25 | 2005:13,14 |
| extraction | F17A 1962:3 | 1913:25 | 1926:5,16 | 2006:9,19,21 |
| 1915:6 | F17C 1960:19 | 1914:3 1916:8 | 2023:13 | 2006:22 |
| 1916:21 | 1961:1 | 1918:20 | 2028:17,19,24 | 2007:16 |
| 1984:6,14,18 | F17E 1963:22 | 1929:22 | 2030:12 | 2020:12 |
| 1985:15 | F18T2PHHG... | 1933:5 | fear 1821:6 | 2021:12,13,19 |
| 1991:21,22,25 | 1990:25 | 1935:25 | 1823:5 1851:2 | 2022:22 |
| 1992:1 | F27 1924:5,21 | 1950:17 | 1906:11 | 2023:23,23,25 |
| 1994:15 | F35 1927:7 | 1960:16 | fearful 1814:25 | 2024:1,2,5,7 |
| 2003:5 | facility 1911:18 | 1965:1 1984:7 | February | 2024:11 |
| 2018:15,17 | 1912:5 | 2008:2 | 1861:3 | 2025:15 |


| filed 1807:9 | 1865:7 1866:2 | focused 1895:13 | forensics | 1829:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1808:23 | 1879:8 | 1933:14 | 1981:17 | 1833:16 |
| 1812:5 | 1885:10 | focusing | 1982:3 | 1834:17 |
| files 1933:2 | 1889:20 | 1820:11 | 2009:20 | 1988:17 |
| 1986:3 | 1895:7 1903:7 | 1897:3 | 2012:25 | 1990:10 |
| 2019:11,22,24 | 1903:11 | 1921:22 | 2014:21 | 1995:4 2031:3 |
| 2020:1,1 | 1918:8 | folder 2019:20 | foreseeable | fourth 1807:7 |
| 2024:16 | 1934:19 | 2020:12 | 1818:8 | frame 1976:16 |
| film 1882:20 | 1941:2,23 | Folders 2020:1 | forget 1828:19 | Francis 1914:14 |
| 1891:16 | 1942:4 | folks 1815:24 | form 1839:22 | 1914:16 |
| films 1876:22 | 1958:13 | 1831:1,12 | 1906:23 | frankly 1943:19 |
| final 1837:11,12 | 1979:22 | 1854:23 | 1939:22 | frantic 1868:20 |
| 1840:13 | 1987:17 | follow 2011:8 | 1947:5,6 | frantically |
| 1843:4 | 1994:11 | follow-up | 1983:9 1984:5 | 1868:18 |
| 2031:12 | 1995:9,18 | 1870:25 | 2031:10 | free 1877:16 |
| finalized | 1997:21 | followed | format 1985:7,7 | frequently |
| 1846:18 | 2013:23 | 1837:19,25 | 1985:13,14 | 1855:23 |
| finally 1810:8 | first-hand | 1855:18 | 1995:9 | 1908:20 |
| 1829:9 1831:7 | 1889:25 | 1868:15 | 2019:19 | Friday 2033:10 |
| 1998:9 | firsthand | 1947:8 1977:6 | 2022:13 | friend 1930:5,11 |
| find 1929:17 | 2026:25 | following 1806:6 | formation | 1930:14 |
| 1933:5 | fit 1990:21 | 1813:6 1841:1 | 2019:21 | friends 1820:19 |
| 2004:13,16 | fitness 1893:17 | 1841:2 | former 1822:17 | 1890:20 |
| finder's 1928:17 | five 1808:16 | 1903:24 | 1930:6 | 1930:6 |
| fine 1814:5 | 1812:8 1835:4 | 1905:18 | Forms 1983:12 | friendship |
| 1816:13 | 1882:11 | 1918:5,16 | forth 1836:12 | 1826:12 |
| 1865:5 | 1884:19 | 1923:4 | 1861:1,14 | front 1808:5 |
| 1941:17 | 1968:9,10,12 | 2001:25 | 1862:7 | 1824:15 |
| 1958:1 | 2003:13,17 | 2002:1,2 | 1881:22 | 1826:15 |
| 1961:25 | five-minute | follows 1809:2 | 1886:23 | 1880:13,23 |
| fingerprint | 1880:16 | 1835:17 | forum 1817:13 | 1881:1 |
| 2024:11,12 | fix 2020:19 | 1888:20 | forward 1839:12 | frustrated |
| fingerprints | flag 1870:15 | 1979:24 | 1843:17 | 1826:19 |
| 2025:14 | flip 1927:8 | forbids 1807:4 | 1859:24 | fuck 1881:16 |
| fire 1868:17 | Florida 1910:16 | force 1906:11,12 | 1891:17 | 1883:13 |
| 1870:14 | Floyd 1928:22 | forced 1824:21 | 1938:20 | 1887:1,9 |
| 1886:3 1954:7 | Flynt 1948:1 | forcing 1825:2 | 1988:15 | fucking 1856:14 |
| first 1806:1 | 1958:12,18 | forensic 1982:1 | 1990:8 | 1856:15,22 |
| 1807:24 | 1959:7 | 1991:21,25 | found 1805:23 | 1883:14 |
| 1810:8 | focus 1828:12 | 2003:4 | 1938:6,10 | 1964:8,10 |
| 1814:22 | 1836:18 | 2013:13 | 1942:25 | 1972:11,13 |
| 1824:12 | 1890:14 | 2018:2 | 2027:23 | full 1847:14 |
| 1828:18 | 1895:6 | 2021:14 | foundation | 1960:8 1971:7 |
| 1832:11,13 | 1899:14 | forensically | 1833:1 | 1979:25 |
| 1838:17 | 1908:17 | 1991:3 | four 1804:21 | 1991:20,22,24 |
| 1839:1 | 1918:18 | 1992:18 | 1812:8 1814:2 | 2021:12,13 |
| 1846:18 | 1919:18 | 1993:20 | 1814:5 1815:3 | 2022:22 |
| 1854:13 | 1946:9 | 2005:22 | 1816:7 1817:2 | fully 1843:22 |
| 1862:13 | 2023:19 | 2006:23 | 1818:19 | 1848:3 1860:6 |
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| 1933:9 1942:9 | 1854:25 | 1878:9,18 | goal 1893:6 | 1901:4,16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fund 1840:11 | games 1917:2,22 | 1897:21 | 1894:3,3,6 | 1904:3,13,14 |
| Funded 2011:18 | gap 2018:5 | 1911:9 | 1958:8 | 1917:18 |
| funding 1838:5 | Gary 1930:8 | 1940:22 | goals 1812:14 | 1918:1,24 |
| 1842:11 | 1999:10 | 1942:16 | 1893:4,23 | 1919:2 1927:8 |
| funds 1837:11 | gathered | 1943:1,21 | God 1855:10 | 1937:11 |
| 1839:21 | 1810:15 | 1950:22 | 1964:8 | 1942:10,11,16 |
| 1841:18,22,23 | Gawker 1919:21 | 1958:13 | goddamn | 1942:17 |
| 1885:20 | 1920:13 | 1959:7 | 1972:11 | 1943:7,10,21 |
| 1886:18 | 1921:24 | 1972:21 | goes 1827:21 | 1948:6,14,19 |
| 1887:4,14 | gay 1922:9,10 | 1982:2 | 1834:5 | 1954:21,23 |
| further 1835:17 | general 1895:16 | 1986:25 | 1914:16 | 1955:16 |
| 1847:16 | 1901:12 | 2030:23 | 1942:23 | 1956:19 |
| 1869:16 | generated | given 1833:11 | 1963:15 | 1957:15,20 |
| 1877:15 | 1936:6 | 1955:5 | 2013:4,7 | 1960:19 |
| 1888:5 1976:2 | generates | 1991:18 | 2014:22 | 1962:3 1964:9 |
| 1979:13 | 2022:15 | 1992:6 | 2020:20 | 1970:18 |
| 2009:6 | gentleman | 2031:12 | going 1804:25 | 1971:21 |
| future 1810:18 | 1864:12 | gives 1826:17 | 1806:1 | 1972:12 |
| 1814:11 | getting 1857:1 | 2006:16 | 1807:25 | 1973:3 |
| fuzzy 1916:9 | 1859:5 | GMT 1996:12 | 1809:16 | 1988:15 |
|  | 1881:17 | go $1816: 13$ | 1810:17 | 1990:7 |
| G | 1883:4 1904:4 | 1819:6,24 | 1811:8,11 | 2020:18 |
| G 1808:22 | 1904:6 1908:8 | 1821:19 | 1814:20 | 2023:18 |
| 1979:22 | 1909:18 | 1824:18,21 | 1816:15,17 | 2024:9 |
| Gabriel 1928:13 | 1910:19 | 1825:5,5 | 1817:9,14 | 2027:11 |
| Gag 1813:10,12 | 1913:12 | 1827:23 | 1818:22 | 2028:4 |
| 1814:22 | 1917:14 | 1829:24 | 1819:6,7,24 | 2030:21 |
| 1815:6,16,20 | 2015:18,20 | 1834:4 | 1820:3,24 | gold 1988:1 |
| 1816:11,19 | giant 2021:18,19 | 1838:15 | 1823:4,4 | Golf 1989:19 |
| 1817:5,6,19 | 2024:10 | 1865:3 | 1825:17 | gonna 1901:2 |
| 1818:10 | Gina 1851:7 | 1876:25 | 1827:9 1831:8 | 1916:5 1973:1 |
| 1819:2,22 | 1876:10 | 1878:13 | 1836:18 | 1998:18 |
| 1821:4,4,22 | 1882:3,16,17 | 1887:13 | 1838:7,14,25 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { g o o d }} 1804: 7,8,9$ |
| 1823:11,17,21 | 1895:20 | 1888:7 | 1843:9 | 1804:13,14,15 |
| 1824:1,8 | 1897:5 | 1920:25 | 1844:11,15,22 | 1811:1 |
| 1826:19 | 1944:17,24 | 1921:3,22 | 1856:14,16 | 1834:10 |
| 1828:25 | 1945:2 1946:2 | 1924:5 | 1857:4,9 | 1835:12,25 |
| 1829:1,10,17 | 1946:7,13,17 | 1934:19 | 1858:5,17 | 1836:5,6 |
| 1831:16,18,22 | 1959:18,23 | 1935:7 | 1862:4,7 | 1839:20 |
| 1832:23 | 1960:6,7 | 1941:24 | 1869:13 | 1870:17 |
| 1833:13 | 1963:12,14 | 1955:16 | 1872:8 | 1875:8 |
| 1834:5,9,9,15 | 1971:6,6 | 1959:3 | 1873:16 | 1889:11,12,13 |
| 1940:20 | Gina's 1971:12 | 1961:24 | 1875:2 | 1939:15 |
| 1941:18,20 | give 1805:10 | 1967:16 | 1880:12 | 1940:15 |
| 1942:3,9,25 | 1818:19 | 1991:6 | 1881:25 | 1944:3,9 |
| 1943:20 | 1831:12 | 1994:21 | 1882:1,17,20 | 1976:19 |
| gain 1936:5 | 1862:9 1873:7 | 1996:14 | 1884:2,3,13 | 1980:5 |
| gallows 1854:19 | 1873:20 | 2033:4 | 1886:2,23 | 2030:19 |

Page 2052

| 2032:14 | guessing 2012:5 | 2023:19 | 1943:4 1950:1 | High 1980:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2033:9 | Guidance | 2028:2 | 2023:15,17 | higher 1942:24 |
| Google 2032:10 | 1981:16 | happening | 2027:2 | 1952:5 |
| gossip 1895:14 | guided 1814:20 | 1821:21 | 2032:23 | highlight 1819:7 |
| government | guilt 1939:21,23 | 1822:1,15,16 | hearing 1804:18 | 2026:1 |
| 1815:15 | 2031:11 | 1876:17 | 1806:14 | highlighted |
| 1818:23 | guy 1807:23 | 1880:19 | 1807:11 | 1833:18 |
| 1820:5 1826:4 | 1826:1 | 1884:11 | 1808:13 | 1850:13 |
| 1827:5 1832:7 | 1856:15,22 | happens | 1816:24 | hired 1970:8 |
| 1904:19 | 1883:9 1906:1 | 1981:11 | 1839:12 | history 1981:14 |
| 1939:2 | guy's 1856:16 | 1984:1 | 1964:7 | 1985:17 |
| 1945:12 | guys 1890:25 | happenstance | 1972:10 | 1986:3 |
| 2026:17 |  | 1925:5,8 | heart 1812:12 | hit 1943:17 |
| gracious | H | happy 1814:12 | heavily 1816:18 | Hoffinger |
| 1864:11 | H 1807:8 | 1904:24 | heavy 2012:5 | 1803:15 |
| Graff 1999:2 | 1825:20 | hard 1904:3 | held 1814:7 | 1804:5 |
| grand 1892:14 | 1835:15 | hardware | 1837:12 | 1970:20 |
| 1905:8 | hair 1876:9,18 | 1982:11 | 1839:5 | Hogan 1803:13 |
| 1933:24 | Hall 1914:14,16 | 1991:17 | 1903:24 | 1910:12 |
| Graykey 1985:3 | hand 1818:22 | harmony | 1905:18 | 1919:22 |
| Grdina 1931:1,7 | 1927:8 | 1885:21 | 1918:5,16 | 1920:6 |
| 1932:14 | 1940:22 | hash 2024:6,7 | hell 1883:12 | 1921:11,12,15 |
| 1934:4,24 | 1970:15,18 | 2024:10,15,16 | Hello 1969:25 | 1921:17 |
| 1936:10 | 1992:4 | 2025:14 | 1970:1 | 1922:21 |
| 1937:4 | hand-signed | hashed 2024:4 | help 1868:25 | 1924:25 |
| 1945:14,17,20 | 1837:6 | hashes 2024:25 | 1869:14 | 1967:25 |
| 1945:22,22,24 | handed 1806:3 | 2025:4,6 | 1896:12 | Hogan's |
| 1946:6 | 1819:12 | hat 1829:15 | 1918:13 | 1920:11,17,21 |
| great 1826:13 | 1940:25 | 1858:2 | 1920:5 1936:5 | 1921:23 |
| 1938:19 | 1941:24 | hate 1881:14 | 1955:1 | 1922:7,16 |
| greater 1826:25 | handled 1882:19 | 1975:20 | 1965:25 | 1926:6 |
| 1845:7 | handles 2016:20 | head 1956:19 | 2018:24 | hold 1882:24 |
| greatest 1947:4 | handling 2018:5 | 2023:22 | helped 1891:8 | holiday 1856:3 |
| Greenwich | handwriting | header 1995:15 | 1911:25 | Holland 1911:14 |
| 1996:12 | 1846:22,24,25 | headers 2000:6 | 1912:13,17 | 1911:17,25 |
| Gregory | Hannity | headphones | 1914:25 | 1912:13,17,20 |
| 1848:23 | 1867:21 | 1954:16,22 | 1948:7 | 1913:12 |
| grossly 1958:24 | 1868:2,7,9,15 | 1955:5 | helpful 1936:9 | Hollywood |
| 1959:5 | 1868:25 | 1960:18,21 | helps 1838:22 | 1876:6,19,20 |
| group 1870:16 | 1869:13 | 1961:24 | HERETO | 1876:20 |
| 1994:11 | 1870:18,19,20 | 1963:23 | 1847:22 | hone 1865:13 |
| growing | happen 1822:24 | healthy 1893:15 | hey 1954:11 | honestly 1823:5 |
| 1854:23 | 1901:16 | hear 1883:23 | 1955:22 | 1965:13 |
| guess 1809:13 | 2014:5 2015:9 | 1904:1 1943:3 | Hicks 1995:3 | Honor 1804:9 |
| 1848:5 | happened | 2008:3 | 1998:2 | 1805:4 |
| 1858:17 | 1818:18 | 2019:25 | Hicks' 1995:5 | 1812:20 |
| 1879:4 | 1851:15 | heard 1827:1 | hide 1965:7 | 1814:16,22 |
| 1887:13 | 1877:13 | 1833:12 | hierarchical | 1815:3,12 |
| 1942:4 | 1967:1 | 1930:21 | 2019:20 | 1816:2,21 |


| 1817:6,23 | 1935:3,14,20 | idea 1870:17 | 2028:10 | 1962:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1818:6,11,17 | 1935:23 | 1900:16,17 | impression | Indict 1803:2 |
| 1818:22 | 1936:14,24 | identification | 1904:7 | indicted 1811:6 |
| 1819:19,23 | 1937:8,20 | 1860:15,18 | 1953:23 | indirectly |
| 1821:20 | 1938:6,10,23 | 1973:12 | improperly | 1843:18 |
| 1822:13 | 1939:8 | 1974:3 1989:3 | 2031:19 | individuals |
| 1823:23,25 | 1998:19 | 1989:4 | inauguration | 1821:15 |
| 1825:4,7,17 | HTAU 1980:17 | 2007:10 | 1858:6 | industry |
| 1826:8 1828:8 | 1980:18,22 | identified | incense 1939:23 | 1893:17 |
| 1828:10 | 1981:25 | 1804:18 | incident 1912:3 | 1981:3 |
| 1829:11,13,20 | 1982:9,19 | identifier 1988:6 | 1913:1,4 | infect 1811:21 |
| 1830:17 | 1983:3,6,15 | 1988:9 1990:3 | 2031:18 | inference |
| 1832:16 | 1987:10,19 | identifies | incidents 1913:5 | 1806:18 |
| 1834:9 | 1988:7 | 2003:25 | include 1932:16 | inferred 1904:16 |
| 1919:14 | 2011:13,14 | identifying | 1998:19 | influence |
| 1940:25 | 2012:12 | 1993:16 | included | 1915:21 |
| 1941:19 | 2023:3,6,9 | identity 1922:10 | 1845:16 | 2031:20 |
| 1943:3 1994:7 | 2028:8,15 | IDK 1872:18,23 | 1893:16 | inform 1814:11 |
| 2008:9 | huge 1858:2 | ignored 1808:7 | 1911:2 | information |
| Honor's 1815:6 | Hulk 1910:12 | image 1893:21 | includes 2032:2 | 1843:19 |
| 1819:18 | 1919:22 | 2019:12 | including | 1881:18 |
| HONORABLE | 1920:6,10 | 2021:14 | 1825:14 | 1891:20 |
| 1803:10 | 1921:12,14,17 | 2023:24 | 1830:25 | 1911:17,25 |
| hope 1830:18 | 1921:23 | images 1919:24 | 1843:20 | 1912:3,10 |
| 1995:3,4 | 1922:7,16,21 | 1919:25 | 1863:12 | 1913:8,9 |
| 1998:2 | 1924:25 | imagine 1952:3 | 1912:4 1941:5 | 1922:25 |
| hoping 1829:5 | 1926:6 | 1964:7 | 1984:12 | 1925:2,9,13 |
| horrific 1949:24 | 1967:25 | 1972:10 | 2005:18 | 1926:1 1930:2 |
| hotel 1876:6,16 | humor 1854:19 | immediately | 2032:6 | 1937:11,25 |
| 1876:19,24 | 1854:25 | 1875:15 | incoming | 1938:12 |
| 1881:2 | hundred 1854:6 | 2014:22,24 | 2027:15,20 | 1985:5 1987:4 |
| 1926:14 | 1929:4,5 | 2016:10,11 | increased | 1993:13,16 |
| 1989:18 | hundreds | immovable | 1933:19 | 2000:7 2005:2 |
| hour 1808:1 | 1874:9 | 1937:21 | indemnify | 2010:14 |
| 1885:13 | 1997:15,16 | impact 1809:24 | 1948:1,8,10 | 2021:4 |
| 1940:8 | hurt 1929:15 | 2030:9 | 1959:8 | 2031:16 |
| hours 1806:14 | hush 1864:13 | implemented | indicate 1812:6 | 2032:11 |
| House 2001:13 | 1866:3,10,21 | 1816:11 | 1933:15 | informed |
| How's 1906:13 | 1867:1 | implication | indicated 1908:6 | 1885:22 |
| Howard | 1877:11 | 1833:9,11 | 1920:13 | 1937:16,18 |
| 1836:19 | 1878:8 | important | 1927:16 | initialed |
| 1841:9,16,18 | hypothetical | 1827:10 | 1935:16 | 1992:15 |
| 1842:4 1855:4 | 1957:9 | 1941:12 | indicates | initially 1851:24 |
| 1855:9 | hypothetically | 2010:8,14 | 2006:12 | initials 1850:15 |
| 1890:17 | 1957:5 | 2013:3 2031:1 | indicating | 1967:20,22 |
| 1891:4,7,19 | 1958:14 | impose 1814:4 | 1938:23 | 1979:1 |
| 1892:4 |  | Impossible | 2029:11 | innocence |
| 1924:18,24 | $\frac{\text { I }}{\text { iCloud } 1982: 17}$ | 1881:7 | indication | 1939:21 |
| 1925:10,14 | iCloud 1982:17 | imprecise | 1961:16,19 | 2031:11 |


