SUPREME COURT NEW YORK COUNTY CRIMINAL TERM PART 59

\_\_\_\_

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK INDICTMENT # 71543/2023

-against

Falsifying Business Records First Degree

DONALD J. TRUMP,

Defendant.

-----:

100 Centre Street New York, New York 10013 May 16, 2024

B E F O R E: HONORABLE JUAN M. MERCHAN, JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PEOPLE:

ALVIN L. BRAGG, JR., ESQ.

New York County District Attorney

BY: JOSHUA STEINGLASS, ESQ.,

MATTHEW COLANGELO, ESQ., SUSAN HOFFINGER, ESQ., CHRISTOPHER CONROY, ESQ., REBECCA MANGOLD, ESQ., KATHERINE ELLIS, ESQ.,

Assistant District Attorneys

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

BLANCHE LAW

BY: TODD BLANCHE, ESQ.
EMIL BOVE, ESQ.
KENDRA WHARTON, ESQ.

NECHELES LAW, LLP

BY: SUSAN NECHELES, ESQ. GEDALIA STERN, ESQ.

SUSAN PEARCE-BATES
Principal Court Reporter
LAURIE EISENBERG, RPR, CSR
LISA KRAMSKY
THERESA MAGNICCARI
Senior Court Reporters

1 (The following proceedings follow a SEALED sidebar proceeding consisting of Pages 3744 to 3748.) 2 \*\*\*\*\* 3 4 (Sidebar discussion continues: ) 5 MS. HOFFINGER: We have additional objections at this time, Judge. 6 7 THE COURT: Do you want it to happen in open court? 8 MS. HOFFINGER: I think I would rather that we remain at sidebar, but unless your prefer to do it in open 9 10 court. 11 You can decide, once I explain --THE COURT: The press doesn't like it very much. 12 MS. HOFFINGER: They will be able to read it later, 13 14 I would assume. 15 Your Honor, based on defense counsel's proposed 16 jury charges, we understand that they will likely be asking 17 Mr. Cohen today about Judge Furman's decision -- recent decision in the Southern District of New York. 18 We understand that he may be able to inquire about 19 it, but we would object to the decision going in as being 20 21 extrinsic and collateral. 22 Also, we do think that if they go into that, meaning Judge Furman's decision, not what he testified to, 23 that we would be, on redirect, seeking to admit Judge 2.4 25 Engoron's decision about that testimony.

So I just wanted to preview that.

2.4

A couple of other things, just before the testimony continues, I don't know if we can do this on the fly as we go, so I wanted to preview it for the Court.

Defense counsel provided us with a number of exhibits.

As you know, there are -- well, you may not know, there were some clips on Tuesday, but now there are -- I may be wrong -- but maybe close to 50 clips relating to Mr. Cohen's either TikTok or other programs, podcast programs.

We have only the full clips -- I asked for the full clips for some of the exhibits that Mr. Blanche told me he was going to seek to admit; we don't have the full clips for the others, but I didn't know that he was seeking to admit them.

He may be seeking to use them.

Of course, the witness may not really be able to determine what else was said on that podcast, but we do have some very specific objections for some of the clips that Mr. Blanche may seek to admit.

One is, there has been significant testimony about Mr. Cohen's bias.

THE COURT: About what?

MS. HOFFINGER: Mr. Cohen's bias, you know, his

hostility towards the defendant; his making money off the defendant.

And we did not even object to the exhibit relating to some of his merchandise -- we felt that it was going to come in, in any event -- but in that merchandise there are pictures of the defendant behind bars, in an orange jumpsuit.

Enough of that has come in at this point.

A number of these clips, we think, are precluded by your Honor's decision on the motion, on the People's motion in limine, which is, they reference opinions about whether he should be in jail, whether he should be in handcuffs, whether he should have a mug shot taken.

First, our Office did not take mug shots, did not take fingerprints.

Mr. Cohen probably is not I aware of that -- it's not something that he may or may not be aware of.

But, at this point, we really think that this is intended to elicit something quite improper for the jury.

And so, B35 -- just to go over a few of them -- B35 -- the other thing is that they are taken out of context.

So, for example, B35, had Mr. Cohen talking about, you know, something like mental excitement about seeing him in an orange jumpsuit, which is what they have excerpted.

But what they haven't included is just before that clip and just after that clip his saying "that's not appropriate, that's not what we should be wanting, what we want is accountability, we should be seeking only accountability, we should be seeking due process, a fair jury, a fair Judge."

So the context has been excerpted out of that.

We are left with an excerpt of a clip talking about excitement about seeing him in a jumpsuit, which, again, we think your Honor has precluded evidence of potential punishment or consequences in this proceeding.

So if that is admitted -- we object to it, but if it's admitted, we are going to seek on redirect to submit the clip and its context.

And there are other clips, the other clips are similar in many ways, perp walk, handcuffs, et cetera.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  BLANCHE: Your Honor, we have provided all the clips to the Defense (Sic).

Most of them --

MS. HOFFINGER: To the Prosecution.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.

MS. HOFFINGER: That's okay. That's all right. I feel the same way sometimes.

MR. BLANCHE: To the Prosecution. Most of them on Tuesday. More yesterday.

1 We are not seeking to offer virtually any of them. They are just to refresh his recollection. 2 3 Now, the People are correct, there are a few that 4 we want to offer. 5 We -- look, the law -- I don't need to pass it up to the Court -- but evidence of bias is always admissible 6 7 and extremely important. And extrinsic evidence of bias is 8 always admissible. 9 And, of course, the Court can limit it 10 appropriately. 11 And we are being judicious, in our view, and we are not offering 50 clips of him saying things. 12 We are -- we have a handful that are targeted to 13 14 his actual, in our view, his actual bias. 15 We are talking about -- I believe we are seeking 16 to actually admit three or four, maybe five short clips, 17 that is out of hundreds that we could potentially seek to 18 admit. So evidence of bias is admissible. We have a ton 19 of evidence of bias. 20 21 We are seeking to admit extrinsic evidence of bias, 22 which we are allowed to do. And in a handful of cases --THE COURT: That's fine. 23 But if it appears that you are taking that out of 2.4 25 context, I have certainly no problem with the People going

back into it on redirect --

2.4

MR. BLANCHE: Sure.

THE COURT: -- and showing that you took it out of context.

MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, I very much appreciate that there is evidence out there from Mr. Cohen that they would want to offer on redirect.

And them stating that I am opening the door to his bias, I don't -- I'm not suggesting -- I'm not suggesting is the opening of the door for that evidence.

THE COURT: Regarding Judge Furman's decision, are you going to bring that out?

MR. BLANCHE: No. But I don't know how he's going to answer questions.

What I intend to ask him about is what happened with the AI case, the situation, and it is just that, what happened, and then ultimately ask, like I'm doing for all of his attempts to get out of supervised release early, just ask whether that was denied and not ask -- I'm not asking about anything about his findings or anything --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BLANCHE: -- because I believe that that's not allowed, it's just not -- the Engoron finding is not allowed.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. HOFFINGER: Just two other things.

1 I apologize.

2.4

One of the clips that they are offering talks about Mr. Cohen -- from 2020, talks about Mr. Cohen's -- the cases that are -- the investigations that he believes are out there, meaning the Southern District investigation and the OAG investigation and an investigation by our Office.

And he talks about speaking with our office about all sorts of financial crimes.

So if that does come in, that does open the door, your Honor, because that was ongoing into 2021 and that was on the clip.

So we would certainly seek to clarify about that, so it will open the door.

And we will argue that it does.

MR. BLANCHE: Well, it's a short clip.

And he does make reference to the fact that he has gone to the District Attorney's Office about all kinds of financial crimes as well.

To the extent that the People believe that opens the door to then redirecting him on evidence of financial crimes, then that certainly opens the door to a whole series of questions that I was not -- that I did not ask about, what this District Attorney thought about his testimony with respect to those financial crimes.

I mean --

MS. HOFFINGER: It's not admissible. 1 THE COURT: Look, all I'm going to say is, as with 2 3 everything else, proceed at your own risk. 4 I can't rule right now. 5 I haven't heard the question, and I haven't heard 6 the answer. 7 But proceed at your own risk. 8 If the question and the answer leave the jury with 9 an impression that may not be entirely accurate, the People 10 will say that the door has been opened and I will rule on 11 that then. MR. BLANCHE: I just -- I don't understand about 12 what the People are saying and what the Court's decision 13 14 is. 15 You would have an objection to even me asking him: 16 You were meeting with the People about more cases than just 17 this one, and having him say yes to that? 18 I'm not trying to hide that from the jury, but if they don't --19 THE COURT: Then what would be your concern with 20 21 that? 22 MS. HOFFINGER: Well, I do have a concern about it. 23 24 Right now we are trying this case, and I think your 25 Honor has precluded all of the rest -- we are talking about

a tax case, we are talking about statements of financial conditions, and I think that opens the door.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

I just think that I wanted to bring it to the Court's attention that this particular clip talks about all other financial crimes that he was involved in, and it's in their clip.

If they do it, we might have to make some decisions.

And that's including -- the question, I guess, is whether, if that's out there, whether the defendant gets cross-examined on that issue.

Now, I know your Honor has made a ruling, I'm just -- I wanted to bring it to the Court's attention.

A decision hasn't been made, but I did notice it on the clip and I think it presents some issues here.

MR. BLANCHE: It is on the clip. And, you know, we very much believe, and the Court will hear the clip, that it's not confusing to the jury.

Especially if they -- if we elicit --

THE COURT: Let's see how it comes out.

MR. BLANCHE: Pardon me?

THE COURT: We will see how it comes out.

MR. BLANCHE: Yeah, sure. Understood.

THE COURT: We can all make all of the arguments we want, but we don't know what it's going to look like and

what it's going to sound like, so let's wait on that.

2.4

MS. HOFFINGER: One more thing, your Honor, and that's it.

I believe the defense is offering B45, which is texts from Jeremy Rosenberg and Michael Cohen.

They are excerpted, only certain portions of the texts that, without context, the context that they've excerpted out, are all of the very serious threats that Mr. Cohen was receiving, including some death threats that Mr. Rosenberg had to follow up on and our Office had to investigate.

If they are seeking to admit texts of that nature, well, first of all, we object.

We don't think that this should come in.

Your Honor had a concern about too much evidence coming in about threats to witnesses, especially because we have a jury who may be concerned.

But we are going to object to the exhibit.

There is one portion on the first page, that's just about the phones, which would be admissible.

But the rest of it is all about Mr. Rosenberg's trying to -- trying to make him feel better, given all of these threats that were happening.

So we would object. And if it's admissible, we would like to put in all of the threats.

THE COURT: Mr. Blanche.

2.4

MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, we redacted it for that -- for the reason the People just said, that there is some back and forth around threats.

The excerpts that we are offering are 100 percent, in our view, continue to go to Mr. Cohen's bias.

They are accounts about Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Cohen talking about holding President Trump accountable, I believe, and he will hold him accountable, and then a further question about the fact that Mr. Rosenberg knows about Mr. Cohen's father.

We are not going to get into any details about that, but it goes to show the relationship that Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Cohen had.

So much so that there is a witness, and the detective knows details -- and we are not getting into details about his father, we're not getting into that, just to point out that they had a very close relationship.

As the Court knows, the phones are an issue, and that's what we are trying to bring out.

THE COURT: What you are describing --

MS. HOFFINGER: I am handing up --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HOFFINGER: I can hand up the exhibits, your Honor, the redacted and unredacted versions for you to

review.

Clearly, it goes to the witness' state of mind.

So they can't bring in texts that are in response to the threats, because they then are not bringing in fulsome understanding of his state of mind at the time.

MR. BLANCHE: I agree with that.

I would ask them to represent which one that we're offering is in response to a threat?

MS. HOFFINGER: Sure.

At the bottom, where -- on your redacted version, and I think the Court can see this on Page -- for some reason I stapled it wrong -- there is discussion all about "Staying strong. I get it. I truly understand the incredible turmoil you are experiencing."

Mr. Cohen says, "Believe me, it's worse than you can possibly imagine."

And you have redacted all of the threats, the telephone calls and the calls to his wife and the threats that he received from someone who was with an online program.

So I think the Judge will be able to see exactly what's redacted.

THE COURT: So, it sounds like if what you are doing -- you want to establish his state of mind and you want to establish something about the relationship, I

suggest that you do something, something appropriate about the relationship, which is fair, which is fine.

2.4

I think the People may very well be able to elicit why the investigator was trying to comfort him and trying to reassure him.

MS. HOFFINGER: And we will be seeking to put in the full version, that's what we will be seeking to do.

MR. BLANCHE: We provided these to the People midday yesterday.

I think if we would have gotten an objection to a few of the lines, like that one, if it was anticipated, we would have been able to agree to redact.

I'm getting into this right away, actually, so if I could have two minutes, I can just go make sure I take that out.

MS. HOFFINGER: Just so the record is clear, I would say you sent me the redacted version of this exhibit at 9:38 p.m. last night.

The original version I didn't object to, but the redacted version you sent me late last night when I asked for it is what I am objecting to.

THE COURT: So you need to take a moment to fix that?

MR. BLANCHE: Excuse me?

THE COURT: You need two minutes?

	3763
1	MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
2	THE COURT: So going forward, please don't wait
3	until I come down to discuss these things.
4	MR. BLANCHE: All right.
5	THE COURT: If you want to come down in advance to
6	discuss issues like these, I can come down earlier.
7	MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Just one second, before you slip away.
9	The schedule is a little bit up in the air right now.
10	And, as you know, we have some pretty large breaks
11	coming up because of graduations and travel plans and the
12	holiday, so at this moment you should plan on working next
13	Wednesday.
14	MR. BLANCHE: We should plan on working on
15	Wednesday?
16	THE COURT: It may not happen.
17	It could be that it won't happen, but right now you
18	should plan on that.
19	MR. BLANCHE: So that is very much fine with us.
20	I will tell you that we have a hearing scheduled in
21	the Southern District of Florida on Wednesday.
22	Now, it's we are only part of a very small
23	motion and our intention was to seek permission from
24	Judge Cannon that President Trump be excused.
25	In the past, she has agreed.

We will, obviously, state that the trial is ongoing.

2.4

I do not anticipate that she will say no, but just so the Court is aware that there is an oral argument scheduled.

Obviously, we will -- if we are sitting here, we won't be there, and I'm okay with that and so is Mr. Bove. We have local counsel who can cover.

But I do need -- we will try to work on putting that letter in today.

We won't say publicly that it's before that Court, so we will be careful --

THE COURT: Now, when I went back and I looked at the motion in limine again, my decision on the motion, nothing has changed.

You know, if you want to make further argument, you know, if you want to change something, that's fine, but I haven't heard anything yet at trial that would change my decision on that issue.

MR. BLANCHE: Understood.

And we may have --

MR. BOVE: I think what we were going to address at 4:00, Judge, is a proffer from us about what we would seek to elicit, so that we can have a sense of whether it's going to be worthwhile to do this.

1 THE COURT: All right. We will do that after the jury is excused today. 2 3 MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor. 4 MR. BOVE: Yes, your Honor. 5 MR. STEINGLASS: Are you going to ask the jury 6 about their availability on Wednesday? 7 THE COURT: Yes. 8 So what I would normally do, I just tell the 9 jurors, look, it's possible we may need to work on 10 Wednesday, would that present a hardship for any of you? 11 it does, raise your hand. I don't -- I'm not crazy about putting them in that 12 13 position. 14 But I prefer to do that rather than have a court 15 officer or somebody else ask those questions. 16 MR. BLANCHE: Okay. 17 MS. HOFFINGER: Judge, may I raise another issue? 18 It's very short, and I apologize. On Tuesday, someone -- some of the defense guests 19 filed in in the middle of direct examination with their 20 21 security detail. 22 And I noticed that some of his guests are already here today with their security detail. 23 But we would just ask that they not be allowed to 2.4 file in, in the middle of Mr. Blanche's cross-examination. 25

3766 1 It's -- with their security detail for the jury and the witnesses to see. 2 THE COURT: Yes. I would advise that that not 3 4 happen. 5 MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, I have less than zero 6 control over what is happening on anything or anyone that's 7 behind me when I am crossing a witness. 8 I don't know what -- I don't have any control over 9 that. 10 I mean, they are members of the public. 11 THE COURT: Are you expecting anybody else today? MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, I have no idea. No. I'm 12 not expecting anybody else, but I might be wrong. 13 14 THE COURT: Oh, okay. 15 (Sidebar concluded.) \*\*\*\*\* 16 17 THE COURT: I apologize for all of the whispering, 18 I think we may be able to get started. 19 Was there anything else that you wanted to go over with the Court? 20 21 MR. BLANCHE: No, Judge. Thank you. There was 22 nothing else. I just wanted to remind you that I asked for one 23 2.4 minute to deal with something. 25 THE COURT: Sure.

	3767
1	(Pause in the proceedings.)
2	*****
3	MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Are you ready?
5	MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
6	THE COURT: All right. Let's get the witness,
7	please.
8	THE COURT OFFICER: Ready for the witness, your
9	Honor?
10	THE COURT: Yes.
11	THE COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.
12	(The witness, Michael D. Cohen, enters the
13	courtroom and resumed the witness stand.)
14	*****
15	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Cohen.
16	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
17	THE COURT: I will remind you that you are still
18	under oath.
19	Let's get the jury, please.
20	THE COURT OFFICER: All rise.
21	Jury entering.
22	(Jury enters.)
23	*****
24	THE COURT: You may be seated.
25	THE CLERK: Do both parties stipulate that all

3768 1 jurors are present and properly seated? 2. MR. STEINGLASS: Yes. MR. BLANCHE: Yes. 3 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 Good morning, jurors. Welcome back. 6 7 Jurors, first, I would like to apologize for 8 keeping you waiting. 9 I know that you were all here early just waiting 10 for us, but we had to take care of some business. 11 apologize for that. Second, as you know, our scheduling the coming week 12 or weeks is kind of broken up by holidays and various 13 14 conflicts, so if possible it may be necessary for us to work 15 next Wednesday. However,, what I'm going to ask you to do 16 is let the Sergeant know during the next break if that 17 creates a hardship for any of you. 18 If any of you are unable to work next Wednesday, we just won't be able to work and that's fine, that's okay, but 19 it's important so that we can plan. 20 21 Okay. Thank you. 22 Mr. Blanche. MR. BLANCHE: May I inquire? 23

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

2.4

25

3769 \*\*\*\* 1 2. CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. BLANCHE: 3 4 Good morning, Mr. Cohen. Q 5 Α Good morning. 6 O So when we stopped on Tuesday, we had just started 7 talking about an individual named Detective Jeremy Rosenberg. 8 Do you remember that? 9 Α Yes. Who is he? 10 O 11 Α He works with the District Attorney's Office. Was he -- going back a year or so to the beginning of 12 0 2023, was he one of the detectives that you interacted with, 13 14 for -- when you were coming to court to meet with the 15 prosecutors, to get your phones, that sort of thing? 16 Α Yes, sir. 17 And did you text with him? O I did. 18 Α 19 And you texted with him on his work phone; correct? 20 Α I believe so, yes. 21 And you also texted with him on a different number, his Q 22 personal phone; correct? Correct. 23 Α Now, just to remind the jurors, Mr. Rosenberg came on 24 Q 25 two separate occasions in January to pick up your phones, which

3770 1 you had consented to the District Attorney doing; correct? 2 Correct. 3 And I'm going to show you, just for you, the parties 4 and the Court, what has been marked for identification as B117. 5 And I'm going to ask that you take a look at that. And it's a 6 couple of pages and it's redacted. 7 I'm sorry. It's a couple of pages. 8 So we will flip through pages while you just take a look at 9 it and let me know if that appears to be the texts, some of the 10 texts you had with Detective Rosenberg? 11 (Witness reading.) MR. BLANCHE: We can flip through as well. 12 (Witness reading.) 13 14 Do those appear to be the texts you -- some of the 15 texts that you appear to have with Detective Rosenberg? 16 Α Yes, sir. 17 Now, there are -- these aren't all of the texts, 18 though, correct, what you are looking at? Α So far, no. 19 20 MS. HOFFINGER: Judge, may we approach for a 21 moment? 22 THE COURT: Sure. (At Side Bar.) 23 \*\*\*\*\* 24 25 MS. HOFFINGER: Judge, there are addresses all over

3771 1 these texts and they are not redacted. MR. BLANCHE: We are not looking for or at the 2 3 addresses. 4 MS. HOFFINGER: I know, but it shouldn't appear for 5 the defendant and all of those behind him, presumably. MR. BLANCHE: I will take that down. 6 7 THE COURT: Please take those down. 8 MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you. 9 (Sidebar concluded.) \*\*\*\*\* 10 11 MR. BLANCHE: We can take down the exhibit, please. Can we put up the redacted version, B118. 12 THE COURT: B118 in private only, Mr. Blanche, 13 14 that's in private only? 15 MR. BLANCHE: Yes. And we don't have to put that 16 up there. That's my fault. That's my fault, a 17 miscommunication. 18 Can we put up B45, just for the defendant, the parties and the Court -- I'm sorry, the witness, the parties 19 and the Court. 20 21 (Displayed to the aforementioned parties only.) 22 Take a look at this, Mr. Cohen, again. This is a 23 couple of pages. MR. BLANCHE: We can flip through those. 2.4 25 (Witness reading.)

3772 1 So do you recognize those as being -- again, there are 2 redactions, but some of the texts that you had with Detective 3 Rosenberg last year? 4 Α Yes, sir. 5 And did those, assuming -- knowing those redactions, do 6 those texts accurately reflect what you wrote to him and what he 7 wrote to you about a year ago? 8 Yes, sir. Α 9 MR. BLANCHE: The defense offers B45. 10 MS. HOFFINGER: May I have a voir dire, your Honor? 11 THE COURT: Sure. \*\*\*\*\* 12 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 13 14 BY MS. HOFFINGER: 15 Mr. Cohen, when you say they accurately reflect your 16 communications with Mr. Rosenberg, are there large spots that are redacted in these texts? 17 18 Α Yes, ma'am. And are they, therefore, out of context without those 19 unredacted portions? 20 21 I believe so. 22 MS. HOFFINGER: We object, your Honor. THE COURT: Please approach. 23 (At Side Bar.) 24 \*\*\*\*\*. 25

THE COURT: So, I, again, sustained an objection --1 MS. HOFFINGER: Uh-huh. 2 3 THE COURT: I am going to allow it in and give you 4 an opportunity to then go back and reread it, if either 5 party wants to do. 6 MS. HOFFINGER: I think we should keep it out. 7 MR. BLANCHE: I mean --8 MR. STEINGLASS: Judge, let's not use the unredacted version. 9 10 MS. HOFFINGER: Or put in the fully unredacted 11 version; your choice. MR. BLANCHE: I believe it's appropriate, your 12 Honor, on redirect, if they believe that there is something 13 14 that is taken out of context, that they want to offer it, 15 then they can, but it's just that this is just the People's 16 belief. 17 THE COURT: Except that right now we only have --18 we have knowledge of it in advance before it even comes in, we know in advance it's going to be taken out of context, 19 and we know that you have an unredacted version that you can 20 21 offer. 22 I don't think it makes sense for us to just play 23 that game. 2.4 Why don't you just go ahead and introduce the 25 unredacted portion.

3774 1 I will sustain the objection to this document. 2 MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you. (Side bar concluded.) 3 \*\*\*\*\* 4 5 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. BLANCHE: 8 So the texts that you just read between you and Mr. --9 Detective Rosenberg, those were around the time you testified in 10 the Grand Jury in this case; correct? 11 Α Correct. Now, and you saw a text, you saw texts just now where 12 0 you and Mr. Rosenberg -- Detective Rosenberg were discussing 13 14 how you were going to hold President Trump accountable; 15 correct? 16 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained. 17 18 Now, you recall the leak -- that there was a leak that 19 the indictment had been returned in this case. Do you recall that? 20 21 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer. 23 I'm sorry. One more time, please. 24 Α 25 Do you recall that prior to the indictment being Q

3775 unsealed in this case, it was leaked to the media. Do you 1 2 recall that? 3 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Can you please rephrase. 5 Q Do you recall whether prior to the indictment being 6 unsealed, the public learned that President Trump had been 7 indicted? 8 Α Yes, sir. 9 And did you yourself learn that President Trump had 10 been indicted prior to it being unsealed in this courtroom? Α 11 Yes. 12 And you learned that from reading the New York Times; 0 13 is that fair? 14 Α Yes, sir. And Detective Rosenberg confirmed it to you, that the 15 O 16 New York Times story was accurate; correct? 17 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Overruled. 18 19 You can answer. 20 Α I'm sorry, one more time, please. 21 Detective Rosenberg confirmed to you that the New York 22 Times article was accurate and that President Trump had been 23 indicted; correct? 24 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 25 THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q Did Detective Rosenberg confirm that "It Was Done" to you?

  A I'm sorry. I don't understand your question.

  Q Well, let's put up, just for you, the Court and the
  - People, B45 again.

7 MR. BLANCHE: And if we can go towards the end, the second to last page of that exhibit. And the page before for one minute.

And, now, if you can turn to the next page.

You can take that down.

(Displayed to the aforementioned parties only.)

- Q Does that refresh your recollection that Detective

  Rosenberg told you that "It Was Done," meaning President Trump

  had been indicted?
  - A He identified a newspaper article.
- Q Your testimony is the text you just read was Detective Rosenberg identifying a newspaper article?
  - A That's what it says, yes.

