1			
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
3	,		
4	) No. 2	nal Action 11-00175	
5	Plaintiff, ) 5 )		
6	vs. )		
7		gton, D.C. ry 11, 2023	
8	Defendants. )		
9	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
10	0		
11		1.2	
12	TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - DAY 12  AFTERNOON SESSION		
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY J. KELLY, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
14	4		
15	APPEARANCES:		
16	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: JASON B.A. McCULLOUGH ERIK M. KENERSON, ESQ		
17	CONOR MULROE, ESQ.		
18			
19	·		
20	Eleventh Floor Washington, D.C. 2053	0	
21			
22	•	Q.	
23			
24	New York, New York 10	010	
25	5		

,		
1	APPEARANCES, CONT'D:	
2	FOR THE DEFENDANT	JOHN D. HULL, IV, ESQ.
3	BIGGS:	HULL McGUIRE, P.C.
4		1420 N Street, Northwest Washington, D.C. 20005
5		NORMAN A. PATTIS, ESQ.
6		PATTIS & SMITH, LLC 383 Orange Street First Floor
7		New Haven, Connecticut 06511
8		
9	FOR THE DEFENDANT REHL:	7166 Mink Hollow Road
10		Highland, Maryland 20777
11	FOR THE DEFENDANT TARRIO:	NAYIB HASSAN, ESQ. LAW OFFICES OF NAYIB HASSAN, P.A.
12	IARRIO.	6175 Northwest 153rd Street Suite 209
13		Miami Lakes, Florida 33014
14		SABINO JAUREGUI, ESQ. JAUREGUI LAW, P.A.
15		1014 West 49th Street Hialeah, Florida 33012
16		marcan, rioriaa 33012
17	FOR THE DEFENDANT PEZZOLA:	STEVEN METCALF, II, ESQ. METCALF & METCALF, P.C.
18		99 Park Avenue Sixth Floor
19		New York, New York 10016
20		ROGER ROOTS, ESQ. LAW OFFICES OF ROGER ROOTS
21		113 Lake Drive East
22		Livingston, Montana 59047
23		
24		
25		

1	REPORTED BY:	LISA EDWARDS, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter
2		United States District Court for the District of Columbia
3		333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest Room 6706
4		Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3269
5		(202) 334 3203
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, we're back on the record in Criminal Matter 21-175, United States of 2 America versus Ethan Nordean, et al. 3 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, everyone. 4 5 I thought what we would do now is proceed to this 6 conflicts issue. I think we'll be able to walk through it 7 unscathed. But let me lay out where I think we are, and 8 then there are some points at which I may need information 9 from the parties or to have a colloquy with a Defendant or a 10 lawyer. I think most of it can be done not under seal. 11 12 But I'll just tell everyone, if someone thinks at some point 13 during what I'm saying we need to be under seal, raise your 14 hand, get my attention, and we'll do that if we need to. 15 But I think for the most part, with maybe one 16 exception, we can just proceed. 17 So --18 MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, may I ask a question? 19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, I wasn't sure, when 21 the Court ruled on the objections, whether the Court had 22 ruled on my objection about the photograph of Mr. Rehl with 23 the -- I didn't hear the Court address that. 24 THE COURT: So there were -- I didn't address that 25 specifically, but it was one of the ones that I did

overrule. I don't think -- let me put it this way: To the extent the item is even recognizable as what you proffer it to be, I think -- it doesn't -- the photograph is from January 6th. And nothing about the photograph suggests that your client was with that person or operating together or knew that person or anything.

So I think, for those -- for those two reasons, I don't think it's an unfair graphic for the Government to use.

MS. HERNANDEZ: As the Court knows, I feel otherwise.

I think, given the emotions in this case and the jurors and -- it's a picture -- the Government chose this.

This is not, like, evidence. This is a demonstrative piece of evidence, which I understand from the Government they're going to use throughout the case, not just in opening statements. I think it would take them no time to change it. So...