| innocuous | interacted | 1820:9 | 1841:20 | 1941:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1808:15 | 1901:20 | 1831:24 | 1843:1 1895:4 | items 2019:9 |
| inquire 1980:6 | interacting | interviews | 1908:20 | 2020:23 |
| 2009:9 | 1949:24 | 1815:10 | 1909:13,22 |  |
| inquiry 1859:3 | interaction | 1830:25 | 1915:10 | J |
| insidious 1810:1 | 1865:17 | 1869:25 | 1929:11 | J 1803:5 1804:2 |
| Instagram | 1866:7 | 1870:1,12 | 1931:18 | 1804:10 |
| 1877:16 | 1869:16 | 1871:3 1961:4 | 1945:3 | jail 1814:10 |
| installments | 1878:6 | 1961:9,12,15 | 1946:18 | James 1931:11 |
| 1952:8 | interactions | 1963:11 | 1948:4 | 1931:13,15 |
| instant 1861:1 | 1859:1 | introduced | 2015:12 | 1945:14,17,20 |
| 1861:13 | 1864:23 | 1931:1 | 2032:12 | 1945:22 |
| 1862:15 | 1890:11 | invade 1851:20 | involvement | January |
| instructed | 1894:18 | invades 1851:2 | 1864:9 | 1859:18 |
| 1897:24 | 1902:9 | invading 1851:5 | involving | 1861:2 |
| 1904:21 | 1904:19 | invasive 2029:4 | 1913:18 | 1862:12 |
| 1918:3 | 1930:7 | 2029:7,13,22 | 1987:11 | 1863:24 |
| 1919:15 | intercepted | investigated | 2031:19 | 1864:3 |
| 2026:6 | 2004:10 | 1910:11 | iPhone 1984:17 | 1867:14,20 |
| 2027:14,17 | interest 1849:24 | 1926:22 | 1987:17,18 | 1869:22 |
| instruction | 1860:3 1936:6 | investigation | 1990:1 | 1871:24 |
| 1898:3,4 | interested | 1897:18 | 2006:13 | 1873:23 |
| instructions | 1822:22 | 1901:21 | iPhones 1984:12 | 1874:6,15 |
| 2027:4 | 1935:24 | 1910:14 | 1987:17 | 1875:7,24 |
| 2031:12 | 1936:3 | 1925:17 | 2021:11 | 1878:11,20 |
| intake 1983:3,6 | 1937:17,19 | 1926:2,7 | 2028:11 | 1882:2 |
| 1983:7,14 | interference | 1927:13,22 | 2029:17 | 1921:11 |
| 1984:1,3,8 | 1991:16 | 1928:1,2 | Iraq 1981:19, 20 | 1947:24 |
| 1991:6,9 | interim 1881:21 | 1987:11,14 | 2009:20,21 | 1948:14 |
| 2017:4 | 2015:23 | 2010:21 | 2010:11 | 1952:22 |
| integrity | internal 1905:15 | 2015:12 | issue 1811:24 | 2028:8 |
| 1814:24 | 1981:12 | investigations | 1812:2,24 | Jay 1931:1,4,7,9 |
| 1821:19 | internet 1898:25 | 1927:1 | 1813:20 | 1932:14 |
| 1834:13 | 2015:3 2032:7 | investigative | 1823:13 | 1934:4 |
| 2010:23 | interpret | 2012:15 | 1898:1 1908:3 | 1936:10 |
| 2013:1,3,17 | 1856:24 | 2023:5 | 1920:20 | 1937:4 |
| 2024:20 | interpreting | 2026:11,12 | 1937:24 | 1945:22,24 |
| Intel 2010:4,7 | 1976:11 | invite 2002:25 | 1940:18,20 | 1946:3,4,6 |
| 2010:17 | interrupt | inviting 1827:11 | 1943:8 | 1999:4 |
| intellectual | 1856:20 | invoice 1811:4 | 2014:13 | jeopardy 1807:3 |
| 1849:22 | interview | invoked 1902:16 | 2032:8 | Jesus 1856:13 |
| intended | 1808:24 | 1902:19 | issued 1805:18 | JG 1932:14 |
| 1805:15,20 | 1827:7 1832:8 | 1962:23 | 1813:21 | Jimmy 1873:17 |
| intense 1823:6 | 1832:10,12 | invoking | 1859:13,20 | 1875:1,16 |
| intent 1821:4 | 1894:12 | 1902:22 | 1926:25 | 1876:23 |
| intention 1815:6 | 1953:21 | 1917:20,21 | 1927:2,12 | job 1981:10 |
| 1816:21 | 1964:1,2 | 1918:25 | issues 1812:11 | John 1931:20 |
| intents 1985:22 | 1972:22 | 1919:4 | 1907:20,24 | 1934:9 <br> joined 1804:11 |
| interact 1950:16 | interviewer | involved | 1916:9 | joined 1804:11 |


| Jonathan | 1888:8,11,11 | 1892:7 | 1987:8 | 1906:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1941:5 | 1888:23,23 | 1902:11 | 1991:13 | 1907:15 |
| Joshua 1803:14 | 1889:1,3 | 1915:11 | 1993:17 | 1909:15,17 |
| 1804:4 | 1939:17 | 1936:9 | 1997:13 | 1912:6,7,12 |
| Journal 1851:24 | 1944:6,9 | 1945:20 | 2000:2 2006:9 | 1913:6,15 |
| 1852:7 | 1968:12 | Katherine | kindly 1839:4 | 1914:2,23 |
| 1858:25 | 1969:14,14 | 1803:17 | kinds 1941:13 | 1924:9 1925:6 |
| 1859:4,14,25 | 2030:21,25 | 1804:6 | 1942:2 | 1925:7,8 |
| 1862:18,25 | 2031:6 | keep 1817:6 | 1982:14 | 1926:8,18,22 |
| JR 1803:12 | 2032:23 | 1828:14,24 | 1985:14,25 | 1928:12,13 |
| JUAN 1803:10 | jury 1803:7 | 1830:16 | 1987:16 | 1930:4,9,21 |
| judge 1805:3,13 | 1804:16 | 1847:16 | 1993:13 | 1931:13 |
| 1806:7 | 1806:10,17 | 1880:12 | 2014:20 | 1932:17,19,21 |
| 1816:16 | 1807:2 | 1884:13 | knew 1822:23 | 1932:23 |
| 1817:3,11 | 1811:15 | 1922:10 | 1910:3 | 1934:13,13 |
| 1823:2 | 1819:4 1832:5 | 1939:20 | 1930:19 | 1936:4 |
| 1824:23 | 1833:5,7,8,10 | 1983:11 | 1931:4 | 1938:14,17,19 |
| 1827:5,9 | 1833:12,22 | 2031:9 | 1937:11 | 1939:14 |
| 1831:18 | 1834:1 1835:5 | keeping 1854:1 | know 1804:16 | 1943:19 |
| 1834:1,23 | 1835:18,19 | 1982:10 | 1805:7 1806:8 | 1945:11,19 |
| 1889:5,7 | 1855:21 | keeps 2005:13 | 1809:15 | 1946:8,15,19 |
| 1918:2 | 1858:21 | Keith 1837:2 | 1810:12,24 | 1952:17 |
| 1939:16 | 1860:5 | 1839:3 | 1813:10 | 1953:16 |
| 1941:23 | 1888:22 | 1847:17 | 1815:5 | 1954:10 |
| 1969:6 | 1892:14 | 1869:19,24 | 1816:17 | 1955:21 |
| 1974:20 | 1905:8 | 1888:18 | 1820:3 | 1956:23 |
| 1979:15 | 1939:25 | 1964:8 | 1824:20 | 1960:2,7,8,8,9 |
| 1980:7 | 1944:4 | 1969:10 | 1830:15 | 1960:9 1963:5 |
| 1983:20 | 1968:14 | 1972:11 | 1832:16,24 | 1963:16 |
| 1989:6 1994:3 | 1969:13,19 | 1975:7 | 1838:21 | 1964:2,5 |
| 2007:4 2009:5 | 1977:19 | 1998:21,23 | 1844:13 | 1965:9,13 |
| 2009:8,11 | 1978:1 | 2005:6 | 1846:13 | 1967:1 1968:4 |
| 2030:20 | 1991:24 | Keith's 1837:7 | 1852:24 | 1971:7,7,8,9 |
| July 1980:15,23 | 2000:3 2013:7 | kept 2014:24 | 1853:16,16 | 1972:8 |
| jumpsuit 1828:2 | 2031:20 | Kevin 1913:21 | 1856:17,21 | 1973:15,18,19 |
| June 1929:14,24 | 2032:17 | kill 1901:2 | 1857:22 | 1976:8,12,21 |
| 1934:21 | justice 1803:10 | Kimmel 1872:8 | 1860:10 | 1983:15 |
| 1935:8,13 | 1812:19 | 1873:17 | 1862:16 | 1987:2,22,24 |
| 1936:10,22 | 1943:16 | 1875:1,16 | 1868:3 | 1992:14 |
| 1938:22 | justification | 1876:22,23,25 | 1872:19,23 | 2000:25 |
| 1939:8 | 1806:21 | 1880:4,20 | 1873:13 | 2001:9,11 |
| jurisdiction | Justin 1950:5 | 1881:11,17,23 | 1875:1 | 2005:8,11 |
| 1832:21 |  | kind 1807:12 | 1878:23 | 2010:7 |
| juror 1833:14 | K | 1829:15 | 1879:1,7 | 2016:18 |
| 1833:14,16 | K 1835:15 | 1856:5 1862:6 | 1883:1,11,13 | 2023:16 |
| jurors 1805:21 | Karen 1851:12 | 1871:13 | 1886:3 1890:6 | 2026:9 2027:3 |
| 1806:18,19 | 1851:25 | 1895:10 | 1897:14 | 2027:8,11 |
| 1821:16 | 1852:9 1853:3 | 1918:9 | 1902:15 | 2028:1,2,4,13 |
| 1835:22,25 | 1853:13 | 1962:18 | 1904:2 1906:6 | 2030:15,16,24 |


| 2031:4 2033:2 | 1959:7 1999:6 | learn 1891:19 | 1847:5,9,19,22 | 1849:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| knowing | Las 1960:9 | learned 1947:13 | 1848:1,8 | 1850:7,7,12,12 |
| 1809:22 | 1971:8,17 | leave 2030:23 | 1859:22 | 1850:16 |
| knowingly | late 1819:23 | 2032:24 | 1865:24 | 1866:3 1907:9 |
| 1814:1 | 1873:17 | leaving 1939:25 | 1869:5 | 1909:19 |
| knowledge | 1950:22 | 1940:4 | 1879:10 | 1910:20,23 |
| 1813:2,7 | lately 1817:16 | 1968:14,18 | 1897:1 | 1932:12,16 |
| 1854:9 | Laurie 1803:24 | led 1859:4 | 1898:13 | linear 1954:3 |
| 1870:19,20 | 1879:12 | 1900:2 1954:1 | 1899:9,15 | lines 1811:8 |
| 1889:25 | 1923:3 | left 1804:11 | 1900:4 | 1813:17 |
| 2026:25 | 2001:24 | 1825:5 | 1915:18,22,25 | 1841:7 1862:5 |
| 2031:19 | law 1803:18,20 | 1889:15 | 1932:9,22 | 1871:12 |
| known 1820:18 | 1901:20 | 1900:25 | 1933:3,15 | 1875:4 |
| 1890:22 | 1910:4,7,16,21 | legal 1810:21 | 1938:24 | 1881:20,25 |
| 1913:23 | 1925:20 | 1811:5 | 1939:8 1947:3 | 1884:4 |
| knows 1808:3 | 1928:11 | 1883:11,12 | 1947:5,6 | 1905:25 |
| 1812:20 | 1936:14 | 1899:15 | 1979:3 | Link 2006:19 |
| 1820:18 | 1946:24 | 1900:1 | letters 2025:8,11 | linked 1911:11 |
| 1941:20 | 1951:19 | 1917:22 | level 1820:9,12 | linking 1907:24 |
| Kotsev 1945:5,9 | 2014:2,7 | 1934:7,14 | leverage 1953:7 | 1908:13 |
| 1946:18 | 2031:12 | 1941:1,4 | 1953:9,13 | links 2017:8,9 |
| 1963:12 | 2032:9,11 | 1948:10,17,20 | 1957:16 | liquidated |
| 1972:6,21 | lawful 1812:22 | 1948:22 | 1958:6,9 | 1844:18,19,25 |
| 1973:2 | 1813:19 | 1949:1 | 1964:10,15 | 1845:2,6,11,15 |
| Kramsky | 1814:1 1911:1 | 1951:16 | 1972:13 | 1845:20,25 |
| 1803:24 | lawn 1866:18 | 1959:8,21 | 1973:1 | 1873:9 |
| 1840:20 | lawsuit 1883:6 | 1964:22 | 1978:21 | Lisa 1803:24 |
| 1879:13 | lawsuits 1909:16 | 1965:14 | liar 1809:3 | 1840:20 |
| 2001:23 | lawyer 1809:4,6 | lengthy 1873:5 | 1822:8 1832:2 | 1879:13 |
|  | 1809:6 | let's 1835:4 | 1882:17 | 2001:23 |
| L | 1810:21,24,25 | 1874:12 | licenses 1983:11 | listen 1954:23 |
| L 1968:23 | 1832:1 | 1884:14 | lied 1830:15 | 1955:5 |
| 1979:22 | 1910:21 | 1888:7 1895:6 | lies 1830:16 | 1960:17 |
| lab 1980:20 | 1917:1 | 1899:14 | life 1856:11 | 1973:10 |
| 1982:10 | lawyers 1809:5 | 1919:18 | 1873:14 | 2007:1 2032:1 |
| 2010:13 | 1905:1 1917:1 | 1938:20 | 1948:20 | listened 1955:13 |
| 2011:15 | laying 1833:1 | 1943:23 | likeness 1893:21 | 1955:24 |
| 2020:8 | layman's | 1944:4 1946:9 | limitations | 2008:3 |
| label 1983:11 | 1991:23 | 1959:25 | 1906:20 | 2026:22 |
| labeled 2005:6 | 2020:19 | 1968:12 | 1907:2 | listening |
| $\mathbf{l a g} 2015: 16$ | leader 1816:6 | 1969:8 1971:3 | limited 1818:13 | 2007:24 |
| language 1805:6 | leadership | 1977:18 | 1818:14 | 2032:3 |
| 1805:10 | 1937:12 | 1986:25 | 1864:9 | lists 1986:4 |
| 1856:11,12 | leading 1822:19 | 2013:20,22 | 1891:11 | literally 1831:8 |
| 1965:7,10 | 1854:22 | 2015:7 | limits 1834:8 | litigated 1909:8 |
| large 1845:25 | leaked 1911:17 | 2023:23 | Lindsay 1911:18 | litigation |
| Largely 1809:9 | leaking 1930:1,4 | letter 1824:13 | line 1813:8 | 1812:24 |
| Larry 1948:1 | leaning 1960:7 | 1842:10 | 1838:10 | 1813:21 |
| 1958:12,18 | 1971:6 | 1846:18 | 1848:20 | 1899:21 |


| 1947:4 1948:2 | 1839:10,14,25 | 1935:5,11 | looks 1834:5 | 1968:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1948:7 | 1840:17 | 1936:1 1939:2 | 1842:20 | main 1816:10 |
| little 1804:16 | LLP 1803:20 | 1941:19 | 1874:14 | 1903:14 |
| 1806:23 | load 1875:8 | 1942:5 | 1994:22 | 1967:13,23 |
| 1810:2,14 | local 1926:22 | 1950:23 | 2001:13 | maintain |
| 1819:24 | 1927:1 | 1963:5 | 2011:25 | 1847:19 |
| 1827:24 | locate 1938:7 | 1964:18 | 2019:19,20 | 1848:1 2013:3 |
| 1855:1,21 | located 1933:6 | 1965:16 | loosely 1928:16 | 2013:17 |
| 1860:5 | location 1813:24 | 1966:8 1967:6 | Los 1936:17,24 | maintaining |
| 1866:12 | 1832:19 | 1967:13 | lose 1964:9,10 | 2013:1 |
| 1868:23 | 2031:24 | 1972:1 1984:4 | 1972:12,13 | major 1891:20 |
| 1871:16 | locations | 1985:15 | 1973:1 | make-up 1876:8 |
| 1872:6 1874:1 | 2031:21 | 1986:25 | loses 1964:9,10 | 1876:9 |
| 1874:1,12 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o g }} 1986: 3$ | 1987:20 | 1972:12,13 | making 1831:9 |
| 1875:22 | 2003:22,24,25 | 1989:13 | losing 1838:1 | 1832:25 |
| 1884:8,10,14 | 2003:25 | 1990:21 | lost 1837:22 | 1903:19 |
| 1885:5,12 | logical 2019:16 | 1993:6 1995:1 | lot 1810:25 | 1907:14,15 |
| 1894:2 1895:6 | 2019:18 | 1998:6 | 1811:2,3 | 1909:22 |
| 1897:13 | 2020:3,15,25 | 2000:22 | 1829:14 | 1911:2 1914:1 |
| 1898:18 | 2022:20 | 2003:18 | 1875:9,11 | 1914:4 |
| 1899:14 | logs 2022:12 | 2005:25 | 1922:8 1952:5 | man 1820:18,19 |
| 1900:4,19 | Lohan 1911:18 | 2007:4 | 1957:16 | 1831:21 |
| 1902:20 | 1912:4 1913:9 | 2018:10,21 | 2001:10 | 1913:21 |
| 1904:3 1916:8 | Lohan's 1912:11 | 2019:11 | 2014:5 | 1950:25 |
| 1944:14,16 | London 1854:1 | 2020:4,16 | 2025:10 | 1979:6,10 |
| 1949:9 1954:8 | long 1828:3 | 2024:25 | 2030:6 | manage 1871:5 |
| 1980:24 | 1832:9 1841:8 | 2025:1 | loud 1844:12 | manager |
| 1984:14 | 1856:9 | 2027:17,17,25 | 1847:15 | 1895:21 |
| 1986:23 | 1882:17 | looked 1804:20 | luck 1955:3 | 1944:19,25 |
| 1991:23 | 1944:19 | 1816:12 | lunch 1939:24 | Managing |
| 1995:7 1996:3 | 1946:24 | 1869:10 | 1940:8,10 | 1839:13 |
| 2000:7 | 1960:3 1965:9 | 1898:9 | luncheon | mandate |
| 2001:18 | 1980:13,22 | 1927:10 | 1940:11 | 1812:22 |
| 2002:23 | 2017:14 | 1932:8 | lying 1811:10,11 | Mandela 1828:3 |
| 2004:24 | 2025:7 | 1952:17 | 1811:11 | Mangold |
| 2006:3 | longer 2007:18 | 2008:25 | 1832:3 1960:8 | 1803:16 |
| 2013:20 | look 1811:8,11 | 2022:5,10 | 1971:7,14 | 1804:6 |
| 2017:23 | 1824:3,5,12 | 2030:9 | M | Manhattan |
| 2023:23 | 1831:22 | looking 1815:19 | M | 1807:13 |
| 2028:10 | 1839:12 | 1834:6 1905:2 | M 1803:10 | manipulate |
| 2031:2 | 1847:7 | 1905:4,15 | 1847:17 | 2012:15 |
| 2032:24 | 1862:16 | 1942:17 | machine 2022:8 | manipulated |
| live 1985:21 | 1863:17 | 1958:2 1993:5 | 2022:15 | 2012:9 |
| live-streamed | 1882:17 | 1993:14 | magazine | 2024:24 |
| 1822:4 | 1917:1 1924:4 | 2001:11 | 1893:13 | manipulation |
| lived 1995:23 | 1924:9,11,21 | 2018:18 | 1947:12 | 2013:11 |
| living 1914:1,5 | 1927:7,9 | 2020:3 2022:2 | Magniccari | 2015:21 |
| LLC 1837:10 | 1932:4 | 2022:15 | 1803:25 | Manny 1928:15 |
| 1838:11 | 1933:11 | 2029:7 | 1923:3 | manual 2018:15 |