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

- Q Detective Rosenberg didn't tell you that they told the New York Times before they told you? Did he tell you that in a text?
  - A I'm sorry. I don't understand your question. It's confusing.
  - Q Did Detective Rosenberg tell you, before the indictment was unsealed in this case, that they told the New York Times

3777 1 about the indictment before they told you?" 2 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 3 THE COURT: Sustained. When you say "they," who 4 are you referring to? 5 MR. BLANCHE: Well, that was going to be my next 6 question to this witness, your Honor. 7 Do you have an understanding about whether 8 Detective Rosenberg told you about the indictment before it was 9 unsealed? 10 Α No, sir. He didn't tell you before there was an unsealing in 11 12 this courtroom that it was done, meaning that President Trump 13 had been indicted? 14 MS. HOFFINGER: Asked and answered, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Overruled. 16 You can answer. No, sir. 17 Α 18 Are you sure about that? 19 Α Yes. 20 So, when did you learn about President Trump getting indicted? 21 22 Α From the New York Times article. And did you have a communication with Detective 23 0 24 Rosenberg about the New York Times article? 25 Yes, sir. Α

3778 1 0 And what did he tell you? He stated -- well, I asked him or texted him: "Nice to 2 find out through the New York Times article. Nice for a head's 3 4 up." 5 0 Isn't it true that he texted you: "I know you heard." 6 And you said: "Nice head's up, huh, tell the Times first?" 7 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Sustained. 9 MR. BLANCHE: Did you sustain the objection? THE COURT: I did. 10 11 O So your testimony, sir, is that you did not hear from Detective Rosenberg before it was unsealed in this case that 12 President Trump had been indicted? 13 14 Α I don't recall hearing from Jeremy Rosenberg that, no, 15 sir. 16 Now, that same day, March 30th of last year, okay, you 17 went on CNN; correct? 18 Α Yes. And that's when you -- you said on TV, that: "This 19 indictment and this case was like David against Goliath." 20 21 Do you remember saying that? 22 Yes, sir. Α And when you said that, you were describing yourself as 23 David and President Trump as Goliath; correct? 2.4 25 Α Correct.

3779 1 And you actually said on March 30th, so before the indictment was unsealed, that you had Goliath on his back; 2 3 didn't you? 4 Α Sounds correct. 5 And that same day, Detective Rosenberg complimented you O 6 and said, you were so sharp and competent, saw the fantastic 7 interview on CNN just now? 8 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 9 THE COURT: Sustained again. 10 MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, may we approach? 11 THE COURT: No. Do you have a recollection, Mr. Cohen, of Detective 12 0 Rosenberg texting you about your appearance on CNN? 13 14 Α Yes, sir. 15 What did he tell you in that text? 16 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained. 17 18 0 Do you recall on March 31st going on TV with a reporter 19 named Joy Reid? Yes, sir. 20 Α 21 And, again, this is Friday, March 31st, so it's when 22 the indictment is still under seal; correct? Yes, sir. 23 Α And do you recall Detective Rosenberg complimenting you 24

about your interview on Joy Reid?

25

3780 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Overruled. 3 You can answer. 4 Α Yes, sir. 5 Now, that was at the same time that the Manhattan 6 District Attorney's Office was telling you not to do TV; 7 correct? 8 Α Correct. 9 Now, do you recall going on your Mea Culpa podcast Q 10 right around that time, on March 30th, 2023, and talking about the indictment? 11 12 Α Yes, sir. 13 So I want to play for you and the parties and the Court, B46. So if you -- I think you have them. 14 15 Do you have the headphones there, Mr. Cohen? 16 (Witness putting on headphones.) 17 MR. BLANCHE: This is just for the parties, the Court and the witness. 18 19 Okay. Can you pull that up? 20 (Audiotape playing for the aforementioned 21 parties only.) \*\*\*\*\* 22 23 Q Were you able to hear that, Mr. Cohen? 24 Yes, sir. Α 25 Please use the microphone.

3781 1 Α Yes, sir. 2 You were able to hear that. 3 And that was your voice, that was just a portion of that 4 Podcast, right, that was just a snippet; right? 5 Α Yes. 6 And that was on May 30th, 2023; correct? 0 7 Α Correct. 8 MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, we offer B46. 9 MS. HOFFINGER: Just for the reasons discussed at 10 the bench, we object. THE COURT: As discussed at the bench, the 11 12 objection is overruled. 13 And we will accept it into evidence. (Exhibit so marked and received into evidence.) 14 15 MR. BLANCHE: And if we can play that for the jury 16 now, B46. 17 Thank you. 18 (Audiotape so being played in open court at this 19 time.) \*\*\*\*\* 20 21 Now, you said on that podcast that you wanted to thank O 22 the Manhattan District Attorney's Office and their fearless 23 leader, Alvin Bragg, with whom you spent countless hours. 24 But you never met Alvin Bragg; correct? 25 That's correct. Α

3782 And what you just said about picturing President Trump 1 0 2 being led through the booking process and whatnot, that wasn't 3 the first time, meaning May 23rd, 2023, that wasn't the first 4 time that you said you wanted President Trump to get a taste of 5 what you went through; right? 6 Α Correct. 7 So, do you remember a podcast, October 23rd, 2020, 8 where you discussed similar things. 9 Do you remember that? 10 Specifically, no, but I'm sure I did. Α Well, let's take a listen. 11 12 MR. BLANCHE: If you would play that just for the 13 Court, the parties and the witness. 14 If we could play B25. 15 So, sir, if you could put your headphones on 16 again, Mr. Cohen. 17 Thank you. 18 (Audiotape played for the aforementioned parties 19 only.) 20 You heard that portion of your podcast? Again, that 21 wasn't your whole podcast; correct? 22 Α Correct. It was just a small portion? 23 0 24 A small portion of that. Α

That was your voice on October 23rd, 2020; correct?

25

Q

3783 1 Α Correct; it is. 2 MR. BLANCHE: The defense offers B25, your Honor. 3 MS. HOFFINGER: Based on the Court's ruling, no 4 objection. 5 THE COURT: Accepted into evidence. (So marked in evidence.) 6 \*\*\*\*\* 7 8 MR. BLANCHE: If we could play B25 for the jury. 9 Thank you. 10 (Audiotape so being played in open court at this 11 time.) \*\*\*\*\* 12 And, now, you said that October 23rd, 2020, right, so 13 Q 14 that wasn't around the time of the indictment in this case; 15 correct? Correct. 16 Α Now, in that same podcast, would it surprise you to 17 18 learn that you also said that "you are not going to lie, 19 thinking about Donald Trump and his family sitting in Otisville prison makes you giddy with hope and laughter?" 20 21 Α Sounds correct. 22 And so, in that instance, just to remind the jury, Otisville is a Federal prison that you spent about a year at; is 23 that correct? 24 25 Α That's correct.

- Q And you testified on Tuesday that you did not enjoy being in prison; did you, Mr. Cohen?
  - A No, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q You've also said that you believed that the work that you did doing interviews with the prosecutors through interviews, your hours spent with prosecutors, your media statements and your podcasts, you believed that that played a role in the indictment in this case; didn't you?
  - A I took some credit, yes.
- Q Well, I'm not -- I'm not trying to put words in your mouth.
- 12 I'm not asking you whether you took credit.
  - You said, did you not, that you believed that the work that you did played a large role in the Prosecutor's indictment of President Trump in this case?
  - A Yes. That's what I believe.
  - Q And we talked about it a little bit on Tuesday, and the Prosecutors asked you about it as well, but we just played two, but there are countless others from your podcasts that are similar to what we just heard; correct?
- MS. HOFFINGER: I'm just going to object as to form.
- 23 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q And there are -- you continued to call President Trump

3785 1 various names on your podcast and when you are even doing CNN interviews; correct? 2 3 Α Correct. So that's continued even up to during this trial; 4 5 correct? 6 Α Correct. 7 Now, do you remember --8 MR. BLANCHE: If we can put up exhibit, it's 9 already in evidence, 408A. 10 (Displayed.) Do you remember when the Prosecutor showed you this, 11 12 this is a Truth that President Trump sent on March 15th, 2023. 13 Do you remember when the Prosecutor showed you this? 14 Α Yes, sir. Now, about five lines down, it says, "And convicted 15 0 liar and felon, jailbird Michael Cohen may have schemed up." 16 And you testified, I believe, that that was directed at you; 17 18 correct? 19 Α Yes, sir. 20 Now, you responded to this Truth; didn't you? Q 21 I'm not on Truth Social, sir. Α 22 0 So if --MR. BLANCHE: We can take that down. 23 24 So if I can show you, just you and the parties and 25 the Court --

3786 1 Well, we will come back to that. 2 Well, you don't have a recollection of responding on X 3 to that Truth? 4 Α Yes, sir. 5 And you responded in kind, right, you called President 0 6 Trump a name right back; correct? 7 Α Sounds correct. 8 You called him "Dumb Ass Donald." Does that sound 0 9 right? 10 Α Sounds correct. Now, we talked a little bit about your statements 11 0 12 during this trial that you've made on your podcast and on 13 TikTok. Do you recall on April 21st, 2023, saying on your TikTok 14 that you have mental excitement about the fact that this trial 15 16 was starting? Yes, sir. 17 Α And that was April 21st, so that was right before 18 19 opening statements in this case; is that right? 20 Α Correct. 21 Opening statements were on the 22nd, the next morning; 22 correct? Α Correct. 23 24 And you knew at the time that there was a paralegal at 25 the District Attorney's Office that was monitoring your social

1 media; right?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- A I believe so, yes.
- Q Well, let me just make sure I understand your answer.

  You did know at the time or you believed that a paralegal was
  monitoring your social media?
  - A I believe that there was a paralegal monitoring my social media.
- Q And you knew that that was happening when you made all of the statements that you made in the past several months, including during this trial; correct?
- 11 A Yes, sir.
- Q But that didn't -- it certainly didn't stop you; did it, Mr. Cohen?
- 14 A No, sir.
- 15 Q Now, I want to talk about something the prosecutors
  16 talked about for awhile on Tuesday, which is your prior -- your
  17 prior testimony under oath.
- Now, you testified under oath on many occasions; right?
- 19 A That's correct.
- Q Many over the years. You have testified in depositions; correct?
- 22 A Correct.
- Q You testified before Congress seven times; is that right?
- 25 A That's correct.

3788 1 0 You testified in a trial last fall; correct? 2 Α Correct. 3 You -- when you -- we talked about your guilty pleas, 4 there were two of them; correct? 5 Α Correct. 6 And in both of those court hearings you testified, or 7 you answered questions under oath; correct? 8 Α Correct. 9 Now, was the oath that you took every single time, so 10 going back to all of the depositions, the same oath that you 11 took on Monday morning in this courtroom? Yes, sir. 12 Α The oath doesn't change depending on the location; does 13 0 14 it? 15 No, it does not. Α 16 And you were asked to do the same thing every single 17 time, right, you put your right hand up; correct? 18 Α Correct. You swear to tell the truth? 19 20 Α Correct. 21 Exactly like what you did in this courtroom? O 22 Correct. Α And when there are times, like now, when your testimony 23 lasts longer than a day, just because you come back the next day 24 25 or in this case, two days later, you are still under oath;

1 right?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A The Judge advised me of such, yes.
- Q The Judge reminded you that you are still under oath because of your oath that you gave on Monday morning?
  - A Correct.
- Q And that wasn't just here, that's happened any time that you've testified and there has been a break, whether it's overnight or even a lunch break; right?
  - A Correct.
- Q So, in addition to the times that you testified under oath where you raise your right hand and swore to tell the truth, you've also met with Federal agents, I believe, somewhere around 17 times?
- Does that number sound right?
- 15 A Sounds right.
  - Q And each time you met with the Federal agents, you were told that if you made a false statement, that that was a felony, that was a Federal crime; correct?
  - A Yes, sir.
    - Q So you -- and just so that the jury understands, that happens when the meeting starts.

So at some point early on you are in a conference room usually and there are some agents, maybe some FBI Agents, there are some prosecutors, your lawyer is there, and early on in the meeting you are told, Mr. Cohen, you can't lie to these agents,

3790 1 you have to tell the truth or something like that; correct? 2 Correct. 3 Now, I want to talk about, again, your testimony in 4 2017 before the House Permanent Select Committee on 5 Intelligence? Yes, sir. 6 Α 7 That's one of the times that you have lied under oath; 0 8 correct? 9 That's correct. Α And just so -- just so everybody is clear about how 10 11 that transpired, you submitted a two-page letter in advance of your testimony; correct? 12 That's correct. 13 Α 14 And then when you testified, you kind of adopt the 15 letter, you even read the letter into the record; right? 16 Α Correct. 17 And that happens after you are sworn in and you take the oath; correct? 18 19 Α Correct. And on that occasion, you lied about this, the Moscow 20 21 Project; correct? 22 Yes, sir. Α And your lies -- there were a couple of different lies; 23 0 correct? 24 25 Α That's correct.

3791 The number of times when you stopped the Project was a 1 0 2 lie; correct? 3 Α Correct. 4 O You said you stopped it in January; it actually lasted 5 a little bit longer; correct? 6 Α Correct. 7 You -- the number of times you spoke with President 8 Trump, you said, was a lie; correct? 9 Α Correct. And what was the other lie? 10 0 I don't -- I don't recall. I think those --11 Α You don't recall the other lies? 12 0 13 I think those were the two. Well, did you tell -- did you tell the Committee that 14 15 you never agreed to travel to Russia and -- in connection with 16 that Project, and that you never even considered asking 17 President Trump to travel to Russia, right, you testified to that and that was not true? 18 19 Α True, correct. 20 So those were the three lies that you -- that you committed when you testified in 2017; correct? 21 22 Α Yes, sir. Now, just to be clear, you knew, at the time that you 23 24 submitted that letter and that you made those statements, that 25 you were lying under oath; right?

A Yes, sir.

- 2 Q And you have said, and you said on Monday and Tuesday,
- 3 that the reason you lied was because of your loyalty to
- 4 President Trump, correct?
- 5 A I said that, yes.
- 6 Q But that's a different -- your reason for lying is
- different from whether you knew you were lying, right, you knew
- 8 | you were lying; correct?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q And then, when you -- when you met with the Special
- 11 Counsel, August 7th of 20 -- of the next year, right, so two
- 12 weeks before you pled guilty in SDNY on August 7th, you met with
- 13 | the Special Counsel; correct?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
- Q And you lied again about those same three topics with
- 16 respect to the Trump Moscow Project; right?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- Q So just as it relates to that issue, you lied under
- 19 oath; correct?
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- 21 Q And you lied -- you committed another felony in the
- 22 meeting with --
- MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 24 MR. BLANCHE: I'm going to rephrase that.
- THE COURT: Sustained.

3793 1 0 And you lied again when you met with the Special 2 Counsel on August 7th; correct? 3 Α Correct. 4 And you, as we talked about, in November -- on 5 November 29th of that year, 2018, you pled guilty to lying to 6 Congress; correct? 7 I did. Α You did not plead guilty, and you have never pled 8 9 quilty to the lies in that meeting, though; correct? 10 Α Correct. 11 And, to be fair, you were truthful at sentencing about the fact that you had lied in the meeting; correct? 12 Yes. 13 Α 14 So there was no -- you weren't trying to hide that from 15 the Court, you weren't trying to hide that from the Special 16 Counsel. 17 You had actually said you lied; right? 18 Α Correct. And so, when Judge Pauley sentenced you for that lie, 19 he knew about the lie to Congress and he knew about the fact 20 21 that you had lied to the agents as well; right? 22 I don't believe it was Judge Pauley. Α You don't believe it was Judge Pauley who sentenced 23 0 24 you? 25 No, Judge Pauley sentenced me. There was the second Α

3794 1 case. 2 0 Correct. 3 But when you were sentenced in front of Judge Pauley, you 4 were actually sentenced for both cases; correct? 5 So, I can refresh your recollection? Yes, sir. Yes, sir. 6 Α 7 So, meaning -- what I mean by that is, you are correct, 8 the guilty plea in November was in front of a different Federal 9 Judge? 10 Α Correct. 11 0 But then your August guilty plea and your November guilty plea were combined so you could be sentenced in front of 12 one Judge? 13 14 Α That's correct. 15 And that was Judge Pauley? O 16 Α Yes, sir. 17 And you remember Judge Pauley sentencing you to two months and a fine of \$50,000 because of your lies to Congress; 18 19 right? Correct. 20 Α 21 And that was to run concurrently, which means at the 22 same time, to the 36 months you got for the other crimes you pled guilty to; right? 23 Correct. 24 Α 25 So when you were sentenced for that crime, your lawyers 0

3795 1 put in a sentencing memo; correct? 2 Correct. Α 3 And you spoke to the Judge? 4 I did. Α 5 And you said that you were accepting responsibility for O 6 those lies, for lying to Congress; right? 7 Α Correct. But, in fact, you repeatedly said, and you even said 8 9 this morning and early this week, that the reason why you lied was because of your loyalty to President Trump; correct? 10 11 Α I worked with the Joint Defense Agreement, and we crafted this document, that two-page document, in order to say 12 one message, the message that we all knew Mr. Trump wanted; 13 14 including with Mr. Trump's attorney at the time. 15 So, are you saying you are accepting responsibility or 16 are you blaming the Joint Defense Committee? Accepting responsibility. I read it and I submitted it 17 Α to the Committee. 18 19 And so, you talked about what you just described, 0 right, the fact that there was a Joint Defense Agreement and 20 21 other lawyers participating in drafting that letter and you talk 22 about that a lot; right? I do. 23 Α 24 O You talk about that in your book? 25 Α Yes.

- Q And you talk about that in your podcasts?
- 2 A Yes, sir.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q And even at the time that you pled guilty, right, so this was in front of the other Judge in November, you said, when you were talking about the lies, that you made those statements up to be consistent with President Trump's political messaging and out of loyalty to President Trump; correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q Now, you also pled guilty on August 21st, so a few months earlier, in front of Judge Pauley to a bunch of other crimes; correct?
- A Correct.
- Q Now, the August 2018 guilty plea had to do with the investigation that you talked a lot about from the search of your hotel room, your office, TD Bank, safe deposit box and your home, your apartment; right?
- 17 A Correct.
- Q That was after the FBI raided your home in April of that year; right?
- 20 A Correct.
- Q And the FBI took a lot of materials from you, hard copy
  materials, electronic materials?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q Telephones --
- 25 A Yes, sir.

- Q Cell phones?
- 2 A Yes, sir.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

24

- Q Now, you knew at the time that -- well, maybe not at the time, but before your guilty plea, you learned that one of the reasons why the FBI raided your -- raided your home and your hotel room was because they had a cooperating witness; right?
- A No, sir.
- Q You were not aware that your business partner, Gene Freidman, cooperated in that case?
- 10 A I know Gene Freidman cooperated, but I didn't know it
  11 at the time. No, sir.
- 12 Q Well, when did you learn that Gene Freidman cooperated?
- 13 A Much later.
- 14 O How much later?
  - A Approximately two months or so.
- Q Okay. Understood. So before you pled guilty in

  August, you knew that some of the evidence that the Southern

  District of New York had against you came from your business
- 19 partner; right?
- 20 A He's not my business partner, no, sir.
- 21 Q How would you describe him?
- A He was a management company, and I leased my medallions to him.
  - I received from him a sum certain every single month, just as every one of the other thousand medallions that he was

1 operating.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

I had no profit sharing with him.

If he had loses, I would not have received any of the loses. It would be no different than if you were leasing an apartment from somebody.

I had no interest in his company at all.

- Q So you used his company or, rather, maybe he used your medallions to try to make money and then you would get some of that as profit; is that correct?
  - A No, sir.
- Q Go ahead. Explain it to me?
- 12 A The way the industry works is he is a licensed
  13 management company with the New York City Taxi and Limousine
  14 Commission.
- I owned medallions, as there are 13,284 in the City of New 16 York.

He would lease my medallion or medallions with an agreement, with a contract, and he would pay me a sum certain every single month whether he made money or he didn't.

No different than, again, leasing an apartment, if you use it or you don't, you are still paying the lease --

- Q And there were times --
- 23 A Oh, I'm sorry.
- Q Oh, no. Go ahead.
- 25 A He was obligated to pay all of the expenses, the tax

M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche 3799 1 stamp, the rate card. I had no obligations regarding the vehicle. That was all 2 3 his. 4 All he did was lease the medallions, because the only way to 5 have a taxi is you have to have a medallion affixed to the front. 6 7 Understood. 0 8 And he would pay you by check every month; is that right? 9 Correct. 10 And there were times when he didn't pay you and you had 11 to chase him down and get your money; correct? Α Correct. 12 There were times when checks bounced? 13 0 14 Α Correct. 15 And there were times when you had to go back and forth 16 with him and say, hey, can I cash this check from you right now 17 or does it have to wait until Monday; correct? 18 Α Correct. Now, he -- just so we understand, when you pled guilty 19

- 20 in late August, you knew that he was cooperating against you, 21 that Mr. Freidman was cooperating against you; right?
  - I was told that, yes. Α
- Well, that's what "you knew" means; right? 23 0
- 24 Α Yes.

22

25 And you -- isn't it a fact, he's actually named in some 0

of the paperwork associated with your guilty plea? He's Taxi Operator Number 2; right?

Yes, sir. Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- So you plead guilty on August 21st, 2018, and a few minutes into that hearing, the same thing happened that happened on Monday morning, Judge Pauley has his deputy swear you in; correct?
  - Α Correct.
- So it doesn't happen right away, but at some point Judge Pauley says to his deputy, please swear in Mr. Cohen, and the same thing happens, that happened today, right -- I'm sorry, that happened Monday; correct?
- Correct. Α
  - And Mr. -- and right after that, Judge Pauley actually told you that you were under oath and that if you didn't -- if you didn't testify truthfully, that you could get in additional trouble; right?
- Α Correct.
- And then a little bit later in that proceeding, when you were talking about your conduct, you said, did you not, in 21 the tax years of 2012 to 2016: "I evaded paying taxes on 22 certain income that I received that I knew was not reflected on the return and that I caused to be filed; " right? 23
- Correct. 24 Α
  - You also said, in that same proceeding, after being Q

placed under oath, that on or about February of 2016, in order to be approved for a HELOC, a Home Equity Line of Credit, you received an application form that did not accurately describe the full extent of your liabilities, but you did not correct the inaccurate information on the form.

You testified to that; right?

A Correct.

- Q You then later testified, in the same proceeding, that you signed that form, the HELOC form, knowing it would be submitted to the bank as part of the HELOC application process; correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q You also said that you understood at the time that you were doing it, that the purpose of those documents were going to help influence the decision the bank made about your HELOC loan; right?
- A Correct.
- Q And you -- you said in that proceeding that you understood that because of the statements I just described, you were quilty of Federal Tax Evasion; right?
  - A Correct.
  - Q And you were guilty of Making a False Statement to a Financial Institution; correct?
- 24 A That's correct.
- 25 Q Now, nobody induced you to or threatened you to plead

guilty; correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A As I stated previously, I was provided with 48 hours within which to accept the plea or the Southern District of New York was going to file an 80-page indictment that included my wife and I elected to protect my family.

Q So you -- and that's what I was -- that's what I was getting to.

So you do feel like you were induced to plead guilty?

A I never -- (indicating with finger).

I never -- I never denied the underlying facts.

I just did not believe that I should have been criminally charged for --

O After --

A -- for either of those two, or, I should say, six offenses.

O I want you to just focus on my questions, okay.

My question was, you felt that you were kind of induced or you were put under pressure to plead guilty because you were given just two days; correct?

A Correct.

Q You felt that if you were to make a decision immediately, there was a risk that your loved one, your wife would be indicted as well; correct?

A That was what I was told.

Q Well, who told you that?

A My lawyer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q So did the Government ever tell you -- did the

  Prosecutors from the Southern District ever say: If you don't

  plead guilty we are indicting your wife?
  - A No. They spoke with my lawyer.
- Q Well, based on what your -- so, to be clear, except for what your lawyer told you, the only basis for you believing your wife was going to get indicted was what your lawyer told you; correct?
- 10 A Correct.
  - Q But you said on countless occasions that that pressure of having your wife indicted and the short timeframe with which you had to make a decision was the reason why you pled guilty?
  - A Yes, sir.
    - Q But on that day, when you were under oath, in front of Judge Pauley, after you raised your right hand, Judge Pauley asked you, didn't you -- didn't he say to you -- or, well, did anybody offer you any inducements or threaten or force you to plead guilty to enter into this plea guilty?
- 20 He asked you that; right?
- 21 A He did.
  - Q And you said, "No?"
- 23 A I accepted responsibility.
- Q Sir, I didn't ask you if you accepted responsibility.
- 25 We will get to that.

M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche 3804 1 Α Okay. I asked whether you said, "No," under oath to Judge 2 3 Pauley, that nobody had threatened or induced you to plead 4 guilty? 5 Α Correct. That was a lie? 6 O 7 That was not true; correct. Α 8 Can we get through this. 9 What's the difference between a lie and something that's not true? 10 11 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. 12 You said "it's not true." 13 14 What is the difference, in your mind, between something that 15 is not true and a lie? 16 Α I said that's correct. I was using just a different 17 terminology. 18 O Okay. So you -- so it was a lie? 19 Correct. Α Now, after you pled guilty in August, one of the things 20 21 that happens is that you meet with a member of the Court staff 22 and they draft what's called a Presentence Investigation Report; 23 right?

A Correct.

2.4

25

Q And you did that in the Federal case that we're talking

- 1 about; right?
- 2 A Yes, sir.
- 3 Q You met with somebody named Christopher Paragano?
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q And did you meet with him in person or over Zoom?
- 6 A In person.

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

- Q And Judge Pauley had told you during the guilty plea that it was important to be truthful and honest with your -- with that individual because it helped him decide what sentence to give you; right?
- A Correct.
- 12 O And even -- and so you met with him a few weeks later?
- 13 A Yes, sir.
- Q And even then, when you met with him and talked about the offense conduct, you blamed others; correct?
- 16 A Yes, sir.
  - Q Much like what you did today, like you explained your conduct by saying that you really didn't think you committed the tax crime; right?
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- Q You said you didn't think you should be -- you didn't think that you should be criminally charged for that; right?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- Q And it was actually something that the pretrial services officer was concerned about when drafting the report,

3806 1 that you had not accepted responsibility; right? 2 Yes, sir. Α 3 And then you show up for sentencing in December; 4 correct? 5 Α Correct. So like four months, five months later about; correct? 6 0 7 Α Correct. 8 And you are going to be sentenced for the August guilty 9 plea and for the false statements to Congress at the same time; 10 right? 11 Α Correct. And at the sentencing, your lawyers and you put in 12 0 papers and you spoke to the Court; right? 13 14 Α That's correct. 15 And at that point, you told Judge Pauley that you were 16 accepting responsibility for your conduct; right? 17 Α Correct. 18 And you did that and your lawyers were asking for a low 19 sentence; correct? In the sentencing memo, yes. 20 Α 21 O Well, and then your lawyer spoke at sentencing as well; 22 right? He did. 23 Α And that was Guy Petrillo; is that right? 24 Q 25 Α Correct.