THE COURT: I also looked at -- I mean, part of it also, I would say, is maybe -- I don't know how often they plan to use it like this, but a lot of times, in the slides, it was used in a very small format as opposed to a big one. And the small format -- but I went and looked at the full -- all the slides about it. Where it's used sort of in the small version, I don't think you can see this at all, to be

```
1
      honest.
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. My concern always is we
2
 3
      don't know what happens in the jury room.
 4
                 The other question I had for the Court -- now it
 5
       completely --
 6
                 THE COURT: Well, Ms. Hernández, I didn't really
7
       recognize you. I wanted to go through the conflicts issue.
 8
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Sorry.
 9
                 THE COURT: But what is it?
10
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Never mind. I'll bring it up --
       oh, on the issue, on the video, the Court -- on the slide,
11
12
       the video that I find very problematic, I understand that
13
       the Court looked at a different video. I'm just going to
14
      ask the Court to please look -- review the one I submitted
15
      to the Court this morning at some point --
16
                 THE COURT: Okay. I mean --
17
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: -- and the arguments that I made
18
       in that memo that I submitted this morning.
19
                 THE COURT: I understand. Look, if -- I'll look
20
      at it so as to be prepared. But obviously, you'll have the
21
       chance to object if the Government tries to move that into
22
      evidence.
23
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Well, my understanding is that
24
       that's an exhibit they will try to introduce. So I will
25
       object.
```

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So on the conflicts front, first, I've been -- the first conflict or set of conflicts has to do with Mr. Roots, his recent introduction into the case. I think there are two categories of conflicts raised by Mr. Roots's now representation of Mr. Pezzola.

One of them, the parties have brought to my attention is presented by the fact that Jonathon Moseley, who used to represent Mr. Rehl in this case, and I -- at least I think understand from representations that he has since been disbarred -- he is now a paralegal at Mr. Roots's firm.

The second category of conflicts is that

Mr. Roots's law partner, John Pierce, used to represent two
individuals with at least a tangential connection to our
case here, Paul Rae and William Pepe. So we'll -- we'll
circle back to them. Pepe used to be Mr. Pezzola's

Co-Defendant before Mr. Pezzola was joined into this matter.

So Roots's conflict, or potential conflict, could arise out of D.C. Rule of Professional Conduct Rule 1.0, the imputed conflicts rule.

That rule provides, quote, "When lawyers are associated in a firm, none of them shall knowingly represent a client when any one of them, practicing alone, would be

1 prohibited from doing so by Rules 1.7 or 1.9." 2 So let's just talk for a moment about the Moseley 3 conflict, which I think we've -- we have a way of addressing 4 that we've talked about already, and that I'll ask Mr. Roots 5 about here today. 6 So again, Moseley's conflict here would stem from 7 Rules 1.7 and 1.9. But because Mr. Moseley joined the firm 8 as a paralegal after his representation of Mr. Rehl ended, 9 which --10 Mr. Roots, you correct me if I'm wrong on that, 11 but I think that's right; he did not join your firm as a 12 paralegal until his representation of Mr. Rehl ended. 13 Correct? 14 MR. ROOTS: Correct. And actually, it's even more 15 disconnected. I learned actually recently that Moseley is 16 not actually an employee of the John Pierce firm. He is a 17 contract paralegal employed by a company called Armchair 18 Detectives. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. ROOTS: And he's only been with the John 21 Pierce firm in any capacity at all since -- I'm thinking 22 August or something like that. 23 THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to proceed as if 24 he was an employee of your firm. It sounds like it may be 25 close enough for conflicts purposes. But I appreciate your

clarification of that.

So given that he -- by the time he came into employ with your firm, he was no longer representing Mr. Rehl. Given that, the conflict need not impute to you, to Mr. Roots, if Moseley is screened from the matter and apportioned no part of the fee therefrom under the rules and Rehl receives notice of the arrangement and the screening protocols.

The rule typically requires written notice, but Mr. Rehl is obviously here and he can receive notice firsthand.

So, Mr. Roots, we talked about this whenever it was last week. Why don't you just put on the record for Mr. Rehl and for all of us to hear what you are doing to segregate, to screen off, Mr. Moseley from any activity and any ability to view any materials that are related to this case.

MR. ROOTS: Yes. I've confirmed that Mr. Moseley is not -- has no way to access any materials from this case at this time right -- this actual case, even though he previously was a lawyer over a year ago for Mr. Rehl for a short time.

He has no access to what we're doing here, what I'm doing.