| 2022:19,23 | 1803:15 | 1855:2 | 2016:18 | 1998:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2023:9 2029:9 | 1804:5 | 1856:20,24 | 2022:1 2024:5 | member |
| Manually | maximum | 1859:19 | 2032:6 | 1839:13 |
| 2029:7 | 1814:5 | 1862:8 1863:7 | meant 1872:10 | 1905:1 |
| March 1953:1 | Mayweather | 1866:13 | 1971:11 | 2031:20 |
| 1953:12 | 1928:22 | 1867:23,25 | measures | members |
| 1954:9 1956:5 | McCarthy | 1868:5 | 2015:23 | 1823:22 |
| 1956:13 | 1941:6 | 1870:11 | media 1806:16 | 1991:24 |
| 1958:3,15 | McDougal | 1871:4,14 | 1806:22 | memo 1805:17 |
| 2003:16 | 1851:12,25 | 1874:22,23 | 1807:2 | 1808:16 |
| Marilyn 1876:5 | 1852:9 1853:3 | 1875:9 1880:2 | 1810:15 | 2006:13 |
| mark 1903:15 | 1892:8,10,25 | 1880:3,22 | 1822:4 1824:3 | memory 1916:8 |
| 1904:5,6 | 1893:10 | 1881:14 | 1908:17,23 | 1989:14 |
| 1989:4,5,8 | 1894:9,22 | 1882:6,22 | 1909:16 | 2021:14,15 |
| 2025:4 | 1902:11 | 1883:9 | 1960:8 | Memos 2005:12 |
| marked 1860:15 | 1907:7 | 1897:17 | 1963:15 | men 1869:19,24 |
| 1860:18 | 1929:23 | 1906:9 | 1971:8 | 1870:11,16 |
| 1861:24 | 1930:3,4,11,23 | 1907:12 | 1972:22 | 1922:9 |
| 1973:12 | 1931:2,4,15 | 1926:8 | 1982:18 | menace 1807:1 |
| 1974:3 | 1932:9 1933:8 | 1952:17 | mediated | menacing |
| 1990:17 | 1933:10 | 1971:10 | 1837:24 | 1826:10 |
| 1992:9 2007:4 | 1934:24 | 1973:17 | mediator | mention 1812:3 |
| 2007:9 | 1936:10,17 | 1984:21,23 | 1837:24 | 1941:14,15 |
| 2008:11 | 1937:2,25 | 1996:12 | meet 1883:3 | 2016:2 |
| married 1931:15 | 1938:6 | 2002:14,17 | 1889:16,17 | mentioned |
| match 1839:23 | 1939:12 | 2010:7 | 1890:25 | 1819:18 |
| 2025:4,14 | 1945:24 | 2017:13 | 1903:1 | 1882:23 |
| materials | McDougal's | 2027:2 | 1934:24 | 1901:12 |
| 1849:23 | 1853:13 | 2028:13 | meeting 1837:25 | 1931:20 |
| matter 1824:6 | 1930:6,7,14 | 2029:9 | 1872:20,24 | 1983:17 |
| 1826:21 | 1935:21 | meaning | 1903:7,11,15 | 1985:2 |
| 1828:20 | 1937:9 | 1871:25 | 1903:17 | 1987:21 |
| 1831:17 | 1945:20 | 1938:3 | 1904:20 | 1991:13 |
| 1860:7 | Mea 1819:1 | 1971:19 | 1908:6 | 1996:22 |
| 1864:18 | 1829:21 | 1992:2 | 1926:11 | 2001:21 |
| 1877:8,15 | 1830:23 | 1996:18 | 1931:23 | 2003:9 2007:7 |
| 1891:14 | mean 1807:22 | 2014:2 | 1935:2 | 2016:2 |
| 1949:18 | 1820:17 | meaningful | 1936:16,21,24 | mentions |
| 2033:10 | 1822:17 | 1985:12 | 1937:2,8 | 1943:13,14 |
| mattered | 1826:1,20 | 2019:6 | 1938:10 | MERCHAN |
| 1832:14 | 1830:2,22 | means 1843:10 | 2003:11 | 1803:10 |
| matters 1824:6 | 1834:8 | 1844:15 | meetings | Merchan's |
| 1824:7 | 1843:25 | 1875:6 1879:1 | 1815:10 | 1831:18 |
| 1832:14 | 1844:17 | 1948:10 | 1901:24 | message 1836:19 |
| 1891:10 | 1847:24 | 1965:13 | 1902:2,8,13,19 | 1862:15 |
| 1917:18 | 1848:10 | 1982:3,4 | 1902:23 | 1935:16 |
| 1949:15 | 1849:20 | 1991:25 | 1908:3 1926:5 | 1937:20 |
| 2010:23 | 1853:5,8 | 2002:15 | 1953:17 | 1938:23 |
| Matthew | 1854:18 | 2004:8 | Melania | 1995:20 |


| messages 1861:1 | 1838:1,8 | 1959:16 | 1882:11 | money 1828:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1861:13 | 1839:1,13 | 1960:5,24 | 1884:19 | 1831:9,11,12 |
| 1868:23 | 1840:7,10 | 1961:8,11,14 | 1996:16,16,19 | 1831:13 |
| 1921:7 1935:8 | 1841:19 | 1961:19,22 | 1996:23,23 | 1841:16 |
| 1935:13 | 1845:21 | 1962:11,16 | 2003:13,17 | 1850:19 |
| 1936:20 | 1846:1,16 | 1963:1,5,11 | minute 1816:2 | 1851:7 |
| 1952:18,22 | 1847:18 | 1964:1 1967:2 | 1816:22 | 1864:13 |
| 1985:17 | 1848:2 1849:6 | 1970:4,8,10,10 | 1825:1,18 | 1866:4,10,16 |
| 1986:2 | 1850:11,23 | 1970:13 | 1897:3 | 1866:21,22,22 |
| 1994:17 | 1852:14 | 1971:4 | 1975:25 | 1867:1,1 |
| 2032:6 | 1853:4,7 | 1972:16,24 | 2008:14 | 1878:8 |
| messaging | 1855:15,22 | 1973:11,16,21 | 2022:19 | 1893:24 |
| 1860:25 | 1856:4 | 1975:10,10 | minutes 1806:20 | 1909:25 |
| 1995:21 | 1857:11,14 | 1976:11 | 1810:16 | 1915:4 |
| messing 1828:14 | 1858:7 1860:1 | 1987:23,25 | 1815:2 | 1922:19 |
| met 1813:25 | 1860:1,25 | 1994:17,19 | 1819:18 | 1929:11 |
| 1864:11 | 1861:2,7,14 | 1995:2 | 1827:9 1835:4 | 1947:21 |
| 1889:18 | 1862:14 | 2000:15 | 1866:8 1869:2 | 1961:17 |
| 2001:4 | 1863:5 1867:9 | 2001:3,4 | 1888:9 | 1964:6 1972:9 |
| metadata | 1867:15,20 | 2014:17 | 1940:19 | money' 1877:12 |
| 1986:21,23,24 | 1868:6,17,25 | 2022:6 | 1968:9,10,13 | monies 1850:22 |
| 1987:4,5,8 | 1869:2,12,22 | 2025:19 | 1975:1,2 | monitoring |
| 2001:21 | 1870:10,23 | mid 1936:10 | 2006:18 | 1926:19 |
| 2002:6 2005:3 | 1871:24 | mid-December | misleading | Monroe 1876:5 |
| 2005:22 | 1872:2,8,14 | 1855:25 | 1865:21 | Montgomery |
| 2006:6 | 1873:23 | 1857:3 | mistake 2029:25 | 1915:11 |
| 2008:24 | 1874:18,24 | middle 1809:20 | mistaken | month 1855:17 |
| 2019:6 | 1875:7,12 | 1832:10 | 1958:24 | 1938:22 |
| 2021:18 | 1878:13,21 | 1954:17 | 1959:5 | months 1812:1,9 |
| 2026:18 | 1879:10 | Mike 1887:4 | Mobile 1981:6 | 1892:23 |
| methampheta... | 1880:10,19,22 | military 1981:18 | mocked 1817:15 | Moran 2012:12 |
| 1915:21 | 1881:4,9 | million 1845:3,4 | mocking | 2012:22 |
| methods | 1882:2,7,13,21 | 1845:13,20 | 1827:14,21 | morning 1804:7 |
| 2022:19 | 1883:5,16,21 | 1916:4,6,13 | 1831:15 | 1804:8,9,13,14 |
| 2029:13,14 | 1884:3,22 | 1922:14 | modified | 1804:15 |
| 2030:12 | 1885:7,18,19 | 1929:4,5,12,13 | 2002:10 | 1807:10 |
| Michael 1809:3 | 1885:23 | 1952:8 | moment 1810:3 | 1808:25 |
| 1809:5 1810:2 | 1886:9 1887:7 | 1958:13 | 1827:1 1873:2 | 1814:17,20 |
| 1810:5,18 | 1887:9,14 | 1959:8 | 1887:25 | 1815:4 |
| 1811:23 | 1890:3,7,12 | millions 1929:2 | 1974:15 | 1835:12,25 |
| 1812:1,10,11 | 1894:22 | 1929:2,2 | 1982:5 1989:6 | 1836:5,6 |
| 1812:12 | 1900:20 | mind 1854:1 | 1992:23 | 1854:11 |
| 1815:24,25 | 1906:1 1911:5 | 1904:18 | 2009:3 | 1856:2 1888:7 |
| 1819:1 | 1911:8 | 1907:17 | Monday 1813:4 | 1889:11,12,13 |
| 1820:10 | 1920:21 | 1939:20 | 1818:22 | 1905:25 |
| 1831:23 | 1921:14,17 | 2031:9 | monetary | 1921:7 |
| 1836:13 | 1949:10 | minimize 1814:9 | 1922:16,20 | 1948:13 |
| 1837:2,8,16,20 | 1953:14 | minus 1878:22 | monetizing | 1952:20,21 |
| 1837:22 | 1954:9 1956:5 | 1878:24 | 1896:5,7 | 2006:17 |


| mouse 1864:23 | 1915:10 | 2021:24 | 1877:13 | 1876:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| move 1807:6 | 1931:11,20 | 2033:4 | 1889:18,19,23 | 2032:14 |
| 1810:8 | 1944:16 | needed 1806:18 | 1889:24 | 2033:9 |
| 1867:11 | 1950:18,19,25 | 1907:21 | 1892:25 | nightly 1831:8 |
| 1882:9 | names 1848:11 | 1946:20 | 1911:11 | nine 1805:24 |
| 1891:17 | 1993:15,17 | 1961:20 | 1929:16 | 1810:16 |
| 1938:20 | 2005:13 | 1962:12 | 1932:18 | 1814:8 |
| moved 1834:1 | nation 1816:6 | needle 1882:24 | 1938:21 | Nods 1900:8 |
| moving 1808:20 | national | 1938:15 | 1946:6 1960:9 | 2023:22 |
| 1810:4 | 1922:24 | needs 1811:18 | 1961:21 | non-attorneys |
| 1869:17 | 1924:13 | 1831:21 | 1962:13 | 1934:14 |
| 1938:15 | 1925:14 | 1845:13 | 1971:8,17 | Non-Disclosure |
| mow 1866:18 | 1936:3,11 | 1925:25 | 1979:6,10 | 1908:21 |
| multimillion | 2010:8 | negotations | new 1803:1,1,2 | non-disparage... |
| 2011:15 | native 1995:21 | 1911:11 | 1803:8,8,13,14 | 1842:22 |
| multiple | natural 2033:3 | negotiate | 1803:14 | 1873:6 |
| 1815:23 | naturally | 1939:12 | 1804:2 | non-paying |
| 1820:22 | 1907:12 | 1947:12 | 1822:22 | 1949:22 |
| 1826:15 | NDA 1845:7 | 1948:8 1966:1 | 1825:15 | nondisclosure |
| 1830:7,23,25 | 1908:25 | negotiated | 1882:18,20 | 1844:1 1848:5 |
| 1831:4,5 | NDA's 1909:13 | 1948:24 | 1898:16 | 1848:7 1965:2 |
| 1858:7 | near-daily | 1951:19 | 1941:3 | normally |
| Mutual 1842:21 | 1891:22 | 1952:1 | 1959:14 | 1985:16 |
| mutuality | necessarily | 1964:19,24 | 1980:11 | 1986:3 |
| 1860:3 | 1829:11 | 1965:2 | 1996:14 | notable 1952:4 |
|  | 1898:2 | negotiating | 1998:12 | notarized |
| N | 1935:22 | 1907:7 | 2006:11 | 1840:1 |
| N 1803:11 | 1956:18 | negotiation | 2012:24 | note 1988:20 |
| 1835:15 | 2010:20 | 1907:13 | news 1819:3 | 1992:21 |
| name 1839:9,24 | necessary | 1919:12 | 1820:6,23 | noted 1833:17 |
| 1840:14 | 1819:21 | 1933:19 | 1864:4,16 | notes 1988:25 |
| 1842:11 | 1839:22 | negotiations | 1865:8 1874:8 | 1989:2 |
| 1846:21,21 | Necheles | 1895:4 | 1885:3 1896:7 | nother 1883:2 |
| 1848:19,20 | 1803:20,20 | 1910:23 | 1898:16,22,24 | notwithstandi... |
| 1850:8 | 1804:12 | 1920:16 | 1899:4 | 1891:22 |
| 1889:14 | 1940:18 | 1926:12 | 2001:10 | November |
| 1904:24 | 1942:15 | 1963:2 | newspaper | 1815:22 |
| 1930:21 | 1943:3,11 | 1964:16 | 1940:25 | 1831:3 |
| 1941:16 | need 1819:22 | neither 1847:16 | nice 1807:22,22 | 1851:11 |
| 1945:5 1950:1 | 1824:18 | 1848:1 | 1807:23 | 1852:12 |
| 1966:19 | 1826:5 | Nelson 1828:2 | 1808:5,13,14 | 1854:4 |
| 1979:25 | 1834:15,21 | net 1851:9 | 1825:25 | 1950:20 |
| 1980:1 | 1846:13 | network | 1826:1,1,5,7 | 1981:22 |
| 1986:15,16 | 1870:3 1918:8 | 1946:21 | 1826:19,20 | 1989:18 |
| 1988:13 | 1940:16 | neutral 1821:2 | 1889:16,17 | number 1804:23 |
| 2006:19 | 1941:24 | never 1842:8 | night 1853:24 | 1813:15 |
| 2009:18 | 1942:12 | 1856:22 | 1854:20 | 1824:13 |
| named 1911:14 | 1954:11 | 1867:3 | 1868:2,7,10 | 1832:11 |
| 1913:21 | 1955:22 | 1870:20 | 1873:17 | 1833:16 |


| 1921:3 1941:4 | 1937:12 | 1976:23 | 1854:10,13 | one-sided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1981:2,3 | observed 1826:8 | office 1874:10 | 1858:5 | 1897:13 |
| 1986:12 | obstruction | 1892:17 | 1860:14 | ones 1819:2 |
| 1988:17,20 | 1948:20 | 1897:20,24 | 1862:25 | 1892:19 |
| 1989:14 | obtained | 1903:2 1905:2 | 1863:17 | 1952:1 |
| 1990:11,13,24 | 1983:21 | 1908:4 | 1865:15,18,20 | 2004:16 |
| 1995:5 | obtaining | 1930:10,17 | 1866:2,4,9 | 2021:21 |
| 1997:13 | 1906:10 | 1932:25 | 1867:7 | 2022:1,8,14 |
| 2024:6 | obvious 1817:24 | 1953:17 | 1869:17,19 | 2024:16 |
| numbers | 1855:11 | 1980:12,14,16 | 1870:10,21 | ongoing 1812:22 |
| 1933:22 | obviously | 1980:20 | 1871:9,24 | 1878:6 |
| 1984:5 | 1857:5 | 1983:10 | 1872:17 | 1893:20 |
| 1993:17 | 1903:18 | 2009:24 | 1873:18 | 2024:19 |
| 1994:12 | occasions | 2011:18 | 1874:11 | ONLY,' 1847:23 |
| 2025:7,11 | 1814:2 1858:7 | 2017:2 | 1875:3,19 | open 1824:15 |
|  | occurred | 2023:20 | 1877:1 | 1905:19 |
| 0 | 1976:21 | 2028:9 | 1878:13 | 1918:17 |
| O 1803:9 | October | officer 1835:9 | 1879:1,8 | 1939:20 |
| 1835:15 | 1836:13,23 | 1835:18 | 1880:1 | 1975:4 |
| 1979:22 | 1838:13 | 1888:10,17,21 | 1883:19 | 1977:24 |
| o'clock 1804:17 | 1839:5 1840:8 | 1931:25 | 1884:1,20,21 | 1978:5,11 |
| 1820:7 2033:1 | 1841:14,24 | 1969:3,9,13 | 1885:4 | 1987:1,3 |
| oath 1835:14 | 1847:10 | 1979:21,25 | 1887:10,24 | 2018:6 |
| object 1904:3 | 1849:1,3,8 | 1980:3 | 1901:22 | 2030:17 |
| objection | 1850:23 | 2032:16 | 1917:13 | 2031:9 |
| 1861:22 | 1886:25 | official 1879:13 | 1918:10,19 | opening 1818:18 |
| 1903:20 | 1921:22 | 1942:19 | 1919:19 | operate 2020:4 |
| 1904:1 | 1973:11,21 | oftentimes | 1924:10 | operating |
| 1905:17,20 | 2005:6,9 | 1864:22,23 | 1939:6 1971:2 | 1987:6 |
| 1906:22 | odd 1856:7 | oh 1828:23 | 1972:7 | 2011:22 |
| 1912:15 | 1858:4 1942:1 | 1848:14 | 1988:15 | operation |
| 1916:1 1917:4 | 1952:13 | 1855:10 | 1990:7 | 1926:5,8 |
| 1926:3 | 1953:25 | 1872:6 | 1995:22 | 1927:16 |
| 1927:17,23 | 1954:2 | 1938:19 | 2000:3 | opinion 1906:4 |
| 1928:6 1956:6 | offenses 1910:15 | okay 1805:12 | 2002:14,17,20 | 1907:3 |
| 1959:1 | offensive | 1817:18 | 2023:21 | 1939:22 |
| 1973:24 | 1904:24 | 1819:9 | old 1876:19 | 2031:10 |
| 1974:19 | offer 1818:24 | 1830:21 | 1996:12 | opponent |
| 1977:13,14 | 1819:7 | 1833:23 | older 2021:11 | 1812:10 |
| 1978:23 | 1861:20,21 | 1838:6,25 | once 1852:17,17 | opportunity |
| 1979:8 | 1929:9 | 1840:10 | 1852:18 | 1819:20 |
| 2012:18 | 1958:20 | 1843:25 | 1918:11 | 1825:13 |
| objections | 1973:23 | 1844:6,17,22 | 1960:3 1983:7 | 1947:16,18 |
| 1994:6 2008:8 | 1974:14 | 1846:10 | 1984:1,3 | 1948:17 |
| obligations | 1994:4 2008:6 | 1847:1,8,11 | 1985:10,14 | 1969:7 1973:6 |
| 1949:4 | offered 1929:1,7 | 1848:14 | 1991:11,13,20 | 1974:2 |
| obnoxious | 1948:1 1959:7 | 1851:11 | 2014:21 | 2007:23 |
| 1828:16 observations | offers 1977:9 | 1852:1 | 2018:8 2024:4 | opposed 1834:6 |
| observations | offhand 1976:10 | 1853:13,18 | 2025:24 | opposing |