3807 1 Mr. Petrillo told the Court about your -- that you had 2 been willing to cooperate with the Special Counsel, with the 3 Mueller Investigation; right? 4 Α Yes, sir. 5 And talked to the Court about the fact that you were O 6 not a cooperating witness; correct? 7 Α Correct. 8 And the Southern District of New York had not offered 9 you a Cooperation Agreement; right? 10 Α Correct. 11 But he still wanted you to get credit for cooperating; right? 12 13 Α Correct. 14 Ultimately, the Judge took all of that into account and Q 15 gave you 36 months in prison; correct? 16 Α Correct. 17 And the fines you talked about on Tuesday? 0 18 Α Yes, sir. And that 36 months in prison was lower than the 19 recommended guidelines range; right? 20 21 Α Correct. 22 So the Judge, presumably -- not presumably, he said that he took into account your lawyer's arguments when 23 sentencing you to 36 months; correct? 24 25 Α Yes, sir.

Q And then -- now, almost right away, right after that sentence, you started saying that you actually had not committed the tax crime you pled guilty to; correct?

A No, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

- Q Well, when did you start saying that?
- A I repeated what I had written as well with my attorney in the sentencing memo, that I take responsibility, but I did not believe that it was a charge that I should have been -- that a -- a crime that I should have been charged with. That's in the sentencing memo as well.
- Q When you wrote a book called "Revenge," you described the tax charges as bogus; correct?
- A Yes, sir.
  - Q And in that same book, you said the tax evasion charges were 100 percent inaccurate; correct?
    - A I believe I should not have been charged, yes, sir.
  - Q So I didn't ask you whether you said you believed you should not have been charged, what I asked you is whether in your book you said the charges were 100 percent inaccurate?
- 20 A I was referring to, again, the same thing.
  - Q But you said that, right?
- 22 A I said that, yes.
  - Q In fact, in that book, you said: "Now allow me to give you the real facts. The DOJ charged the tax evasion. They are all 100 percent inaccurate and, most importantly, SDNY

3809 1 prosecutors knew it." Right? 2 Yes, sir. Α 3 And you felt and believe -- I believe you still do feel 4 that you did not engage in tax fraud, but you had to plead 5 guilty to protect your wife and family; right? 6 Α Correct. You've also said on TikTok as recently as April 1st of 7 8 this year, that the Federal investigation against you was the 9 most corrupt prosecution in at least the last 100 years; 10 correct? 11 Α I've said that, yes. And then on CNN, very recently, March of last year, so 12 0 March of 2023, you said that the lies by the Southern District 13 14 of New York against me for tax evasion, I actually hope that all 15 comes out? 16 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. Can we 17 approach for a moment? THE COURT: Yes. 18 19 (At Side Bar.) \*\*\*\*\* 20 21 MS. HOFFINGER: Judge, he is reading off a lot of 22 documents that are not in evidence. MR. BLANCHE: Okay. 23 THE COURT: Yes, he is reading from documents that 24 are not evidence. 25

3810 1 (Side bar concluded.) \*\*\*\*\* 2 3 Do you recall on March 30th of last year, 2023, going 4 on CNN Tonight? Yes, sir. 5 Α 6 I want to show you what has been marked for 7 identification as B52. 8 MR. BLANCHE: And I would ask that it just be 9 shown to the witness, the parties and the Court. 10 (Displayed for the aforementioned parties only.) 11 And if we can go to Page 9 of that exhibit. Take a look at Page 9, and maybe if you can look about -- if 12 we can blow up about a third of the way down. 13 14 (Displayed for the aforementioned parties.) So on that --15 16 MR. BLANCHE: We can take that down. 17 Thank you. 18 During that CNN interview that you just saw a 19 transcript of, you said that you hoped the tax evasion charges would eventually all come out; right? 20 21 Α Yes, sir. 22 That the lies by the Southern District of New York Prosecutors would eventually be exposed; correct? 23 Correct. 2.4 Α 25 Now, you testified that you provided a lot of documents

M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche 3811 1 to the Manhattan District Attorney's Office; correct? 2 Α They were part of the phone, yes. Did you also provide any boxes of materials? 3 0 4 Α Yes, sir. 5 Not necessarily in connection with the investigation, O but you provided them materials; correct? 6 7 Α Correct. 8 And you received a subpoena from the defense in this 9 case; correct? 10 Α Correct. And in any of the materials that you -- have either 11 12 provided to the defense or to the District Attorney, did you 13 provide proof that you have been talking about, that there were 14 documents to support the fact that there was no tax evasion? 15 Α I'm sorry, I don't understand your question. 16 Well, you say you want the truth to come out that the Prosecutors in the Southern District of New York were corrupt 17 18 and knew it; right? 19 Α Correct. 20 Have you provided any materials to anybody suggesting 21 that the charges that you pled guilty to were not appropriate? 22 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. 23

THE COURT: Sustained.

24

25

Q So, in addition to the Prosecutors, you also believe that Judge Pauley is corrupt as well; correct?

## M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche

		3812
1		MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor.
2		THE COURT: Overruled.
3	А	I have said that, yes.
4	Q	And he's deceased, by the way?
5	А	He is.
6	Q	And you believe that Judge Pauley was in on it; right?
7	А	I've said that, yes.
8	Q	Well, that's a different question. You have said it;
9	correct?	
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	Do you believe that Judge Pauley was in on it?
12	А	I do.
13		(Whereupon, at this time Principal Court Reporter
14	Sus	an Pearce-Bates relieved Lisa Kramsky as the official
15	cou	rt reporter.)
16		*****
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (Continued from the previous page.)

- Q You called the Southern District of New York prosecutors and Judge Pauley fucking animals, correct?
  - A Correct.

Q But in addition to what we just talked about so, your podcast statements, your statements on TikTok and your statements to the pretrial services officer, you also testified under oath that you did not commit tax crimes that you plead guilty to before Judge Pauley, correct?

A I stated, again, that I never -- that I don't dispute the facts of the case, but that I should not have been prosecuted. I have for the last six years, including in the sentencing memo, said the same thing, again, again.

First time tax evader, never filing a late tax return, paying the taxes, all the money in Capital One Bank located at the base of the building I lived in, all the documents, all the bank records provided to my CPA and organized in three-ring tabulated books, which the FBI took, I don't believe that I should have been charged.

I should have been given the same opportunity as everybody else when you receive a letter from the IRS indicating that there is an issue with your taxes. I never received that. And I never had an opportunity to meet with an agent, with my lawyer or CPA, whomever, in order to keep this civil. It immediately, within that 48 hours, went criminal.

3814 1 0 All right. So, let me ask my question again. 2 All right? 3 Yes, sir. Α You testified under oath at a different trial that you 4 O 5 did not commit the crimes that you had pled guilty to before 6 Judge Pauley, correct? 7 Α Correct. 8 That was at a trial at 60 Centre Street right across 9 the street from here? 10 Α Yes, sir. And you testified on October 24th and 25th of last 11 12 year, 2023, correct? 13 Α Correct. 14 And not to spend too much time on it, you were placed 15 under oath just like you are here? 16 Α Yes, sir. The Judge told you, you had to tell the truth, 17 0 18 correct? 19 Α Correct. 20 And do you remember being asked a question about 21 whether you have ever made any public statements concerning the 22 legitimacy of your conviction and you said more than one, 23 correct? 24 Α Correct. 25 And then you were asked why you did that.

Do you remember testifying because there was no tax evasion, at best it could be characterized as a tax omission?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q Do you remember testifying about, back in October 24th, about the legitimacy of your conviction?
  - A As what I had just stated before.
  - Q Meaning that?
  - A I should not have been charged with a tax crime.
- Q You also talked in that trial -- you also answered questions under oath about the HELOC violation, correct?
- 12 A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q You also said you should not have had to plead guilty to the HELOC violation either, correct?
- A Correct.
- 16 O Tell us why you think that.
  - A Because while the statement on the document was not reflective, the HELOC, which stands for home equity line of credit, it is a nicer way of saying a line of credit based upon your home's equity, which really wouldn't sound right, I had more than ten times coverage.

And it's not the first HELOC I have had on that property. I have had a HELOC on that property for over ten years. I just moved it to First Republic Bank for a mortgage.

And as the TD HELOC was expiring, I had asked Gary Farro, the

banker, whether or not I can get a HELOC there.

So, I did not believe that it was material and that's why I said that I did not believe I should have been charged with that crime as well.

- Q Are you finished?
- A I am now, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q When you testified under oath and pled guilty that you knew at the time that your false statements on that application would be used as a decision by the bank, were you lying?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A I took the global plea that was provided.
- Q Sir, sir, please don't make a speech. It was a simple question.

MS. HOFFINGER: Your Honor, objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Please answer the question.

Q My question was, I wasn't looking for a global plea explanation. My question was a lot simpler than that.

When you testified under oath in front Judge Pauley that you knew at the time that you filled out those forms that the information you provided was going to be used by the bank in making a decision about that HELOC, were you lying at the time you made those statements?

A Yes.

- Q And that's because of the explanation that you gave in this courtroom just a minute ago?
  - A Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q So, do you remember on Tuesday when the prosecutor asked you about your testimony that I am talking about now, and the prosecutor said to you, that you answered questions in response to -- in response from President Trump's lawyer?

Do you remember that?

- A I am sorry. Can you say that again?
- Q When the prosecutor was asking about your testimony last October on Tuesday, do you remember those questions?
  - A I remember they were asking me questions, yes.
- Q I am not asking if you remember the questions from October.
  - A That's way the question sounds --
- Q I am asking if you remember the questions from Tuesday from Ms. Hoffinger?
- 18 A Yes.
  - Q And she said to you that you answered questions that were put to you by President Trump's lawyers in October, right?
  - A Correct.
    - Q But the questions that you just talked about, those were when you talked about the HELOC, and when you talked about the fact that there was no tax evasion, that was in response to questions from the Assistant Attorney General, correct?

- 1 A I believe so, yes.
  - Q So it wasn't just President Trump's lawyers that asked you about whether you lied in front of Judge Pauley, the Assistant Attorney General asked you questions as well, correct?
  - A Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

- Q Now, when President Trump's lawyers did start asking you questions, again, I am talking about questions at trial last October 24th and 25th, do you remember being asked whether when you told Judge Pauley that you were pleading guilty because you were guilty, do you remember being asked whether that was a lie, and you said, yes, that was a lie?
- 13 A Correct.
  - Q And you were asked again under oath last October whether you lied more than once in front of Judge Pauley and you said, yes?
- 17 A Correct.
- 18 Q And you believe you did lie more than once before
  19 Judge Pauley, correct?
- 20 A Correct.
- Q You also answered a question, do you recall that the reason why you lied was because the stakes affected you personally, right?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And you agreed?

M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche 3819 1 Α Yes. 2 0 And so, when you said that last October, was that 3 true? 4 Α Yes. 5 0 Meaning the reason you lied to a Federal Judge is 6 because the stakes affected you personally, correct? 7 Α Yes. 8 And there is no doubt that you know what perjury 9 means, correct? 10 I know what perjury means. Α Now, a few months after your guilty plea, I am sorry 11 0 12 we are jumping around a little bit, a few months after your 13 guilty pleas and sentencing, you testified in front of Congress on February 27, 2019, correct? 14 15 Α Correct. And the very next day you testified in front of the 16 Senate on February 28, is that right? 17 18 Α Yes. 19 And; again, you were put under oath like every other 20 time, right? 21 Α Yes. 22 0 Same exact oath? 23 As a matter of fact, the cover art for your Mea Culpa

A That is correct.

24

25

Podcast is a picture of you taking the oath, right?

3820 And it was taking the oath at one of those hearings in 1 0 2 February 2019, correct? 3 Α Correct. Now, when you testified in front of Congress in 2019, 4 0 5 you testified that you confessed to your mistakes about taxes 6 and other mistakes and plead quilty to that, correct? 7 Α Correct. 8 Did you tell Congress, either the House or the Senate, 9 that, actually, you had lied to Judge Pauley? 10 Α I did not. So, on Tuesday you talked about omissions. 11 12 Would you agree with me that by not telling Congress 13 or the Senate that you had lied under oath, that you were 14 omitting important information? 15 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. THE COURT: Overruled. 16 17 Α I don't believe I was asked the question. 18 Well, if we can go to, again, just for the witness, 19 the parties and the Court, B-518. And there is a long back and 20 forth when Congressmen ask you questions, they go on and on, 21 correct? 22 Α Yes, sir.

Even more than I do. 0

23

24 If we can go to page 36, excuse me. Sorry. Page 32, 25 and then if you can read, Mr. Cohen, the bottom of page 32 and

3821 1 then we will turn the page and read in to page 33. 2 Mr. Jordan, I thank the gentleman --3 I don't want you to read it aloud. Just read it to 4 yourself. I should have been more clear. 5 (Witness reads the displayed document.) 6 In your answer, correct? Q 7 Α Correct. 8 You say you said that you took responsibility and that 9 you take responsibility, correct? 10 Α That's correct. And you said that you take responsibility for your 11 0 12 mistake, right? 13 Α Yes. 14 You said you were remorseful and you are going to 15 prison? 16 Α Unfortunately correct. 17 Again, I am not prolonging this, but when you say, 0 18 remorseful, you are away from your family, away from your children, correct? 19 20 Α Yes. 21 But what you didn't say in that answer was that as 22 part of accepting responsibility you had actually lied under oath, right? 23 24 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Sustained.

Q Well, did you say at any point in your testimony before Congress on either February 27th or February 28th, what you testified to last October, that you actually lied to Judge Pauley?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q You repeatedly said to Congressmen, Senators under oath over the course of two days that you had accepted responsibility for your conduct, correct?
  - A Correct, and that I was going to prison as a result.
- Q And that you were going to prison as a result, correct?
- 13 A Correct.

- Q But do you agree with me that lying under oath is not accepting responsibility?
- A Can you clarify your question?
- Q Do you agree with me that when you plead guilty to a crime and you are lying, that's not accepting responsibility for your conduct, is it?
- A I accepted responsibility, and I was suffering the consequences as a result.
- Q So, let me ask the question again, putting aside the fact that you are testifying today that you accepted responsibility, my question is different.
  - When you plead guilty one of the things that you get,

one of the benefits you get of pleading guilty is a little bit of time off your sentence because you accepted your responsibility, correct?

- A That's correct.
- Q So when you were sentenced in December the Judge took into account that you had accepted responsibility for your crimes, correct?
  - A I don't know what the Judge made his determination on.
- Q Well, you know that under the guidelines calculation you get time off for accepting responsibility, correct?
  - A You do. You get a reduction.
- Q And you got that reduction for accepting responsibility, correct?
- 14 A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

19

20

21

- 15 Q By pleading guilty, correct?
- 16 A I plead quilty.
- 17 Q And for timeliness of your guilty pleas, right?
- 18 A Correct.
  - Q So, my question is, again, when you got the credit at sentencing for accepting responsibility you got that credit even though you lied, you lied to the Judge when you pled guilty?
- A Again, I don't know how Judge Pauley made his
  determination. Judges, as you know, have a wide range of
  discretion over guidelines.

I have seen people with me while I was in Otisville who had far greater, longer tax evasion issues who had a year and a day. So, I don't know Judge Pauley's determination.

Q Do you think Judge Pauley would have liked to know that you had lied to him?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled. He can answer.

- A I don't know what Judge Pauley would have thought.
- Q Your testimony is you don't know whether Judge Pauley would want to know that you had lied to him?
  - A I am certain that he would have.
- Q And if he had known that, that would have been something he would have taken into account at sentencing, correct?
  - MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 16 THE COURT: Sustained.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q Well, if you had told him in your sentencing submission, which you talked about a lot, by the way, I lied to you. What do you -- what's your understanding from all the folks you met at Otisville, and everything you been through, what's your understanding of what would happen if you put that in your sentencing submission?
- MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Sustained.
  - Q The reality is, and the truth is, there was nothing in

3825 1 your sentencing submission about the fact that you had lied 2 under oath, correct? 3 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 4 THE COURT: Overruled. 5 Α No. It was not in, but the sentencing came, 6 obviously, before. The sentencing memo was put in before the 7 sentence. 8 0 Does that matter? 9 Α No. You also were asked at sentencing whether you had 10 reviewed the sentencing submission and you said you had, 11 12 correct? 13 Α Correct. 14 And you had an opportunity to make a statement, and 15 you made a statement, correct? I did. 16 Α 17 O And your lawyer made arguments, correct? 18 Α Correct. 19 And your lawyer was asking for a sentence of time 20 served, correct? 21 Α Correct. 22 But you will agree with me that neither you nor your O 23 lawyer told Judge Pauley that you had lied to him, correct? 24 Α That's correct. 25 So you, by the way, you blamed a lot of people over

3826 the years for the conduct that you were convicted of, correct? 1 2 Α I blamed people, yes. 3 You blamed your accountant, correct? 0 4 Α Correct. 5 And at times you blamed the bank even? 6 Correct. Α 7 You blamed, as we talked about, the Federal 8 prosecutors, correct? 9 Α Yes, sir. 10 You blamed the Judge? 0 Yes, sir. 11 Α 12 You blamed President Trump? O 13 Α Yes, sir. Now, do you have any doubt in your mind that the 14 outcome of this trial will affect you personally? 15 Can you -- could you clarify your question? 16 Α Does the outcome of this trial affect you personally? 17 0 18 Α Yes. 19 Did you or your lawyers, as part of your sentencing 20 submission, or what you said at sentencing, say anything to 21 Judge Pauley about the fact that you had felt pressured and 22 threatened by the Government to make a quick decision on your guilty plea? 23 24 Α Did not. 25 So, by the way, your wife had nothing to do with the

3827 n,

leasing arrangement that you talked about with Mr. Freidman,
did she?

- A Some of the medallions, corporations, were in her
  - Q And when you -- when you received monthly payments, were the checks made to both you and your wife or just you or who were the checks made to?
    - A The corporation names.
- 9 Q What was the corporation's name?
- 10 A Which one. There were 16 corporations.
- 11 Q So you had 16 corporations to collect the lease fees 12 for your medallions.
- 13 A That's correct.
- Q By the way, there is nothing illegal or improper about having 16 LLCs, correct?
- 16 A Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

name.

- 17 Q It's actually smart business?
- 18 A It's actually standard in the industry.
  - Q And good business practice, correct, standard in the industry?
  - A In the Taxi and Limousine Commission, when you have what's called a Mini Fleet Corporation, that's two medallions or more, you need to have them in a corporation, as opposed to an individual medallion.
- 25 So just as an FYI, the A through F medallions that you

- see, those are individuals. The other ones are generally corporations.
  - Q Understood. Thank you.
- A You're welcome.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Now, jumping forward to -- still talking about the HELOC loan, you testified that -- so, in February of 2016, you get this HELOC loan from the bank, correct?
- A Correct.
- Q And that's the paperwork that you pled guilty to being false -- providing false information, correct?
- 11 A Correct.
- Q But when you opened that HELOC, line of credit, it had nothing to do with Ms. Daniels, correct?
- 14 A Correct.
  - Q So we are fast forwarding now to October, and I believe your testimony was that one of the reasons why you decide to use the HELOC was because you could hide it from your wife, correct?
- 19 A That's correct.
  - Q And while her name was on the HELOC loan, your testimony is that it was paperless so, you thought that you could move the money into the HELOC, pay Ms. Daniels and your wife would not know?
  - A Move the money out of the HELOC into the new company, what became Essential Consultants, and, yes, she would not know

3829 1 because it was paperless. 2 Well, you are skipping a step, right? 3 You would move the money from the -- let's say you 4 have, basically, a HELOC with no balance, you are allowed to 5 put money on it. So apply 131,000 to your new LLC from the 6 HELOC, and then you would owe on your line of credit \$131,000 7 right? 8 Α Correct. 9 And you were able to hide that from your wife because Q 10 you have paperless statements or what have you, correct? Correct. 11 Α 12 And you didn't tell your wife -- well, when did you 0 13 tell your wife about the HELOC? 14 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Overruled. 15 16 You can answer. Α I am sorry. The question again? 17 18 You testified that you didn't tell your wife --19 MS. HOFFINGER: May we approach? 20 THE COURT: Yes. (Discussion is held at sidebar, on the 21 22 record.) MS. HOFFINGER: Judge, I believe there is a 23

marital privilege. He is asking what he told the wife and

he is asking about underlying transactions. I don't think

24

	3830
1	it's admissible.
2	MR. BLANCHE: On direct examination as evidence
3	of the crime charged, this witness testified that one of
4	the reasons why he did this was to keep it from his wife
5	so, if anything, there is a crime fraud exception that
6	talks about
7	THE COURT: It wasn't to keep it from his wife.
8	It was to protect his wife.
9	MR. BLANCHE: He testified it was to keep it from
10	his wife. She is
11	MS. HOFFINGER: I never asked about
12	communications with his wife. I asked why he used the
13	HELOC.
14	THE COURT: There is a privilege here. It is
15	privileged.
16	(Discussion at sidebar concluded, and the
17	following occurred in open court.)
18	THE COURT: Sustained.
19	CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. BLANCHE:
21	Q Without talking about any communications that you had
22	with your wife, do you know whether your wife ever found out
23	about what you did with the HELOC and the \$131,000?
24	MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q You, by the way, you remember on March 9, 2018,
Ms. Daniels' lawyer, Michael Avenatti, put out a public
statement regarding the fact that you had paid \$130,000 from
the HELOC?

Do you remember that?

A Yes, sir.

- Q And you issued your own statement at the time and you said, in part, the funds were taken from my home equity line and transferred internally to my LLC account in the same bank, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q And you testified on Monday, and just a few minutes ago, that you decided to do it this way, it was quick, you could move the money quickly and because you wanted to conceal it from your wife, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q And you separately said on your podcast that your wife had no knowledge of the HELOC prior to March 2018, correct?
- A Not that she didn't have knowledge of the HELOC, that she didn't have knowledge of the transaction.
  - Q That's a fair correction.
- So, of course, she knew that you had a HELOC. She didn't have knowledge of what you testified about, that you moved \$131,000, right?
  - A Correct.

3832 1 0 Now, do you know that just two days later so, 2 Mr. Avenatti releases that statement on March 9th, Mr. Cohen? 3 Yes. Α 4 0 And you issued a statement the same day, correct? 5 Α Yes, sir. And then two days later, you know that you deleted all 6 0 7 the text messages that you had with your wife on March 11th? 8 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Overruled. 10 You can answer. I am not -- I am not aware of that. 11 Α 12 Well, did you have a practice of communication --0 13 deleting communications, generally, around that time, so March of 2018? 14 15 Α I didn't have a specific practice of that, no. But were there certain folks that you communicated 16 with over either Signal, Dust or WhatsApp that you encouraged 17 18 them to delete your communications with them? 19 Α Yes. 20 Q Which people? 21 On Signal it actually does it automatically. Α 22 people like David Pecker. But did you have a habit of asking, for example, your 23 0 24 wife to delete her communications? 25 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

3833 1 THE COURT: Sustained. 2 Well, do you know someone named Shirlene Sachs? 0 3 Α I do. Do you recall asking Ms. Sachs to delete all of her 4 O 5 communications with you and that you would do the same? 6 I don't recall that specifically. Α 7 MR. BLANCHE: So, if we can show the witness, the 8 Court and the parties, what's been marked for 9 identification as B 216. 10 Can you just take a look and see if this refreshes 11 your recollection? 12 MR. BLANCHE: We can go to the next pages, and 13 the next page. 14 The next page. And then if we can skip ahead to 15 page 22 of this exhibit. 16 And if you see the second entry, and the first entry. We can take that down. 17 18 Does that refresh your recollection that you asked 19 Ms. Sachs to delete all of your communications? 20 Α Yes. 21 So, I want to talk now about your testimony to 22 Congress about whether you ever requested a pardon, okay? Yes, sir. Α 23 24 On that February 27, 2019, House Committee Hearing you

gave a statement under oath that you never asked for, nor would

3834 1 you ever accept a pardon from President Trump, correct? 2 Α Correct. 3 And that was false, correct? 0 4 Α No, sir. Why was that not false? 5 6 I never asked for it. I spoke to my attorney about it Α 7 because we had seen on television President Trump talking 8 about, potentially, pre-pardoning everybody and putting an end 9 to this, what I deemed to be a nightmare. 10 So, I reached out to my attorney to ask him whether or not this is legitimate. 11 12 So, when you were asked -- when you provided 0 13 testimony -- and, again, same thing happened on that occasion, 14 you had to prepare remarks that you provided the committee and 15 then you read into the record, right? 16 Α Yes, sir. 17 And both of those prepared remarks in writing and also 0 18 when you said it in the record under oath you said, and I have 19 never asked for, nor would I accept a pardon from President 20 Trump, correct? 21 Α Correct. 22 Now, that was on February 27th. Do you remember about ten days later you were deposed 23 24 in the House Oversight Committee?

25

Α

Yes, sir.

Q And do you remember being asked the same question about accepting a pardon and you saying that you directed your lawyer to explore the possibility because you were a hundred percent open to accepting it?

A Yes, sir.

Q And the lawyer -- there were a couple of lawyers that you were talking about, right?

One was Mr. Ryan, who worked -- who was your lawyer who worked with a law firm called McDermott, Will and Emery?

A Yes.

Q And you spoke with her here named, Robert Costello about that same issue, about exploring the possibility of a pardon, correct?

A I spoke to Mr. Costello about that as well.

Q And in that deposition so, not the sworn testimony on February 27th, but in that deposition, you said that, you directed your lawyers to explore the possibility of a pardon because the possibility was constantly being dangled in your face, right?

A Correct.

Q So, do you remember that right after you gave that answer, the person who was questioning you asked you to reconcile your testimony ten days earlier saying you never asked for, nor would you ever accept a pardon and your testimony at that deposition?

Do you remember a question about how could you reconcile these two statements?

A I don't.

Q So, if we go to -- well, let me see if I can refresh your recollection.

MR. BLANCHE: If we can go to what has been marked for identification as B-80, just for the parties and the witness.

If we can go to the first page, that is the House Subcommittee deposition from March 6th, and now, if we can jump ahead to page 116.

Q And if you can look at the part where you are answering questions of Mr. Ratcliff about the statement regarding the pardon.

So, let me know when you have had a chance to read that?