We use -- the John Pierce firm uses a platform

1 called Slack. Slack has different channels, each pertaining 2 to a different case. Mr. Moseley's cases that he's working 3 on, which I'll just say at the moment are mostly civil, 4 totally unrelated, they are walled off completely. And I'm 5 walled off from his stuff for the most part. I don't work 6 on the same cases he's working on. 7 THE COURT: All right. You will obviously -- he 8 will play no part, as you've said before, in your 9 representation of Mr. Pezzola? 10 MR. ROOTS: None. None whatsoever. 11 THE COURT: Okay. So I think that adequately 12 addresses the issue regarding Mr. Moseley. 13 The situation with Mr. Rehl is -- I mean, with 14 Mr. Pierce is slightly different. I've taken a closer look 15 at Rule 1.10 since our last -- since our earlier exchanges 16 on this. And because Mr. Pierce and Mr. Roots were law 17 partners while Mr. Pierce was representing Mr. Rae and 18 Mr. Pepe, it's not necessarily enough to screen him from the 19 matter even if Mr. Roots had no negligible involvement in 20 those cases. 21 Pierce would probably have conflicts under Rules 22 1.7(b) and 1.9 if he were to represent Mr. Pezzola, and 23 under Rule 1.10, those conflicts would be imputed to 24 Mr. Roots. 25 So let me just walk through those rules. Under

Rule 1.7(b)(4), a lawyer shall not represent a client with respect to a matter if the lawyer's professional judgment on behalf of the client will be or reasonably may be adversely affected by the lawyer's responsibilities to or interests in a third party.

Now, Pierce's and, therefore, by imputation,
Mr. Roots's obligation to Rae and Pepe include Rule 1.6's
requirement not to disclose confidence and secrets.

So Pierce and, therefore, Mr. Roots cannot use any confidences attained from Mr. Rae or Mr. Pepe to benefit Pezzola.

Now, it's not at all clear to me that such information even exists. But out of an abundance of caution, I think this is worth addressing.

The conflict is waivable if, A, Mr. Pezzola provides informed consent to the representation after full disclosure of the existence and the nature of the potential conflict and the possible adverse consequences and, B, Mr. Roots reasonably believes that he will be able to competently and diligently represent Mr. Pezzola. That's Rule 1.7(c).

Now, again, I guess this is belt and suspenders on top of belt and suspenders. It's also possible the conflict would not impute to Mr. Roots at all. Rule 1.10(a)(1) provides that a lawyer's conflict under this rule does not

automatically impute to other lawyers at the same firm if, quote, "that interest does not present a significant risk of adversely affecting the representation of the client by another lawyer at the firm."

Here, Mr. Roots has represented to me that he has

had no or negligible involvement with these cases. So I think there's -- I don't think there's a substantial risk that Mr. Pierce's prior representation of these individuals would negatively impact Mr. Pezzola.

But out of an abundance of caution, especially because Mr. Roots did work on, I believe, one small matter for Mr. Rae, what I plan to do then is just conduct a quick colloquy with Mr. Pezzola and with Mr. Roots. And the idea for Mr. -- with regard to Mr. Pezzola would just be to get him to understand --

MR. METCALF: Can I have 20 seconds with him?

THE COURT: Sure. Let me just finish what I'm saying and then I'll give you a moment to confer with

Mr. Pezzola.

MR. METCALF: Thank you.

THE COURT: The purpose of my colloquy with Mr. Pezzola will simply be to make sure that he understands that there might be information that Mr. Roots has learned or at least information that might be imputed to Mr. Roots because he is associated in practice with Mr. Pierce --

1 there could be information that Mr. Roots might know but that he would not be able to use to Mr. Pezzola's benefit. 2 3 So just -- you know, what I'm going to ask him after further going into the issue and talking about the 4 5 case is just that -- whether he understands that if Mr. Rae 6 or Mr. Pepe gave Mr. Roots or his law partner, Mr. Pierce, 7 confidential information that could help Mr. Pezzola, but 8 that neither one of those gentlemen gave Mr. Roots 9 permission to share it, Mr. Roots might not be able to use 10 that information or represent him as well as he possibly 11 could because of that prior conflict. And that's all. 12 So -- and then with regard to Mr. Roots, 13 Mr. Roots, I'm just going to ask you again some questions 14 about whether you think your firm's prior representation of 15 Mr. Pepe or Mr. Rae -- whether you think that could hinder 16 your ability to provide competent and diligent 17 representation to Mr. Pezzola. 18 If Mr. Pezzola waives and, Mr. Roots, you're 19 satisfied it won't affect your ability to provide competent 20 and diligent representation, then I think we've addressed 21 the issue and we can move forward. 22 So let me give you, Mr. Metcalf and Mr. Roots, one 23 moment to talk to Mr. Pezzola and then we'll go from there. 24 MR. METCALF: Thank you, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Absolutely.