| 1949:17 | outgoing | 1928:15 | 1866:22 | 1807:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1962:17 | 2027:16,20 | Pacquiao's | 1867:2 | 1814:17 |
| orange 1828:2 | outlets 1822:4 | 1928:18 | 1877:11 | 1815:1,8,9 |
| order 1804:18 | 1823:1 1864:4 | page 1805:17 | 1878:8 | 1832:18,19 |
| 1805:14,18,20 | 1865:8 | 1808:16 | 1885:20 | 1834:15,17 |
| 1805:24 | outrageous | 1813:8,15,16 | 1886:5,5 | 1841:8 1844:1 |
| 1806:3 1807:4 | 1824:21 | 1827:23 | 1912:13,17,20 | 1856:25 |
| 1807:7 | outside 1809:7 | 1828:5,5,17 | 1913:12 | 1861:6 |
| 1808:22 | 1810:13 | 1829:24,25 | 1915:1 1916:4 | 1891:25 |
| 1810:9 1812:8 | 1811:16 | 1830:9,9,14 | 1916:6 1934:1 | 1893:16 |
| 1812:22,25 | 1815:9 1827:6 | 1841:2,7 | 1934:14 | 1896:3,4 |
| 1813:7,11,12 | 1991:16 | 1842:2,20,20 | 1948:18 | 1942:19 |
| 1813:20 | 2011:4,9 | 1843:6 1844:7 | 1952:8 | 1945:14 |
| 1814:1,8,18,19 | 2023:9 | 1844:9,20,23 | pal 1870:24 | 1965:14 |
| 1814:22,23 | overall 1833:21 | 1846:11,17,18 | pants 1828:24 | 1967:13 |
| 1815:6,12,17 | overflow | 1847:11,11 | 1868:17 | 1969:3 |
| 1815:20 | 1822:21 | 1848:14,15 | 1870:13 | 1987:10,13 |
| 1816:11,19,23 | overlooking | 1849:13,13 | 1954:7 | 2003:4 |
| 1817:5,6,19 | 1823:14 | 1850:16 | Рара 1989:18 | 2011:18 |
| 1818:10 | overnight | 1862:3 | papers 1806:21 | 2023:5 |
| 1819:2,19,20 | 1837:7 | 1867:16 | 1812:5 | 2026:11,12 |
| 1819:22,24 | Overruled | 1870:22 | 1819:14 | participants |
| 1821:4,4,22 | 1912:16 | 1871:11 | 1820:23 | 1805:19 |
| 1823:2,3,12,17 | 1956:7 1979:9 | 1873:18,18 | 1834:3 | participated |
| 1823:22 | 2012:19 | 1875:3 | paperwork | 2017:4 |
| 1824:2,8 | overseas | 1878:15 | 1839:9,22 | participation |
| 1826:19 | 1877:12 | 1881:8,20,25 | paragraph | 1812:13 |
| 1828:25 | overt 1911:2 | 1884:4 1921:3 | 1837:3,5 | particular |
| 1829:1,10,17 | owed 1928:17 | 1923:5 1924:2 | 1839:4,8,11,13 | 1811:25 |
| 1831:17,18,22 | 1929:2 | 1924:5 | 1840:2,4 | 1851:21 |
| 1832:23 | owned 1849:24 | 1934:19 | 1843:7,16 | 1854:9 |
| 1833:13 | 1877:12 | 1935:7 1939:3 | 1844:8,16 | 1855:24 |
| 1834:5,9,9,15 | 1932:2 | 1956:25 | 1845:8 1846:2 | 1857:14 |
| 1922:17 | 1945:14 | 1966:11 | 1847:9,14 | 1865:6 |
| 1940:20 | owner 1983:24 | 1967:9,10,10 | 1866:3 1877:3 | 1872:14 |
| 1941:18,20 | 1995:2 | 1967:11,16 | 1877:7,14 | 1878:15 |
| 1942:3,9,12,21 | ownership | 1975:13 | 1933:12,14 | 1879:9 |
| 1942:25 | 1849:21 | 2001:25 | 1975:12,14 | 1884:23 |
| 1943:10,20 | owns 1932:1 | 2002:2 | Pardon 1833:6 | 1931:5 1954:5 |
| 1969:3 |  | pages 1804:24 | parentheses | 1975:12 |
| ordinarily | P | 1812:5 | 1839:22,23,24 | 1984:9,17 |
| 1954:4 | P 1803:11,11 | 1816:14 | 1839:25 | 1988:12 |
| ordinary | p.m 1836:25 | 1828:11 | parenthesis | 1995:20 |
| 1908:25 | 1839:18 | 1927:10 | 1843:19,22 | 2024:10 |
| Organization | 1874:15 | 1974:25 | parse 2021:24 | particularly |
| 1890:1 | 1996:18 | 1997:21 | parsed 2022:14 | 1811:18 |
| original 1842:9 | 2002:13 | 1998:1,6,9,12 | 2025:25 | 1867:16 |
| 1845:7 1847:8 | 2003:10 | 1998:15,18 | Parsing 2022:1 | 1903:8 |
| outcome 1888:2 | Pacquiao | paid 1856:22 | part 1803:1 | 1907:19 |


| 2029:22 | 1914:17 | 1882:25 | 1973:12 | 1890:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| parties 1835:22 | 1915:7 | pending 1958:25 | 1974:3,7,21,25 | 1909:16 |
| 1847:18,22,25 | 1916:22,23 | Pennsylvania | 1989:5,8 | 1944:20 |
| 1848:11 | 1948:19 | 1808:25 | 1990:17,17 | 1959:20,21,24 |
| 1857:8 | paying 1856:23 | people 1803:2 | 1992:5,10,17 | persecution |
| 1899:22 | 1917:24 | 1803:12 | 1992:21,21 | 1832:17 |
| 1924:3 1927:6 | 1948:10 | 1804:1,3,4,21 | 1993:25,25 | persistent |
| 1944:5 | payment | 1804:21,25 | 1994:4,24 | 1805:19 |
| 1954:14 | 1810:21,24 | 1809:6 | 1997:1 | person 1846:8 |
| 1969:17 | 1843:4 1845:7 | 1810:25 | 1999:13,21 | 1903:14 |
| 1989:1 | 1900:2 | 1811:3 | 2000:20,22 | 1905:14 |
| 1990:17 | 1907:21,25 | 1813:13 | 2001:15 | 1983:14 |
| 1994:18,19 | 1916:13 | 1815:18,24 | 2002:22 | 1984:7,8 |
| 1995:2,19 | 1933:23 | 1819:12,21 | 2003:18 | 2031:15,19 |
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| 1877:8 | 1808:16 | 1989:7 | 1933:23 | 1899:25 |
| 1938:18 | 1809:15 | 1992:24 | 1982:25 | 1948:21 |
| 2000:11 | 1810:6 | 2015:11 | perceptions | 1951:3 |
| 2004:9 | 1819:25 | 2023:3 | 1904:8,9 | 1964:22 |
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| patient 1912:4 | Pecker's | 1860:15,18 | performed | petulant |
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| Patty's 2000:16 | 1820:10,25 | 1867:12 | 1858:5,6 | 2016:15 |
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| 1988:18,20 | 2018:18 | 1870:14 | 1877:16 | 1865:25 |
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| 2011:22 | 2002:7 2022:5 | 1963:21 | 1939:22 | 1936:21 |
| 2015:4,5,7 | 2022:10 | 1977:22 | 1940:1 1955:7 | 1939:12 |
| 2018:18,21,21 | pictures 1983:10 | 1978:2,9,17 | 1960:18 | 1942:24 |
| 2019:12 | 1985:18 | 2008:15,21 | 1961:10 | 1953:21 |
| 2020:7,10 | 1986:6,7 | Playboy 1893:16 | 1962:9 | 1959:14 |
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| 2022:12,13,22 | 2018:25 | 1960:22 | 1966:9,14 | 2008:6 |
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| 1930:5 | posts 1813:13 | preparing | 1834:19 | 1840:18 |
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| 1901:4 | PP 1843:16 | presents | 1823:14,22 | 2012:24 |
| 1919:11 | 1844:3 1850:7 | 2017:20 | 1824:3,15,17 | 2015:14 |
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| positively | 1909:13 | presidency | 1833:17,18,18 | 2010:20 |
| 1833:4 | 1936:14 | 1816:7 | 1858:23 | 2015:6,11 |
| possess 1848:2 | 1965:22 | 1825:13 | 1864:24 | privately 1857:4 |
| possessed | 1967:22 | 1827:16 | presume | 1860:15,17 |
| 1922:5 | 1988:12 | 1834:19 | 1926:21 | privilege 1851:3 |
| possession | practiced | president | pretty 1809:12 | 1851:6,20 |
| 1847:19 | 1925:20 | 1804:10 | 1909:18 | 1853:15 |
| 1987:20 | 1946:24 | 1813:10 | 1976:19 | 1902:13,16,23 |
| possible 1910:23 | practices | 1815:7,8,19,21 | prevent 1805:20 | 1917:20,21 |
| 2010:15 | 1908:23 | 1816:4,5 | 2012:8 | 1918:9,12,25 |
| 2023:9 | practicing | 1817:12,12,15 | previous | 1919:3,4,5,17 |
| possibly 1823:17 | 1951:19 | 1817:18 | 1806:15 | 1951:2 |
| 1904:4 | 2017:13 | 1818:2,9,12,13 | 1812:23 | 1962:23 |
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| 1895:16 | 1868:16 | 1820:2,13,22 | 2006:12 | 1978:22 |
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| 1912:10 | 1904:9 | 1822:5,11,17 | 1835:16 | 1863:14 |
| 1919:24 | predicate | 1823:8 1824:1 | 1868:12,13 | 1883:4 |
| 1920:2,13 | 1926:1 | 1824:5 1825:3 | 1880:24 | 1919:12 |
| 1921:24 | prefer 1814:8 | 1825:21,25 | 1888:19 | 1951:4 |
| 1941:8 | prefers 1805:4 | 1826:13,17 | 1969:11 | probably 1952:1 |
| 1942:18 | prep 1872:20,21 | 1827:12,22 | previously- | 1956:3 |
| 1944:15 | 1872:24 | 1828:1,4,21 | 2007:6 | 2010:18 |
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| 1946:12,22 | 1816:24 | 1829:22,23 | 1857:7 | procedure |
| 1947:11 | prepare 1863:25 | 1830:4,11,12 | 1860:20 | 1983:3,6 |


| procedures | 1983:11 | protect 1814:23 | 1951:7,9 | 2023:1,24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011:8 | produced | 1883:10,23 | 1961:3 | 2024:1,2,4 |
| 2013:17 | 1838:19,24 | 1942:12 | publically | 2025:22 |
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| 1809:19 | profits 1873:7 | protecting | 1864:24 | 1922:21,21 |
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| 1812:12,13,16 | 2025:25 | protection | publicized | 2014:20 |
| 1812:18 | 2031:23 | 1831:21 | 1851:24 | purely 1806:12 |
| 1814:9 | programs | prove 1812:21 | publicly 1862:2 | purported |
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| quality 1832:1 | 1831:24 | re-posting | 1866:7 1893:1 | 1920:20 |
| quantify | 1832:11,13 | 1806:23 | 1942:12 | 1922:24 |
| 2017:24 | 1834:12 | re-sign 1842:9 | 1954:6 1960:6 | 1924:18 |
| quarter 2031:3 | 1888:5 | re-tweets | 1971:5 | 1927:3,15 |
| 2032:25 | 1892:19 | 1818:25 | 2018:17,25 | 1933:19,21 |
| Quebec 1989:18 | 1903:14 | reached 1895:1 | 2025:6 | 1935:4 1939:1 |
| question | 1917:3 | 1920:10 | 2029:13,18 | 1939:11,11 |
| 1807:17,18,24 | 1953:18 | 1921:23 | reason 1815:3 | 1945:12,13 |
| 1808:9 | 1961:8 | reaching 1817:7 | 1818:20 | 1950:4 1952:6 |
| 1809:18 | 1964:14 | 1899:18 | 1819:13,23 | 1952:7,9,10,12 |
| 1820:8,13 | 1970:3 1976:2 | 1935:20,23 | 1823:2,3 | 1953:6,20,24 |
| 1821:2 1822:6 | 1976:24 | react 1814:17 | 1824:7,25 | 1954:9 |
| 1824:10 | 1979:13 | reacting | 1838:1 | 1957:13 |
| 1825:22 | 2026:13,14 | 1822:13 | 1872:15 | 1958:11,15 |
| 1826:2,7 | 2028:24 | read 1805:5 | 1891:25 | 1960:5,11,12 |
| 1832:15 | quick 1840:5 | 1807:16 | 1897:23 | 1960:13 |
| 1838:23 | quickly 1827:18 | 1827:6 1832:7 | 1904:17 | 1961:14,22 |
| 1840:5 | 1827:24 | 1837:1 1843:9 | 1946:12 | 1963:11,14,18 |
| 1844:15 | 1828:22 | 1843:12 | 1947:10 | 1964:4,12 |
| 1848:18 | 1844:22 | 1844:11,13 | 1954:2 | 1988:17,22 |
| 1853:17 | 1852:1 | 1847:15 | reasonable | 1991:4 |
| 1855:12 | 1999:12 | 1859:10 | 1813:3 1817:5 | 1998:12 |
| 1857:20 | 2010:15 | 1862:7,19 | 1824:2 | 2004:18 |
| 1865:22 | 2011:3 | 1864:2 | reasonably | recalled 1904:15 |
| 1883:18 | quote 1811:7 | 1871:20,23 | 1845:18 | recalling 1913:6 |
| 1887:12 | 1847:23,23 | 1872:6 1874:3 | reasons 1821:22 | receipt 1837:13 |
| 1902:15,22 | 1875:8 | 1877:1 1884:9 | 1834:10 | 1857:9 |
| 1904:11,17 | 1920:14 | 1884:10 | recall 1852:19 | 2031:15 |
| 1909:20,21 | 1960:15 | 1885:18 | 1853:19 | receive 1840:2 |
| 1910:19 | 1975:22 | 1971:23 | 1863:16 | 1841:23 |
| 1912:9,18 | quoting 1830:10 | 1985:10 | 1886:13,25 | 1849:10 |
| 1914:12 | 1856:12 | 2032:1 | 1891:14 | 1981:8 |
| 1916:5 | R | readable 1985:7 | 1892:22 | 2028:18 |
| 1917:15 | R | reading 1806:5 | 1900:24 | received 1839:4 |
| 1918:3,12,21 | R 1803:9,11 | 1824:4 | 1902:2,22 | 1841:22 |
| 1919:2,15,16 | rabbits 1858:2 | 1844:14 | 1903:10,11,15 | 1850:23 |
| 1927:11 | radio 2014:24 | 1864:16,17,25 | 1903:17 | 1858:22,22,24 |
| 1947:15 | 2015:3 2016:8 | 1865:5 2032:2 | 1907:23 | 1859:3 |
| 1951:18 | Rain 1883:12 | 2032:3,4 | 1908:3,6,7,11 | 1864:13 |
| 1958:25 | raise 1940:20 | ready $1854: 23$ | 1912:19,20,22 | 1866:3 1890:2 |
| 1959:4 | raises 2026:13 | 1859:5 1969:5 | 1913:11,12,14 | 1890:3 1974:1 |
| 1961:10 | raising 1941:13 | real 1846:21 | 1914:13,14,16 | 1974:23 |
| 1976:15,20 | Ralph 1989:19 | 1848:11 | 1914:19,20,22 | 1977:17 |
| 2018:6 | ran 1870:15 | 1893:10,12 | 1915:14,15,16 | 1988:1 |
| 2030:17 | 1919:21 | 2012:15 | 1915:17,19,20 | 1989:23 |