- A Yes.
- Q So today you testified just a few minutes ago that when you said you never asked for, nor would you accept a pardon from President Trump, you said you never did, you just directed your lawyers to do that, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q But when you were asked in 2019 to explain the disparity, you said that you were talking about the -- you were talking about the present tense, you weren't talking about the

past tense when you were writing and stating that statement,
right?

A Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

O So which one is it?

Is it that you were talking in the present sense when you testified that you never asked for, nor would you ever accept a pardon from President Trump, were you talking about the present sense, like you testified under oath ten days later, or were you meaning that you never personally asked for one like you testified here today?

- A That I personally.
- Q So when you testified under oath at the deposition on February -- excuse me, on March 6th, that you were talking about the present tense, that was not true?
- A No. It was the present tense, that I  $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$  -- I was not asking for it.
- Q So, you are -- so, is your testimony that when you said, I have never asked for, nor would I accept a pardon from President Trump, when you said that you were talking in the present sense?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q But were you also -- did you also mean that you didn't personally ask for it, you had your lawyers ask for it?
- A Yes, sir, to explore it. Because, again, as I wrote, or as I stated, it was being dangled.

Q But maybe I am not being clear with my question. I will try to be clearer.

Is it that you, when you made that statement, you were speaking in the present sense, and so, it was a truthful statement, or did you mean I wasn't talking about myself, I was talking about my lawyers?

- A In the present sense.
- Q So, it has nothing to do with whether you directed your lawyers. You did direct your lawyers to explore the possibility of a pardon, correct?
- A I did.

- Q And when you read a statement that says that you would never accept a pardon, but you directed your lawyers to explore the possibility, that's not a true statement, is it?
- A At that present moment it was true. I wanted this nightmare to end. And so, with it being dangled, seeing it on television, I asked them, is this really something that they are talking about, can you find out.
- Q And what I am trying to understand is, given what you just said happened, what you wrote and then later said after being put under oath, that you never did that?
  - A I am sorry. Can you repeat that.
- Q You just gave a story that you wanted the nightmare to end, right?
  - A Yes, sir.

- Q And you had been hearing on television that they were dangling pardons. So, you directed your lawyer, hey, find out if I can get a pardon. I want this nightmare to end, right?
- A Not if I can get a pardon. If the President was going to be doing these pre-pardons.
- Q But you -- you testified that you were 100 percent open to accepting it, anything to end this, right?
- A Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

- Q And so -- and you did that with a couple of your lawyers, Mr. Ryan and Mr. Costello, correct?
  - A Mr. Costello was never my lawyer.
- Q Well, you asked Mr. Costello, putting aside whether he was your lawyer, you asked Mr. Costello to reach out to people in the administration, including Mr. Giuliani, about the possibility of a pardon?
- 16 A We spoke about it.
  - Q And as part of your conversation with him, you asked him to reach out to Mr. Giuliani and explore it, correct?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
  - Q And so, when you testified under oath less than one year later, February, on February 27th, 2019, that you never asked for, nor would you ever accept a pardon, that was a lie, wasn't it?
    - A At the time it was accurate.
      - Q Well, the very next day -- so, again, February 27th,

you say, I would never ask for a pardon.

March 6th, you say, yes, I would. I would direct my lawyer to find out about a pardon. And you --

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q The very next day, after all of that happened, your lawyer issued a statement, a public statement, that admitted that you had actually directed your lawyer, your attorneys at the time to explore the possibilities of a pardon, right?
  - A I just stated that, yes.
- Q And they did that to correct the record from your testimony in front of Congress, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q As a matter of fact, another one of your lawyers, Michael Monico, actually sent a letter to the Committee correcting your comment, correct?
- 17 A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

- 18 Q But your testimony today is that your comment was 19 true?
  - A The conversation was confusing for me at the time and so we corrected the record.
    - Q The conversation? What conversation, sir?
- 23 A The testimony.
- Q Sir, this wasn't a confusing conversation. This was a pre-written statement by you that you then read into the record

3841 1 when the testimony started, correct? 2 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. THE COURT: Overruled. 3 4 Α I am sorry. One more time. 5 You said that the conversation was confusing, but, 6 correct me if I am wrong, that statement was made in writing as 7 a prepared statement, and then you read it into the record as 8 part of your opening statement after being sworn under oath, 9 correct? 10 Α Correct. I was referring to what you just showed me, which was the -- that's why I am saying it was confusing. 11 12 thought you were referring to the comments that I just made. 13 And, yes, the statement, we corrected the statement. 14 So, your lawyers corrected the statement because it 15 wasn't true when you made it? 16 Α Correct. So, after the FBI searched your house and your hotel 17 0 18 and your office, you met with a bunch of lawyers, right? 19 Α I had one lawyer. 20 Well, you met with several lawyers, correct? Q 21 Α Correct. 22 Ultimately, you hired Guy Petrillo to be your lawyer? Q Correct. Correct. 23 Α 24 And you testified on Tuesday that you met with 25 Mr. Costello that time as well?

3842 1 Α Yes. 2 0 And you communicated with him multiple times on the 3 phone? Yes, sir. 4 Α 5 0 And over text? 6 Α Yes. 7 The first time you met Mr. Costello was actually in 8 Lowes Regency where your family was staying, correct? 9 Α Correct. 10 And you met him and Jeff Citron, correct? Correct. 11 Α 12 And you knew Mr. Citron from something that has 0 13 nothing to do with this, right? Sterling National Bank. 14 And the reason why you met with Mr. Costello was to 15 O talk about whether you might hire him, correct? 16 Α Correct. He was referred to me by Jeffery Citron. 17 18 And you understood at the time, I believe you 19 testified on Tuesday, that Mr. Costello had a good relationship with Mr. Giuliani, right? 20 21 Α Correct. 22 And he told you that? Yes, sir. 23 Α 24 And at that time Mr. Giuliani wasn't representing 25 President Trump, but he started representing him very closely

3843 thereafter, right? 1 2 Α Correct. 3 And you talked to Mr. Costello about your options, 0 4 right? 5 Α Can you clarify, options? 6 Sure. You talked to him about what you should do, 0 7 what your next steps would be given the FBI had just raided your office, home, hotel and safe deposit box? 8 9 Α Yes, sir. 10 And one of the things you talked about was cooperation, correct? 11 12 Α I don't recall that, no, sir. 13 So, you don't recall Mr. Costello telling you that one 14 of the things that you could do was cooperate against President 15 Trump, correct? 16 Α Correct. You don't think he said that or you just don't recall? 17 0 I don't recall. 18 Α 19 Well, do you remember telling him that you had nothing 20 on President Trump and could not cooperate? 21 Α No, sir. 22 Do you just not remember or are you sure you did not say it? 23 24 Α I do not recall. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Blanche, why don't we take our

1 morning break.

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Jurors, lets take our break. I will ask you during this break to please let the Sergeant know if you are unable to work next Wednesday, okay.

Thank you. I will see you in about 15 minutes.

(The jury exited the courtroom and the

following occurred:)

THE COURT: You may be seated.

(Witness is excused.)

(Recess is taken.)

SERGEANT: All rise.

Part 59 is back in session.

MR. COLANGELO: Your Honor, one application from the People regarding the cross conducted.

Mr. Blanche asked a series of questions of the witness regarding disclosure of the indictment while the indictment in this case was still under seal on March 31st.

We are concerned that that leaves a misleading impression with the jury because, as the Court knows, the fact that the indictment was unsealed by Order of this Court on the evening of March 30th, and there was a series of questions whether the indictment was still under seal on March 31st and later.

So, we request that the Court takes judicial

notice of the fact that the indictment was unsealed on the evening of March 30th and give a curative instruction to the jury of that fact.

THE COURT: Mr. Blanche.

MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, there was sustained objections to the fact that Detective Rosenberg told Mr. Cohen before the matter was unsealed that, it is done, and that was sustained, and the exhibit is not in evidence. And there was a series of interviews that were done by this witness that he testified about before and after that date.

And so, to the extent that the Court either on redirect or even on cross, I can elicit the fact that the indictment was unsealed on a particular day is fine. I don't think a formal curative instruction about a couple of questions is necessary.

MR. COLANGELO: I am looking at the real-time transcript, your Honor, so this may not be perfectly accurate, but Mr. Blanche asked a series of questions:

Do you recall on March 31st going on TV with a reporter named, Joy Reid?

Yes, sir.

Question: And, again, this is Friday,

March 31st, so it's when the indictment is still under

seal?

Correct.

That clearly left the impression with the jury that there was something improper about the status of the -- his understanding of the indictment. And as the Court knows, the fact that the indictment was unsealed the day before, it is perfectly appropriate for the jury to be advised of that.

THE COURT: I think the jury should be advised. The question is how.

What is the best way to do that?

MR. BLANCHE: I can -- well, I guess two options in my mind, better than the Court giving an instruction, I can just lead him and tell him and he will say, yes, or on redirect the People can do that and make it clear.

I don't disagree that there shouldn't be confusion on that type of issue.

THE COURT: Why don't we see if you are able to address it. If you are unable to address it properly, the People can do it on their redirect.

I don't think it requires an instruction from the bench.

MR. COLANGELO: Our only concern is this was an Order of the Court. We don't know if the witness was aware of the Court unsealing the indictment because it was the Court's own order.

We think it is appropriate for the curative

·	M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche
	3847
1	instruction to come from to you. It can be done quickly at
2	the end of this proceeding after this witness. And because
3	the questions were misleading, your Honor, we think it's
4	important that the Court correct it.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6	Why don't you let him to try to clean it up?
7	In the meantime, you can draft a curative
8	instruction to come from the bench. I will review it and
9	see if I should give it.
10	The jurors indicated that they cannot work next
11	Wednesday. So, that's off the table.
12	Let's get the witness, please.
13	LIEUTENANT: Witness entering.
14	(Whereupon, the witness entered the
15	courtroom and was properly seated.)
16	THE COURT: Let's get the jury, please.
17	LIEUTENANT: All rise. The jury is entering the
18	courtroom.
19	(Whereupon, the jurors entered the courtroom
20	and were properly seated.)
21	THE COURT: Please be seated.
22	THE CLERK: Case on trial continued.
23	All jurors are present and properly seated.
24	THE COURT: Jurors, I am informed that you are

unable to work next Wednesday.

3848 Thank you for considering that. 1 2 Mr. Blanche. 3 CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. BLANCHE: 5 0 So, Mr. Cohen, before the break, well -- so, you 6 testified earlier this morning you were never offered a 7 Cooperation Agreement with the Southern District of New York, 8 correct? 9 Α That's correct. 10 Same thing with the Special Counsel, with Mueller, O 11 right? 12 Α Correct. 13 The same thing, you are not a cooperating witness in this case either? 14 15 Α No, sir. The Attorney General, the trial that you testified 16 about before the break, you were just a witness in that case as 17 well? 18 19 You were not a cooperating witness, right? 20 Α Correct. 21 But is it fair to say that one of the reasons that you 22 accepted responsibility and pled guilty in August and then 23 again in November was because you wanted to explore 24 cooperation, correct? 25 Can you clarify that? Α

- Q Well, did you try to cooperate -- not did you try to cooperate. Did you meet with the Special Counsel in between the first meeting on August 7th and your sentencing?
  - A I did.
- O And on several occasions?
- 6 A Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

- Q And at those meetings, at least some of them, prosecutors from the Southern District of New York were there as well?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q So, just to help the jury to understand that, there are two separate prosecutors, Special Counsel just from DC, that was Robert Mueller, and then the Southern District of New York prosecutors, which are here in Manhattan, correct?
- 15 A Correct.
  - Q And you were meeting with them and providing information, correct?
- 18 A Correct.
  - Q But, ultimately, that effort did not result in a Cooperation Agreement, correct?
    - A That's correct.
- Q And since your sentencing in December, you continued to meet with the Special Counsel and Southern District of New York prosecutors, occasionally, until you showed up to serve your sentence for at least a little bit of time after your

3850 1 sentence, correct? 2 Α Correct. 3 And then we talked about yesterday, once you were at 4 Otisville you started meeting with the representatives from the 5 Manhattan District Attorney's Office. 6 So that was in August, correct, of 2018? 7 (Nodding affirmatively.) Α 8 And then, since you have been released from prison, 9 technically, although a lot of that was spent on home 10 confinement because of COVID, you have made several attempts to be released from your supervised release early, correct? 11 12 Α Correct. 13 And is it your understanding that there are all kinds 14 of factors that go into that decision, but, ultimately, the 15 Judge can decide whether to grant that, whether to release you 16 early, correct? 17 Objection. MS. HOFFINGER: 18 THE COURT: Sustained. Please clarify which 19 Judge we are talking about. 20 Q So Judge Pauley passed away? 21 Α Yes. 22 And your Federal case was assigned to a new Judge? 0 Yes, sir. 23 Α 24 And so, when you made these motions in Federal Court,

that was made in Federal Court to the new Judge, right?

3851 1 Α Correct. 2 And you tried that on multiple occasions, correct? 0 3 Correct. Α You first tried that, to be released from supervised 4 O 5 release about six months or so after it started, is that right? 6 Α No, sir. 7 How long after? 8 It was some months after, but it was not for 9 supervised release, it was for home confinement. 10 Right. You testified about that yesterday. 0 Before you were released from prison, you tried to 11 12 have your prison sentence reduced as well, correct? 13 Α Correct. Pursuant to the Rule 35. Pursuant to Rule 35, which is made within one year of 14 15 your sentencing and a Judge under certain circumstances can 16 reduce your sentence, correct? 17 Α Correct. 18 And then that didn't result in a lower sentence, did 19 it? 20 Α No, sir. 21 And then when your sentence ultimately expired, you 22 then went from being sentenced to being on probation or supervised release, right? 23 24 Supervised release. Α

And you are still on supervised release today?

A I am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q After you started supervised release, you have made several efforts to have your supervised release terminated early, is that right?

- A Correct.
- Q How many occasions?
- 7 A Three.
  - O Could it be four?
  - A It could be four.
  - Q And none of those have been successful, right?
- 11 A No, sir.
  - Q Now, in all four of those, one of the reasons stated to ask the Judge to release you on early supervised release was your ongoing cooperation with law enforcement, right?
  - A In conjunction with the first three included the work credits, as well as the program credits received at Otisville.
  - Q So one of the reasons were the overall circumstances of your sentence, right?

That you believed you were entitled to credits. You believed the calculation was inaccurate, but also in the Judge's discretion you wanted the Judge to release you early because of your cooperation, right?

- A For both of those reasons, yes.
- Q But you never, this whole time, all the meetings, you were never offered a Cooperation Agreement and you were never a

3853 1 cooperating witness, correct? 2 Α That's correct. 3 So I want to go back to your testimony last October in a different trial, October 24th and 25th, when you were under 4 5 oath and answering questions, correct? 6 Α Correct. 7 And you were asked questions about your cooperation 8 and you said that you did cooperate with the Government, 9 correct? 10 Α Yes, sir. And then you were asked a question about whether you 11 12 received a 5K1 or substantial assistance letter from the 13 Government, right? 14 Α Correct. 15 O Can you tell the jury what a 5K1 is? 16 Α It is a Cooperation Agreement with the Government. The Federal Government? 17 0 The Federal Government. 18 Α 19 It is a motion, a 5K1 Motion, correct? 0 20 Α Correct. 21 And if the motion is made by the Government, the 22 Federal Government, it allows the Judge to give you a lower sentence, right? 23 24 Additional benefit, yes. Α 25 And you get that, potentially, if you are a

3854 1 cooperating witness? 2 Α You have to be a cooperating witness. 3 And you were never offered a Cooperation Agreement, 0 4 right? 5 Α Correct. 6 And in response to that question, and on October 24th, 0 7 the question was whether you received a 5K1 or substantial 8 assistance letter, you said you refused such a letter, correct? 9 Do you remember saying that? 10 I do. Α That's not true, is it? 11 12 Α It's true. 13 So all of your efforts of cooperation, the Rule 35 Motion and every time you asked for early termination of 14 supervised release because you are a cooperating witness, your 15 testimony is that you refused a 5K1 letter is truthful? 16 17 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. THE COURT: Overruled. 18 19 Yes, it's truthful. The 5K1 concept was given to Guy 20 Petrillo, my lawyer, that was after I had pled, after the 48 21 hours that I was given to plead. And so, I turned it around 22 and I said, I am not interested. So let's not even talk about 23 it. 24 Who did you say that to? Q

Guy Petrillo, my lawyer.

25

Α

Q So you are saying that was early on, right after you plead guilty like in August?

A If I plead guilty, yes. The concept came up, and I wasn't interested, and I said don't even bring it up.

- Q And the concept you are talking about is the acceptance of an offer of a Cooperation Agreement?
  - A The 5K1.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q But you get a 5K1 if you sign a Cooperation Agreement?
- A Which I did not.
- Q Which was never offered to you, correct?
- A It was never -- it was never offered to me. As
  expressed to Mr. Petrillo, I wouldn't accept one.
  - Q So, all right.

Let's talk about your desire to work at the White

House.

You testified on Monday, but also on Tuesday, that you were -- that you had conversations with a lot of people about working with President Trump in the White House, correct?

- A Correct.
- Q And I believe you testified that you were never offered the role of Chief of Staff, and while you agreed that that role maybe wasn't right for you, you wish you would have been, at least, considered, is that right?
  - A I would have liked to be considered for ego purposes.
  - Q You also testified that you were offered the role of

3856 1 Assistant General Counsel at some point, correct? 2 Α That's correct. 3 That could have been -- you would have been a White 0 4 House employee in the White House General Counsel's Office, 5 right? 6 Α That's correct. 7 Now, as part of your sentencing in December, the 8 Southern District of New York wrote in their sentencing --9 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 10 THE COURT: Sustained. Do you recall -- do you recall arguments being made at 11 12 sentencing that you had wanted a role in the White House? 13 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 14 THE COURT: Please approach. 15 (Discussion is held at sidebar, on the 16 record.) 17 THE COURT: When you say, arguments being made, 18 what are you referring to? 19 MR. BLANCHE: So, the Southern District in their 20 sentencing submission said that there were text messages. 21 The reason why I am laying that foundation is because he 22 then testifies about that in front of Congress. 23 So, Congress says -- at Congress he is asked a 24 question, Southern District said you wanted a job in the 25 White House?

	3857
1	And he answers that question and the answer was a
2	lie.
3	MS. HOFFINGER: Your Honor, you already precluded
4	the Southern District's opinions one way or another as
5	being inadmissible in this case.
6	So, I guess I don't know what the relevance is.
7	I guess if he wants to ask if he wanted to work in the
8	White Hous, You can ask him that, but not what the
9	arguments were.
10	THE COURT: Right.
11	Do you feel like that is an inconsistent
12	statement?
13	MR. BLANCHE: I can go right to the testimony and
14	ask him to say, yes or no, about Southern District.
15	THE COURT: Why don't you skip whatever everybody
16	was arguing or saying and just get to the question?
17	All right?
18	MR. BLANCHE: All right.
19	(Discussion at sidebar concluded, and the
20	following occurred in open court.)
21	BY MR. BLANCHE:
22	Q So, I want to direct your attention again to that
23	February 27th, 2019, testimony from the House Sub-committee.
24	We talked a lot about that today, okay?
25	A Yes.

1 0 Do you remember being asked a question about your 2 desire to work in the White House? 3 Do you remember questions about that? 4 Α Yes. 5 And as part of the questions, the questioner said --6 asked about certain text messages that they had reviewed that 7 suggested you wanted a job in the White House, correct? 8 Correct. 9 And they had reviewed those from a sentencing 10 submission from December, correct? MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 11 12 THE COURT: Sustained. 13 So, do you remember -- do you remember telling 14 Congress that it was a lie, that you did not want to go to the White House? 15 Do you remember saying that to Congress? 16 I remember telling Congress I did not want to work in 17 Α the White House. 18 19 Well, do you remember saying, what you testified to on 20 Tuesday is that you didn't want to go to the White House? 21 Α Yes. 22 And that you wanted to continue in the role as President Trump's personal attorney, right?

And you testified that every President had one, right?

23

24

25

Α

Yes, sir.

3859 1 Α Yes, sir. 2 And you even testified about certain matters that you 3 handled for President Trump as his personal attorney while he was President, right? 4 5 Α Yes, sir. 6 But you definitively stated under oath that you did 7 not want, when asked the question about whether you wanted to 8 work in the White House, you said no, sir, right? 9 Α Correct. 10 You testified that you did not want to go to the White House, right? 11 12 Α Yes, sir. 13 And that you were offered jobs in the White House, O 14 right? 15 Α I was offered a role, yes. 16 O You also testified that you were present when President Trump reamed out Mr. Priebus because you hadn't taken 17 18 a job that you were offered, right? 19 And that job was a job we talked about a minute ago in 20 the White House Counsel's Office? 21 Α Correct. You weren't working for Don McGahn, right? 22 Correct. 23 Α 24 But the truth is, Mr. Cohen, you really wanted to work

25

in the White House, correct?

M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche 3860 1 Α No, sir. 2 You didn't simply indulge friends and family about 3 working in the White House like you testified about, you really 4 wanted to work in the White House, correct? 5 Α Again, no, sir. 6 You hoped that you would be named the White House 0 7 Chief of Staff, not just be considered, but be named the White House Chief of Staff, correct? 8 9 Α No, sir. 10 Are you familiar with somebody named Spencer Zwick? 11 Α Yes, sir. I know Spencer Zwick. 12 Who is that? 0 13 Α He was the fundraiser for Mitt Romney. 14 And was that when Mr. Romney was running for President? 15 16 Α Yes, sir. Do you recall having a conversation with Mr. Zwick 17 0 18 where he asked you whether you wanted to be Attorney General 19 Cohen or Chief of Staff, and you answered Chief? 20 Do you recall that? 21 Yes, sir. Α 22 And that was -- that was still during the campaign, correct? 23 24 Α Correct.

And then after President Trump was elected in

25

Q

1 November, he congratulated you, and he said, Chief of Staff.

And you said, that would be nice, correct?

- A Correct.
- Q Are you familiar with somebody named Rita Veygman?
- A I am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

- Q Who is that?
  - A It's a friend, family friend.
- Q She is a fashion executive in New York?
- 9 A Yes, sir. Actually, Florida, but, yes, she relocated.
  - Q And do you recall on November 9th, so right after the election, you told her that she was going to come to the White House with you to be your Assistant, Assistant to the Chief of Staff?
- Do you remember saying that?
- 15 A Yes.
  - Q And then a few days later, November 12, so still November 2016, you had a series of communications with a family member, with your daughter, where you discussed whether you still had a chance at the Chief of Staff position, right?
  - A Amongst other texts, yes.
- 21 Q Pardon me?
- 22 A Amongst other text messages, yes.
- Q And your daughter actually alerted you to the fact that she read that there was a consideration that Mr. Priebus
- 25 | would be Chief of Staff.

3862 1 And you said he is pushing like a mad man, right? 2 Α Yes, sir. 3 And then there was a continued conversation about 0 whether you still had a chance to be Chief of Staff, and you 4 5 said there was still many opportunities, right? 6 Α I think I also used the word, hybrid. Yes. 7 And in that text exchange you used the word, hybrid? 8 Α Yes, sir. 9 MR. BLANCHE: Let's take a look at -- just the 10 witness, parties and the Court. MS. HOFFINGER: It's in evidence. 11 12 THE COURT: We can show it to the people. 13 And you talked about --14 MR. BLANCHE: We will move on. We don't need to 15 show that. You can take the exhibit down. 16 17 0 You talked about, with your daughter, as you testified 18 on Tuesday, about other opportunities in the White House besides Chief of Staff, correct? 19 20 Α Amongst other things, yes. 21 Are you familiar with somebody named Kedar Massenburg? Q 22 Α Yes, I am. Who is that? 23 0 24 He is a friend of mine, a former CEO of Motown Α

25

Records.

- O He is like a record producer?
- A Former CEO of Motown, yes, sir.
- Q The same day that you spoke to your daughter about Mr. Priebus being named Chief of Staff, you had a communication with Mr. Massenburg where you, again, discussed whether you would be Chief of Staff, correct?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q And you told him at that point you just don't know, right?
- A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

- Q And then the next day -- so, do you recall on or around November 13th, President Trump picked Mr. Priebus to be the Chief of Staff, right?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
- 15 Q You told your daughter you were disappointed?
- 16 A That I wasn't considered, yes, sir.
  - Q And as you testified on Tuesday, you said that

    President Trump needed an insider and that's why you weren't

    selected, correct?
- 20 A Yes.
- Q And your daughter was frustrated, at least she
  appeared frustrated over texts, that President Trump didn't
  talk to you about it before he picked Mr. Priebus, right?
- A I don't know if I would characterize it as frustrated,
  as much as disappointed.

3864 There were discussions around that same time about who 1 0 2 would be President Trump's Attorney General, right? 3 Α Yes. 4 O And you told people you would like to be Attorney 5 General, correct? I don't recall that. 6 Α 7 You don't recall telling Keith Davidson that you 8 wanted to be Attorney General? 9 Α I don't recall if I told him that or he asked me, what about you being Attorney General? 10 So you recall him asking that or you just don't recall 11 0 12 at all? 13 Α I don't recall him asking that, no. And I don't 14 recall me telling him that's what I wanted. And then, eventually, there was a discussion about 15 O working in the White House Counsel's Office, correct? 16 Α That's correct. 17 18 You wanted to be named Special Counsel to President 19 Trump, which was the same title that you had had for nine and a 20 half years, correct? 21 Α No, sir. It was Personal Attorney to President Donald 22 J. Trump. 23 (Whereupon, Principal Court Reporter Susan 24 Pearce-Bates was relieved by Senior Court 25 Reporter Theresa Magniccari.)

1 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were continued from the following page:) 2 \* \* \* 3 CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION 4 5 BY MR. BLANCHE: 6 Ο. That's what you eventually were, but I am talking about 7 in November 2016, did you and your daughter have a conversation 8 where you said that you're going to ask to be Special Counsel to 9 the President? 10 Yes, but I was referring to Personal Attorney to the 11 President. Well, you talked about how, if you had that job, the 12 Ο. pay would be very low because you would be working in the White 13 14 House, correct? 15 No, I think that was for a different job. Α. 16

- What job was that for? Ο.
  - That was supposed to be Assistant White House General Α. Counsel.
  - So your testimony is, that when you said you want to be 0. Special Counsel to the President, you were talking about the job you ultimately were awarded, to be his Personal Attorney?
    - No, sir. Α.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When you were talking -- when you had this intense Ο. exchange about being Special Counsel to the President, that would be you working in the White House as the Special Counsel,

correct?