1 (Discussion had off the record amongst counsel and 2 the Defendants.) 3 MR. ROOTS: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Pezzola, the reason for this 4 5 exchange we're going to have right now is to discuss the 6 potential risks or problems that could result from you being 7 represented by a lawyer, Mr. Roots, whose law partner, 8 Mr. Pierce, represented your former Co-Defendant, Mr. Pepe, 9 and Mr. Paul Rae, someone who, in theory, could be a witness 10 in this case. 11 Now, as you've heard me discuss, there are some 12 issues because Mr. Pepe's and Mr. Rae's cases are, under the 13 rules of ethics, similar to this one; they're all about the 14 events of January 6th. I have to assure myself that you 15 understand the risks of potential conflicts that could arise 16 by being represented by an attorney, again, whose law 17 partner formerly represented the two third parties that we've mentioned. 18 19 So I'm going to discuss those risks and concerns 20 with you and ask you some questions about whether you 21 consent to proceed. 22 Do you understand? Any questions before we begin? 23 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: No. I'm pretty clear, your 24 Honor. 25 THE COURT: Okay. If at any point you don't

```
1
       understand something, wave your hand --
 2
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Okay.
                 THE COURT: -- and I'll try to explain it better.
 3
                 First, just some very basic questions.
 4
 5
                 How old are you, sir?
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: 45.
 6
 7
                 THE COURT: Okay. How far did you go in school?
 8
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Some college.
 9
                 THE COURT: And what type of work did you do
10
       before January 6th?
11
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: I owned my own commercial
12
       flooring installation business.
13
                 THE COURT: Okay. And do you have any -- prior to
14
       this, did you have any experience in -- with the criminal
15
       justice system at all?
16
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: None.
17
                 THE COURT: And today, are you under the influence
18
       of any alcohol, drugs or medication that could affect your
19
       ability to understand our conversation today?
20
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: No, sir.
21
                 THE COURT: Do you understand the charges against
22
       you in this case?
23
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: I do.
24
                 THE COURT: Okay. And do you understand the
25
       penalties associated with them?
```

1 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. So the law -- the rules 2 3 governing how lawyers have to represent their clients 4 provide that every defendant in a criminal case is entitled 5 to be represented by a lawyer who does not have a conflict 6 of interest. 7 A lawyer must be loyal to each and every one of his clients, and that means that the lawyer's advocacy on 8 9 behalf of his client must be for the benefit of that client 10 and not for anyone else. 11 A conflict of interest occurs when a lawyer has 12 divided or split loyalties as between his clients. When a 13 lawyer represents two different clients in the same case, 14 there is the possibility that a lawyer's loyalties will be 15 divided between the clients and, as a result, a defendant 16 might not receive from his lawyer the zealous advocacy that 17 the lawyer is supposed to provide. Do you understand all that? 18 19 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: I do. 20 THE COURT: And you understand that you have the 21 right to hire your own lawyer? 22 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: And for the record, if you couldn't 24 afford a lawyer, you could have a lawyer appointed to 25 represent you.

DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. So the issue that might arise here relates to confidentiality. A defendant in a criminal case has the right to have his communications with his counsel and any other secrets that his lawyer learns in the course of the representation kept confidential.

You probably have heard of the attorney-client privilege. Generally speaking, if a lawyer -- if a defendant tells his lawyer something in connection with his case, the lawyer can't share what was said with anybody else, including co-defendants, without the defendant's express permission.

Any questions there?

DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: No, sir.

THE COURT: So I want you to be aware of the potential complication that could arise when one lawyer represents a defendant in a case that is substantially related to one in which the lawyer's law partner used to represent another defendant.

That complication is when a client shares information with his lawyer, the lawyer may only share it with others if the former client gives permission for that to occur.

And if that information is particularly helpful to the lawyer's new client or current client at the expense of