| 1991:3,13 | 1904:12 | 1818:15 | 1921:19 | 1927:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994:10 | 1953:23 | 1856:21 | 1924:22 | 1928:2,4,17 |
| 2030:6 | 1962:2 | 1859:21 | 1954:23 | 1948:7,15 |
| receiver 1955:1 | 1992:20 | 1878:7 1880:6 | 1990:21 | relation 1845:12 |
| receives 1983:4 | 2008:24 | 1956:10 | refuses 1872:1 | 1876:15 |
| receiving 1861:5 | recorded | 1958:18 | 1918:13 | relationship |
| 1874:9 | 1953:19 | 1975:18,21 | regard 1868:23 | 1826:12,13 |
| 2000:12 | 1954:1 1970:3 | 1976:16 | 1900:1 | 1845:14 |
| recess 1835:6 | 1973:10,18,19 | referenced | regarding | 1854:7 |
| 1888:7,14 | 1974:6 | 1852:8 | 1819:4,25 | 1864:15 |
| 1940:11 | recording | 1875:14 | 1820:10 | 1877:5,24,25 |
| 1968:20 | 1820:5 | 1901:8 | 1859:1 | 1878:4,6 |
| 1969:1 | 1926:11 | 1927:21 | 1883:20,22 | 1890:17,19 |
| reciprocal | 1955:6,8,14 | 1945:2 | 1913:9 | 1897:1,5 |
| 1897:4,13 | 1960:22 | references | 1919:22 | 1898:8 |
| recognize | 1962:5 | 1833:14 | 1921:12,23 | 1929:24 |
| 1836:20 | 1973:15,16 | referencing | registered | 1930:2 1933:8 |
| 1842:17 | 1974:9 1976:9 | 1833:16 | 1833:19 | 1936:13 |
| 1852:5 | 2004:19 | referral 1897:4 | regular 1989:20 | 1949:9,25 |
| 1858:19 | 2005:2,3,5,8 | 1931:17 | regularly | 1950:25 |
| 1860:21 | 2006:6,11,14 | referred 1854:25 | 1815:25 | release 1839:6 |
| 1863:20 | 2006:15,23 | 1915:15 | regurgitation | 1842:21 |
| 2007:11 | 2007:18,21,24 | 1925:2 1950:9 | 1859:12 | 1875:2 |
| recognizing | 2009:1 | referring 1817:1 | rehab 1911:18 | released 1813:13 |
| 1815:7 | 2026:17 | 1869:5 1887:2 | 1913:10 | 1874:20 |
| 1819:20 | 2027:16,21,23 | 1913:6,8 | reimbursed | 1875:18 |
| recollection | 2028:1 | 1956:24 | 1887:23 | reliability |
| 1853:13,23 | recordings | 1957:1 | reinvigorate | 2013:4 |
| 1854:2 | 1976:25 | refers 1846:2,8 | 1873:14 | reliable 2013:11 |
| 1857:13 | 1977:2 | reflect 1837:9 | rejuvenate | 2017:10 |
| 1861:15,18 | 1986:10 | reflecting | 1893:6,19,20 | relieved 1840:19 |
| 1876:8 | 2006:12 | 1816:7 1823:6 | relate 1812:11 | 1879:13 |
| 1921:10 | records 1803:6 | 1898:25 | 1812:14 | 1968:23 |
| 1924:13,22 | 1890:1,3 | refresh 1853:23 | 1996:24 | relieves 1923:3 |
| 1927:11 | 1983:11 | 1854:2 | related 1806:15 | 2001:24 |
| 1933:9 1939:7 | recover 2019:9 | 1857:13 | 1809:18 | rely 1809:5 |
| 1954:24 | RECROSS | 1921:10 | 1811:13 | remain 1843:4 |
| 1955:20,25 | 1976:6 | 1924:13 | 1845:18 | 1969:18 |
| 1957:24 | redacted 1993:6 | 1927:11 | 1913:9 | remember |
| 1958:3,22 | 1993:13 | 1939:7 | 1936:15 | 1824:12 |
| 1960:2,15,23 | redactions | 1955:20,24 | 2031:7 2032:9 | 1836:14 |
| 1962:10 | 1993:3,9,10,11 | 1957:23 | relates 1829:17 | 1850:25 |
| 1963:25 | 1993:14 | 1958:2,22 | 1831:16 | 1851:15 |
| 1988:24 | redirect 1968:8 | 1960:23 | relating 1842:22 | 1853:10 |
| 1990:22 | 1969:23 | 1962:10 | 1911:8 1912:3 | 1857:2 1861:5 |
| reconcile | refer 1816:18 | 1963:25 | 1922:25 | 1900:7 1903:7 |
| 1886:21,22 | 1818:7 1990:7 | 1988:23 | 1924:25 | 1908:10,11,13 |
| record 1813:9 | reference | 1989:14 | 1925:17 | 1908:21 |
| 1828:1 | 1817:24 | refreshes | 1926:25 | 1916:14,16,17 |


| 1916:18,19 | 1926:25 | 1930:23 | 1840:11 | 1815:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1917:7,17,24 | 1927:2,12,15 | 1931:5 | 1842:12 | 1824:24 |
| 1922:12,14 | 1937:12 | 1945:25 | resolve 1954:11 | 1829:18 |
| 1930:10 | 1994:22 | 1946:9 | 1955:22 | responsibilities |
| 1931:21 | 1995:13 | 1959:22 | resolved | 1982:8 |
| 1936:18 | 1997:4 2000:4 | representations | 1951:24 | rest 1966:6 |
| 1937:22 | 2003:2,21,22 | 1909:22 | respect 1806:1 | restart 1955:4,7 |
| 1938:25 | 2027:19 | 1910:1 | 1825:1 1834:4 | restate 1866:24 |
| 1952:20,21 | 2031:18 | representatives | 1890:9 1907:9 | restrict 1814:23 |
| 1964:7,14 | reported 1831:7 | 1919:8 | 1942:9 | restricting |
| 1970:5 | 1877:12 | 1920:11,17,21 | 1994:18 | 1805:14 |
| 1972:10 | 1911:19 | 1921:23 | respond 1805:17 | result 1849:22 |
| 1973:8 | 1951:1,4 | 1922:7,17 | 1817:18 | 2027:8 |
| 1990:10,13 | reporter | 1926:6 | 1818:1,5,9,12 | results 1854:20 |
| 1998:15 | 1803:23 | represented | 1818:17 | resumes 1888:19 |
| 2004:16 | 1840:18,20 | 1810:25 | 1827:12 | 1969:11 |
| 2026:19 | 1859:15,25 | 1811:3 | 1834:12,22 | retained |
| remembered | 1879:12,13,14 | 1885:17 | 1839:15,19 | 1896:14,16,17 |
| 1936:21 | 1891:12 | 1911:14 | 1855:9 1863:5 | 1950:20 |
| remind 1813:4 | 1923:2,3 | 1914:10,25 | 1870:2,23 | Retainer 1899:7 |
| 1835:14 | 1968:23 | 1915:2 | 1871:9 | 1932:19 |
| 1846:4 | 2001:23,24 | 1951:12 | 1872:17 | Retention |
| reminding | reporters | representing | 1875:12 | 1933:10 |
| 1854:5 | 1807:14 | 1914:14 | 1881:4,9,12 | rethink 1859:13 |
| remorse 1953:4 | 1808:8 1831:1 | 1916:20 | 1882:13 | retired 1931:25 |
| 1954:10 | reporting | reprisal 1814:25 | 1885:12,23 | retrieved |
| 1955:21 | 1880:4 1951:4 | 1823:5 | responded | 1838:20 |
| 1959:11 | 1951:9 | Republican | 1808:9 1859:8 | return 1873:8 |
| remote 1903:12 | reports 1830:2 | 1822:19 | 1859:10 | 2031:16 |
| remotely | 1877:5 | republished | 1862:20 | returned 1837:7 |
| 2012:16 | 1885:19 | 1898:20 | 1872:18 | 1840:1 |
| remove 1819:21 | 1951:7 | repurposed | responding | 1897:21 |
| rendering | 1980:21 | 1898:20 | 1808:8 | revealing |
| 2008:2 | 1982:13 | request 1858:24 | 1811:25 | 1863:14 |
| repaid 1857:1 | 1994:14 | 1869:3 1871:5 | 1815:20 | reverse 1819:24 |
| repeat 1856:12 | 1995:10 | 1938:9 1942:4 | 1826:2,6 | review 1973:6 |
| repeated | 2022:15 | 2031:14 | responds 1882:3 | 1974:2 1992:9 |
| 1815:23 | 2027:22 | requested | response | 1993:19 |
| 1829:18,22 | repost 1828:3 | 1845:24 | 1816:23 | 2022:24 |
| 1830:2 | Reposting | 1874:24 | 1819:18 | 2024:23 |
| repeatedly | 1828:20 | 1876:24 | 1820:8 1821:1 | reviewed |
| 1815:5 | represent | required | 1827:6 | 1992:12 |
| 1822:11 | 1889:14 | 1915:18 | 1829:16 | 1993:2 |
| 1831:14 | 1897:17 | 2030:24 | 1831:23 | reviews 2011:22 |
| repeating | 2009:18 | requires 2011:4 | 1832:11 | revisiting |
| 1880:24 | representation | research 2032:8 | 1841:21 | 1943:9 |
| rephrase | 1811:2 1892:7 | reside 2020:20 | 1859:24 | rhetoric 1805:19 |
| 1961:10 | 1916:3 | residence 1980:3 | 1927:4 1938:9 | Rhona 1999:2 |
| report 1807:2 | 1918:18,23 | Resolution | responses | right 1806:19 |
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| 1810:13 | 1912:1,5,23 | 1977:7 1979:1 | Rodriguez | ruled 1943:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1811:16 | 1913:24 | 2002:10 | 1851:7 | rules 1809:23 |
| 1813:6 | 1914:10,23 | 2006:24 | 1876:10 | 1934:14 |
| 1822:20 | 1915:1,11 | 2009:1,16 | 1895:20 | ruling 1942:2 |
| 1824:19 | 1916:4 1917:8 | 2010:1,10,12 | 1896:1,10 | 1943:5,22 |
| 1825:4,5 | 1919:25 | 2010:15,21 | 1897:3,5,15 | rulings 1942:16 |
| 1826:17 | 1920:6,11,14 | 2011:5,16,25 | 1898:8 | rumors 1843:21 |
| 1831:19 | 1921:8,16,24 | 2012:6,12,22 | 1944:17,24 | 1859:13 |
| 1832:10 | 1922:3,5,22 | 2013:5,14,23 | 1945:2 1946:2 | 1864:13 |
| 1833:5 | 1924:25 | 2014:3,5,8,11 | 1946:7,17 | 1866:3 |
| 1849:25 | 1926:9,14,20 | 2014:14,17,22 | 1947:11 | run 1815:22 |
| 1850:18 | 1928:2,8,18,25 | 2014:25 | 1959:18,23 | 1906:21 |
| 1867:11 | 1929:3,9,15,24 | 2015:4,7,9,12 | 1963:12 | running 1815:8 |
| 1876:22 | 1930:3,8,20,24 | 2015:25 | Rodriguez's | 1816:5 |
| 1877:25 | 1931:2 | 2016:8,16,21 | 1946:13 | 1822:11 |
| 1879:2,5 | 1932:10,18 | 2016:23 | 1960:3 | 1825:2 1863:2 |
| 1881:3 | 1933:24 | 2017:2,4,7,11 | 1963:14 | 1870:14 |
| 1884:17 | 1934:15,23 | 2017:14,21,24 | role 1981:25 | rushed 1833:8 |
| 1887:10 | 1935:3,24 | 2018:6,10,13 | romantic 1864:5 | rushing 1806:8 |
| 1889:21 | 1936:11,14,25 | 2018:18,22 | 1865:9,14,17 | 1940:5 |
| 1890:1,7,10,15 | 1937:9,12 | 2019:9,12,20 | 1865:19 |  |
| 1890:17,19,23 | 1938:1,6,13,20 | 2019:21 | room 1806:19 | S |
| 1891:5,8,10,12 | 1939:13 | 2020:2,8,16,23 | 1822:21 | S 1803:11 |
| 1891:18 | 1944:17,20 | 2021:2,19,22 | 1831:1 | 1835:15 |
| 1892:1,4,12,15 | 1945:3,7,14,20 | 2022:3,5,6,12 | 1876:16 | 1979:22,22 |
| 1892:19 | 1945:22 | 2022:16,21 | 1889:21 | S-E-S-S-I-O-N |
| 1893:1,4,6,11 | 1946:2,4,24 | 2023:14,19 | 1979:10 | 1940:14 |
| 1893:17,21,24 | 1947:19,21 | 2024:9,11,13 | 1984:17 | S-O-T-U |
| 1894:10,16,23 | 1948:15,18,22 | 2024:20,24 | 1991:14,15,15 | 1872:10 |
| 1895:18 | 1948:24 | 2025:2,8,11,15 | 1991:15 | saddened |
| 1896:10,18 | 1949:1,4,7,13 | 2025:19 | 2016:3,4 | 1856:4 |
| 1897:1,11,15 | 1949:19 | 2026:1,7,14,18 | 2018:9 | safety 1901:1 |
| 1897:18,25 | 1950:7,12,16 | 2026:23 | 2029:22 | Saturday 1856:2 |
| 1898:19,20,22 | 1951:17 | 2027:1,6,12 | rooms 2030:4 | save 1826:22 |
| 1899:5,7,16,23 | 1952:5,15,18 | 2028:2,8,11,12 | Roosevelt | saved 1856:16 |
| 1900:9,12,14 | 1952:22,24 | 2029:4,14,15 | 1876:5,19,23 | Saving 1996:24 |
| 1900:16,20 | 1956:14 | 2029:16,19,23 | 1881:2 | saw 1812:7 |
| 1901:5,9,11,13 | 1957:7 | 2030:4,6,21 | Rosen 1999:6 | 1827:1 |
| 1901:25 | 1958:20 | rights 1891:16 | Rotstein 1999:8 | 1937:20 |
| 1902:6,9,14,20 | 1959:14,19 | 2011:1 | Roughly | saying 1805:13 |
| 1903:2,9 | 1961:4,9 | Rip 2029:16 | 1892:24 | 1806:22,22,25 |
| 1906:1,17 | 1962:14,19,21 | rise 1835:18 | routine 1983:14 | 1818:1,2,4,5 |
| 1907:9,13 | 1963:8 1965:8 | 1888:10,21 | row 1921:5 | 1818:11 |
| 1908:1,17 | 1965:11,14,17 | 2032:16 | rows 1935:9 | 1820:9 1821:2 |
| 1909:2,4,6,10 | 1965:20,23 | risk 1954:19 | RPR 1803:23,24 | 1821:17,18 |
| 1909:13,18,19 | 1966:1,4,11,17 | 2013:10 | RSA 1803:23 | 1822:2 |
| 1909:23 | 1967:17,25 | 2017:21,23,24 | Rueda 1928:13 | 1823:16,25 |
| 1910:4,8,20,24 | 1968:12 | 2024:3 2030:8 | 1928:24 | 1826:7 |
| 1911:15,20,22 | 1976:18,25 | rival 1817:12 | 1929:14,15 | 1827:13 |
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| 1866:20 | screaming | 1835:23 | 1942:23 | 1885:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1868:5 | 1963:17 | 1888:24 | 1954:23 | 1886:9 |
| 1873:11,12,13 | screen 1827:17 | 1889:1 1940:1 | 1956:10 | 2000:11 |
| 1882:21 | 1880:15 | 1944:6 | 1957:4,17 | sends 1871:14 |
| 1885:9 1904:7 | 1963:21 | 1968:15 | 1975:14 | 1897:7 |
| 1904:15 | 1977:19 | 1969:15,19 | 1977:19 | Senior 1840:19 |
| 1908:10,11 | 1989:12 | 2032:19 | 1985:16 | 1879:12,13 |
| 1922:12 | 1990:20 | second 1806:2 | 1987:1 1993:3 | 1923:2,3 |
| 1926:12 | 2000:21 | 1807:6 | 1995:9 | 2001:23,24 |
| 1943:4 | 2007:6 | 1825:19 | 1997:13 | sense 1824:2 |
| 1945:12 | 2018:20 | 1827:8 | 2000:3 | 1854:23 |
| 1954:9 | 2019:1 | 1847:14 | 2003:13 | 1940:6 |
| 1957:13 | 2026:22 | 1865:20 | 2005:15 | sensitive |
| 1958:11,15 | screens 1833:19 | 1866:3 1884:2 | 2018:20 | 1847:25 |
| 1960:5,7,11,13 | 1884:6,16 | 1884:17 | 2019:12 | 1907:20 |
| 1961:14,22 | 1921:2 1975:5 | 1885:11 | 2022:9 | 1918:7 |
| 1963:14,18 | 1977:21 | 1887:6 1972:5 | 2027:15 | sent 1829:1 |
| 1964:4,7,12 | 1978:4,8,15 | 1987:18 | 2032:15 | 1837:15,16 |
| 1971:7 | 1989:12 | 2029:19 | seeing 1999:19 | 1854:10 |
| 1972:10,18 | 1990:20 | second-third | seeking 1814:10 | 1859:22 |
| 1978:19 | 1994:25 | 1960:1 | 1942:12 | 1862:17 |
| 2000:12 | 1997:3,23 | seconds 1975:1 | 1943:11 | 1867:8 1869:6 |
| 2009:16 | 1998:4 | 1975:2 | seen 1806:9 | 1869:8,10,20 |
| says 1808:4 | 1999:14,23 | 2006:18 | 1868:13 | 1869:20,21 |
| 1818:10 | 2001:16 | 2007:15,18,20 | 1997:11 | 1880:15 |
| 1822:10 | 2008:17 | 2007:24 | 2011:25 | 1882:1 1885:6 |
| 1826:4 | scroll 1874:12 | 2008:3,16,22 | 2012:14 | 1898:13 |
| 1828:23 | 1884:14 | secure 2011:22 | segments | 1934:23 |
| 1830:14 | Scrolling | 2017:10 | 1970:16 | 1938:23 |
| 1877:23 | 1881:20 | 2025:7 | 2025:21,23 | 1949:19,20,21 |
| 1882:17 | 1885:5 | secured 2014:24 | seize 2014:10 | 1949:22 |
| 1884:22 | scrolls 1884:16 | security 1931:23 | seized 2028:17 | 1967:2 |
| 1918:11 | scrutiny 1823:7 | 2010:9 | 2028:19 | sentences |
| 1957:4 | 1824:21 | see 1821:8,9,17 | Sekulow 1999:4 | 1865:7 |
| 1958:12 | search 1933:2 | 1822:25 | select 2025:25 | 1915:24 |
| 1964:5 1972:4 | 1983:9,15,17 | 1823:18,20 | selectively | separates |
| 1972:8 | 1983:19,20,21 | 1829:20 | 1808:9 | 1991:15 |
| 1996:18 | 1984:4 2014:3 | 1831:13 | self-explanatory | September |
| 2024:6 | 2014:10 | 1838:22 | 1995:18 | 2006:16 |
| scenario | 2029:19 | 1852:4 1872:3 | self-serving | 2026:17 |
| 2014:21 | 2031:24 | 1874:14 | 1954:8 | serial 1988:20 |
| scene 2014:7 | 2032:10 | 1885:6 1888:9 | send 1828:15 | 1989:14 |
| schedule | searched | 1905:9 | 1863:15 | 1990:13,24 |
| 1868:23 | 2023:13 | 1924:21 | 1870:25 | series 1841:8 |
| scheduled | searches 2023:4 | 1932:12 | 1872:4 | 1867:14 |
| 1867:21 | 2023:10 | 1933:17 | 1885:11 | 1868:14 |
| 1868:1,6 | seated 1804:11 | 1934:20 | 1886:1,7,12 | 1874:3 |
| Schiller 1998:23 | 1806:17 | 1935:18 | 1897:11 | 1880:14 |
| SCIF 2012:2,4 | 1835:11,20,21 | 1936:15 | sending 1861:5 | serious 1960:6 |