2.

- A. If there was a role such as that, yes.
- Q. You told your daughter that President Trump told his new Chief of Staff that he wanted you to be Special Counsel to the President; correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
    - Q. And you told your daughter that would be great, right?
- A. I am sorry. I don't think your are characterizing this correctly at all. My conversations with my daughter was I wanted a hybrid position, one where I would still have access to President Trump, but not be a White House employee.

That was what I had been asking for and the conversation with my daughter.

Q. In that conversation I believe we were both talking about, didn't you say that President Trump was very complimentary to you but that he couldn't come up with a title.

That was what I had been asking for and that was the conversation with my daughter.

- Q. In the conversation I believe you were both talking about, didn't you say that President Trump was very complimentary to you but that he couldn't come up with a title, right?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Well, you actually spoke with President Trump about that; didn't you?

A. No, sir. What I had spoken Mr. Trump, President Elect Trump at the time was to be Personal Attorney to the President. In fact, I brought in an attorney who truly a Presidential Historian.

Q. We'll get to that.

You don't recall having a communication with your daughter, we're still in November, where you said you were with him now, I'm talking about President Trump, and he wants me to go, just not sure the position, needs came up, and he told them it was complimentary, but not happy with the title I wanted.

Do you remember saying that to your daughter?

A. Yes.

- Q. And that title is Special Counsel to the President; correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And at the time -- I know eventually you're Personal Attorney, but at the time when you were having that conversation with the President Elect and with his newly named Chief of Staff, you wanted the title Special Counsel to the President and Mr. Priebus didn't like that title; correct?
    - A. I believe so, yes.
  - Q. And President Trump expressed some frustration that his new team couldn't find a place for you at the White House; right?
    - A. That we had not come up to a role for me in the White

House, that's correct.

- Q. Didn't you -- in the conversation I believe we're both talking about, didn't you say that President Trump was very complimentary to you, but they couldn't come up with a title yet?
  - A. Right. Yes, sir.
- Q. And then your daughter said, why not Special Counsel, who else would they give that to, Trump is President, he has the power to appoint anyone he wants; that's what she said to you?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you told your daughter that you were disappointed that the Chief of Staff, Mr. Priebus, was the one who got to pick what your role was; right?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you felt that way in part because you took some credit for Mr. Priebus getting the job as Chief of Staff; right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. So part of your frustration, as you expressed to your daughter, was that now that the Chief of Staff that you had helped President Trump pick was put in charge of finding you a job; right?
  - A. Again, my daughter may have called it Special Counsel to the President. The role that I had been asking President Elect Trump for was Personal Attorney to the President, which is

why, as I said to my daughter it's a hybrid role. I had already had other ideas in terms of what I wanted to do and what I needed to do financially for my family.

- Q. Well, what you really said to your daughter, and I am talking about on November 14th, is that you were very disappointed that Preibus was being given the power to determine my position, without me, he wouldn't even be in this spot; right?
  - A. I said that.

- Q. That wasn't about hybrid, that wasn't about being his Personal Attorney, that was frustration that President Trump's new Chief of Staff was given the power to select where you were going to go; right?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. You still even after November were still looking for a position in the White House, correct?
- A. Yes, sir.
- No, sir, I was looking for that same title, as Personal Attorney to the President.
- Q. Well, at what point did you switch from wanting to work in the White House as Special Counsel or General Counsel's Office to wanting to be Personal Attorney?
- A. I didn't want the General Counsel office. I made that crystal clear. I always wanted the title Personal Attorney to the President. I always said that there was no shame in being

Personal Attorney to the President of the United States.

- Q. Well, early in November Mr. Cohen, there were no communications about Personal Attorney, all the communications were about whether you would be Chief of Staff and then Special Counsel to the President in the White House; correct?
  - A. That was for my ego, yes.
- Q. Well, two questions ago you said you always just wanted to be the Personal Attorney. But I'm looking at text messages in November where you're not talking about being Personal Attorney, Mr. Cohen, you're talking about wanting a job in the White House as Special Counsel to the President Trump; correct?
- A. No, sir.

- If you look at the texts my daughter, I turn around and I state to her that I'm not the right person for Chief of Staff.

  Also, I also would not expect that I would be Attorney General because it wasn't within my qualifications.
- Q. But, you did think you were the right person to be Special Counsel to President Trump, you told that to your daughter; correct?
- A. Personal Attorney to with Donald J. Trump is what I wanted. Later on in the text messages you see the clarification in that title name.
- Q. So, later on, meaning in December and maybe in January, you clarified to your daughter about what you meant in November; is that what you said?

- A. My daughter used the title that I had at The Trump
  Organization, it was always supposed to be Personal Attorney to
  President Donald J. Trump.
  - Q. Are you familiar with someone named Gary Cohen?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Who is that?
  - A. Gary Cohen was the former President of Goldman Sachs.
  - Q. And when you say former, did President Trump appoint him to be the Director of the National Economic Counsel?
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. That was in that same period, in between the transition?
- 13 A. The transition, yes.
- Q. You were frustrated that Mr. Cohen was named to that position; weren't you?
- 16 A. I had asked for Mr. Cohen.
- Q. Were you frustrated that he was named in that position?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- Q. You were not despondent that he was being given a White
  House role and you were not?
  - A. No, sir.
- Q. You testified -- well, your testimony is that you never had a conversation with Mr. Davidson where you expressed frustration about Mr. Cohen?

- A. I stated I don't recall having a conversation with Mr.

  Davidson about that.
  - Q. Do you recall -- now we're talking we're in December now of 2016, your daughter expressed that it was ridiculous that Mr. Cohen was appointed and not you; correct?
    - A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

20

- Q. And she also complained that you were having a hard time getting tickets to the Inauguration Ball; correct?
  - A. I believe so.
- Q. Your daughter said that President Trump and his new people were walking all over you; correct?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you agreed with that, didn't you, at the time?
- 14 A. At the time.
- Q. You also agreed with your daughter that President

  Trump, and this is in December, isn't doing right by you in any
  way; correct?
- A. I was still waiting for the title Personal Attorney to the President.
  - Q. And, ultimately, you got that title in January; right?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. But you were disappointed that after all the work you had done for President Trump for nine and a half years, nobody, including President Trump, offered you a position in the White House?

- A. That's not accurate.
- Q. You were not embarrassed that after all the work you had done for him you were left being his Personal Attorney and nothing more?
- A. That's the role that I wanted. In fact, I asked Gary Cohen who provided me with the attorney Orin Snyder. And Orin Snyder and I, for about an hour, sat with President Elect Trump in his office expressing the reason why Personal Attorney to the President was the exact role that I should play. That's the role that they gave to me because this was a way that I could monetize that which I did.
  - Q. Now, do you know somebody named Darrell Scott?
- 13 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

- Q. Who is that?
- A. Darrell Scott was my co-founder of the National

  Diversity Coalition for Trump. He is a pastor in Cleveland,

  Ohio.
- Q. The event that you -- the only event that you attended during the campaign was at Pastor Scott's church; is that right?
- 20 A. Yes.
  - Q. That is the one you spoke at?
  - A. The New Spirit Revival Church.
- 23 Q. You were friends with Pastor Scott?
- A. We become friends, yes, sir.
  - Q. You knew Pastor Scott for years and years; right?

- A. I knew him for more than a year.
  - Q. Well, did you know him in 2011 when there was some talk about whether President Trump would run for the presidency in 2012?
    - A. I don't recall if he was part of that.
- Q. So you recall only knowing him during the 2015/16 campaign?
- A. I apologize. I don't recall if he was part of the 2011, but I have known him for years.
  - Q. Did you all communicate on the phone?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 12 O. Over texts?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And in person?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do you recall expressing disappointment to Pastor Scott repeatedly that President Trump didn't bring you into his administration?
- A. Not into the administration. I knew the role that I
  wanted to have and I may have expressed frustration, but I don't
  recall.
- Q. Well, do you not recall -- or let me ask it a different way. Did you have communications with Pastor Scott --
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Let me finish.

-- about your frustration that President Trump did not bring you to the White House?

A. I don't recall that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

- Q. Did you have communications with Pastor Scott even after President Trump was in the office of the Presidency about the fact that you weren't working in the White House and you weren't part of the administration?
  - A. I don't recall that.
- Q. Do you recall on National Prayer Day expressing frustration that you were sitting in your office and not in the White House with everyone else, all the people that you had worked with on the campaign; do you recall that?
- A. That I wasn't invited, yes, sir.
  - Q. Do you recall talking to Pastor Scott about that?
    - A. I believe so, yes.
- 16 Q. What do you recall saying to him?
  - A. It would have nice had I been invited, considering everybody that was part of the Diversity Coalition, people that I helped put together, were all there and I wasn't.
- Q. But your testimony is: You didn't say to him at that time, "I should be working in the White House with President Trump?"
  - A. Not that I recall.
- Q. Do you recall communicating with Pastor Scott regularly on the phone and over texts asking him to put in a good word

with President Trump on your behalf?

- Yes, I recall that.
- I am talking about 2015 and 2016, but even after the Ο. President was in the White House; do you recall that?
  - Α. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

- And your communications with him, this is while you Ο. were working at The Trump Organization and while you were Personal Attorney to President Trump; correct?
  - Α. Yes.
- Your communications were to him, in sum and substance, Ο. were about putting in a good word with President Trump so the President Trump would bring you to the White House?
  - I don't recall. To the White House? I knew the role, Α. again, that I wanted. I had already had the idea in advance, which is what I expressed to my daughter.
- Why did you need Pastor Scott to put a good word in for you with President Trump?
- Α. I knew he was going to be seeing him. While you are there, say something.
- What about during the campaign when you testified that Ο. 21 you talked to President Trump almost every day?
  - Α. I did.
- Why did you need Pastor Scott to put in a good word for 23 Ο. 24 you along that time?
  - Α. It's always good to have somebody else advocate.

- Q. What were you asking him to say to President Trump about you?
- A. How important it was for the Diversity Coalition as a basis for the campaign and its success.
- Q. Do you recall in November of 2023, just a few months ago, your lawyer, not your lawyer that is here today, one of your lawyers, applied for early termination of supervised release on your behalf?
  - A. Yes, sir.

Q. As part of that application, do you recall that there were fake cases, meaning fake legal cases, included in the letter around that application?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. What was your role in that situation, if you could explain that to the jury?
- A. So, as I was helping my friend, who had just moved his law office, for another attempt to submit papers for early termination of supervised release, I went on Google Bard, which is an A.I. tool, and I typed in a series of queries regarding the Second Circuit here in New York decisions on early determination of supervised release.

And the reasons -- because in our papers, for whatever reason, I believe we had the Eighth Circuit, and it created a

whole bunch of what they call, I think, phantom results, because

A.I. wants to please the user.

And I then provided to my counsel these three cases that were directly on point for why supervised release for me under the circumstances was just improper.

And I provided it to him and he included it in the document.

And those citations were inaccurate. Not the sum and substance, but the citations themselves.

- Q. When you say inaccurate, the cases just didn't exist; correct?
  - A. Under that specific citation, correct.
- Q. But that wasn't my question, about the specific citation.

My question was: The three cases that you gave to your attorney were not real cases; correct?

A. That's correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

- Q. And you knew that your lawyer was going to use those cases in support of your application; correct?
- A. I gave them to him to use in support of the application, yes.
  - Q. You were an attorney -- well, by that you were disbarred?
    - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. You were an attorney for over 30 years?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

- Q. And when you were a practicing attorney, you did corporate and litigation?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Part of litigation is drafting briefs; correct?
- 6 A. Yes.
  - Q. You did that?
    - A. I did that.
- 9 Q. All right.

I want to talk about something you testified about on October -- excuse me -- on Tuesday. You testified about a phone call on October 24, okay, 2016, so that's two days right before you make a payment to the HELOC. And then you move money over from your HELOC to your LLC. Then you wire the money to Mr. Davidson on the 26th?

- 16 A. Yes.
  - O. Correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you recall testifying in response to conversations from the prosecutor about the phone call you had with Mr.

  Schiller at it 8:02 p.m. on the 24th, two days earlier; do you recall testifying about that?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You recall saying that you called Mr. Schiller on that evening because you wanted to speak to then Mr. Trump; right?

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. You wanted to speak to President Trump to discuss the Stormy Daniels matter and the resolution of it; that was your testimony, right?
  - A. That was.
- Q. Then you testified just a couple of days ago that you were successful, you called Mr. Schiller and you had a conversation, and in that conversation you resolved you were moving forward to fund the deal; correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Can you explain to us how that works, you know that Mr. Schiller is with President Trump, and so you know that you can call his phone and that Mr. Schiller just hands President Trump the phone?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Was he on speaker? Do you usually just have privacy with President Trump when that happens?

Meaning, does Mr. Schiller put his cell phone on speaker and you talk to President Trump or does he actually give him the phone and you have a private conversation?

- A. I've seen both.
- O. On October 24, 2016, which one was it?
- A. I don't know the answer. I wasn't with them.
- Q. Can you tell from your conversation with President
  Trump whether he was on speaker or whether you were just talking

to him?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

20

21

22

- A. I didn't take notes.
  - Q. So you don't recall either way?
  - A. No, sir.
  - Q. But you recall that on that call -- I don't want to put words in your mouth, you discussed the Stormy Daniels matter and the resolution, and you also discussed the conversation would be that it was resolved, that you were going to move forward and fund the deal; right?
- A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. That was your testimony?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So I appreciate it was a long time ago, but what would you have said to President Trump on that phone call, what would he have said to you?
- MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 17 THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. Do you have any recollection of what you said to him on that day?
  - A. We talked about the matter. That it was resolved.
  - Q. I am not going to hold you to an exact language, when you talked about the matter, that it was resolved, is that the sort of thing that you would have said to him?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. I am sorry. How would you have said it to him?

1 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 2 THE COURT: Sustained. 3 The point is, you have a distinct and specific Q. 4 recollection, do you not, that on October 24th at 8 o'clock you 5 talked to President Trump about the Stormy Daniels situation; 6 correct? 7 Yes, sir. Α. 8 Now, you testified in the Grand Jury last March; right? Ο. 9 Α. Yes, sir. 10 You didn't talk about this phone call in the Grand Ο. 11 Jury; did you? Not that I recall, no. 12 Do you want me to show you the Grand Jury transcript 13 Q. 14 and you can check? 15 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained. 16 17 When you say you don't recall, do you recall talking 18 about this phone call when you met with the prosecutors before 19 your Grand Jury testimony? MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 20 21 THE COURT: Sustained. 22 Do you recall ever talking to the prosecutors prior to your testimony earlier this week about this phone call? 23 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 24 25 THE COURT: Overruled.

A. I don't recall.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. So the first time that you recall having a conversation with President Trump on October 24th at 8:02 p.m. is when you testified two days ago?
- A. No, sir. I just said I don't recall when I spoke to the DA about that specific matter.
- Q. On Tuesday you recall you were shown a particular call log between you and Mr. Schiller, and the prosecutor went right up to October 24th and said you had two phone calls that day, a voicemail and then a 1 minute and 36 minute phone call; do you remember that?
- A. I do.
- Q. You said that was with President Trump, Mr. Trump; you said that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. And do you remember being interviewed on March 7th of last year in the District Attorney's Office, which was about a week before you testified, and not saying anything about this phone call?
- 20 HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 21 THE COURT: Overruled.
  - A. I said I don't recall. They refreshed my memory.
- Q. Let me show you what has been marked for identification as B255.
- 25 MR. BLANCHE: This is just for the parties, the

1 witness and the Court. 2 Ο. These are some notes from the meeting. 3 You didn't take these notes, did you, Mr. Cohen? 4 No, I did not. Α. 5 Do you see at the top the date March 7th? Ο. 6 Α. Yes. It started at 9 a.m.? 7 0. 8 Yes, sir. Α. 9 MR. BLANCHE: If we can go to Page 9, please. 10 Actually, the page before. If we can blow up the bottom 11 line that says October 23rd to 25th. 12 (Displayed.) 13 Ο. Can you take a look at that to see if it refreshes your 14 recollection that you didn't return the phone call? MS. HOFFINGER: Can we approach? 15 16 (Whereupon, there was a sidebar discussion held:) 17 MS. HOFFINGER: Judge, this is classic Bornholdt. 18 He is not directing -- it is classic People v. Bornholdt. He is not directing his attention to where he was asked the 19 20 question about it. 21 MR. BLANCHE: I don't understand what the 22 objection is. THE COURT: The objection is, that you tried to 23 impeach him with an admission, but you haven't established 24

that he was asked the question about it.

	388.
1	MS. HOFFINGER: People versus Bornholdt.
2	MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, that's not what this is
3	showing. They walked through every day and he talks about
4	what he remembers for each day.
5	As a matter of fact, on the 26th, which I am about
6	to show him, he has a specific recollection of telephone
7	calls with Trump.
8	On the 23rd to 25th there is a dash verbatim
9	writing of everything that he is saying. There is no
LO	question and answer. It's just giving an explanation of
L1	what he remembers.
L2	MS. HOFFINGER: Which is exactly why he may have
L3	not been asked the question.
L <b>4</b>	THE COURT: That's why we have Bornholdt, to
L5	ensure that people are not impeached simply because they
L6	forgot to say something.
L7	You have to establish that he was asked the
L8	question. That he was directed to a particular area and
L9	they failed to given the opportunity, they failed to
20	reveal it.
21	(Whereupon, the following occurred in open court.)
22	MR. BLANCHE: If we can put back up to 255, just
23	for the witness, the parties, and the Court. Go to Page 8.
24	CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLANCHE:

1 Can you take a look at that, Mr. Cohen, and see if it refreshes your recollection about whether you were asked any 2 3 questions about the phone call on the 25th? 4 Α. Yes, sir. 5 Does that refresh your recollection about whether you Ο. 6 were asked any questions about phone calls on the 24th? 7 Α. No, sir. 8 And you have no independent recollection of that Ο. 9 meeting that would answer that question? Α. 10 I do not. 11 MR. BLANCHE: Now, if we can look at the next page of those notes and blow up that top. 12 13 (Displayed.) 14 If you look at the third line. It talks about calls 0. 15 between you and President Trump on the 26th, correct, two days 16 later? 17 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. 18 THE COURT: Why don't you direct his attention and have him read it. 19 Take a look at the third line. If you can read the 20 21 third and fourth line. 22 MS. HOFFINGER: Is there a question? Does that refresh your recollection that you did talk 23

on that date about phone calls with President Trump on the 26th?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

2.4

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. Do you have a recollection of talking on that day with the prosecutors about phone calls with President Trump on the 26th?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you did; right?
- A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

24

25

- Q. Do you remember -- I appreciate this goes back a while, do you remember at that time, October 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 2016, you were receiving a bunch of ongoing and continuing harassment phone calls, so somebody was calling you constantly; do you remember that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. And do you remember that on the 24th, at around 7 o'clock at night, the person who was harassing you forgot to block the number and you got the number; do you remember that?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- Q. Let me show you what has been marked for identification, just for you, the Court, and the parties as B165.

We're going to highlight some of this for you.

MR. BLANCHE: If we can highlight just the first couple of texts.

- Q. So, if you see, this is just for you.
- But, do you see the number, and that's you, then a
- 3 | number that ends in 0594; do you see that?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Do you see your text to this number that says, "This number has been sent to Secret Service for your ongoing and continuous harassment to both myself as well as to the organizations named on it?"
    - A. I do.
- 10 Q. That is at 7:10 p.m.; right?
- 11 A. Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

- Q. And then the text back says, "It wasn't me, my friend told me to call, I am sorry for this, I won't do it again;"

  14 right?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Then you respond and said, "They're going to have to explain that to the Secret Service," because you have been receiving dozens of these harassing calls over the past three days; right?
- 20 A. Correct.
- Q. "If you are a minor, I suggest you notify your parent or guardian;" that's what you said to them, right?
- 23 A. I did.
- Q. The person texted you back and said, "I didn't do it, I am 14, please don't do this."

3889 1 And you asked them to have their parent or quardian 2 contact --3 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection. He is reading from the 4 document. 5 THE COURT: Sustained. 6 Ο. You eventually said to have their parent or guardian 7 contact you? 8 When they expressed they were 14, I felt it was proper. Α. That was at 7:24 p.m. on that same date, October 24; 9 Ο. 10 right? 11 Α. I am sorry. What time? The last text was at 7:24 p.m.? 12 Ο. Correct. 13 Α. 14 So that whole exchange was between around 7:10 and 7:24 Q. 15 p.m.? 16 Α. Correct. 17 That was an exchange, because you had been receiving a Ο. 18 bunch of harassing phone calls the prior three days? 19 Α. Correct. Do you recall at 7:48 texting Keith Schiller about this 20 21 14 year old; do you recall that? Do you recall that? 22 Α. I don't recall. Do you recall texting Keith Schiller at 7:48 p.m., "Who 23 Ο. can I speak to regarding harassing calls to myself and office, 2.4 25 the dope forgot to block his call on one of them; you don't

recall that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

A. It sounds right. Yes, sir.

MR. BLANCHE: Let's take a look. If we can show the witness B266. Just the witness, the Court and parties.

Q. This is a series of texts between you and Mr. Schiller on that same date. You said: "Who can I speak to regarding harassing calls to my cell and office, the dope forgot to block his call on one of them?"

Do you see that?

- A. I see it.
- Q. Mr. Schiller says --

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, reading a document not in evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q. Do you recall at 8:02, your initial text to Mr. Schiller is at 7:48, and then at 8:02 he says, "Call me," to you; right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.

MR. BLANCHE: So if we can put up what is already in evidence as Exhibit 341 on the screen, please.

(Displayed.)

- Q. These are the phone calls between you and Mr. Schiller; right?
- MR. BLANCHE: And if we can go to the second page and highlight the 10/24, the 8:01 and 8:02 calls, please.

3891 1 (Displayed.) 2 Do you see --Ο. 3 MR. BLANCHE: If you can highlight the 10/24, the 4 8:01 and 8:02 calls. I see them. 5 Q. That's fine. That shows a voicemail at 8:01 from Keith Schiller to 6 7 you? 8 Yes, sir. Α. 9 And then at 8:02, he says, "Call me," and then it looks like you then call him at 8:02 for 1 minute and 36 seconds; 10 11 right? Α. Correct. 12 MR. BLANCHE: If you look at the "call me" text. 13 14 If we can take that down for a second and put back up B166, 15 which is your text message from that day. 16 (Displayed.) 17 You will agree with me that Mr. Schiller told you to call him at 8:02 and 21 seconds; right? 18 19 Α. Yes, sir. And so you called him back. 20 21 MR. BLANCHE: And if we can go back to that phone 22 record chart on 341 and highlight the bottom. (Displayed.) 23 You called him back at 8:02, it was likely after 8:02 24 25 and 21 seconds; right?

A. That's correct.

- Q. This is the call that you testified about on Tuesday, that you had a conversation with President Trump, that you called Keith Schiller, it wasn't to talk to Keith Schiller, it was to talk to President Trump about the Stormy deal and the moving forward; that was your testimony?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Let's look at what happens next. Let's go back to B166, at 8:04.

You text Mr. Schiller the number --

MS. HOFFINGER: I am going to object to reading a document that is not in evidence.

THE COURT: It's not in evidence.

MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, I will offer B166 in evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. HOFFINGER: I think he just needs to lay a foundation.

Q. You see the texts that you are looking at, B166, between you and Mr. Schiller. You can look at the first page too.

MR. BLANCHE: Please highlight the top third of the page.

Q. See, it says Cellebrite, it has your number, Mr. Schiller's number?

	3893
1	A. Yes.
2	MR. BLANCHE: We offer B166.
3	MS. HOFFINGER: With redactions?
4	THE COURT: If you can make the necessary
5	redactions.
6	MR. BLANCHE: We'll redact it, of course,
7	absolutely.
8	For now can it be shown to the jury and not in the
9	courtroom?
10	THE COURT: I don't know if you can do that.
11	We were told that we can.
12	It is being shown to the jury but not anybody else
13	in the Court.
14	Q. Let's look at it with the jury.
15	Just to go back now to the conversation between you and
16	Keith. "Who can I speak to regarding phone calls to my cell and
17	office, the dope forgot to block one of them." That was at
18	7:48.
19	At 8:02 he said: Call me.
20	I can put it back up again.
21	At 8:01 is when he leaves that voicemail?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. You call him back at 8:02 for 1 minute and 36 seconds.
24	At 8:04, you text him the number of the 14 year old who was
25	prank calling you; correct?

A. I did, yes.

2.4

- Q. Immediately he texts you back within a few seconds, he said, "Okay?"
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. The very next morning, at 7:58 a.m., you say, "Did you reach the family;" right?
  - A. Yes, sir.

MR. BLANCHE: Let's take that down.

- Q. When you testified on Tuesday that that you had a specific recollection that that 1 minute and 36 minute phone call on October 24th was not with Keith Schiller, that you called Keith Schiller and he passed the phone to President Trump, you finalized the deal with Stormy Daniels and you said, "We're going to move forward," and he said, "yes," because you kept him informed all the time; that was your testimony, right?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. That was a lie, you were actually talking to Mr. Schiller about the fact that you were getting harassing phone calls from a 14 year old; correct?
  - A. Part of it was the 14 year old, but I know that Keith was with Mr. Trump at the time and there was more than potentially just this. That's what I recall based upon the documents that I reviewed.
    - Q. Five minutes ago I asked you if you remember harassing

phone calls, and you said no.

And then I refreshed your recollection.

It's totally fair if you don't remember.

But now your testimony is that you were testifying truthfully on Tuesday, to a 1 minute and 36 second phone call, and you had enough time in that 1 minute and 36 seconds to update Mr. Schiller about all the problems you were having with these harassing phone calls and also update President Trump on the status of the Stormy Daniels situation because you had to keep him informed because every time you made any decision, you ran it by The Boss; that's your testimony?

- A. I always ran everything by The Boss immediately. And in this case, it could have just been saying everything is being taken care of, it's going to get resolved.
- Q. That's not what you testified to on Tuesday. You said you had a recollection of a phone call on October 24th at 8:02 p.m. where you called Mr. Schiller and he gave the phone to President Trump and you told President Trump about the updates, that you were moving forward with the funding, and he said, okay, go.