1 the former client, there is the problem of the lawyer having 2 divided loyalties. It may be appropriate for a lawyer to 3 share that information with his other client only if the former client gives permission for that to happen. 4 5 A further layer here is that if one lawyer at a 6 law firm would have such a conflict, the conflict applies to 7 every lawyer at the firm. So even though Mr. Pierce is not 8 your lawyer, any conflict he would have in representing you 9 applies to Mr. Roots by virtue of them being partners. 10 Do you understand all that? 11 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Yes. 12 THE COURT: And do you understand that if Mr. Rae 13 or Mr. Pepe gave Mr. Roots or Mr. Pierce confidential 14 information that could help you, but Mr. Rae or Mr. Pepe did 15 not give Mr. Roots permission to share it with you or use it 16 on your behalf, that Mr. Roots might not be able to 17 represent you as well as if he had been permitted to share 18 that information? Does that make sense? 19 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: It does, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Do you understand that Mr. Rae or 21 Mr. Pepe may have told Mr. Roots or Mr. Pierce something you 22 would want to know, but Mr. Roots may not be able to let you 23 know it? Do you understand that? 24 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Yes. 25 THE COURT: These would all be conflicts.

```
1
       knowing these potential conflicts as I've described them to
2
       you, do you still want Mr. Roots to represent you?
 3
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Yes, your Honor.
                 THE COURT: All right.
 4
 5
                 DEFENDANT PEZZOLA: Thank you.
                 THE COURT: Very well.
 6
 7
                 MR. METCALF: Thank you.
 8
                 THE COURT: Mr. Roots, will you just give us --
 9
       obviously, without divulging any secrets or
10
       attorney-client-privileged information, can you just
11
       describe the extent of Mr. Pierce's representation of
12
       Mr. Rae and Mr. Pepe? Just to the best of your knowledge.
13
                 MR. ROOTS: Yeah. Actually, Mr. Pierce actually
14
       hasn't done much on either of those. He might have done a
15
       little bit more on the Rae situation. But the Pepe case is,
16
       as far as I know, almost completely or completely done by
17
       another lawyer named Bill Shipley. And Bill Shipley has 100
18
       percent handled that Pepe case.
19
                 John Pierce and Mr. Shipley have sort of a -- I
20
       won't call it a partnership. They shared cases.
                                                         I quess
21
       that's a way of a partnership. And they no longer do so.
22
       They're not even -- they don't speak. They've had a little
23
       bit of a falling-out. Maybe I'm giving too much
24
       information.
25
                 But anyways, there's no danger of Mr. Pierce
```

```
1
       getting anything from Mr. Shipley. They're not on good
2
       terms at the moment.
 3
                 THE COURT: It sounds like they're not even --
       they engage in joint representations as opposed to being --
 4
 5
                 MR. ROOTS: Yes.
 6
                 THE COURT: -- business partners. Is that
7
       accurate?
 8
                 MR. ROOTS: Yes. It was a joint representation of
 9
      Mr. Pepe.
10
                 THE COURT: Okay.
11
                 MR. ROOTS: I'll say I've never -- I didn't even
12
      know Mr. Pepe's first name until this -- until I got right
13
      here.
14
                 And back to that Slack channel, the word "Pepe"
15
       appeared. I was never ever allowed into that channel.
16
      Never worked on a Pepe case. Never spoke to him.
17
                 THE COURT: So you never worked on Pepe's case.
18
                 And if you would -- I know you had discussed this
      with me the other day. Tell me about Paul -- you had a
19
20
       little bit of -- you played a small role in Paul Rae's case.
21
                 MR. ROOTS: I was called in -- and maybe it was a
22
       last-minute thing -- to work on a motion to -- a motion for
23
      Mr. Paul Rae to fly -- he had to go to a wedding or
24
       something in Las Vegas. And also, he wanted a motion to
25
      modify his conditions of release and remove his ankle
```

1 monitor. And so I worked on that motion, submitted it to 2 John Pierce, who filed it. 3 So that's the extent of my entire knowledge of 4 Paul Rae. 5 I've talked to him on the phone. Seemed like, you 6 know, a nice guy. Never read his indictment. That was the 7 extent of all I know about Paul Rae. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any reason to 9 believe that your firm's involvement with Mr. Pepe could 10 hinder your ability to provide competent and diligent 11 representation to Mr. Pezzola? 12 MR. ROOTS: I have no -- no doubt that I can 13 completely represent Mr. Pezzola without any conflict 14 whatsoever. 15 THE COURT: And do you have any reason to believe 16 that your firm's involvement with Mr. Rae might hinder your 17 ability to provide competent and diligent representation to 18 Mr. Pezzola? 19 MR. ROOTS: No. No doubts. 20 THE COURT: All right. There's -- we're not quite 21 done with the conflicts that -- potential conflicts that 22 flow out of this situation, because there are Rule 1.9 23 issues also stemming from Mr. Pierce's prior representation 24 of Mr. Rae and Mr. Pepe. 25 That rule provides that a lawyer who has formerly