| 1965:14 | 1979:1 | 2018:20 | 1847:5,9,19,22 | 2009:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1971:5 | settlements | show 1804:18 | 1848:1,8 | 2020:2,3 |
| served 1845:23 | 1915:9,10 | 1806:3 1807:8 | 1891:7 1900:4 | Similarly |
| 1896:12 | settler's 1953:4 | 1808:22 | 1907:9 | 1971:23 |
| service 1838:20 | 1954:10 | 1810:9 | 1927:19 | 1974:2 |
| 1846:14 | 1955:21 | 1812:25 | 1979:3 | simplest 1866:15 |
| services 1899:15 | 1959:11 | 1813:1 1820:6 | sidebar 1903:25 | simply 1983:24 |
| 1900:1 | setup 1825:12 | 1838:6,22 | 1918:6 | 1986:24 |
| session 1969:4 | seven 1827:23 | 1844:22 | sides 2017:6 | 1987:3 |
| set 1810:14 | 1828:5,11,17 | 1852:1 1857:4 | sidestepped | 2022:25 |
| 1813:9 | 1830:10 | 1857:5 | 1820:13 | single 1874:4 |
| 1825:11 | sex 1913:18,23 | 1860:14 | sign 1848:17 | 1884:9 |
| 1926:11 | 1919:22 | 1867:11 | 1849:7 1850:4 | sir 1835:12 |
| 1954:16 | 1921:24 | 1868:2 | 1850:8 | 1917:14 |
| 1983:7 | sexual 1863:12 | 1873:17 | 1863:15 | 1940:2 1944:3 |
| 2025:21 | 1864:5 1865:9 | 1875:3,19 | 1875:15 | 1968:16 |
| sets 2025:7 | 1865:14,18,19 | 1876:23 | 1915:21,25 | 1976:20 |
| setting 2010:17 | 1865:24 | 1880:20 | signal 1881:15 | 2011:24 |
| 2010:17 | 1877:5,23,24 | 1881:18 | 2004:17 | 2012:1 |
| 2013:5 | 1950:24 | 1882:5,5 | signals 2012:3 | sit 1853:10 |
| settle 1928:24 | share 1886:9 | showed 1881:10 | 2015:4,5 | 1906:19,25 |
| 1957:16 | Sheen 1914:23 | 1936:20 | 2016:8 | 1952:10 |
| 1964:8 | 1915:1,3,4,7 | 1970:16 | signature | 1957:10 |
| 1972:11 | 1916:3,20,22 | 1971:23 | 1840:1 1847:7 | 1976:21 |
| settlement | 1917:24 | showing | 1849:10,11 | site 2032:4 |
| 1839:22,24 | 1918:22 | 1836:16 | 1850:7 | sitting 1806:19 |
| 1842:10,21 | 1919:8 | 1842:14 | 1880:11 | 1813:5 |
| 1843:3,3 | Shera 1950:18 | 1858:12 | 1881:10 | 1926:16 |
| 1844:9 | 1950:19 | 1871:11 | 1966:11,13 | situation |
| 1845:22 | shielding | shown 1858:14 | 1967:9,12,16 | 1806:13 |
| 1848:7,9,11 | 1814:24 | 1884:6 1921:2 | signed 1848:16 | 1856:7 1873:3 |
| 1849:19 | shit 1875:8 | 1970:22,23 | 1848:22,24,25 | 1873:4 |
| 1851:9 1860:6 | 1960:8 1971:8 | 1975:5 | 1849:2,4,8 | 1926:19 |
| 1860:8 | shits 1828:24 | 1977:21 | 1850:10 | 1942:13 |
| 1861:10,11 | shopping 1830:3 | 1978:4,8,15 | 1880:25 | 1950:9 |
| 1866:11 | 1856:2 | 1989:11 | 1881:2 1882:8 | 2029:18 |
| 1873:5 | 1857:10 | 1990:19 | 1933:2,8 | situations |
| 1899:18,23 | Short 1835:6 | 1994:25 | 1966:16,21 | 1826:24 |
| 1916:16,19,24 | shorthand | 1997:3,23 | 1968:5 | 1909:22 |
| 1916:24 | 1959:11 | 1998:4 | 1978:25 | 2026:13 |
| 1918:21 | shortly 1818:23 | 1999:14,23 | significant | six 1820:7 |
| 1929:1,9,18 | 1858:25 | 2000:21 | 1823:13 | 1827:23 |
| 1948:3,7,21 | 1872:18 | 2001:16 | 1827:11 | 1828:5,11 |
| 1949:13 | 1882:13 | shows 1830:4 | signs 1839:22 | 1952:13 |
| 1951:14,16 | 1938:5,10 | Shrugs 1906:14 | 1983:20 | slash 1885:18 |
| 1952:7,12,14 | shot 1872:19,24 | sic 1921:11 | Silly 1848:18 | small 1858:1 |
| 1959:6,9 | 1873:13 | side 1835:2 | similar 1829:15 | 1872:6 |
| 1964:24 | 1920:14 | 1842:10 | 1834:17 | smart 1869:25 |
| 1975:24 | shots 1808:17 | 1846:18 | 1965:19 | 1984:12 |


| 1985:1 1986:1 | 2002:8 2003:7 | 1833:13 | 1929:23 | 1880:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1986:13 | 2015:23 | 1876:24 | 1939:17 | 1882:4,8 |
| SMZ 1804:2,19 | 2019:19 | 1984:15 | 1940:21 | 1885:11 |
| social 1822:4 | sorts 1822:4 | 1985:25 | 1955:12 | 1886:6,15,22 |
| 1942:19 | SOTU 1872:9 | 2027:25 | 1971:3 | 1887:2,3,8,19 |
| software | sound 1903:9 | spelling 1979:25 | 1977:18 | 1897:21 |
| 1981:16,17 | 2015:2 | spend 1827:9 | 2009:21 | statements |
| 1982:11 | sounded | 2025:10 | 2013:22 | 1805:15 |
| 1985:11,22 | 1900:22 | split 1934:1 | started 1824:16 | 1808:16 |
| 1986:2 | 1901:1 1904:6 | spoke 1807:20 | 1831:8 | 1811:24 |
| 2006:15 | 2009:19 | 1825:24 | 1898:18 | 1812:2,7,18 |
| somebody | 2011:21 | 1833:5 | 1901:24 | 1814:6,23 |
| 1931:20 | soundest | 1871:25 | 1903:1 | 1818:19 |
| 2017:6,7 | 2016:12,14 | spoken 1889:23 | 1929:24 | 1820:1 1824:4 |
| 2027:4 | sounds 1960:12 | stack 1940:25 | 1939:12 | 1824:6,14 |
| 2029:25 | source 1852:24 | 1941:24 | 2009:19 | 1826:10 |
| Somewhat | 1852:25 | staff 1901:8 | starting 1804:3 | 1827:5 1834:6 |
| 1897:16 | 1885:19 | 2022:23 | 1862:3,10 | 1834:17 |
| 1908:18 | 1886:18 | stage 1856:11 | 1871:15,19 | 1871:3 |
| sophisticated | 1887:4 | 2018:9 | 1878:15,18 | 1903:19 |
| 2019:3,5 | 1890:13 | stages 1868:18 | starts 1878:21 | 1947:23 |
| sorry 1813:16 | 1891:20 | 1870:14 | 1996:13 | 1978:20 |
| 1837:12 | 1995:20 | stake 1888:2 | state 1803:1,2 | states 1822:18 |
| 1856:20 | 2000:12 | 2011:1 | 1804:1 | 1827:16 |
| 1875:13 | 2006:20,21 | stamp 1838:22 | 1872:13 | 1865:7,10 |
| 1884:4 1889:4 | sources 1991:16 | stand 1809:20 | 1904:18 | 1901:13 |
| 1894:25 | space 1967:17 | 1810:7 | 1906:17 | 2011:4,5 |
| 1992:25 | 2020:16,18 | 1824:22 | 1907:1 | stating 1864:7 |
| 2001:6,8 | speak 1824:16 | 1826:3 1829:6 | 1910:11 | 1868:6 |
| 2007:9 | 1825:3,13 | 1835:8 1836:7 | 1925:23 | 1874:20 |
| 2026:16 | 1852:14 | 1872:14 | 1962:2 | station 1808:25 |
| sort 1837:24 | 1855:14 | 1888:20 | 1979:25 | status 1897:25 |
| 1849:22 | 1872:1 | 1969:12 | stated 1815:5 | statute 1906:20 |
| 1854:19,21 | 1949:16 | standard 1983:3 | 1845:2 1853:2 | 1907:2 |
| 1856:6 | 1961:11 | 1988:12 | statement | staying 1907:9 |
| 1860:12 | speaking 1805:7 | 1996:20 | 1807:10,17 | steadfastly |
| 1868:17,18 | 1805:7 1821:9 | 2003:15 | 1808:2,20,21 | 1872:1 |
| 1869:11 | 1953:25 | 2006:17 | 1809:2 1810:4 | steer 1943:2,24 |
| 1870:13 | 1957:5 | standards | 1810:8,11,13 | Steinglass |
| 1881:15 | 1958:14 | 1981:3 | 1825:6,20,21 | 1803:14 |
| 1896:1 | 1963:11 | stands 1846:4 | 1832:7,8 | 1804:4,5 |
| 1901:20 | speaks 1810:15 | 1988:11 | 1863:23,25 | 1819:10 |
| 1905:7 | specific 1906:24 | 1996:11 | 1864:21 | 1835:3,24 |
| 1913:23 | 1910:7 1942:3 | stars 1876:21 | 1865:21 | 1836:1,3 |
| 1931:17 | 1952:12 | start 1805:13 | 1872:25 | 1841:5 1843:6 |
| 1937:9 1942:2 | 1960:14 | 1806:5 | 1873:1 | 1844:7 |
| 1954:4 | 2019:11 | 1815:19 | 1874:25 | 1846:11 |
| 1988:12 | 2029:18 | 1838:15 | 1875:14,17,23 | 1847:2 1850:1 |
| 1995:23 | specifically | 1872:21 | 1877:1,20 | 1857:5,16 |


| 1858:14 | 1804:12 | 1874:25 | 1938:3,20 | 1932:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1860:17 | steps 1913:17,17 | 1876:12,23 | 1963:15 | 2014:13 |
| 1861:20 | 1915:7 | 1878:4,8 | 1964:8 | subsequent |
| 1862:1 1870:3 | 2013:21 | 1880:3,7,19 | 1972:11 | 1904:19 |
| 1870:7 | Steve 2012:12 | 1881:22 | straight 1813:9 | 1905:14 |
| 1871:16 | Stevens 1930:8 | 1882:8,16,16 | 1917:3 | 1933:19 |
| 1873:25 | 1930:21 | 1882:18 | straightforward | subsequently |
| 1874:12 | stick 1807:23 | 1883:1,5,6,20 | 1954:7 | 1895:17 |
| 1875:21 | stills 1920:6 | 1883:22 | strange 1909:12 | substance |
| 1884:7,14 | sting 1926:5,8 | 1886:24 | strangely 1856:6 | 1836:8 |
| 1887:25 | stink 1829:5 | 1887:14 | strangely-dec... | 1895:16 |
| 1888:5 1889:4 | stipulate 1889:2 | 1895:17,20 | 1856:8 | 1956:17 |
| 1903:20 | 1944:5 | 1896:17 | Street 1803:8 | 1957:1 |
| 1904:2 1905:9 | stood 1810:16 | 1902:9 1907:8 | 1851:23 | 1972:22 |
| 1906:22 | 1824:15 | 1944:19,24 | 1852:7 | substantially |
| 1908:20 | stop 1827:3 | 1946:10 | 1858:25 | 1807:1 |
| 1912:15 | 1884:17 | 1948:2 | 1859:4,14,24 | succession |
| 1916:1 1917:4 | 1939:15 | 1949:12 | 1862:17,25 | 1880:15 |
| 1926:3 | 1955:15 | 1953:4,14 | stress 1948:13 | sue 1853:3 |
| 1927:17,23 | 1962:9 1972:4 | 1956:2,4 | strict 1864:25,25 | 1883:1 |
| 1928:6 | 2008:15 | 1957:11 | strike 1855:6 | sued 1891:15 |
| 1941:23 | 2030:22 | 1960:6 1963:2 | 1950:23 | sufficient |
| 1944:7 1956:6 | storage 1992:2 | 1963:15 | strong 1863:6,8 | 1957:25 |
| 1959:1 1968:9 | store 1856:5,8 | 1964:6,16 | 1869:3 | suggest 1905:12 |
| 1968:11 | 1857:10,21,22 | 1965:4 1970:7 | 1890:16 | suggesting |
| 1969:5,6,20,21 | 1857:23,24,24 | 1971:6,16 | structure | 1892:3 |
| 1969:24 | 1887:22 | 1972:9,15,18 | 2020:13 | suggestion |
| 1970:21 | stores 1932:1,3 | 1972:25 | structured | 1816:8 |
| 1973:23 | stories 1864:18 | 1975:24 | 1954:5 | suing 1970:10 |
| 1974:14,16,24 | 1896:5 | 1978:20 | stuff 1908:8 | suite 1876:5,24 |
| 1975:25 | 1924:14 | 1979:1 | 2020:20 | sum 1929:11 |
| 1976:2,24 | stormy 1817:17 | Stormy's | subject 1823:11 | 1972:22 |
| 1977:14 | 1817:20,24,24 | 1868:19 | 1823:21 | summarizing |
| 1978:23 | 1818:2,2,5 | 1883:3 | 1831:18 | 1904:14 |
| 1979:8,15 | 1842:9,23 | story 1852:8 | 1838:10 | summer 1924:14 |
| 2033:5 | 1844:4 1848:5 | 1856:6 1863:2 | 1860:8 | 1950:1,3 |
| step 1888:9 | 1848:23 | 1868:19 | 1978:21 | sums 1915:4 |
| 1901:19 | 1850:4,25 | 1869:24 | 2013:10 | supervising |
| 1940:3 | 1855:18 | 1870:12 | submit 1812:22 | 1982:1,9 |
| 1968:17 | 1859:1,6 | 1883:20,22,23 | 1813:24 | supervision |
| 1979:16 | 1861:8,10,11 | 1893:1 1894:7 | submitted | 1982:10 |
| 2013:23 | 1863:1,15,23 | 1895:23 | 1804:24 | supplying |
| 2032:20 | 1864:19 | 1896:1,13 | 1819:14 | 2031:16 |
| Stephanie | 1865:24 | 1898:18 | submitting | suppose 1906:8 |
| 1848:22 | 1866:22 | 1899:4 | 1932:9 | 1907:11,16 |
| 1849:24 | 1868:1 | 1925:10 | subparagraphs | supposed 1942:8 |
| 1850:9 | 1869:13 | 1930:11,15 | 1933:12 | SUPREME |
| 1885:17,18 | 1871:7,25 | 1935:17,24 | subpoena | 1803:1,10 |
| Stephen 1803:21 | 1873:3,13,16 | 1936:7 1937:9 | 1838:24 | sure 1805:3 |


| 1821:5 1823:3 | sworn 1835:16 | 2007:4 | 1811:15 | 1877:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1827:20 | 1856:1 | 2018:24 | 1817:8 | 1878:2 |
| 1842:8 | 1888:19 | taken 1835:6 | 1820:17,19 | 1926:10 |
| 1853:12 | 1969:11 | 1888:14 | 1821:24 | technology |
| 1872:22 | 1979:22 | 1895:23 | 1822:7 1823:1 | 1980:17 |
| 1879:6 1891:1 | system 1987:6 | 1896:15 | 1824:10 | 1982:11 |
| 1903:23 | 2021:12,13 | 1946:13,22 | 1830:5,11 | Telegram |
| 1906:16 | 2022:22 | 1947:11 | 1831:4,5,24 | 2004:17 |
| 1910:25 | 2024:15 | 1969:1 | 1832:1,2 | telephone |
| 1914:4 |  | 1976:13 | 1833:20 | 2032:6 |
| 1944:23 | T | 2001:12 | 1836:11 | television |
| 1950:21 | T 1835:15 | takes 1815:9,10 | 1891:4 1894:6 | 1830:3 1868:2 |
| 1957:10 | 1968:23 | talk 1805:6 | 1912:8 | 1882:4 |
| 1984:5 | table 1804:12 | 1806:2 | 1927:13 | tell 1806:13 |
| 1993:22 | 2030:15 | 1808:14,20 | 1930:20 | 1808:18 |
| 2010:6,25 | tabloids 1877:12 | 1810:2 1812:4 | 1931:13 | 1830:15 |
| 2012:3 | tactic 1864:22 | 1816:1,2 | 1941:12 | 1843:10 |
| 2024:14 | take 1814:11,25 | 1819:25 | 1942:7,8 | 1854:1,2 |
| 2029:24 | 1829:6 1835:4 | 1825:16,17 | 1943:17 | 1855:21 |
| surprise 1822:17 | 1857:16 | 1827:3 | 1950:7 1954:3 | 1859:10 |
| 1854:21 | 1863:17 | 1834:11 | 1956:2,4 | 1867:23 |
| 1891:19,25 | 1888:7 | 1873:12,14 | 1957:11 | 1871:21 |
| surprised | 1898:24 | 1882:17 | 1959:6 1963:2 | 1874:5 1875:5 |
| 1964:5 1972:4 | 1901:19 | 1894:1 | 1971:20 | 1882:3 1883:8 |
| 1972:8 | 1904:25 | 1900:25 | 1972:25 | 1884:10 |
| surprises | 1921:21 | 1901:19 | 1995:10 | 1893:1 1894:7 |
| 1822:24 | 1924:4,9,11,21 | 1902:20 | 2015:3,4 | 1894:21 |
| 1891:22 | 1927:7 1932:4 | 1944:14 | talks 1808:4 | 1935:20 |
| surprising | 1933:11 | 1949:9 1953:3 | 1811:25 | 1951:22 |
| 1822:20 | 1935:5,11 | 1994:11 | 1953:23 | 1975:16 |
| surreptitiously | 1937:11 | 1996:3 | Tampa 1927:12 | 1980:24 |
| 1973:16,17 | 1938:12 | 2013:20 | 1927:15,21 | 1981:4,13 |
| Susan 1803:15 | 1939:2 | 2023:18,23 | tape 1913:18,23 | 1984:14 |
| 1803:20,23 | 1941:19 | 2030:12 | 1914:9,18 | 1986:23 |
| 1804:5,12 | 1943:8,9 | 2031:6 | 1919:22 | 1989:17 |
| 1840:18 | 1950:22 | talked 1809:24 | 1922:8 1975:6 | 1990:21 |
| suspected | 1964:18 | 1810:11,17 | 1975:9 | 1995:4,7,15 |
| 1822:24 | 1965:16 | 1817:13,13 | tapes 1921:24 | 2001:11 |
| suspension | 1967:6 | 1892:6 1900:4 | 1922:5,17,22 | 2002:6,6 |
| 1914:21 | 1968:12 | 1900:19 | 1922:22,25 | 2003:7,12,13 |
| sustained | 1972:1 | 1929:20 | 1924:14,25 | 2021:1 |
| 1903:21 | 1980:20 | 1935:2 | 1925:11,15 | telling 1817:9 |
| 1905:17,20 | 1982:5 | 1959:23 | targeting 1926:5 | 1824:20 |
| 1906:23 | 1983:10 | 1961:8 1979:6 | targets 2012:15 | 1837:23 |
| 1916:2 1917:5 | 1984:17 | 1991:23 | team 2023:5 | 1838:3 |
| 1926:4 | 1985:12 | 2022:19 | 2026:11,12 | 1930:10,13 |
| 1927:18 | 1989:13 | talking 1807:2 | technically | 1972:24 |
| 1928:7 | 1990:21 | 1809:19 | 1865:1,2,4,12 | tells 1963:15 |
| 1978:24 | 1991:2,14 | 1810:5 | 1866:6 | ten 1804:17 |