That was a lie, you did not talk to President Trump on that night, you talked to Keith Schiller about what we just went through; you can admit it?

- A. No, sir, I can't. I am not certain that is accurate.
- Q. You were certain it was accurate on Tuesday when you

were under oath and testifying, you were certain it was accurate you had a phone call to President Trump, but now you are saying you are not certain it was accurate?

- A. Based upon the records that I was able to review, in light of everything that was going on, I believe I also spoke to Mr. President Trump and told him everything regarding the Stormy Daniels matter was being worked on and it's going to be resolved.
- Q. We are not asking for your belief. This jury doesn't want to hear what you think happened?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BLANCHE: I want to put up People's Exhibit

262. It's in evidence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

(Displayed.)

Q. Sir, you may recall that the People showed you this exhibit and you testified that these were certain text messages between you and Mr. Schiller. It spans March 4, 2016 to November 4, 2016.

Do you see the exhibit?

- A. I am sorry, one more time the dates.
- Q. The dates, I believe --

MR. BLANCHE: If we can blow up the last one.

24 (Displayed.)

Q. It's from March 4, 2016 to November 4, 2016?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. You were shown all those texts by the prosecution?
- 3 A. Correct.
  - Q. If we can focus in on the October timeframe on this exhibit.

Did the People include the text messages that I just showed you between you and Keith will Schiller on October 24th on this exhibit?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You see those text messages on that exhibit?
- 11 A. I don't.
- Q. The People did not bother to include those on this chart; did they?
  - A. Not on this chart, no, sir.
    - Q. When they prepped you and they showed you this chart, right -- they prepped you and they showed you this chart, you didn't see this chart for the first time on Tuesday; did you?

      MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. When they prepped you, did they show you a chart?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

22 THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. Were you ever shown in prep the texts that I just showed you between you and Mr. Schiller about the harassing phone calls?

1 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. No, sir.
- Q. The first time that you seen those texts in seven or eight years was just a few minutes ago?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Given that your testimony to this jury is still, when you testified on Tuesday, that you had a specific recollection of a phone call with President Trump on October 24th, at 8:02, for 1 minute and 36 seconds, that you were telling the truth?
- A. Based upon what was going on and based upon the other message text messages and so on, regarding the Stormy Daniels matter, yes, I believe I was telling the truth.
- Q. So you were not basing your testimony on Tuesday based upon your memory, you were basing it on documents that the People showed you in prep; is that your testimony?
  - A. That refreshed my memory, yes, sir.
- Q. Was that true for just phone calls or was it true for other phone calls too?
  - A. I don't recall telephone calls on a specific date going back to 2016. Based upon the records and based upon the documents that you were reviewing.
  - Q. Mr. Cohen you just said that you don't recall phone calls back in 2016. That is not what you testified to on

```
3899
 1
     Tuesday. On Tuesday you testified that you remembered the phone
 2.
     call?
 3
                   MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
 4
                   THE COURT: Sustained.
 5
                   MR. BLANCHE: Is now a good time for break?
                   THE COURT: Jurors, let's go ahead and take our
 6
 7
          luncheon recess.
 8
                   Please remember all of the admonitions.
 9
                   Please do not discuss the case either among
10
          yourselves or with anyone else.
11
                   Please continue to keep an open mind as to the
          defendant's guilt or innocence.
12
                   Please do not form or express an opinion as to the
13
14
          defendant's guilt or innocence.
15
                   Enjoy your lunch.
16
                   (Jury leaving courtroom.)
17
18
                   THE COURT: You can step down.
19
                   (Witness leaving courtroom.)
                   * * *
20
21
                   THE COURT: Be seated.
22
                   I will see you at 2:15.
23
                   (Whereupon, the Court took a luncheon recess.)
                   * * * *
2.4
25
                   A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N.
```

1 MR. BLANCHE: Just briefly, we have a curative instruction drafted by the People regarding the unsealing 2 of the existence of the indictment. 3 4 My intention was to rehabilitate the questions 5 right out of the box after lunch. 6 If you want to take a look at that. 7 THE COURT: Let me take a look at it. 8 So let's see how it goes with you. 9 If it looks like it needs to be cleaned up some 10 more, I will read the instructions. 11 MR. STEINGLASSS: Very respectfully, the only relevance of this entire line of questioning was to suggest 12 there was an improper leak of evidence. They use the word 13 14 "leak." You sustained it. They used it once without being 15 sustained and once with being sustained; some kind of 16 improper leak. 17

Two, that Michael Cohen or Jeremy Rosenberg or both engaged in this conduct. There is no other reason to ask those questions.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, respectfully, this is not something that should be cleaned up by the person who asks the questions or on redirect. This should be cured by the Court.

The Court has given numerous limiting instructions in realtime at the defendant's request. You made this application at the morning break. It still hasn't been

1 cleaned up.

To be honest with you, I don't think cleaning it up by the parties is the right way to go. I think your Honor ought to clarify the record and eliminate any suggestion there was some kind of impropriety.

I think those questions were entirely improper.

I think it should be up to the Court to cure it, not Mr.

Blanche.

MR. BLANCHE: Judge, there are texts between Mr. Cohen and the detective where it's clearly --

THE COURT: What?

MR. BLANCHE: Where it's clear the news of the indictment had leaked.

Your Honor had sustained objections around that. The questions were not asked out of the blue. There was a very good faith basis for the questions. Indeed, the detective said they told the New York Times before they told you. Nevertheless, it's done.

I wasn't trying to do anything other than elicit the fact, which is entirely appropriate, that a detective assigned to this case thought it appropriate to tell a witness it was done.

You sustained the objection.

Your Honor, I am happy to clean it up. It shouldn't be an instruction from the Court to assume there

was something improper about the question. There is evidence that it happened.

THE COURT: There is nothing improper about the question except that we now know that you left the jury with the mistaken impression.

I appreciate the record you are making, Mr. Steinglass. I take instructions from the bench to the jury very seriously. So I weigh that heavily before I decide to do it.

I am going to give Mr. Blanche the opportunity to do it himself.

If I am not satisfied what he has done fairly and completely cleans up the issue, I will take care of it.

MR. STEINGLASS: The last point I will make -that's fine. I don't know if the witness knows that the
Order was issued by the Court unsealing the fact of the
indictment on March 30th.

THE COURT: I realize that. That's why I am keeping my options open. I might have to give the limiting instruction.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Separately, I have been informed one of the jurors apparently has a 1:30 appointment next Thursday. I have not yet spoken to that juror. I would like to take it up with that juror in the robing room

3903 1 during the break. I would like to invite one attorney from each side to join me in the robing room with the Court 2 3 Reporter so we can discuss it further. 4 All right. 5 Let's get the witness. 6 (Witness entering courtroom.) 7 8 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Cohen. 9 (Jury entering courtroom.) \* \* \* 10 11 THE COURT: Please be seated. THE CLERK: Case on trial continued. All jurors 12 are present and properly seated. 13 14 THE COURT: Mr. Blanche. 15 MR. BLANCHE: May I continue? 16 THE COURT: Yes. CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. BLANCHE: 18 O. Good afternoon, Mr. Cohen. 19 In the beginning of the day today, do you remember I 20 21 showed you some text messages between you and Detective 22 Rosenberg? Α. I do. 23 Now, I want to make sure there is no confusion. 24 Ο. 25 You don't have any evidence that anybody at the

1 District Attorney's Office improperly leaked or even leaked at all the indictment before it was unsealed; do you? 2 3 Α. No. We were talking about dates, and just to go back to 4 Ο. 5 that time a little over a year ago, you know that around 6 March 30th or actually on March 30th, the Court unsealed the 7 indictment, so it was then part of the public record; correct? 8 Α. Correct. 9 So to the extent that I asked you questions about what 10 you learned or heard from Detective Rosenberg about the 11 indictment by March 30th, it was public and unsealed; correct? Α. Correct. 12 13 THE COURT: Please approach. 14 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held at 15 sidebar:) 16 THE COURT: That was good, but you have to take it 17 a step further. At the time he appeared on CNN and spoke 18 about it, it was already unsealed. MR. BLANCHE: All right. 19 20 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in 21 open court:) 22 CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BLANCHE: 23

I also asked you questions about appearing on television on that

24

25

Ο.

Just a couple of more questions about that, Mr. Cohen.

day; right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

- A. You did.
- Q. And just to be clear, when you did those interviews, the indictment was unsealed by the Court; correct?
  - A. I had read it through the New York Times article.
- Q. But beyond that, if I suggested to you that you were not supposed to talk about it on CNN, I want to make sure you understand by the time you went on CNN it was public?
  - A. Correct.
- MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, before lunch we had

  offered B166 without redactions. We now have redactions.
- 12 THE COURT: Thank you.
  - MR. BLANCHE: If we can put up B165, just for the witness, the Court and the parties.
    - Q. Mr. Cohen, you are looking at what we talked about before lunch, which is a series of messages between you and an unknown who says they're 14?
- 18 A. Yes.
  - Q. The difference now is we applied redactions; correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. Now, the number that you are communicating with is 0594, the rest is redacted?
    - A. That is correct.
- MR. BLANCHE: We offer B165.
- 25 MS. HOFFINGER: No objection.

THE COURT: Accepted.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

24

25

(Whereupon, Defense Exhibit B165 was received and marked into evidence.)

MR BLANCHE: Just very quickly, if we can blow up the first four or five texts back and forth.

(Displayed.)

- Q. So these are the texts that we talked about before lunch where this 0594 probably mistakenly forgot to block their number at some point. Can you read what they said to you and what you said back?
- A. This number has just been sent to Secret Service for your ongoing and continuous harassment to both my cell as well as to the organization's main line.
- Q. That was at 7:10. At 7:11 we answer back. He says: It wasn't me?
  - A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. At 7:11 he says, "My friend told me to call;" correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. Three minutes later an apology, "I'm sorry for this?"
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. A further apology, "I won't do it again."
- What do you say at 7:15? If we can focus on that part of the tech exchange?
  - A. "You will need to explain this to Secret Service as we have been receiving dozens of these harassing calls over the

past three days. If you are a minor, I suggest you notify your
parent or guardian."

Q. Then the response back a few minutes later, one minute later, "I didn't do it," in all caps.

Then another one: "I'm 14."

Another one: "Please don't do this."

Then, you as you testified earlier, if we can go down to the 7:17 text, what do you say back?

- A. "Please have your parent or guardian contact me before Secret Service reaches out to them."
- Q. Just so when you testified earlier that that last message back to this 0594 number, that was at 7:24 and 50 seconds; correct?
- 14 A. Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

- Q. You testified on Monday -- what I would like to do, Mr. Cohen, is going through in a timely fashion what you testified about on Monday. I want to start in 2011. You said you came across a poll that suggested that President Trump might be a good candidate for President; correct?
- 20 A. That's correct.
  - Q. I just want to make sure we're on the same page. That poll was actually in 2010, late 2000s?
    - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And there was some press coverage about it at the time; correct?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. You testified you caused a website to be created "Should Trump run;" right?
  - A. Dot com.
- Q. Dot com.

And that was put up in November of 2010; does that sound right?

- A. Correct.
- Q. At the time, is it fair to say that the press regarded this as a little bit of a stunt by President Trump?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. And a little bit later on, in March of 2011, isn't it true the National Enquirer actually ran an article about this issue and about how strong President Trump looked in the polls?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. You actually worked with the National Enquirer to help get that story out; correct?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 O. This was in 2011?
- 20 A. Correct.
  - Q. And they actually -- the National Enquirer actually wrote a positive story about you personally at that time as being the person who started "Should Trump Run Dot Com;" right?
  - A. That's correct.
    - Q. You were the source or one of the sources for that

story; right?

2.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And the reason for the question is, you worked very hard -- putting aside what happened in 2015 and 2016, you worked very hard during your time working for The Trump Organization to get positive stories into the press about President Trump and all the things he was doing; right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. You also worked very hard to make sure that there were positive stories about you at times as well; right?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Now, can you explain to the jury how you go about doing that? So how do you go about getting a reporter or a newspaper or interviewer to say positive things about you or about The Trump Organization?
- A. So I know many of the journalists/reporters in the various different newspapers, and have a longstanding relationship with, again, many of them, what I would do, depending upon what the issue is, whether it's a construction, an acquisition, whether it had something to do with one of the various businesses that fell within the umbrella of the Trump Organization, I would reach out to them and I would ask them if they would be interested in doing an article about this specific topic. That I would give them the exclusive on it.
  - Q. That was one example. If you learned -- now, let's

take the opposite. If you learned that a reporter or a
newspaper or magazine was going to write something negative
about The Trump Organization or of the The Apprentice or
President Trump himself, what kind of steps would you take, if
any, to either get rid of that story or to minimize the negative
press?

A. So that's a little bit different. One of the things is instead of me calling the journalist, the journalist was calling me to send an email to somebody at The Trump Organization saying we're writing a story about whatever the topic may be. We have a deadline of say 5 p.m., so we would like for you to comment on the topic.

What I would do then is, I would immediately go to Mr. Trump's office and I would discuss that specific topic with him and we would come up with a response, a way to craft a response that I would then take back to the journalist.

- O. You did that a lot; is that fair?
- A. That's fair.

- Q. You had a Rolodex full of reporters, contact information; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. So you wouldn't always have to go into President

    Trump's office to ask him how to handle the story, you often

    just handled it on your own, depending on the story; correct?
- 25 A. No, sir.

Q. You never reached back out to a reporter, ever, without first checking with President Trump?

- A. It was my routine to always advise Mr. Trump, because if the story that I was going to put out is not the way he would want it; one, it would cause him to blow up at me. And, two, it would probably mean the end of my job.
- Q. Over the course of nine and a half years, every time that you worked to change the narrative of a story, you did that never on your own, only in consultation with President Trump?
- A. For the story, yes. Always in consultation, but remember, one magazine, one newspaper would pick up the same story. So I would use the same statement over and over again. So with those, I would not go to Mr. Trump and tell him. I would just send it out to my list of reporters. Or if they contacted me, hey, we're looking for a comment on so and so. Generally what would happen, after one newspaper puts out a story, somebody else tends to follow and so we just mimic the same response to the next magazine or the next newspaper and so on.
- Q. There were plenty of times, Mr. Cohen in 2015 and 2016, for example, that you would comment about stories without speaking to President Trump at all; isn't that true?
- A. No, sir. I would always get a comment or something in line with a conversation that we had on that specific topic.

  Again, if I did that, and he didn't like the response, it would

probably cost me my job.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

- Q. But you knew when President Trump was running in 2015 and 2016, you knew the campaign at times was very frustrated with you because you were going off message from what President Trump and the campaign wanted; correct?
- A. I knew they were upset about it. However, Mr. Trump had turned around and advised me, I don't answer to them. And so, he's free to speak on his own as I was not part of the campaign. I was a surrogate.
- Q. So your testimony is that the frustration towards you didn't come from President Trump but it came from the campaign staffers?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Going back to 2011, eventually President Trump says,

  "I'm not going to run?"
- 16 A. That's correct.
  - Q. Several months later you worked with Mr. Davidson to cause The Dirty to remove the article about Ms. Daniels; correct?
- 20 A. Correct.
  - Q. That was in May or so, President Trump said he wasn't going to run; correct?
    - A. It was around the sweeps at the time.
  - Q. Much later, in 2011, is when The Dirty article came down and you talked to Mr. Davidson; correct?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. So fair to say that the first time that you heard about that incident and the story by Ms. Daniels is when you talked to President Trump about it, he said that he was worried about what his family would think; correct?
  - A. Yes, as well as, of course, for the brand.
- Q. Well, do you recall meeting with law enforcement on February 18, 2021, and saying that the first thing that President Trump said to you was that his family won't like that very much; that's true, right?
  - A. That is true.
- Q. And often, including on that occasion, you handled that type of story by threatening legal action; right?
- 14 A. Yes.
  - Q. Whether it's a cease and desist by you or by another party, that's a frequently common way that you handled negative stories or stories that you want to be taken off of websites or not be published?
  - A. Along with -- The Dirty was actually effectuated by Keith Davidson, not by myself.
    - Q. Understood.
    - But my question was: Who did it?
- The question was: The plan was for you and Mr.
- 24 Davidson to threaten legal action. A letter was written by Mr.
- 25 Davidson and it worked?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. The way you handled it, the way you handled that wasn't unusual, you handled it many times for President Trump that way, threatening legal action, writing a letter or having somebody else do that working with you; correct?
- A. Not necessarily a letter. Many times it was just via phone.
- Q. And that's not unique to you, that happens all the time in litigation when a party is trying to get a story taken down, for example?
- 11 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 12 THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. You've used that tool many times over the years;

  correct?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And some of the reporters that you had a very strong relationship with include folks like Chris Cuomo?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Katy Tur?
- 20 A. Yes?
- Q. And we talked a little bit on Tuesday about a reporter named Maggie Haberman?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So, talking for a few minutes about Ms. Haberman, who does she work for?

- A. She is with the New York Times.
- Q. And over the years -- well, let me ask you this: When did you first meet Ms. Haberman?
  - A. Over 20 years ago.
  - O. So you met before so early 2000?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Over the years, you have a very strong -- would you describe your relationship with her very strong?
- A. I would.
  - Q. You asked her to write positive stories about you; correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
  - Q. As a matter of fact, when you started in your official role in 2017 as President Trump's Personal Attorney, you asked her to write a story and say what a great idea it was?
    - A. I asked her if she would write a story.
  - Q. That was my question. You asked her to write a story saying how good it was that you had that role for President Trump; right?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And, in exchange for that, you would give tips to Ms.
  Haberman; correct?
- A. Not in exchange, I would use Ms. Haberman if the story
  was something that I believed the New York Times would run, and
  if it wasn't the New York Times style story, I would go to a

different newspaper.

- Q. But there were a number of times when you gave Ms. Haberman a scoop, as you testified about, on Tuesday?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Even at times -- by the way, you recorded a lot of conversations that you had with reporters; right?
  - A. No, sir, I won't characterize it as a lot.
  - Q. How many would you characterize it as?
  - A. Forty.
- Q. So 40, with 40 separate reporters, or just a handful of reporters that you recorded?
- A. Over the ten years, it was probably a little more than a handful.
- Q. Why did you record conversations you were having with reporters?
- A. I used to use the recordings as well -- as sort of to memorialize it for note taking, so I could go back and listen to it, instead of not paying attention when I was talking to them.
- Especially if it revolved around being a surrogate for the campaign. That way, I could use the conversation to figure out what was the best response when I was on television, so that it made sense and that it was what I believed Mr. Trump would want.
- Q. Well, have you stopped -- did there come a time when you stopped recording conversations with reporters?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. When was that?
- A. After the election.
  - Q. After which election?
  - A. 2016.
- Q. You didn't record conversations with reporters in 2017 and 2018?
  - A. I would have to check.
  - Q. We'll check together in a minute.
- 10 A. Okay.
  - Q. Did you at one point record -- well, do you recall sharing a recording that you had made of another person with Ms. Haberman to help her write a story?
- 14 A. I am sorry, one more time.
  - Q. Do you recall in 2018, in February, sharing with Ms. Haberman a recording you had made where you recorded a different person to help her write a story; do you recall that?
  - A. I recall sharing a recording. I don't remember the exact nature of it.
  - Q. Well, do you remember --
- MR. BLANCHE: Well, let's show you, if I may B174,

  just for the Court, the witness and the parties.
- 23 And if we can go to Page 295.
- Q. So you see a back and forth text there between you and
  Ms. Haberman and then you see the title of article.

We can go to the next page.

2 And then you see that you received an article from Ms.

3 Haberman.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

21

22

23

Then you answer her back at the bottom in green.

Can you take a look at that.

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you say -- do you not --

MR. BLANCHE: Can you take that down.

- Q. To help her write another story, you're going to share with her a recording that you made of another individual; right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. By the way, did you tell people you were recording them?
- 14 A. No, sir.
  - Q. Do you remember on several occasions people asked you if you were recording them and you said no on the recording?
- 17 A. No, sir.
- 18 Q. You don't remember that?
- A. I don't remember that specifically. It's not illegal in New York for one party.
  - Q. Mr. Cohen, I did not ask you whether you were breaking the law. I just asked you if you told the people you were recording them.
- 24 And you didn't; right?
- 25 A. That's correct.

- Q. Ms. Haberman over the years has written a lot of articles about you?
  - A. I don't know how to characterize a lot.
  - Q. Is 38 a lot?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

A. Sounds like it, yes.

MR. BLANCHE: Well, let's take a look at B242, just for the witness, the parties and the Court.

- Q. Take a look at what's just a screen shot of a number of articles that Ms. Haberman has written about you, including as recently as two weeks ago; right?
  - A. Yes, sir.
    - Q. Does 38 articles sound about right?
- 13 A. I didn't participate in all 38 of these.
  - Q. My question is, the reason why -- one of the reasons why you want relationships with reporters is to give you an opportunity to respond before an article is written; right?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. To give you an opportunity to push information to the reporter if you think an article should be written; correct?
- 20 A. Correct.
  - Q. Also to shape an article -- so, maybe that's not the word you would use, you can pick the word, but to make the article come out in a way as favorable to you or at the time President Trump as possible; right?
  - A. That is correct.

- Q. So the example I just went through with Ms. Haberman, you had several reporters where you had the same relationship?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Now, with reporters, you communicated over text?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. Signal?

3

4

7

8

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Dust?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. WhatsApp sometimes?
- 11 A. Sometimes.
- 12 Q. Obviously, on the phone.
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Did you distinguish among those types of
  communications, depending on the story or the reporter, or it
  depended on what you were using with the reporter?
- A. Depends on what I was using with the reporter. If it
  was a private or an unusual type of situation, I would go to one
  of the encrypted apps.
- Q. Now, you said that you recorded approximately 40 separate times with reporters. But there were 95 secret recordings on your iPhone?
- 23 A. Correct.

- Q. Who were you recording besides reporters?
- 25 A. This gentleman that you showed me.

- Q. Which gentleman?
- 2 A. Fromer.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

22

23

- Q. Which gentleman?
- A. Fromer. He is not a reporter.
  - Q. When you say "the person I just showed you," you mean the recordings you were sharing with Ms. Haberman was a recording between you and that individual; right?
    - A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. That's one. I am not looking for you to name, you 10 know, 55.
- 11 A. The reason I am bringing him up -- the reason I am
  12 brining him up --
- 13 0. Sure.
- A. Because there were multiple recordings of him. That's why I said there were about 40.
- Q. So, besides him, you recorded -- who else did you record surreptitiously, it was reporters, that individual, who else?
- A. I recorded -- off the top of my head, I can't tell you.

  Jeff Zucker on one event. Mr. Trump on another event. And

  there are other reporters.
  - Q. Let's talk about the recording that you made of your then client, correct, President Trump?
  - A. Correct.
- 25 Q. You understand that it's not ethical for a lawyer to

3922 record a conversations with their client; correct? 1 2 Α. That's correct. 3 Ο. And you were a member of the New York Bar at the 4 time? 5 Α. I was. You know that there are a lot of New York Bar opinions 6 Q. 7 on this, but unless there is very specific circumstance, you're not supposed to record your client; correct? 8 9 A. You're not except, of course, Crime-Fraud Exception Rule 12. 10 11 12 13 (Whereupon, Theresa Magniccari, Senior Court Reporter was 14 relieved by Susan Pearce-Bates, Principal Court Reporter.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche 3923 1 (Continued from the previous page.) 2 The crime fraud exception, didn't you testify that you were recording -- that you recorded your client because you 3 wanted to convince Mr. Pecker that money was coming? 4 5 Α That's correct. 6 So, are you saying that you did the recording under a 0 7 client fraud exception? 8 Α No. You asked if there are exceptions, and I said 9 yes, the crime fraud exception rule. 10 So, you --O I was just giving the example. 11 12 Just so I understand it, you surreptitiously recorded 0 13 your client so that you could play a privileged, recorded 14 communication between you and your client with a third-party, that's what you did, right? 15 That's correct. 16 Α And, again, you never -- you certainly didn't tell 17 0 18 President Trump you were recording him, did you? 19 Α I did not. 20 Now, you talked about 2015 when President Trump 21 announced he was going to run, and he comes down to Trump 22 Tower, he comes down the escalator, correct? Α Yes, sir. 23 24 Prior to that President Trump had launched an

Exploratory Committee in March of 2015, right?

Α Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

- And an Exploratory Committee is a step in the right direction for someone who may seek to run for the Office of the Presidency of the United States, correct?
  - Α Correct.
- And in June of that year is when he announced, 0 correct?
- Α Correct.
  - Now, you testified that you have very specific Q recollection of a meeting that you then had at Trump Tower with yourself, President Trump and David Pecker, correct?
  - Α Yes, sir.
- And this is a meeting where you all discussed what National Enquirer, Mr. Pecker, would do to help President 14 Trump, correct?
- 16 Α Correct.
  - You testified earlier this week that the so-called 0 power of the National Enquirer is its placement in supermarkets, right?
    - Α Correct.
- 21 But you never said that to the Grand Jury, did you? O 22 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- THE COURT: Sustained. 23
- 24 That's not something -- did you ever discuss the power 25 of the National Enquirer's placement in the supermarket with

anybody prior to your testimony on Monday?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A I am so sorry. One more time, please.
- Q Prior to your testimony earlier this week when you testified that the power of the National Enquirer is one of the -- is its placement in the supermarket, my question is, had you ever told anybody that before your testimony this week?
  - A Not that I recall.
- Q Now, and when we talked about this on Tuesday afternoon, but you learned about what David Pecker testified about in this trial, didn't you?
  - A No, sir.