1 represented -- quote: "A lawyer who has formerly 2 represented a client in a matter shall not thereafter 3 represent another person in the same or a substantially 4 related matter in which that person's interests are 5 materially adverse to the interests of a former client 6 unless the former client gives informed consent." 7 So under Rule 1.10(a), the imputation rule, if Mr. Pierce would have a Rule 1.9 conflict representing 8 9 Mr. Pezzola, Mr. Roots would also have that same conflict. 10 I think Mr. Rae -- from what I understand of 11 Mr. Rae and Mr. Pepe's cases, they are likely substantially 12 related under Rule 1.9, so I assume that for purposes of the 13 analysis. 14 The bigger question is whether Mr. Pezzola's 15 interests in this case are materially adverse to Rae's or 16 Pepe's. The rule does not define "materially adverse." 17 The ABA has advised that material adversity 18 exists, quote, "where a lawyer is negotiating or litigating 19 against a former or prospective client or attacking the work 20 done for the former client on behalf of a current client in 21 the same or a substantially related matter. 22 "It also exists in many, but not all, instances 23 where a lawyer is cross-examining a former or prospective 24 client; and generally, it may exist where a former client is

not a party or a witness to a case but can identify some

25

1 specific material, legal, financial or other identifiable 2 concrete detriment that would be caused by the current 3 representation." That's from an ABA opinion -- ABA opinion 21-491 4 5 dated February 10th, 2021. 6 "But a claimed detriment untethered from a 7 demonstrable and material harm or risk of harm to the former client's interests doesn't suffice." 8 9 So I think what I need to do is just assess the 10 positions of Mr. Pepe and Mr. Rae vis-à-vis this litigation 11 to see if they would qualify as materially adverse. So I'll 12 begin with Mr. Pepe. 13 Again -- and I'll say my piece here and see if the 14 parties need to correct me on this. I don't think either 15 side -- I haven't seen any sign, I don't think, that either 16 side intends to call him as a witness, so I don't see how he 17 could have an interest materially adverse to Mr. Pezzola's in this matter. So I don't think this is a case where a 18 19 demonstrable and material risk of harm would come from it. 20 So if that's so, I don't think there's a Rule 1.9 21 conflict with respect to Pepe. So he would not have to 22 consent to the representation. 23 But I just want to hear if any party thinks 24 otherwise. 25 I see everyone looking around, but -- no one

1 thinking -- well, hold on. I'll give the Government a 2 moment to... 3 MR. KENERSON: Your Honor, I guess -- Erik Kenerson for the United States. 4 5 I think, as we've said in our papers, it's hard to 6 evaluate on the record that we have. It's theoretical. We 7 certainly would not take the position that such material 8 adversity exists on the current record. 9 But given that they were at one point 10 Co-Defendants charged as co-conspirators in an indictment, 11 depending on how the case comes in, that could crop up. But 12 on the current record, we don't see it. 13 THE COURT: Obviously, if -- at that point, we 14 would have the possibility of -- if that were to crop up, we 15 could, number one, seek Mr. Pepe's consent, if need be. And 16 if that -- failing that, I could -- Mr. Pezzola has two 17 lawyers. I could disqualify Mr. Roots if I need to. 18 But again, we're not -- we're not there. But I'm 19 just saying we have those in our back pocket. So I think 20 that seems like a reasonable place to move forward with 21 Mr. Pepe. 22 With regard to Mr. Rae, I'll note that he does 23 appear -- well, I -- I'm pretty sure he does appear on at 24 least one witness list. I don't know whether either side is 25 intending to call him or whether -- well, I don't know the

1 status of Mr. Rae in this litigation. 2 So let me just ask -- and if the parties need to 3 make this representation other than in open court, you can 4 let me know. But I do need to know whether there's any 5 information about Mr. Rae that we should be aware of. 6 MR. METCALF: The only other information other 7 than what was submitted in our writings and what was asked or inquired of Mr. Roots is that I believe that Mr. Rae was 8 9 put on a defense witness list by someone who was not -- by 10 another Defendant other than Pezzola. 11 THE COURT: Right. But it's important for me to 12 know in this analysis whether any Defendant intends to call 13 him as a witness. 14 MR. METCALF: And I don't have any other 15 information on that. 16 THE COURT: You don't. But I may need to hear 17 from any other Defendant. 18 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, Mr. Nordean may call, or 19 attempt to call, Mr. Rae as a witness. 20 But again, I think -- just to skip to the next 21 beat here, I don't understand the issue, when there's two 22 defense lawyers for Mr. Pezzola, one of whom doesn't have a 23 conflict, because then that defense lawyer would conduct any 24 cross and there wouldn't be any ethics issue. So that's why