| 1813:13 | 1948:13 | 1879:8 1880:8 | 1980:7 | 1985:14,22,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1820:22,23 | 1973:5 | 1882:1 1884:3 | 1989:10 | 2002:14 |
| 1823:1,22 | 1976:17 | 1884:18,22,25 | 1991:1 | 2010:8 2011:3 |
| 1831:5,6 | 1979:23 | 1885:6 1935:7 | 2001:19 | 2022:2 |
| 1833:23,23 | 2025:17 | 1936:20 | 2009:5,8,11 | 2026:10 |
| 1888:9 | testifies 1821:5 | 1937:20 | 2024:9 | think 1805:4,10 |
| 1980:15,23 | 1888:20 | 1952:17,22 | 2032:13 | 1806:11 |
| 1981:15 | testify 1823:4 | 1972:23 | 2033:5,8 | 1807:12,14 |
| 1998:17 | testifying 1808:1 | 1978:16 | Thanks 1862:23 | 1809:10 |
| tentatively | 1808:4,12 | 1985:17 | 1870:24 | 1813:20 |
| 1867:21,25 | 1809:16,17,25 | 1986:2 | 1958:1 | 1815:14 |
| 1868:1 | 1820:3,4 | 1994:17 | 1970:24 | 1817:3 1822:7 |
| tenure 1960:3 | 1992:8 | 1996:1 2032:6 | 2000:18 | 1822:8 |
| Tequila 1913:15 | testimony | texted 1938:5 | TheDirty.com | 1826:24 |
| 1914:9,17 | 1807:19 | texting 1873:21 | 1859:23 | 1835:7 1854:6 |
| term 1803:1 | 1809:21 | 1874:7 1875:5 | theme 1810:6 | 1855:3 1856:2 |
| 1866:21 | 1819:4 | texts 1841:8,13 | Theresa 1803:25 | 1857:22 |
| 2029:8 | 1820:10,18,25 | 1841:15 | 1923:2 | 1860:9 |
| terms 1809:10 | 1822:8 | 1858:9 1861:5 | TheStormyDa... | 1862:16,19 |
| 1811:2 | 1825:23 | 1862:11,15 | 1877:17,18 | 1864:22 |
| 1899:21 | 1826:8 | 1868:14 | Thien 1914:17 | 1865:3,4,13,16 |
| 1900:25 | 1831:25 | 1871:14 | thing 1806:9 | 1866:15,21 |
| 1908:23 | 1836:9 | 1874:4,14 | 1809:14 | 1868:16 |
| 1933:7 | 1899:21 | 1880:14 | 1810:1 | 1869:5,25 |
| 1938:16 | 1902:16 | 1995:1 | 1844:12 | 1870:3,17 |
| 1948:5,6 | 1907:5 | thank 1813:18 | 1870:1 | 1872:5 1873:3 |
| 1949:1 1952:1 | 1908:12 | 1814:13,14,16 | 1873:12 | 1876:14,25 |
| 1966:3 | 1911:12 | 1819:10 | 1920:18 | 1877:21 |
| 1991:23 | 1912:7,25 | 1834:25 | 1993:17 | 1878:3 |
| 2020:19 | 1916:15 | 1836:4 1837:3 | 2010:22 | 1885:17 |
| terribly 1826:23 | 1934:4 1936:7 | 1837:14 | 2022:12 | 1886:3 |
| 1827:2 | 1936:8 1946:6 | 1839:11 | things 1808:5 | 1890:22 |
| Terry 1910:12 | 1946:17 | 1857:16 | 1809:7,12 | 1891:6,13 |
| testified 1820:15 | 1952:11 | 1860:17 | 1812:1 | 1892:7 1893:3 |
| 1826:11 | 1971:12 | 1862:1,4,22 | 1823:16 | 1893:23 |
| 1835:17 | 2028:16 | 1863:4 1872:7 | 1825:16 | 1894:17,21,25 |
| 1840:6 | 2031:22,25 | 1875:13 | 1831:11 | 1895:1,7 |
| 1862:17 | text 1842:2 | 1887:11 | 1834:3 1858:3 | 1896:4 1897:6 |
| 1880:18 | 1853:25 | 1888:6 1889:7 | 1870:14 | 1897:12 |
| 1882:9 1890:9 | 1854:10,13 | 1918:15 | 1883:14 | 1899:18 |
| 1892:14,25 | 1855:4,9 | 1927:20 | 1891:7 1892:6 | 1900:9,22 |
| 1908:19 | 1862:7 | 1940:2,9,24 | 1938:22 | 1903:12 |
| 1930:22 | 1867:14 | 1954:20 | 1942:2 1945:3 | 1904:4 1906:3 |
| 1931:1 | 1868:12,22 | 1957:19 | 1956:22 | 1906:4 |
| 1936:16 | 1869:17,20 | 1968:16 | 1957:14 | 1908:17 |
| 1941:9 | 1870:4,11,25 | 1969:7,21,22 | 1960:10,24 | 1913:25 |
| 1943:12 | 1872:4,14 | 1974:20 | 1971:9,20 | 1918:8 1921:5 |
| 1944:16 | 1873:23 | 1976:3 | 1972:16,19 | 1921:7 |
| 1947:23 | 1874:19 | 1979:15 | 1973:2 | 1929:23 |

Page 2077

| 1930:22 | threatened | 1851:12 | 1995:19 | 1996:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1931:23,25 | 1853:3 | 1852:13 | 1996:3,4,11,12 | timing 1813:23 |
| 1932:8 | 1914:17 | 1853:14 | 1996:12,13,18 | 1852:23 |
| 1935:25 | 1929:17 | 1854:1,1,5,7,7 | 1996:19,19,20 | 1853:1,7 |
| 1936:20 | 1960:9 1971:8 | 1854:10 | 1996:22,24 | title 1987:1 |
| 1937:20 | 1971:17 | 1855:25 | 2000:10 | 2005:5,6 |
| 1941:17,17 | threatening | 1857:3,10 | 2002:10,10,11 | 2006:9,11 |
| 1942:3,12 | 1826:4,10 | 1858:5 1860:4 | 2003:9,12,13 | TMZ 1911:20 |
| 1943:1,5,24 | threats 1883:11 | 1861:8 | 2003:15,15 | 1911:25 |
| 1945:15 | 1911:2,4,8,10 | 1865:23 | 2005:20 | 1912:3,10,20 |
| 1946:5,15,19 | three 1837:6 | 1873:2 | 2006:10,18 | 1913:9,13 |
| 1951:1 | 1893:3 1902:5 | 1875:11 | 2008:25 | today 1804:17 |
| 1953:22 | 1902:23 | 1878:18 | 2015:16 | 1809:17 |
| 1954:2,11,17 | 1989:19 | 1882:1 | 2017:14 | 1816:24 |
| 1955:1,22 | 1997:21 | 1884:19 | 2018:6 2021:5 | 1817:1,8 |
| 1958:24 | 1998:9 | 1885:22 | 2024:22,25 | 1818:20 |
| 1959:5 1962:7 | 2022:19 | 1887:5,7,8,19 | 2025:1,10 | 1820:4 |
| 1963:5 | throw 2016:7 | 1889:20 | 2027:16,18,23 | 1834:14 |
| 1966:16 | thumb 1819:8 | 1893:19 | 2028:15 | 1839:5 |
| 1998:17 | 1819:11 | 1895:7,13,20 | 2030:19 | 1885:19 |
| 2009:22 | 1973:7 | 1898:15 | timeframe | 1890:9 1892:7 |
| 2012:14 | 1982:17 | 1903:4 1909:2 | 1908:16 | 1900:4,19 |
| 2013:22 | 1992:4,6,10,12 | 1909:15 | 1959:19 | 1906:19,25 |
| 2016:2 | 1992:16,20 | 1910:17 | 1961:3 | 1908:12 |
| thinks 1809:23 | 1993:6 | 1911:20 | 1963:10 | 1952:10 |
| third 1808:20,21 | Thursday | 1912:21 | times 1805:24 | 1976:18 |
| 1843:23,24 | 1837:12 | 1913:23 | 1814:8 | 1982:21 |
| 1894:6 | ticked 1882:16 | 1914:20 | 1830:16 | 1992:8 |
| third-parties | TikTok 1829:21 | 1915:21 | 1855:17 | 2025:17 |
| 1909:23 | 1831:8,12,14 | 1922:1 1930:1 | 1856:17 | Todd 1803:19 |
| third-party | TikToks 1812:3 | 1930:19 | 1877:4 1883:7 | 1804:10 |
| 1919:7 | Tila 1913:15 | 1934:23 | 1883:11 | told 1841:16,17 |
| thought 1807:18 | 1914:9 | 1937:18 | 1891:6 | 1844:3 1856:9 |
| 1825:22 | time 1807:19 | 1939:15 | 1900:24 | 1880:25 |
| 1869:12,13 | 1808:21 | 1944:20 | 1901:7 | 1886:17 |
| 1901:2 1907:4 | 1809:20 | 1946:16,24 | 1902:17,18 | 1887:7,9 |
| 1908:7 | 1811:17,17,19 | 1948:1 | 1944:22 | 1895:23 |
| 1957:15 | 1814:14 | 1949:25 | 1945:2 | 1929:14 |
| thousand | 1815:19 | 1955:11 | 1954:11 | 1939:7 |
| 1997:18 | 1822:3 | 1956:20,21,23 | 1955:22 | 1954:18 |
| thousands | 1825:24 | 1959:21,24 | 1964:25 | tomorrow |
| 1983:1 | 1826:22 | 1963:10 | 1975:17 | 1882:4,18 |
| 1997:17,18 | 1834:20 | 1964:1 1970:7 | 1996:15 | 2031:1,2 |
| thread 1882:24 | 1836:24 | 1970:11 | 2002:15 | 2032:15,24 |
| threat 1820:21 | 1838:17 | 1972:20 | timestamp | tonight 1863:3,3 |
| 1820:21 | 1839:6,17 | 1976:13 | 2005:13,18,20 | 1867:21 |
| 1906:11 | 1840:10 | 1979:19 | 2006:16 | 1872:3 |
| threaten 1883:5 | 1843:17 | 1982:19 | timestamps | tools 1984:25 |
| 1907:21 | 1850:22 | 1994:3 | 1861:17 | 1985:4 |


| top 1828:9,12,17 | 2032:3 | 1892:13 | 1863:12 | 1886:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1830:22,24 | transfer 1837:11 | 1893:7,9 | 1864:5,9,11,13 | try 1811:20,22 |
| 1862:10 | 1849:18,23 | 1894:8,24 | 1864:15 | 1897:19,23 |
| 1878:18 | 1965:12,17 | 1895:9,12,25 | 1865:9,17,25 | trying 1830:6 |
| 1935:18 | transferred | 1896:6 | 1866:4,23 | 1868:18 |
| 1937:14 | 1849:25 | 1898:11 | 1867:2 1877:6 | 1873:1 |
| 1975:13 | transit 2015:24 | 1899:25 | 1878:5 | 1882:23 |
| 2010:18,20 | travelled | 1901:14,18 | 1886:18 | 1883:2,3 |
| 2012:24 | 1936:24 | 1903:6 | 1887:4 | 1905:11 |
| 2015:6 2029:9 | treatment | 1906:18 | 1889:14,18,23 | 1930:11,15 |
| topic 1855:18 | 1911:18 | 1909:7,24 | 1890:1,7,10,12 | 1947:11 |
| tortious 1915:8 | 1913:10 | 1910:2,5,13 | 1930:3 | 1965:25 |
| total 1804:24 | trial 1803:7 | 1911:21 | 1935:17 | 1971:11 |
| totem 1937:14 | 1806:8,8 | 1925:22 | 1941:8 | 2011:7 |
| touch 1947:12 | 1811:9,10,16 | 1928:9 1932:2 | 1943:18 | 2017:24 |
| 2011:7 | 1817:13,14 | 1948:12,25 | 1958:9 | 2023:7 |
| tough 1817:16 | 1818:16,16,17 | 1951:15,21,23 | 1961:20 | Tuesday |
| track 1830:16 | 1821:21 | 1951:25 | 1962:12 | 1808:25 |
| 2005:13 | 1822:15,16,18 | 1959:13,17 | 1975:19,21,22 | 1814:10,18,21 |
| tracked 2016:21 | 1827:15 | 1962:15 | 1979:4 | 1815:13 |
| trail 1815:12 | 1829:12 | 1967:5 1977:3 | 1987:11 | 1816:23 |
| trainees 1981:12 | 1831:25 | 1977:5 | 1998:10,13,16 | 1819:19 |
| trainers 1981:12 | 1832:14,15,18 | 2017:16 | 1998:25 | 1822:14 |
| training 1981:8 | 1832:20 | Trump 1803:5 | 2009:18 | 1836:7,11 |
| 1981:9 2030:6 | 1867:22 | 1804:2,11,15 | Trump's 1816:4 | 1889:20 |
| transaction | 1868:21 | 1813:10 | 1817:12 | 1892:7 1893:3 |
| 1885:18,22 | 1888:3,25 | 1815:7,19,21 | 1829:22 | 1895:1 |
| 1887:5,7,8,20 | 1902:17 | 1817:15,18 | 1830:11 | 1908:16 |
| 1914:20 | 1969:16 | 1818:16 | 1832:19 | 1932:8 |
| transcript | 2013:5 | 1820:2,13,22 | 1901:4,8 | 1936:16 |
| 1813:7 1923:4 | 2031:17 | 1821:1,6,9,17 | 1941:2 | 1979:11 |
| 1957:17,25 | 2032:3 | 1822:6,25 | trust 1837:22 | Turley 1941:5 |
| 1958:2 | tried 1811:22 | 1823:9 1824:1 | 1838:1 1839:5 | turn 1822:14 |
| 1960:20 | 1832:21 | 1824:5 | 1864:15 | 1828:5,22 |
| 1962:4,7 | 1897:17 | 1825:21,25 | 1936:5 | 1844:7 |
| 1963:20 | 1928:24 | 1826:14,17 | 2024:15 | 1957:14,15 |
| 1970:16 | 1957:16 | 1827:12,22 | trusted 1898:10 | turned 2022:25 |
| 1971:25 | trouble 1809:7 | 1828:1,4,21 | truth 1808:18 | turning 1842:2 |
| 1974:6,9 | true 1826:6 | 1829:7,12,19 | 1830:15 | 1846:17 |
| 1977:10,11,11 | 1830:3 1831:7 | 1830:4 1831:2 | 1838:3 1941:8 | 1847:11 |
| 1977:12 | 1834:16 | 1831:14,16,22 | 1942:19 | 1848:14 |
| 1978:2 | 1848:13 | 1834:7,11,18 | 1963:5,6 | 1849:13 |
| 2001:25 | 1854:8 | 1842:25 | truthful 1820:14 | 1870:21 |
| 2007:14,15,20 | 1864:18 | 1846:9,15 | 1885:16 | 1884:4 |
| 2007:23 | 1865:1,2,5 | 1848:6 1853:6 | 1886:16 | TV 1808:25 |
| 2008:2,17,19 | 1866:6 | 1854:22 | 1917:12,14 | 1890:7 |
| 2026:21 | 1877:21,23 | 1855:8,13 | truthfulness | tweets 1818:25 |
| transcripts | 1878:2 | 1856:1 1859:2 | 1864:21 | twice 1957:16 |
| 1819:3 1977:6 | 1889:22 | 1859:6 | 1877:19 | 1996:16 |


| Twitter 1881:8 | 2025:15 | 1865:21,22,23 | 1901:3 | uses 1824:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| two 1808:1 | 2029:13 | 1866:20,25 | unenforceable | 1983:6 |
| 1809:19 | typical 1916:13 | 1870:10 | 1845:9,10 | usually 1984:22 |
| 1810:19 | typically 1983:8 | 1871:4 | unfair 1806:12 | UTC 1854:1,5,7 |
| 1815:22 |  | 1874:22 | 1833:21 | 1854:10 |
| 1816:19 | U | 1880:2,6,22 | unfettered | 1878:22,24 |
| 1824:23 | U 1979:22,22 | 1882:6 | 1815:7 | 1882:2,10,11 |
| 1825:2 1826:3 | uh 1886:3 | 1883:16,18 | Union 1872:13 | 1884:19 |
| 1826:9 1827:5 | 1971:11,11 | 1885:2 | unique 2024:5 | 1996:8,10,16 |
| 1827:23 | Uh-huh 2018:16 | 1887:10 | unison 1860:12 | 1996:16,18,22 |
| 1829:25 | 2019:17 | 1898:12 | Unit 1980:17 | 1996:23 |
| 1831:4 | 2030:5 | 1905:9 | 1983:4 | 2003:13 |
| 1841:12 | ultimate 1843:3 | 1909:20 | United 1822:18 |  |
| 1855:18 | 1886:18 | 1919:9 | 1827:16 | V |
| 1865:6,7 | 1887:4 | 1925:25 | 1901:13 | V 1835:15 |
| 1886:21 | ultimately | 1942:9 | 2011:4,4 | Vaguely |
| 1907:24 | 1886:12 | 1947:15 | Universal | 1937:23 |
| 1926:25 | 1928:8 | 1951:2,18 | 1996:11 | 1961:23 |
| 1931:24 | 1951:13 | 1975:17,20 | unredacted | valid 1821:14 |
| 1933:22 | 2013:4 2014:3 | 1976:15 | 1993:6 | 1915:9 |
| 1936:15 | 2018:25 | 1987:19 | unsigned 1967:4 | 1948:22 |
| 1954:18 | 2022:15 | 2023:7 | 1968:2 | 1966:3 |
| 1959:10 | um 1880:24 | understanding | unusual 1845:6 | validation |
| 1981:15,18 | 1883:12,13 | 1837:17 | 1997:8,9 | 1886:4 |
| 1987:13,17,20 | 1886:4 | 1841:17 | upheld 1909:10 | valuable |
| 1991:6 | 1887:12,25 | 1855:3,5 | UPS 1932:1,2 | 1947:18 |
| 1996:15 | 1986:2 | 1866:1 | upset 1852:20 | value 1866:16 |
| 1998:1 | Ummm 1855:22 | 1868:24 | 1852:22,23 | 1893:20 |
| 2000:11 | unallocated | 1869:15 | 1853:1,2,5 | 2024:10,17 |
| 2006:12,18 | 2020:16,18 | 1872:10 | 1882:7 | vault 2011:25 |
| 2014:18 | Unbelievable | 1883:15,21 | 1901:17 | 2014:22 |
| 2017:6 | 1842:6 | 1893:8 | use 1850:8 | 2015:7,18 |
| 2025:15,18 | undercover | 1894:11 | 1858:9 1867:1 | 2018:9 |
| 2028:7,10 | 1922:10 | 1931:16 | 1867:3,4 | Vegas 1960:9 |
| type 1852:25 | underlying | 1932:2 1945:1 | 1896:14 | 1971:9,17 |
| 1920:18 | 1845:18 | 1948:5 | 1904:23 | ventures |
| 1964:24 | 1848:9 | 1972:20 | 1953:13 | 1829:13 |
| 1980:21 | 1849:22 | 1973:2 | 1957:4 1958:6 | verifies 2024:25 |
| 1981:10,19,24 | 1851:24 | 1976:12,19 | 1984:25 | version 1843:4 |
| 1982:12 | 1860:7 | 1978:19 | 1985:11 | 1849:10 |
| 2004:11 | undermine | understood | 1988:6 2004:5 | 1933:2 |
| typed 1876:2 | 1887:3 | 1863:8 | 2010:15 | vet 1937:9 |
| types 1832:13 | understand | 1867:23,25 | 2020:18 | vetted 2004:10 |
| 1900:18 | 1811:23 | 1868:5 | 2025:25 | viability |
| 1908:23 | 1821:12 | 1873:11 | 2031:23 | 1829:19 |
| 1919:11 | 1834:24 | 1880:18 | user 1986:15,16 | vice-versa |
| 1980:19 | 1847:24 | 1882:7 | 2019:9 2021:1 | 1897:11 |
| 1984:25 | 1853:5,8 | 1887:18 | 2029:22 | victories 1947:4 |
| 1986:2 2022:2 | 1863:7 | 1892:10 | users 2004:5 | video 1805:5,9 |