- Q You didn't say on TikTok, from everything I heard from people today, David Pecker is basically corroborating what I have been saying for years?
  - A Yes. That's a general statement.
- Q Because people told you about Mr. Pecker's statements, you testified about that on Tuesday, correct?
  - A What David Pecker was testifying to, people just corroborated that it corroborates my story. That I am -- that I have been talking about for the last six years, not the specifics.
  - Q So -- and you testified thereafter about a story that the National Enquirer folks alerted to you involving Dino

3926 1 Sajudin, correct? 2 Α Correct. 3 Now, you testified a lot about that on Monday, but that story, by the way, is completely false, correct? 4 5 Α Yes, sir. 6 And by, completely false, I mean, money was paid to 7 keep the story from getting out, but the story was false, 8 correct? 9 Α I believe so, yes. 10 Well, do you have any doubt in your mind that it was 0 false? 11 12 Α No, sir. 13 And isn't it true that at the time when you talked to President Trump about this false story, he was worried about 14 the story getting out because of his employees, right? 15 He mentioned that I should speak to them as well, yes. 16 Α Well, he told you, did he not or -- you previously 17 0 told law enforcement that he told you that he was concerned 18 19 about the story because it involved people that still worked 20 with him and worked for him, correct? 21 Α Yes, sir. 22 And so, it was important to him to keep it from getting out, correct? 23 24 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

25

Α

Yes, sir.

- Q Now, you testified on Monday when you were talking about this story that you kept President Trump updated all along the way, right?
  - A That's correct.
- Q And there was a liquidation clause in that contract, correct?
  - A That's correct.
- Q You never told President Trump details like that, did you?
- 10 A No, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

- Q So things like that, within the contract, you were the lawyer, you were his lawyer, you handled it, right?
- 13 A Yes, sir.
  - Q Now, as it relates to the Ms. McDougal story, which you testified about earlier this week, you testified that you were worried at the time that this story would have a significant impact on the campaign, that's what you testified to, right?
  - A Correct.
- 20 Q But President Trump didn't share your view, did he?
- 21 A I am not sure I would agree with that.
- Q Didn't you previously tell the Government that
- 23 President Trump said he didn't think this story would hurt him?
- A I would need to see that document, please.
- 25 Q Sure.

MR. BLANCHE: If we can show the witness what's marked for identification as B-127. Just for the witness, the Court and the parties.

(Displayed.)

- Q Take a look at that, notes from a March 7, 2023, interview.
  - A Which bullet point, please?
- Q If you get to the third bullet, Mr. Cohen, you can stop there.
- A Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 11 MR. BLANCHE: You can take that down.
- 12 Thank you.
- 2 So, let me just re-ask my question.

When you testified that you believed that the story would have a significant impact on the campaign, and my simple question to you is that President Trump, at least initially, didn't think it would hurt him, correct?

- A Initially, yes.
- Q Now, you also have testified, I am sorry, told the Government that one of the things that President Trump was worried about as it relates to this story was his family, right?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- Q And his family meaning his wife but also his children, correct?

M. Cohen - Cross/Blanche 3929 1 Α Correct. 2 Now, you testified that you spoke -- you testified on 3 Monday that you have a recollection of a telephone call with 4 President Trump on June 16, 2016. 5 Do you remember testifying about that? 6 Α Yes, sir. 7 Now, they showed you some text messages with Mr. 8 Schiller, and that was another time that you testified that you 9 called Mr. Schiller, and he gave the phone to President Trump. 10 And that you have a specific recollection you testified and you recall providing him with updates. 11 12 Do you remember that testimony? 13 Α I do. You don't have a specific recollection to a telephone 14 15 call, a telephone call that you had in June of 2016, do you? 16 Α No, sir. And just to put some context around that. It was 17 0 18 not -- I am not quibbling with your answer. 19 It was a long time ago, correct? 20 Α That's correct.

Q At that time, how many phone calls do you think you were getting in a day?

A Many.

21

22

23

24

25

Q Many like 20?

A Hundreds.

3930 1 Q A day? 2 Α Sure. 3 Well, that's -- let's just say 50 a day. 0 4 Α Okay. 5 So, that means that you are getting around 350 a week, O б is that right? 7 I know you are estimating. 8 Yes, sir. Α 9 That's around 1400 a month, right? Q 10 Yes, sir. Α So, we are talking about, conservatively, 14,000 calls 11 12 a year in 2017 -- 2016 to 2017? 13 Α Yes, sir. And the same would be true, basically, 2018, and then 14 15 until you went to prison for 13 months, that number is about 16 right? 17 Α Yes, sir. 18 So -- and I know we are just estimating, we are 19 talking about more than 50,000 phone calls between 2016 and 20 today, would you agree with that? 21 Α Yes, sir. 22 And so, when you testified on Monday and Tuesday, about specific conversations that you had with different folks, 23 24 Mr. Pecker, Mr. Howard and President Trump, you were not 25 testifying from a specific recollection of that phone call,

1 | were you?

- A I was.
- Q You were?
  - A I was.
  - Q So 50, 60,000 telephone calls later, you have still specific recollections about phone calls?

A Because these phone calls are things that I have been talking about for the last six years. They are -- and they were extremely important, and they were all consuming.

So, while I did not know that it took place at 8:02 p.m., what I did recall is the conversation that I had had, not the specific time of the conversation, but rather the specific sum and substance because it was such a significant event and because I had been telling the same story about it for six years.

- Q So, you now -- so, your testimony is that you have been talking about these phone calls for six years?
- A That I have mentioned of these phone calls or a specific phone call where I had advised Mr. Trump that I was going across the street to First Republic Bank, where I had just done the transaction, everything is done because it was that significant.
- Q I am talking right now about this June 16, 2016, phone call that you testified about on Monday and Tuesday, okay?
  - You testified that -- the prosecutor asked you whether

3932 1 you had a specific recollection and you said, yes, that you had 2 a specific recollection. 3 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Overruled. 4 5 0 And so, what I am trying to do is reconcile what you б said a few minutes ago, that you don't have a specific 7 recollection, with what you just said, which is that you do. For this phone call, do you have a specific 8 9 recollection of this phone call in June of 2016? 10 Α Can you show me which phone call we are referring to? 11 0 Sure. 12 MR. BLANCHE: If we can put up, it's already in 13 evidence, People's Exhibit 349. And if we can go to June 16, 2016, that phone call at 6:51 p.m., and just blow 14 that up, please. 15 16 (Displayed.) 17 Α I am sorry. 18 Which date are we looking at? 19 We should be able to blow it up for you, Mr. Cohen. 0 20 We are looking at a June 16, 2016, phone call at 6:51 p.m. 21 22 Do you see that? I do. 23 Α 24 And how long was this phone call? O 25 Two minutes and 31 seconds. Α

Q Just so I understand your testimony, as you sit here today, you have a specific recollection of that phone call on June 16, 2016?

A Based upon the other documents that I was able to look at, what it did was jogged into my memory, again, the story that I have been telling in regard to this conversation.

Q I am still looking for an answer.

Do you have a specific recollection, or do you not have a specific recollection?

MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.

A I recalled, as I had stated before, I recalled the conversation based upon the other documents.

Q Well, I understand that, but my question isn't whether you recall a conversation. I am asking you whether you recall that conversation on that phone call, at that time, on that day in June of 2016?

A Again, based off of the documents that I had looked at and reviewed, I did.

Q Do you remember, for example, speaking for a very long time with Chris Cuomo just mere seconds before this call?

A Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q What were you talking to Mr. Cuomo about?
- A We were talking about my appearance and we were talking about different topics.
  - Q Were you talking about your feelings?

3934 1 I didn't hear what you said. 2 Α I was talking about my appearance. 3 Your appearance. Got it. 0 4 Your appearance to be on his show? 5 Α Yes, sir. 6 So, you now also have a specific recollection of a 7 conversation you had with Chris Cuomo eight years ago? 8 It was over an hour. It was a very long conversation, 9 and, again, I recorded it as contemporaneous note-taking so 10 that I could pay attention to the conversation, and I could ensure that the things that I brought up on his show were the 11 12 things that I wanted to say. 13 So I crafted my responses. 14 0 And you remember that conversation today? 15 Α I remember having the conversation, yes. Do you -- I want to talk a minute about the recording 16 O 17 that you did surreptitiously with President Trump. 18 Now, that recording was about two minutes, 51 seconds, 19 right? 20 Α Correct. 21 And you didn't actually start talking until about a 22 minute into that recording, is that correct? Α That's correct. 23 24 And you were talking to President Trump at the time

about transferring information regarding our friend David,

- which was Mr. Pecker, right?
- A Correct.

- Q And the information you were talking about transferring was, supposedly, all kinds of -- a secret box about bad information on President Trump, right?
  - A That's correct.
- Q And at the time there was a concern because AMI was looking to potentially acquire Time Magazine or the other way around, right?
- A No, sir.
- Q What was happening?
- A David Pecker was being considered to be the CEO of Time Incorporated, Time Magazine, and the concern was being that these documents were the property of AMI, that he would not be able to, of course, take them. That whoever the new CEO might be, may end up not being as supportive of Mr. Trump as David was.

And so, we were concerned that potentially one of those stories could be leaked.

- Q And you -- and President Trump said, he could get hit by a bus, meaning something could happen to Mr. Pecker, and the rest would be the same, correct?
- 23 A Correct.
- Q Now, the concern here was even beyond the election, 25 right?

Meaning, this conversation wasn't tied to the election, it was a real concern that Mr. Pecker could get hit by a bus at any time or something could happen to him and you guys wouldn't have those files, right?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q Now -- and you said, I am all over it?

  You said, I'm all over it, right?
- A Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q So, eventually, you learned that there was nothing in those files, correct?
- 11 A I was told by Mr. Pecker that, not to worry. There is 12 nothing in the files.
- 13 Q That was later though, right?
  - A After he was not accepted as the CEO of Time.
- Q And then you testified about a comment that was made in response to a question about financing.
- And you say -- and President Trump says, what financing?
- 19 And then there is a comment made about cash, right?
- 20 A Yes, sir. Mr. Trump turned around and used the word cash.
- Q And when he says, cash, he is not talking about
  Benjamins and green dollar bills, right?
- He is talking about paying for something with cash, not financing, correct?

A No, sir.

- Q Well, isn't it true that over the time you worked for President Trump he very often would purchase things with cash, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q As a matter of fact, you testified you talked to the prosecutors on multiple occasions about the fact that President Trump would purchase buildings with cash, right, at times?
  - A I don't know what you are referring to, sir.
- Q Well, were there times when President Trump acquired property, whether it's a golf course, whether it's a building and paid cash, meaning no financing, right?
- A Yes, sir.
- O That happened, right?
  - A I may have said that using that term, yes.
  - Q No. No. Put aside the term. I am just asking you separate from that.
  - There were times when President Trump bought property as part of his business and didn't finance it, right?
  - A I am not aware of that.
  - Q Well, you are aware that you said that there were certain properties that President Trump paid for, just paid cash, right?
- A Yes. That was -- that was the message that I was to use, that there is no financing. He is very rich and that he

paid all cash.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

22

23

24

O Yes.

But my point is, Mr. Cohen, when you say he is very rich, and he pays all cash, you are not saying that you or Mr. Trump or his sons go down to the bank with a bunch of bags full of cash and buy something, you are saying that it's not financed. We are just going to pay with cash.

We are not going to finance, right?

- A That's correct.
- Q When you testified on Tuesday that President Trump when he said, cash, was talking about green, that's not what he is talking about, is it?
- A It was, which is why, sir, I used the word, no, no, no, check. We needed to do it by check.
- Q Hang on for a second.
  - When you say, we need to do it by check, that's when this audio gets cut off, right?
- 18 A It was not exactly after that. It was after I
  19 received a phone gall.
- Q Right. As you say, check, or the word check is said, 21 it cuts off right then, correct?
  - A No. I believe there is a few seconds more where I say hello to somebody on the phone.
    - Q Now, which phone did you make that recording on?
- 25 A On one of the two phones.

3939 1 0 When you say, one of the two phones, you mean one of 2 the two phones that the FBI took from you in April 2018? 3 Α Yes, sir. 4 0 And that's one of the two phones that they eventually returned to you, right? 5 6 Α Yes, sir. 7 And then that's one of the phones that you -- one of 8 those phones that you eventually gave to, with consent, to the 9 People, right? 10 Α Correct. Good. 11 0 12 MR. BLANCHE: If we can put up what's already 13 admitted into evidence as 248. 14 (Displayed.) MR. BLANCHE: If we can --15 16 O This is a transcript that we talked about on Tuesday, 17 Mr. Cohen, right? 18 Α Yes, sir. 19 Or Monday. 0 20 If we can go to the second page, and you will see the 21 last thing that's said is Donald J. Trump, check, right? 22 Α Correct. MR. BLANCHE: Now, we can take that down. 23 24 The conversation continued, correct? 0 25 The conversation continued, yes. Α

- Q And you received a phone call from a bank, right?
- 2 A Capital One Bank.
  - Q And your testimony is that you answered that call?
- 4 A I did.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

- Q So, just so I understand, you are in a meeting with President Trump talking to him about the financing or cash for the McDougal story, and you are recording him, but the phone rings, and you just answer that call?
- A I did.
  - Q And what was the bank calling you about?
- 11 A I don't specifically remember. I just remember it was 12 a big issue.
  - Q If you don't have a recollection --
  - A If my recollection is correct, it was -- I was the subject of identity theft the second time. People were going into the account and taking money out.
- 17 O Wait.
- 18 You do remember, or you don't remember?
- 19 A I believe that's what it was. I am not a hundred 20 percent certain.
  - Q Well, you started out by saying, you don't remember.
- Then gave a long explanation, and then you said you do remember, but you are not a hundred percent certain.
- MS. HOFFINGER: Objection your Honor.
- THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q Now, when you hung up with that phone call that you had with the bank, you were still talking to President Trump?
  - A For a few moments more, yes.
  - Q You didn't restart the recording?
- 5 A No, sir.

3

4

6

7

8

9

- Q And the transcript, or the recording, you could hear what you say is your are answering a phone, right?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q So did you have two phones at the time?
- 10 A I had two phones at the time, yes.
- 11 Q Did the call come in on the phone that you were 12 recording President Trump on?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q Are you sure about that?
- 15 A Positive.
- Q You testified -- I just want to talk for a few minutes
  about your testimony about the use of encrypted apps as it
  relates to communications you were having with Mr. Pecker,
  Mr. Howard and others associated with the Non-Disclosure
  Agreement, correct?
- 21 A Correct.
- Q You testified that you would use those apps at times because you wanted to keep conversations confidential, right?
- 24 A Correct.

25

Q But you will agree with me that a lot of the most key

3942 communications regarding that deal, the deal with Ms. McDougal, 1 2 and also the NDA with Ms. Daniels, were just on texts, right? 3 Α Yes, sir. And the documents, the NDA, it was just emailed back 4 0 5 and forth, right? 6 Between myself and Mr. Davidson, yes. Α 7 Right. But you weren't using Signal to send the NDA, 8 were you? 9 Α No, sir. 10 You just emailed it? 11 Α Correct. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Blanche, can we take our break 13 now? 14 MR. BLANCHE: Sure. 15 THE COURT: All right. Jurors let's take our afternoon recess. 16 17 We will see you in about 15 minutes. 18 (Whereupon, the jurors exited the 19 courtroom.) 20 (Witness is excused.) THE COURT: You may be seated. 21 22 Can I have one attorney from each side and the 23 court reporter join me in the robing room? 24 (Whereupon, proceedings were held in Judge 25 Merchan's robing room.)

	3943
1	LIEUTENANT: Please be seated.
2	Come to order. Part 59 is back in session.
3	THE COURT: All right.
4	So we had a conference in the robing room with
5	one of the alternates who has indicated a conflict.
6	Counsel was there.
7	Have you had a chance to fill in your colleagues
8	on what was discussed?
9	MR. STEINGLASS: Yes. I think our suggestion is
10	let's just not promise the jury that they are going to be
11	able to go home at one o'clock Thursday. Let's wait and
12	see where we are at in terms of what part of the case we
13	are up to, and then decide if it is feasible.
14	It's an alternate juror. We can decide whether
15	to keep the alternate juror or release them, depending on
16	where we are at.
17	MR. BLANCHE: That makes sense. I think that our
18	view would be, if it comes to it, and we need the
19	afternoon, which we probably will, we can address it then.
20	THE COURT: Okay. I agree.
21	Let's get the witness, please.
22	LIEUTENANT: Witness entering.
23	(Whereupon, the witness entered the
24	courtroom and was properly seated.)
25	THE COURT: Let's get the jury, please.
	l

	3944		
1	SERGEANT: Yes, judge.		
2	All rise.		
3	Jury entering the courtroom.		
4	(Whereupon, the jury entered the courtroom		
5	and was properly seated.)		
6	THE COURT: You may be seated.		
7	THE CLERK: Case on trial continued.		
8	All jurors are present and properly seated.		
9	THE COURT: Mr. Blanche.		
10	CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION		
11	BY MR. BLANCHE:		
12	Q I want to talk for a few minutes about the \$130,000		
13	payment you made to Mr. Davidson, okay?		
14	A Yes, sir.		
15	Q So, by the way, you learned from Mr. Davidson along		
16	the way that another news organization was interested in buying		
17	Ms. Daniels' story, correct?		
18	A Correct.		
19	Q At what time during the process did you hear that from		
20	Mr. Davidson?		
21	A After we had failed to transfer \$130,000 as per Mr.		
22	Davidson's cut-off date.		
23	Q The news organization or the organization that was		
24	interested Mr. Davidson told you was ABC, correct?		
25	A ABC, and I believe it was also Daily Beast.		

- 1 Q Well, was that later?
- 2 A Yes. It was ABC.
- Q So, and in particular, you were told that ABC had
  offered, in essence, the same amount of money Mr. Davidson was
  trying to get from you, correct?
- 6 A Correct.

7

13

19

20

21

- 0 \$130,000?
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9 Q Who is the reporter that you, put aside whether it is
  10 true, that Mr. Davidson told you about that was trying to
  11 negotiate that with Ms. Daniels?
- 12 A I am actually blanking on his name.
  - Q Was it an individual named John Santucci?
- 14 A John Santucci, yes, sir, ABC News.
- Q And you never confirmed one way or the other whether that was true?
- 17 A I spoke to Mr. Santucci about it.
- 18 Q When did you speak to him?
  - A He contacted me and asked me whether or not I was responsible, or I knew that we were responsible for them not getting the story. John Santucci used to come to the office quite a bit.
- Q So, and you talked about that interaction you just talked about in a recording that you made with Mr. Davidson March 27, 2018, correct?

1 A Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

- Q So, do you remember when that phone call -- that meeting with Mr. Santucci was in relation to 2016, October, and when you told Mr. Davidson about it in March of 2018?
  - A I said October.
- Q So, what did you say to Mr. Santucci, and what did he say to you?
- A First, I was a little shocked that John Santucci actually, did it. Meaning, he had to spend quite a bit of time following the Trump campaign, and then, of course, he denied that they were involved.
- Q Now, did he -- do you recall Mr. Santucci asking you whether you, meaning Mr. Cohen, was able to kill that story because he said Ms. Daniels had gone dark?
  - A Yes, sir. That's what I was saying before.
- 16 O Okay, understood.
  - Now, when you met with the District Attorney, with Mr. Pomerantz, so a while ago, do you remember saying that you believed that Mr. Davidson on behalf of Ms. Daniels was engaging in extortion?
- 21 MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 22 THE COURT: Overruled.
- You can answer.
- 24 A Yes. I recall making a statement like that.
- Q What statement did you make?

- A That they were extorting Mr. Trump.
- Q And the reason you said that is because of all the factors you talked about on Monday or Tuesday, right, you said that there was urgency because of the Access Hollywood tape, correct?
- A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

16

17

- Q And there was an election and in your mind, in your mind, there was either two choices, pay it, or don't pay it, and the story comes out, correct?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q But you went a long time without paying, correct?
- 12 A Yes. We went several weeks without paying.
  - Q And, ultimately, though, you did?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
- 15 O And we will talk more about that in a little bit.
  - But you referred in direct to this payment as a hush money payment.
- 18 Do you recall that?
  - A Yes. It's been called, the hush money payment.
- Q I am not asking whether it's been called that. I am asking whether on direct you referred to it as a hush money payment?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- Q And do you recall the prosecutor saying it was a payoff. And you said, yes.

3948 1 Do you remember that? 2 Α Yes. 3 Make no mistake, this was a completely legal, binding 0 4 contract? 5 Α Yes, sir. 6 MR. BLANCHE: Let's pull it up, Exhibit 276. 7 It's in evidence. 8 You testified about this on Tuesday. 9 This is a very long contract, correct? 10 Α Correct. And it's signed by you, right? 11 It is. 12 Α 13 And Mr. Davidson? O 14 Α Yes, sir. And Ms. Daniels? 15 O 16 Α Yes, sir. 17 But Donald J. Trump never signed anything associated 0 with this agreement. He didn't sign this agreement. 18 19 He didn't sign the side letter either, correct? 20 Α That's correct. But in your mind then, and now, this is a perfectly 21 22 legal contract, correct? Yes, sir. Α 23 24 What I mean by that is, a Non-Disclosure Agreement, an 25 NDA, a settlement between two parties happens all the time,

1 right?

3

4

- 2 A Yes, they do.
  - Q Now, you testified that there were two names used
    Peggy Peterson and David Dennison, right, pseudonyms?
- Those are not the real names, pseudonyms?
- 6 A Yes, sir.
  - Q Who came up with those names?
- 8 A Keith Davidson did.
- 9 Q Do you know why?
- 10 A I believe he knew a David Dennison, and Peggy
  11 Peterson, I don't know the answer.
- Q Now, you testified that you have, again, still focusing on the legality of this contract, you testified that you lied on the account opening documents with your bank and called it -- said that it was going to be for consulting because you were worried that if you told the truth they would have further questions, correct?
- 18 A Or they wouldn't open up the account.
- 19 Q Or they would say, no way, we are not doing it, right?
- 20 A Correct.
- Q But you agree with me that there is nothing illegal about a settlement contract between two parties both of whom had lawyers, right?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q And you weren't interacting directly with Ms. Daniels,

3950 1 you were going through Mr. Davidson, correct? 2 Α Yes. 3 And you testified you never met Ms. Daniels until the 0 4 podcast, right? 5 Α That's correct. 6 And, similarly, you were a lawyer for -- you were a 0 7 lawyer at that time working on behalf of The Trump 8 Organization, right? 9 Α Yes, sir. 10 Working on behalf of --0 11 MS. HOFFINGER: Judge, may we approach? 12 THE COURT: Yes. 13 (Discussion is held at sidebar, on the 14 record.) MS. HOFFINGER: I think there have been more than 15 16 a few questions now about the lawyers involved in this contract. When we were at a similar place with Keith 17 18 Davidson, your Honor sustained an objection. 19 Defense counsel has persisted with the presence 20 of counsel issue; and so, I just want to alert the Court, I 21 think at this point two or three questions have been asked 22 about a lawyer. I didn't object. 23 Now, I am going to start objecting. 24 MR. BLANCHE: What is wrong with asking what the 25 lawyers --

3951 THE COURT: Well, what's wrong with it, it is a 1 2 very slippery slope. 3 As you know, we dealt with the whole presence of counsel, appearance of counsel, advise of counsel, and we 4 5 don't want to go there. 6 In fact, on this, unless I am mistaken in 7 reviewing the proposed jury charge, there was an 8 instruction there regarding the presence of counsel. 9 So I would stay away from that. I think you 10 asked enough questions on that. 11 MR. BLANCHE: Thank you. 12 (Discussion at sidebar concluded, and the 13 following occurred in open court.) BY MR. BLANCHE: 14 15 Q Now, you testified about your work for the Trump 16 Organization. 17 You reported directly to President Trump, right? 18 Α Correct. 19 And over the nine and a half years you worked for the 20 Trump Organization, you did work for the Organization, legal work, correct? 21 22 No. Not much legal work. Well, were you assigned, for example, to help with new 23 0

projects, potential new projects?

Yes, sir.

24

25

Α

3952 That's for The Trump Organization, correct? 1 0 2 Α That's correct. 3 And you worked on The Apprentice, right? 0 I assisted in The Apprentice, yes. 4 Α 5 That was for The Trump Organization, right? O 6 That was certainly for Mr. Trump. Α 7 No. No. 8 You are telling me that you worked with The 9 Apprentice, and it wasn't for The Trump Organization, it was for Mr. Trump? 10 I am not sure if The Apprentice was for The Trump 11 Α 12 Organization, as opposed to Mr. Trump personally. 13 Well, was The Apprentice -- was the money made from The Apprentice part of The Trump Organization revenues? 14 That I wouldn't know. 15 Α 16 Did you -- and then you did personal work for President Trump, correct? 17 18 Α Correct. 19 And you did personal legal work for some of the kids, 0 20 right? 21 Α Yes, sir. 22 You said you didn't recall doing any work for Eric Trump, but for Donald Trump, Jr.? 23 24 Α Yes, sir. 25 And for Ivanka Trump, yes?

3953 Ivanka I said I couldn't recall, but it seems 1 Α 2 possible. 3 0 And for Melania, President Trump's wife as well, 4 right? 5 Α Yes, sir. 6 And you never had a retainer agreement with any of 0 7 those individuals, did you? 8 Α No, sir. 9 And the reason why you didn't have a retainer agreement is because you didn't need one, right? 10 Α Correct. 11 12 And you didn't need one because you were employed by 0 13 the Trump Organization, correct? That's correct. 14 Α And so, you knew you were going to get paid, right? 15 O 16 Α Yes. 17 And there were some parts of your salary you didn't 0 know, that would be bonus? 18 19 You knew your salary? 20 Α Yes, sir. 21 So, you didn't have to worry when you get -- when you 22 did personal work for Donald Trump, Jr. about a retainer 23 agreement because you were getting paid by The Trump 24 Organization, correct? 25 Α Correct.

- Q Now, you testified multiple times on Tuesday that when you were President Trump's personal attorney in 2017, you had no retainer agreement, right?
  - A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

- Q But the truthful testimony is that in the whole time you worked for The Trump Organization, you never had a retainer agreement, correct?
  - A I had -- I never had a retainer agreement.
- Q So, it's not just January 2017, that you did not have a retainer agreement. It is from the day you never went back to your law firm, and The Trump Organization sent some guys over and packed up your bags and you started a working for Donald J. Trump, and you never had a retainer agreement, right?
  - A No, sir.
  - Q And, by the way, nothing wrong with that, correct?

    MS. HOFFINGER: Objection.
- 17 THE COURT: I am sorry.
- 18 Can you repeat that, please?
  - Q Is there anything wrong in your view, you were a lawyer, right?
- 21 A Yes, sir.
- 22 Q And you were acting as a lawyer for --
- THE COURT: Overruled.
- I am sorry.
- The objection is overruled.