25

I'm --

```
1
                 THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure it's limited to the
       cross-examination.
2
 3
                 MR. SMITH: Or, you know --
                 THE COURT: Right. That's the issue. I mean,
 4
 5
       you're right. There is a possibility of doing something
 6
       about a cross that would eliminate part of it.
 7
                 But it also may be that, if that's the case,
       Mr. Roots might not be able to remain as part of the defense
 8
 9
       team.
10
                 You know, again, I think we'll -- if -- just as
11
       long as all parties know that could be the case.
12
                 MR. SMITH: In terms of probabilities, your Honor,
13
       because Mr. Rae has been charged and I believe he has new
14
       counsel now, I --
15
                                  I don't disagree with what you're
                 THE COURT: No.
16
       saying. You're telling me, though, that you don't -- let's
17
       put it this way: Do you have any information to suggest
18
       that he would not -- that you'd really be in a position to
19
       call him and that he would provide testimony in the case?
20
                 MR. SMITH: It's possible, your Honor. It's
21
       possible. But I can't give a probability.
22
                 But, you know, at the same time, I -- again, I
23
       don't really see how it impacts Mr. Pezzola when he has two
24
       counsel, one of whom doesn't have the conflict.
25
                 THE COURT: Right.
```

1 Again, I think -- you may be right with the 2 question. I think I might have to disqualify Mr. Roots if 3 that were to happen. But again, maybe not. But he does 4 have two lawyers. 5 So let me turn to the -- ask the Government. Are 6 you all comfortable going forward on this record? 7 MR. KENERSON: I think, similar with -- with 8 Mr. Pepe, things could arise that create a material 9 adversity where, right now, one is theoretical. So, you 10 know, that's what the Government noted in bringing this up; 11 and obviously, if all the parties know, we might have to 12 cross that bridge mid-trial, but we might have to cross that 13 bridge mid-trial. 14 THE COURT: All right. But in any event, the 15 worst-case scenario for Mr. Pezzola would be that he would 16 just continue on with one attorney. I'm not saying it would 17 have to be, but I'm just -- that's the worst-case scenario. 18 All right. 19 I think that sounds -- and as I said, the other 20 possibility is the individual gives consent. The other 21 individual gives consent. And then we don't have to 22 cross --23 MR. SMITH: And, your Honor, I think that's a 24 reasonable possibility as well, so I --25 THE COURT: Right.

1 MR. SMITH: If it were probable that this witness 2 would testify and decline to invoke any privilege he may 3 assert, then it's not unreasonable to expect that he would 4 also waive any kind of hypothetical privilege, you know, 5 power he has over -- to assert this conflicts issue. 6 THE COURT: I think -- on this record, I think we 7 can proceed. And if things evolve, we'll -- we'll address them. 8 9 Okay. So, Mr. Roots, we're done with you. 10 MR. ROOTS: Thank you, your Honor. MR. KENERSON: Could I ask a factual clarification 11 12 question, going back to Mr. Moseley? 13 I think I heard this correctly -- I just want to 14 make sure I heard it correctly -- that I understand that 15 Mr. Moseley is walled off from accessing any of Mr. Roots's 16 materials as it relates to this case. And I think Mr. Roots 17 said it went the other way. I just wasn't as clear on that. 18 I just wanted to double-check, that Mr. Roots is walled off 19 from anything Mr. Moseley may have as it relates to 20 Mr. Rehl. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Yes. 22 MR. ROOTS: The answer is absolutely yes, I'm 23 walled off from anything that -- I don't believe there is 24 anything that exists, but to the extent -- even if there 25 were, I would be walled off from it.

1 THE COURT: To the extent Mr. Moseley has come 2 into your employ, he's not -- there would be no reason to 3 have materials related to his representation of Mr. Rehl on your firm's computers. Is that right? 4 5 MR. ROOTS: Mr. Moseley has no files. He just 6 works on paralegal work at times, I believe part-time. He's 7 sort of sailing off into retirement. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. ROOTS: And he brings no files to the John 10 Pierce firm. 11 THE COURT: Okay. The second -- so now we turn to 12 Mr. Hull and some of the issues we've known about and some 13 that have been affected by recent developments. 14 There are three, at least, potential conflicts 15 arising out of Mr. Hull's representation of Mr. Biggs: his 16 prior representation -- "his" meaning, obviously, 17 Mr. Hull's -- prior representation of Mr. Tarrio before the 18 January 6th Committee and his representation of Tarrio in 19 some related civil cases; two, his contemplated 20 representation of Mr. Bertino before the -- and then two 21 issues the Government has raised more recently: his 22 contemplated representation of Jerry Bertino before the 23 January 6th Committee and, third, his representation of Jay 24 Thaxton, an individual -- another individual before the 25 January 6th Committee the Government has alerted me to.