| 1819:3 | 1832:14,14 | 1996:3 2000:2 | 2027:17,25 | 1942:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| videos 1985:17 |  | 2015:2 | watch 1822:9 | 1960:17 |
| view 1827:10 | W | 2023:19 | 1881:17 | 1967:11 |
| 1882:4,20 | walk 1825:4,5 | 2025:10 | 2001:10 | 1984:18 |
| 1905:12 | 1871:13 | 2026:1 2028:6 | watching | 1991:17 |
| 2031:21,24 | 1876:20 | 2030:24 | 1831:11 | 1992:17 |
| 2032:1 | 2000:2,6 | 2031:4 | 1880:3,19 | we're 1882:23 |
| viewed 1897:24 | 2002:8 2003:8 | wanted 1843:12 | 1881:18 | 1883:2 1905:2 |
| violate 1815:16 | 2006:8,8 | 1852:24 | waves 2014:25 | 1905:4,14 |
| 1832:23 | Wall 1851:23 | 1859:1 1863:8 | 2015:3 | 1917:1 |
| 1834:13 | 1852:7 | 1873:14,14 | way $1807: 11$ | 1941:19 |
| 1910:4 | 1858:24 | 1875:1 | 1817:19 | 1943:11 |
| violated 1805:24 | 1859:4,14,24 | 1883:21 | 1825:12 | 1954:21 |
| 1814:1 1824:1 | 1862:17,25 | 1886:4 1893:1 | 1831:5,10 | 1955:16 |
| violates 1943:19 | want 1805:13 | 1895:23 | 1833:17 | 1957:20 |
| violating 1814:7 | 1816:13 | 1897:21 | 1834:12 | 1960:8,8 |
| 1828:24 | 1817:19 | 1940:20 | 1845:8 | 1962:2 1971:7 |
| 1834:7 | 1823:8 | 1947:11 | 1851:19 | 1971:7 |
| 1853:15 | 1825:19 | 1948:18 | 1855:5,7 | 1975:14 |
| 1941:20 | 1827:17,18 | 1959:9 1964:6 | 1862:6 1869:3 | 1985:21 |
| violation 1805:2 | 1832:24 | 1972:9 | 1869:3 | 1996:13,15 |
| 1805:11 | 1838:6 1841:6 | wants 1825:14 | 1873:20 | 1998:18 |
| 1806:1,2 | 1843:6 1844:7 | 1883:23 | 1881:12 | 2015:3 |
| 1807:6 | 1846:11,14 | 1943:18 | 1898:12 | we've 1841:12 |
| 1812:25 | 1851:19 | warehouse | 1904:20 | 1941:23 |
| 1813:12 | 1852:1 | 1857:24 | 1954:17 | weaker 1806:24 |
| 1817:5 | 1853:20 | 1901:15 | 1957:14 | weather 1817:17 |
| 1819:25 | 1860:14 | warning | 1962:23 | 1817:20,24 |
| 1820:16 | 1866:2 1867:8 | 1820:14 | 1967:1 1968:4 | web 1895:13 |
| 1821:3 | 1867:11,16 | 1826:5 | 1971:13,16 | website 1920:2 |
| 1829:17 | 1869:17 | warrant 1983:9 | 1982:12 | 1942:20 |
| violations | 1875:3 | 1983:17,19,20 | 1985:20 | wedge 1960:6 |
| 1804:22 | 1878:13 | 1983:22 | 1996:12 | 1971:5,5 |
| 1805:1 | 1879:4 | 1984:5 | 1997:10 | week 1891:6 |
| 1806:15 | 1884:13 | 2014:10 | 2016:12,14 | weekend |
| 1814:5,11 | 1892:11 | Washington | 2019:3,6,20 | 1817:11,12 |
| visit 2031:21 | 1894:1 | 1856:14,16 | 2020:3,4,7 | 1818:19 |
| voice 1955:18 | 1904:11 | wasn't 1811:1 | 2021:7,8 | 1855:24 |
| 1961:1 1975:7 | 1907:13 | 1811:25 | 2024:2,19,22 | 1872:20,24 |
| 1975:10 | 1918:18 | 1819:13 | ways 1811:2 | weeks 1812:1,8 |
| 1977:2,4 | 1921:22 | 1820:14,15 | 1936:13 | 1877:4 |
| 2005:12 | 1922:10 | 1824:17 | 2014:5 | 1963:16 |
| 2006:12 | 1929:20 | 1831:24 | 2018:12,13 | weigh 1816:18 |
| volition 1874:21 | 1940:6 1942:6 | 1833:16 | 2019:14 | weighed |
| volume 1954:18 | 1949:9 | 1866:10,10 | 2021:10 | 1942:22 |
| voluminous | 1957:23 | 1881:18 | 2029:3 | weighing |
| 1834:18 | 1963:6 | 1894:3 1895:4 | we'll 1902:20 | 1996:12 |
| voted 1830:13 | 1975:12 | 1901:4 1933:8 | 1934:19 | weight 2013:7 |
| voters 1815:11 | 1994:11 | 1954:6 2027:8 | 1939:17 | Weiss 1803:21 |
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| 1804:12 | 1870:11,16 | 1821:17,18 | 1980:13,22 | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weisselberg | withdrawn | 1822:2,5 | 1981:15 | X 1803:2,7 |
| 1998:7 | 1866:25 | 1823:3 1826:5 | 2023:3 | 1827:22 |
| Welcome | 1876:1,15 | 1828:20 | working 1896:9 |  |
| 1835:13,25 | 1878:7 | 1941:9,15 | 1899:3 | Y |
| well-versed | 1985:24 | 1942:7 | 1913:20 | yeah 1853:16 |
| 1909:18 | witness 1807:25 | 1943:12,13 | 2012:9,9 | 1866:25 |
| wellbeing | 1807:25 | witnesses' | 2022:18 | 1893:14 |
| 1901:1 | 1808:4,11 | 1904:8 | 2024:20 | 1953:22 |
| went 1811:7 | 1809:25 | woman 1911:14 | works 1954:17 | 2010:2 2015:5 |
| 1814:2 | 1810:1,7,17 | 1944:16 | worth 1862:21 | 2021:15 |
| 1824:14,17,17 | 1817:14 | won 1855:12 | 1964:11 | 2026:24 |
| 1903:4 | 1818:8,16 | 1947:1 | 1972:14 | 2028:18 |
| 1934:23 | 1823:7 1835:7 | Wonderland | wouldn't | year 1816:19 |
| 1936:2 | 1835:9,10,16 | 1857:25 | 1864:16 | 1828:10 |
| weren't 1854:6 | 1888:13,16,17 | 1901:15 | 1964:4 1972:3 | 1915:14 |
| Westchester | 1888:18,20 | word 1822:5 | 1972:8 | 1919:22 |
| 1980:4 | 1897:25 | 1823:7 1865:3 | wrap 1833:25 | 1987:6 |
| whatsoever | 1904:7 1918:2 | 1865:3 1867:3 | write 1859:14 | 1996:16 |
| 1809:4 | 1919:14 | 1867:4 | 1863:6,8 | years 1810:25 |
| whereabouts | 1924:4 1927:6 | 1897:23 | 1869:3 1886:6 | 1815:22 |
| 1853:14 | 1939:6 1940:4 | 1898:4 1900:9 | writing 1839:7 | 1816:7,19 |
| whining 1828:24 | 1940:17 | 1906:3,4,9 | 1896:21 | 1826:14 |
| whisper 1822:3 | 1943:23 | 1953:7,9,13 | written 1846:22 | 1864:6 |
| White 2001:13 | 1944:1 | 1957:9 1958:6 | 1847:8,9 | 1865:10 |
| widely 1900:18 | 1954:15 | worded 1869:11 | 1907:25 | 1877:6 1903:4 |
| willful 1809:22 | 1955:5,9,10,13 | words 1904:16 | 1946:13 | 1916:12,16 |
| 1811:14 | 1959:2 | 1976:11 | 1956:25 | 1952:13 |
| 1813:2,12 | 1960:21 | 2008:3 | wrong 1809:11 | 1959:6,10 |
| 1817:4 | 1962:6 | work 1839:20 | 1869:9 | 1980:15,23 |
| 1820:16 | 1963:23 | 1875:8,10 | 1894:21 | 1981:2,9,15,16 |
| 1821:3 | 1968:18 | 1891:2 | 1896:23 | 1981:18 |
| willfully $1814: 1$ | 1969:8,9,10,12 | 1908:23 | 1933:7 | yelling 1963:17 |
| 1824:1 | 1970:23,24 | 1929:17 | 1942:25 | Yellow 1989:19 |
| willfulness | 1979:17,18,21 | 1949:12,20 | 1949:6 | Yep 2016:19 |
| 1824:7 | 1980:2,4 | 1950:14 | 1950:23 | yesterday |
| willingness | 1989:2 | 1951:16 | 1962:7 | 1844:3 |
| 1811:20 | 1990:18 | 1959:18 | wrote 1822:13 | 1886:17 |
| window 1880:16 | 1992:4,7 | 1980:10,11,16 | 1823:22 | York 1803:1,1,2 |
| windows 2012:5 | 2032:21 | 1981:14,19,24 | 1849:8 | 1803:8,8,13,14 |
| 2019:20 | witness' 1904:18 | 1982:7 | 1865:23 | 1803:14 |
| 2020:4 | 1989:11 | 1987:10 | 1874:23 | 1804:2 |
| wire 1838:11 | 1990:19 | 1996:4,5 | 1937:20 | 1822:22 |
| 1839:4 | witnesses | 2009:22,23 | 1938:9 1945:9 | 1825:15 |
| 1841:23 | 1805:21 | 2011:12 | 1946:15 | 1882:18,20 |
| 1850:23 | 1809:19 | worked 1898:12 | 1987:2 | 1898:16 |
| wired 1841:16 | 1810:1 | 1898:24 | WSJ 1862:25 | 1941:3 |
| 1841:18 | 1811:15 | 1945:16 | WTF 1881:13 | 1980:11 |
| wise 1869:19,24 | 1821:3,8,9,10 | 1946:6 |  | 1996:14 |
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| 2012:24 | 1933:23 | 15 1813:8,17 | 1920:2 | 2003:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1974:25 | 1846:11 | 1944:15,24 | 2005:7,9 |
| Z | 10,000 1850:21 | 1933:24 | 1945:10 | 2018 1858:18,25 |
| zero 1964:11 | 1912:20 | 1934:21 | 1946:9,18 | 1859:18 |
| 1972:14 | 1913:12 | 1967:10 | 1981:22 | 1861:3 |
| 1989:18 | 10:30 1884:18 | 1990:17 | 2012 1910:11 | 1862:12 |
| 1996:14 | 10:56:42 | 15-second | 1919:18 | 1863:24 |
| zeroes 2021:22 | 2006:17 | 1832:8 | 1920:10 | 1864:3 |
| 2022:1,8,14 | $1001803: 8$ | 150,000 1933:23 | 1921:22 | 1867:14,20 |
| 2024:16 | 1870:6,23 | 1934:5 | 2015 1908:16,24 | 1869:22 |
| Zervos 1950:1,3 | 1929:12,13 | 1500 1916:10 | 1909:13 | 1871:24 |
| zip 2023:25 | 10013 1803:8,14 | $161973: 11,21$ | 1922:25 | 1873:24 |
| 2024:1,10 | $1081852: 1$ | 168 1836:16 | 1924:14 | 1874:15 |
| zone 1996:19 | 10th 1840:9 | 16th 1828:19 | 1929:14 | 1875:7,24 |
| 2003:12,13 | 1859:18 | 2005:6,9 | 2016 1836:13,23 | 1877:10 |
| zones 1996:5,13 | 1862:12 | 17 1846:17 | 1838:13 | 1878:11,20 |
| 1996:14 | 1863:24 | 176-A 1841:6 | 1839:5 1840:8 | 1882:2 |
| zoom 1847:2 | 1864:3 | 176A 1853:21 | 1841:14,24 | 1884:18 |
| 1865:20 | 1878:11 | 1862:6 1935:6 | 1847:10 | 1887:13 |
| 1871:16 | 11 1881:20,25 | 1939:3 | 1849:1,3,8 | 1901:24 |
| 1874:1 | 1974:25 | 17th 1867:20 | 1851:11 | 1902:6,24 |
| 1903:12 | 1975:1,13 | 1869:22 | 1852:12 | 1921:11 |
| 1921:5 1932:6 | 11-111 1935:9 | 18 1847:12 | 1853:9,11 | 1947:24 |
| 1935:9 1939:4 | 11:55 1885:6 | 1892:23 | 1854:3 1877:9 | 1948:14 |
| 1966:13 | $1101829: 9$ | 1962:4 | 1886:25 | 1950:1 |
| 1978:16 | 1115 1939:4 | 19 1849:13 | 1890:14 | 1952:11,22,24 |
| 0 | $1121881: 20,25$ | 1867:17 | 1891:4,23 | 1953:1,12 |
| 0114 1988:19 | 113 1881:20,25 | 1ST 1803:6 | 1893:8,20 | 1954:9 1956:5 |
| 016 1967:13 | 11th 1840:8,9 | 2 | 1895:18 | 1956:13,23 |
| 017 1967:7,13 | 12 1841:7 |  | 1899:12,14 | 1958:4,16 |
| 1967:16 | 1884:4 1998:6 | 21867.16 | 1900:5,20 | 1960:1,24 |
| 020 1966:9 |  | 1916:4,6,1 | 1909:18 | 1961:3 |
| 021 1965:16 | 122 1884:4,5 | 1924:5 | 1911:3,8,11 | 970 |
| 0226 1995:6 | $1231884: 4$ | 2:15 1939:17 | 1929:24 | 2028:20,25 |
| 09 1981:21 | $1261818: 24$ | 20 1936:22 | 1931:18 | 2021 1903:9 |
| 1 | 12th 1830:10 | 1981:2 | 1934:21 | 2023 1892:21 |
| 11842:20 | 13 1842:2 | $20061877: 9$ | 1935:8,13 | 1898:9 1908:4 |
| 1845:3,4,13,20 | 1884:18 | 2010 1911:14 | 1936:10,22 | 2028:8 |
| 1862:3,5 | 1916:16 | 1913:17 | 1938:22 | 2030:10 |
| 1958:13 | 1975:1,2 | $1914: 1$ $20111859 \cdot 13.20$ | 1939:8 | 2024 1803:9 |
| 1959:8 | 130,000 1843:4 | 2011 1859:13,20 | 2006:16 | 2033:10 |
| 1,000 1814:5 | 1856:23 | $1859: 23$ $1869: 68$ | 2026:18 | 21-minutes |
| 1.61952:7 | 1857:1 1873:8 | 1869:6,8 $1877 \cdot 91895 \cdot 8$ | 2017 1877:9 | 1832:9 |
| 1/25/2018 | 1885:20 | 1877:9 1895:8 | 1908:17,24 | 214573 1921:4 |
| 1872:3 | 1886:4 1900:2 | 1895:20 | 1909:13 | 22 1815:22 |
| 1:30 1882:2 | 1961:16 | 1896:9 | 1950:20,22 | 22nd 1810:10 |
|  | $1331884: 5$ | 1898:12 | 1973:11,21 | 1829:8 |
| 1844:7 | 14th 1828:13 | 1915:13 | 2002:12 | 23rd 1809:1 |


| 1813:5,8,17 | 1999:13 | 4 1996:16,19,23 | 1988:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1820:6 1827:8 | 265 1973:13 | 2032:25 | 6th 1853:12 |
| 2028:8 | 1974:7 1975:1 | 2033:1 | 2006:16 |
| 24 1804:2,19 | 1992:25 | 4.2 1933:12,14 | 2026:17 |
| 1996:13 | 2004:18 | 4:30 2003:10 | 7 |
| 24/7 1821:25 | 266 1992:5,10 | 45 1930:23 | 7 |
| 246 1992:5,10 | 1992:21 | 1933:20,23 | 7 1871:11 |
| 1993:25 | 1994:1,5 | 46 2007:15,18 | 1935:8,13 |
| 1994:4 | 2004:23 | 2007:20,24 | 1954:9 1956:5 |
| 2006:22 | 2005:1 | 2008:3,16,22 | 1958:15 |
| 2007:1,16 | 267 1974:4,21 | 49th 1807:12 | 1987:18 |
| 2008:4,15 | 1974:25 | 4th 1829:11 | 1990:1 |
| 247 1994:4 | 26th 1872:5,7 | 1852:12 | 7:02 1839:18 |
| 2005:25 | 27 1838:13 | 1960:24 | 7:09 1996:21 |
| 2008:25 | 1839:5 | 1964:3 1970:4 | 7:09:12 1996:18 |
| 248 1992:17 | 276 1842:15 | 1970:7 | 71543-2023 |
| 1993:20,25 | 277 1863:17 | 1972:21 | 1803:3 |
| 2007:5,10 | 278 1875:19 |  | 71911 1804:2,19 |
| 2008:7,13 | 279 1932:5 | 5 | 73 1871:12 |
| 249 1994:4,12 | 27th 1841:14,24 | 5 1866:18,18 | 74 1873:19 |
| 24th 1871:24 | 1850:23 | 1878:22,24 | 75 1873:19 |
| 25 1929:14 | $2851838: 6$ | 1996:17,23 | 75,000 1914:18 |
| 251 1994:12 | $2861858: 13$ | 5.1.2 1844:8 | 8 |
| 252 2001:15 | 28th 1847:10 | 5:39 $2002: 13$ | $\frac{\mathbf{8}}{\mathbf{8} 1873.18}$ |
| 253 2000:20,22 | 1849:1,8 | 5:49:59 1874:15 50 1812.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 81873: 18 \\ & \mathbf{8 : 2 3} 1836: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{2 5 4} 1994: 4 \\ 2002: 22 \end{array}$ | 29th 1831:15 | $\mathbf{5 0} 1812: 4$ $\mathbf{5 0 , 0 0 0} 1929: 7$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \mathbf{8 : 2 3} 1836: 25 \\ \mathbf{8 0} 1982: 25 \end{array}$ |
| 255 1860:19 | 3 | $5001804: 24$ | $861875: 4$ |
| 1862:3 | $31843: 61939: 3$ | 1812:5 | 87 1875:4 |
| 1867:12 | 2006:11 | 1816:14 | 88 1878:16 |
| 1878:14 | 3,392 1982:21 | 51 2006:18 | 8th 1828:10 |
| 1884:3 | 3.1D 1843:7 | 511-A 1989:9 | 2002:12 |
| 1920:25 | 3:00 1854:11 | 511-B 1990:17 | 2003:10 |
| 1992:21,25 | 30th 1814:18 | $531921: 5$ | 9 |
| 1994:12 | 1873:23 | $5361841: 7$ | $91844: 91875: 3$ |
| $2561994: 5$ | 1874:6,15 | 537 1841:7 | 1878:15 |
| 1999:22 | 1875:7,24 | $561939: 4$ $\mathbf{5 9} 1803 \cdot 1$ | 9:30 2033:10 |
| $2571994: 12$ | 31 1882:2 | 59 1803:1 | $901832: 22$ |
| $2591994: 24$ 25th 1806.4 | 1927:10 31st 1849:3 | 1969:3 | 1982:25 |
| 25th 1806:4 | 1878:20 | 6 | 90-day 1914:21 |
| 1810:10 | 33 1975:2 | 6:47 1838:18 | 95 1806:10 |
| 26 1836:23 | 35 1933:15,22 | 60 1915:18 | 1833:8 |
| 1964:19 | 37 1830:9,9 | 61 1818:24 | $9641813: 8,16$ $971878 \cdot 16$ |
| $2601994: 13$ | 385 1999:18 | 63 1829:24 | 971878:16 |
| 261 2003:18 | 39 1827:21 | 64 1828:22 | 9th 1854:4 |
| 262 1994:13 | 39,745 1997:7 | 1871:12,19 | 1857:19 |
| 263 1997:1 | 3rd 2033:10 | 67 1829:3 <br> 6866 1990:12 | 1900:19 |
| 264 1994:5 | 4 | 6s 1987:17 |  |