	3955
1	Q You were acting as a lawyer the whole time you worked
2	for The Trump Organization?
3	A Well, I did legal matters and non-legal matters.
4	(Whereupon, Principal Court Reporter Susan
5	Pearce-Bates was relieved by Senior Court
6	Reporter Lisa Kramsky.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

		3956	
1		(The following proceedings are continued from the	
2		previous page.)	
3		****	
4	CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION		
5	BY MR. BLANCHE:		
6	Q	Understood.	
7	But you did legal matters?		
8	А	Yes.	
9	Q	And, ethically, there was nothing wrong; correct?	
10	А	I was an employee of the Trump Organization, nothing	
11	unethical.		
12	Q	Right.	
13	So w	hen you were an employee, you had a job with The Trump	
14	Organization; right?		
15	А	Yes, sir.	
16	Q	And your job was to report directly to President Trump;	
17	right?		
18	А	To whatever Mr. Trump wanted me to do.	
19	Q	You were an Executive Vice President; right?	
20	А	Right. Yes, sir.	
21	Q	And if that direction included doing legal work for	
22	Melania	Trump, for example, you did it; right?	
23	А	Yes, sir.	
24	Q	And, ethically, nothing wrong with that; correct?	
25	А	Correct.	

3957 1 Because you know under New York Ethics Rules, you don't need a Retainer Agreement to do work for a client; do you? 2 3 Α No, sir. 4 Now, I want to talk for a minute about --5 MR. BLANCHE: If we can put up what's already 6 admitted in evidence as 201, please. 7 (Displayed.) 8 You -- we went through this letter on direct. Do you 9 recognize this letter? I do. 10 Α 11 This is February 8th, 2018. It's a letter to the Federal Election Commission; correct? 12 That's correct. 13 Α 14 Now, this letter was put in in response to a complaint O 15 that was filed earlier by Common Cause; right? Α 16 That's correct. 17 Now, I want to first highlight the first paragraph. And your lawyers -- by the way, you read this letter before it 18 19 went out; correct? Yes, sir. 20 Α 21 Your lawyers write that they are writing on behalf of 22 you, in response to the Common Cause Complaint and they are responding to it; right? 23 Yes, sir. 2.4 Α 25 MR. BLANCHE: If we can go to the second paragraph.

3958 1 (Displayed.) So, this second paragraph says: "In a private 2 3 transaction in 2016, before the US Presidential Election, 4 Mr. Cohen used his own personal funds to facilitate a payment of 5 \$130,000 to Ms. Stephanie Clifford." 6 "Neither The Trump Organization nor the Trump Campaign was a 7 party to the transaction with Ms. Clifford and neither 8 reimbursed Mr. Cohen for the payment directly or indirectly." 9 Right? 10 Α Correct. 11 0 So, by the way, I believe you testified to this, that's true, right, I know you said that it's --12 It's an omission. 13 Α 14 But that it is a true statement; right? O 15 That is a true statement. Α 16 0 Meaning, you used your own funds to make the payments to Ms. Daniels? 17 18 Α Correct. And neither The Trump Organization nor The Campaign 19 20 paid you back; right? 21 Α Was a party to the transaction, they were not. 22 Well, they weren't a party to the transaction, and 0 because they had -- they didn't give you any money; right? 23 No reimbursement; correct. 24 Α 25 Because President Trump reimbursed you from his own Q

3959 1 personal funds? 2. Either from President Trump's -- from his own funds or from The Trust. 3 4 MR. BLANCHE: So if we can bring the third 5 paragraph down, now, please. 6 (Displayed.) 7 This is responding directly to the allegations that 8 were in the Common Cause Complaint; right? 9 It says they are speculative, and that neither your LLC made any in-kind contributions to Donald J. Trump for President or 10 11 any other Presidential Campaign Committee. 12 It also said, I think, accurately, that you were not a Government employee. 13 14 And that's right; right? 15 That's correct? 16 Α That's correct. 17 And that it doesn't constitute a campaign contribution 18 or expenditure and, therefore, the FEC lacks jurisdiction over 19 this matter; right? 20 Α Correct. 21 0 Now --22 MR. BLANCHE: We can take that down. -- that same day, well, that was February 13th. 23 The complaint was filed before that, right, the Common Cause 2.4 25 Complaint?

3960 1 Α Yes. And the complaint, is that a public or a sealed 2 document? 3 4 Α Sealed document, I believe. 5 So, but you're -- I'm right that you actually shared or 0 6 showed the complaint to a bunch of reporters before it was 7 public; right? 8 Α I believe so. 9 And that's a sealed document; right? 10 And you were not necessarily giving it to the reporters, but 11 you're showing it to them; correct? Yes, I may have showed it. 12 Α Well, do you have any doubt that you showed it? 13 0 14 Α No, sir. 15 And you were very angry that the complaint had been 16 filed; right? 17 Α I was. 18 And you told some reporters that you were going to seek 19 sanctions, potentially Rule 11 sanctions; right? Α Correct. 20 21 And, at that point, you were sick of having to defend 22 yourself from these frivolous allegations; right? Α Yes. 23 MR. BLANCHE: Now, if we can put up 202, which is 24 25 already in evidence.

3961 1 (Displayed.) This is the statement that you issued the same day; 2 0 3 right? 4 Α Correct. 5 And you wrote that? O Yes, sir. 6 Α We won't read the whole thing, but you said on Tuesday, 7 0 8 that you didn't plan to provide any further comment because you 9 were worried that by issuing the statement you would start 10 getting a lot of calls; right? 11 Α I wrote that, yes. And that's why you wrote that on the second to last 12 0 13 paragraph; right? 14 Α No, sir. 15 No, that's not why? 16 Α That's not why. 17 I must have misunderstood your testimony from Tuesday. 18 You didn't want to provide any further comment; right? 19 Α That's correct. And the reason why you put that in the statement is 20 21 because you were worried that if you just sent out a statement 22 without that, reporters would want you to comment; right? They would be asking me the question, in the paragraph 23 Α above it, "Neither The Trump Organization nor The Trump Campaign 24 25 was a party to the transaction."

My concern was that they would expand upon it and they would ask me about Mr. Trump personally or some other account.

MR. BLANCHE: Now, if we could highlight the very last paragraph.

(Displayed.)

Q It says: "Just because something isn't true doesn't mean that it can't cause you harm or damage. I will always protect Mr. Trump."

You wrote that; right?

A I did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q Now, when you wrote that, do you recall sending that statement out to a ton of reporters?
- 13 A I sure did.
  - Q And you followed up that statement by sending it to them, you followed up with some communications with them making it clear that you believed and that you felt strongly that that statement was completely true; right?
  - A I was validating the statement that I had sent out with that paragraph.
  - Q When you say that you were validating it, you mean you were telling the reporters that what you wrote was true?
    - A I wanted them to believe it was true, yes.
- Q So did you call them and say; I want you to believe this is true?
- 25 A No, sir.

- Q Or did you call them and say; it is true?
- A I called and told them, this is true.
- Q And you -- you also, and this is, again, is in February of 2018, you recorded yourself talking to reporters, telling them that your statement was true; right?

Among other things?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

20

21

22

23

24

- A Amongst other things, yes.
- Q And you did that -- you even said, and correct me if I'm wrong, to one reporter, they had to believe you, that you are a really bad liar.
- You said that; right?
- 12 A I believe so, yes.
- Q But the testimony in this trial is that you were lying to them when you told them that; right?
- 15 A Yes, sir.
- Q And you recorded them, at that time in 2018, for what reason?
- A I don't recall. I don't recall why I recorded it.

  Maybe it was a different part of the conversation.
  - Q So it may have been for some other reason other than what we're talking about on the screen and what you were talking about as far as trying to validate your statement?
    - A Yes, sir.
  - Q And that statement, by the way, was approved by your lawyers at the time, at McDermott Will & Emery; is that right?

Proceedings 3964 1 Α That's correct. 2 And they were the ones that wrote the letter, which is 3 201; correct? 4 Α Yes. 5 So -- and you worked with them to make sure that the statement was truthful; correct? 6 7 Α I did. 8 And you worked with them to make sure that the letter 9 was truthful; correct? 10 I worked with them to put this letter out, which, Α again, I have characterized as deceptive. 11 12 I understand your characterization of it, but the 0 13 reality is, we just read it. Nothing on that letter is not the truth; correct? 14 15 Α Correct. So -- but is it your testimony that you were lying to 16 17 your lawyers, to the McDermott lawyer? 18 Α No, sir. 19 MS. HOFFINGER: I'm going to object here, Judge. 20 THE COURT: Sustained. 21 MR. BLANCHE: I'm going to move to another area. 22 THE COURT: Why don't we stop at this point. All right. 23

4:00, so we are going to stop now.

Jurors, I know that we were going to stop today by

24

Before I excuse you, I ask you to please not talk either among 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 I have directed you to 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 the trial.

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

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

And 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 case, and that includes the reading or the listening to the reading of any transcripts of the trial, or the reading of posts on any court site.

Do not attempt to research any fact, issue or law

2.4

1 related to the case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do not communicate with anyone about the case by any means, including by telephone, text messages, email or the internet.

And 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.

I hope you have a good weekend.

I will see you Monday at 9:30:

THE COURT OFFICER: All rise.

(Jury exits.)

\*\*\*\*\*\*

THE COURT: You may be seated.

Mr. Cohen, thank you.

You may step down.

(Witness excused.)

\*\*\*\*\*

THE COURT: Mr. Blanche, we had spoken about using this time to address some issues that you wanted to take up.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. Please proceed.

MR. BLANCHE: I will turn it over to my colleague.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.

What we are hoping to address is the potential testimony of the expert that has been discussed in the motions in limine, Brad Smith, regarding Campaign Finance Law.

And your Honor set forth in your ruling on that motion a series of categories that you would accept or allow testimony from Mr. Smith on.

And the one that we wanted to discuss -- the category that we wanted to discuss is general definitions and terms that relate directly to this case, such as campaign contributions.

And I think, just to frame the conversation, what has changed since the time of the ruling is that both parties had put in requested jury instructions and both parties are seeking instructions regarding FECA and some of the definitions at issue.

So one of the reasons that we wanted to bring this up before bringing the expert in is to give your Honor a sense of what we would be seeking to do and to make sure that we are not encroaching on your Honor's potential legal instructions.

You have at once both parties who are asking the Court, I think, for instructions on a similar area.

And we just want to make sure that the Court is still contemplating what I think is set up as sort of a

1 battle of the experts on some of these issues.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: That's fine.

You understand that at this point those are just requests. I haven't ruled on any/either request.

MR. BOVE: Of course, Judge. And that's why we just wanted to flag this.

And, if I could, I would proffer the scope of what we would be seeking to do through Mr. Smith.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BOVE: So what we would like to do is touch upon basic statutory definitions, and I will discuss those more specifically; and then there are phrases within those definitions that we think it's important, that one way or another the jury gets some guidance on, whether that is through the competing experts that have been noticed or your Honor.

I can talk about the ones that we are focused on; and one of them is the meaning of the phrase "For the Purpose of Influencing An Election For Federal Office."

The meaning of that --

THE COURT: Just give me one second.

MR. BOVE: Yes.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: Can you repeat that again?

MR. BOVE: The phrase "For the Purpose of

Influencing An Election For Federal Office."

2.4

And that's a statutory phrase.

And then both parties have requested instructions regarding what I will describe as "The Irrespective Rule." And that's from the FEC's regulations.

And then the third issue is "The Press Exemptions" where we've requested an instruction.

I don't think that there is a competing request, and we would be seeking to elicit testimony regarding that exemption from Mr. Smith.

So, for basic statutory definitions, I think your Honor has seen those in the parties' proposals, "contribution," "relative individual contribution limits," the term "expenditure," and the term "coordinated expenditure" are, I think, what would be the focus.

And within a couple of those definitions the statute lays out that phrase "For The Purpose of Influencing an Election."

And so that's why we think -- we would seek to elicit from Mr. Smith an interpretation of what that phrase means.

And, really, what we would be seeking to do through him, Judge, is sort of track what is in the request that we've submitted to your Honor.

So by tracking that phrase is giving content by the

Supreme Court's decision in Buckley, that the test is an objective one -- excuse me, an objective one under the D.C. Circuit's ruling in Orloski.

2.4

We would seek to have Mr. Smith describe the facts of Orloski a little bit so that the jury can understand what it means to have an objective test for the concept of "For The Purpose of Influencing an Election."

And then describe the -- then you are relating to the Congressman Jim Moran 5141 that's cited in our papers, again, describing some facts, to give the jury a sense of a situation where the FEC has applied that term and how they have done it.

Then "The Irrespective Rule" --

THE COURT: You are referring to past decisions and/or hypotheticals?

MR. BOVE: Not hypotheticals, Judge.

Just the past decisions that are cited in our request to charge.

So that's "For The Purpose of Influencing The Election."

Next, I mentioned "The Irrespective Rule," which is set out in the FEC's regulations and cited, I think, by both parties in their request to charge.

It's at 11 CFR 113 -- I'm sorry. .1(g).

And so, we seek to have Mr. Smith discuss that

rule, and discuss the focus on whether an expense would exist irrespective of the candidate's campaign, which we think is an important issue for the jury to consider with respect to whether the payments at issue could be considered expenditures and/or contributions.

And then talk about a little bit how that regulation was developed beginning in 1995.

We've cited for your Honor our request for the Federal Register Provisions that discuss the FEC's thinking about that.

And, again, through Mr. Smith, what we're doing is trying to give the jury a sense of what the requirements are for this term and how the FEC has applied them.

And so, we would walk through a couple more of the MURs that are cited in our request, 7025, 4944.

And there is an advisory opinion we cite from 203. Not hypotheticals, but just seeking, again, to give the jury a sense of applications and how the agency then administers the regulation that it created and applies it in practice.

And then the last issue that I mentioned that we would be seeking to cover with Mr. Smith is the "Press Exemptions."

And that sort of has a basis in both the statute as well as the FEC's regulations.

And we have also cited an advisory opinion in our

request to charge that, alternatively, we would have

Mr. Smith describe, again, just to give the jury a little

bit of content around these terms.

And I say that, and make this whole proffer with a little bit of concern that we don't want to be treading on your Honor's legal instructions.

These are things that, coming into the trial, based on the in limine ruling, we had hoped to do through Mr. Smith.

Now, you have these two competing jury instructions and so there is a little bit of tension here, and so we wanted to --

THE COURT: So you believe that the biggest impetus to this is to ask this Court about -- to argue that we now have two competing instructions, not the facts of the case or that the testimony has changed, just the request for the instructions?

MR. BOVE: The reason that I'm making the proffer, your Honor, if the instructions had not come in, in the way that they had, meaning that if the parties were not in agreement at least with respect to the question of should the Court give instructions about FECA and these terms, we understand -- we think we understand what your Honor's in limine ruling says and we were going to abide by that through Mr. Smith.

We are now making this proffer to your Honor so that everybody sort of has eyes wide open coming into Monday, when I think it's very possible this testimony could come in, that there is a little bit of tension right now between the pending request and what we would cover from -- through Mr. Smith.

We are sensitive to that, and we don't want to have him up on the stand and give the impression that we are encroaching on your Honor's province.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. COLANGELO: Your Honor, I think 95 percent of the proffered testimony that was just described flies directly in the face of your extremely clear March 18th Order, which expressly said that Mr. Smith may not testify regarding the interpretation and application of Federal Campaign Finance Laws.

You specifically held that he could identify general definitions, but not interpretation or application.

So as to each of the three terms of art in the Federal Campaign Finance Law that Mr. Bove just described, "For The Purpose of Influencing," "Irrespective of the Candidacy," and "Press Exemption," I think he just walked your Honor through a very long list of Federal Case Law, Supreme Court and D.C. Circuit Case Law, as well as Agency Advisory Opinions and Agency Adjudications interpreting

those terms.

2.

That is -- that kind of testimony from an expert is precisely the reason that there is a general and broadly followed prohibition on testimony by an expert witness on legal matters.

And, your Honor, I think there are two compounding problems here.

One is that, as Mr. Bove noted, we have also retained an expert witness who, if necessary, would be prepared to testify as to the same issues.

But then -- and we anticipate that he would say, based on what we've seen in the defendant's briefing, that the way the defense is interpreting the application of those statutes is inconsistent with how the Agency and how Federal Courts have done the same.

But then we've got three people telling the jury what the law is, when there should be only one.

It should be your Honor exclusively instructing the jury on how the law applies.

I mean, by analogy this would be like calling an expert witness to opine on whether the intent to defraud in the Penal Law definition does or does not -- is or is not limited to a pecuniary financial motive only.

That's a brief -- we have briefed it. It's identified in the charge. Your Honor has ruled on it. And

that should be the end of it.

The -- in fact, the very fact that this is a contested legal issue in the parties proposed instructions to the jury is even more reason why this should be resolved through argument before your Honor at pre-charge conference, not something that we should be putting in expert testimony -- expert testimony to discuss.

I think there are two other problems.

First, and unless I'm missing it somewhere, the possibility of any testimony on the "Press Exemption" has never been included in any of the defense's disclosures regarding this witness, either before or after your Honor's motion in limine.

So there is a serious notice problem with the "Press Exemption" proposal from the outset.

And then there is a broader notice problem, your Honor, which is that it's, as you know, dating back to last November, we tried for months to compel the defendant to disclose reciprocal discovery, including this expert testimony.

We had to move the Court to compel reciprocal discovery in November.

Your Honor granted that motion.

We didn't get the defense expert disclosure until January, and then the entire point of pretrial notice of

proffered expert testimony is so the parties can prepare.

We filed a motion in limine to exclude their expert testimony.

Your Honor largely granted it.

And we have prepared a potential rebuttal witness based on the language in your Honor's -- the Court's March 18th Order.

So to expand Mr. Smith's testimony at this point, just a few days before he may take the stand, presents a significant notice problem as well because our witness, in reliance on the Court's Order, we have not prepared him to talk about the facts about a D.C. Circuit case or the Orloski case or the Buckley versus the Valeo Supreme Court decision or how it applies.

So, your Honor, what Mr. Bove just described is totally outside and way beyond both what your Honor already ruled and any recognized exception to the general prohibition on legal testimony from an expert.

MR. BOVE: We are not seeking to have three people at this trial instruct the jury about these issues, Judge, and that's exactly why I'm raising this -- why we're raising this right now, which is that the changed circumstance, from our perspective, is: I don't think there was a -- to our understanding, there was not an agreement prior to the start of this trial that your Honor would provide instructions to

the jury regarding these issues.

And, as you noted, there is still -- it's still not clear that the Court will.

Judge, as a matter of just basic fairness, given the way that the People have now structured their theory of the case, the jury has to be provided instructions one way or another -- or I will say information, one way or another, about how to apply these principles.

And so, what I have proffered is from our standpoint what I think are the very basics and the bare minimum that would be required for the jury to make an analysis of whether or not any of these things were unlawful contributions, which is a necessary showing here, at least that there was a conspiracy with that intent.

I think we've been clear in pretrial motion practice and from the start that we don't think this jury here should be evaluating a FECA violation.

We understand that before your Honor we've lost that fight.

What we're saying now is that just basic fairness requires that they understand what the principles are in a fair way.

And I think on the "Press Exemption" question in particular, I don't think there could be any reasonable dispute that that was absolutely central to both AMI's

defense and the FEC's analysis of whether or not there was a campaign contribution both in the Non-Prosecution Agreement and in the Conciliation Agreement.

And so --

THE COURT: People, anything else?

MR. COLANGELO: Yes, your Honor.

Just two quick points and one to correct the record.

My recollection is that Ms. Necheles said to your Honor at a bench conference last week, before any of the proposed jury instructions were in, that they intended to raise with your Honor, to question what their expert would be permitted to testify to.

So I'm not sure that we can credit the characterization that this proffer and these instructions are necessitated by differences of opinion regarding the law in the proposed jury instructions.

And then, second, on the press exemption, as you know, your Honor, we haven't yet responded to the submission that the defense put in the other day.

I'm not sure, as I stand here right now, that we will oppose the exclusion of the language in the charge to define the "Press Exemption," but the "Press Exemption" is why this entire undertaking is way beyond what any witness should testify to.

1 The statutes and the regulations combined contain about 20 words of texts on the "Press Exemption." 2 3 That entire concept is developed almost entirely 4 through additional case law in courts and through agency 5 application. 6 So, it's exactly the kind of thing that has been 7 developed through the adjudicative and agency determination 8 process and that the parties can discuss with you and that 9 you should decide, your Honor, not an expert, certainly not 10 competing experts instructing the jury. 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 12 Mr. Blanche, just give me a second, all right. 13 14 MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor. 15 (Pause.) 16 THE COURT: I don't think that the fact that each of you has submitted proposed jury charges necessarily 17 18 changes my ruling or my decision to the motions in limine. 19 To direct your attention specifically to the area that dealt with this, I direct your attention to Pages 1, 2 20 21 and 3 of the Court's decision. 22 And I will read from the very last, next to last paragraph of the Court's decision: 23 "The People's motion is granted to the extent that 24 25 Smith may not testify as a lay fact witness, offer opinion

testimony regarding the interpretation and application of Federal Campaign Finance Laws and how they relate to the facts in the instant matter, nor may Smith testify or offer an opinion as to whether the alleged conduct in this case does or does not constitute a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA).

However, Smith will be permitted to testify generally as to the following:

General background as to what the Federal Election Campaign Commission is; background as to who makes up the FEC; what the FEC's function is; what laws, if any, the FEC is responsible for enforcing; and general definitions and terms that relate directly to this case; such as, for example, campaign contribution.

As I listen to your presentation, Mr. Bove, it sounds to me like what you are asking is that I enlarge this decision quite a bit.

When I hear you use words like "interpretation,"

"past decisions," "advisory opinions," that does sound an

awful lot like what would normally be called opinions on the

law.

And, in fact, you used the term, "a battle of the experts."

The only reason we would get into "a battle of the experts" is if your expert got on the stand and testified as

2.4

to some sort of expert opinion not only about FECA, but possibly the law and then the People would put on their expert to rebut that; and then I would have to instruct the jury.

We are definitely not going to go there.

What I'm going to do, in fairness to you, because I would like to digest both submissions further, I will take some time this weekend to do that, to read and study both sets of submissions.

I would also like to read the minutes from what has just happened here.

But until you hear differently from me, my ruling has not changed.

It's going to be limited to the very, very general definitions and very general background information.

I also do agree with the People that they had asked for a very long period of time for disclosure and notice regarding the expert witness, and despite the repeated efforts to get that, it didn't come until, finally, very late in the game. It was offered, but in a manner to suggest that the witness would actually testify as a fact witness, and you know what my ruling was on that, an expert can't testify as a fact witness because they don't know the facts of the case.

So, at that point, the purpose of your expert was

greatly diminished.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Again, in fairness to you, I will consider your arguments.

I will go back and reread the submissions, but until and unless you hear differently from me, my ruling has not changed.

If there is any question as to what the ruling is, again, go back to Pages 1, 2 and 3.

MR. BOVE: Thank you, Judge.

That's understood.

THE COURT: Sure.

What else?

Nothing else from either side?

MR. BLANCHE: No.

THE COURT: Let's talk schedule.

As we discussed a little bit, I'm doing everything possible to avoid big breaks between summations, jury charge, jury instructions and deliberations.

I will try not to break up summations, if at all possible.

And as we discussed in the robing room, the deliberations should follow immediately after the jury charge.

It's not ideal for there to be a big lapse in time between summations and the jury charge.

1 So I'm trying to avoid that to the extent that I'm able. 2 3 You asked me if we could possibly start early. 4 going to look into that and see if we could start early. 5 I think that we can work a little bit late on some 6 days, but unfortunately we can't work on Wednesday. 7 As of right now, we know that one of the alternates 8 can only work until 1:00 on Thursday. 9 I don't think that that's going to be a problem one 10 way or the other. 11 We will play it by ear and see how that plays out. How much more do you think you have of Mr. Cohen? 12 MR. BLANCHE: I think not a lot. I think -- I 13 14 would say, I think I will be finished with cross Monday 15 before the morning break. THE COURT: All right. Any sense of how long the 16 17 redirect might be? 18 MS. HOFFINGER: No. But I would say under an hour, 19 your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. At this point, do you expect to 20 21 call any other witnesses on the direct case? 22 MR. STEINGLASS: No, Judge. THE COURT: Other than the expert witness, that we 23 just discussed at this point, do you expect to present a 2.4 25 defense case?

1 MR. BLANCHE: We anticipate reaching a decision at least with respect to any potential rebuttal witness very 2 3 soon, like today. 4 And we will communicate that to the folks -- to the 5 People and including the Court. 6 If we do have any rebuttal witnesses, we do not 7 anticipate that they would be long, at least on direct. 8 I don't think it's necessarily -- well, I don't 9 want to make commitments about the day on Monday, but it's 10 certainly reasonable to believe that if, aside from 11 Mr. Smith, that the witnesses will be able to get on and off on Monday. 12 THE COURT: And when you say "rebuttal witnesses," 13 14 are you referring to the witnesses that we spoke about 15 earlier today or something else? 16 MR. BLANCHE: The witnesses that we spoke about 17 earlier. 18 THE COURT: All right. So it sounds like we might possibly be done with the presentation of evidence on 19 Monday. 20 21 MR. BLANCHE: I was not speaking about President 22 Trump, obviously. 23 THE COURT: Right. MR. BLANCHE: So that's another decision that we 2.4 25 need to think through.

	3985
1	THE COURT: Right.
2	There is a possibility that we will be done with
3	the presentation of evidence on Monday.
4	And if that happens, we will have our pre-charge
5	conference on Monday.
6	Please be prepared to begin summations on Tuesday,
7	if we do wrap it up on Monday.
8	Of course, you will see my instructions before you
9	deliver your summations.
LO	I will get them to you with as much notice as I can
L1	probably get them to you.
L2	I will make every effort to get both summations in
L3	in one day.
L4	That means working early/ working late.
L5	If push comes to shove, I might have to break one
L6	of the summations over to the next day, which I hate to do.
L7	Anything else, as far as scheduling? I am open to
L8	your suggestions.
L9	All right. Thank you.
20	MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
21	MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, your Honor.
22	(Whereupon, at this time, the matter was adjourned
23	to Monday, May 20, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.)
24	*****
25	