1 So with regard to Mr. Tarrio, part of this is a 2 process we've already -- and Mr. Tarrio well knows; we 3 already addressed it fairly thoroughly -- a number of months 4 ago, I appointed an independent conflicts counsel to address 5 any potential conflicts posed by Mr. Hull's representation 6 of Tarrio before the January 6th Committee and some related 7 civil cases. I'll note that the status of Mr. Hull's 8 9 representation of Tarrio in those related civil matters 10 seems to be in a gray area. It looks like, Mr. Hull, you 11 moved to withdraw, and Judge Mehta hasn't granted that 12 motion yet, or he denied them because they weren't 13 accompanied by Mr. Tarrio's written consent to the 14 withdrawal. 15 MR. HULL: That's correct, your Honor. It wasn't 16 done --17 THE COURT: Right. 18 MR. HULL: -- and we had not gotten around to 19 doing it, but the intent is to withdraw completely. 20 THE COURT: Understood. 21 In any event, the report and recommendation that 22 the conflicts counsel provided me included a thorough 23 analysis of Rule 1.7's applicability here, which governs 24 conflicts generally and the simultaneous representation of 25 two individuals in substantially related matters, as well as

the rule I mentioned earlier again, Rule 1.9, which deals with former clients.

And when I conducted colloquies with both

Mr. Tarrio and Mr. Biggs back in November, we discussed the

possibility that a conflict might arise stemming from either

or both sources.

And at bottom, as the report and recommendations set out, the potential conflicts that might arise if Tarrio is Hull's current client in civil matters, or former client, are more or less the same.

Conflicts under both rules are waivable if affected clients provide informed consent. And Mr. Hull reasonably believes that he would be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each client.

So as I set out in an order a few weeks ago, which I filed under seal because it related to these hearings that we had that were sealed because of the possibility of getting into privileged and other sensitive information, I did make a finding that both Mr. Tarrio and Mr. Biggs provided informed consent to the representation.

Again, on the conflicts counsel's recommendation,

I appointed both Mr. Tarrio and Mr. Biggs independent

conflicts counsel, one for each of them, both of whom were

well-versed in these issues.

Both Defendants represented to me that they had

ample time to discuss the potential conflicts here with their special counsel, and counsel represented them at that hearing. And when I questioned both Defendants, I further explained -- and they will remember -- in excruciating detail, I think they'll agree -- all the issues that might arise under Rules 1.9 and 1.7, and both Defendants consented to Mr. Hull's representation of Mr. Biggs nonetheless.

In addition, I'll note that, after reviewing the transcript of the colloquies I conducted with Mr. Tarrio and Mr. Biggs, it was clear to me that neither Defendant's consent sort of turned on whether Mr. Pattis was also representing Mr. Biggs as Mr. Hull's co-counsel. For example, one of the obvious issues that might arise here would be if Mr. Tarrio ended up testifying and Mr. Hull had to cross-examine him.

I questioned Mr. Tarrio about this very prospect, and he responded that he was comfortable with it and consented to Hull's representation of Biggs here.

Similarly, I explained to Mr. Biggs that, given Mr. Hull's involvement with Mr. Tarrio, a conflict might arise, let's say, during closing arguments if Mr. Hull had to argue that the evidence against Biggs was weaker than the evidence against Tarrio.

I then clarified that even if Mr. Pattis would be delivering the closing, Mr. Hull would still be sharing

information and helping him to prepare. Mr. Biggs said he understood, and he reaffirmed that he wanted Mr. Hull to represent him.

So for all those reasons, I don't think there are -- that any further colloquies of Mr. Biggs or Mr. Tarrio on this issue are necessary, even in light of the fact that we may not have Mr. Pattis in the case. I note he's moved to withdraw.

Unless any party thinks I need to further engage those colloquies, I'm going to move to talk about Mr. Thaxton.

All right.

The Government also brought to my attention two new potential issues regarding Mr. Hull's involvement here, both of which it seems the Government only recently discovered.

One potential issue the Government raised is

Mr. Hull's representation of an individual named Jay Thaxton

at his January 6th Committee deposition. Looking at it

closely, I don't see an issue -- I don't see a problematic

issue here.

Mr. Thaxton doesn't appear on either side's witness list. I have no record of his knowledge of or involvement with these Defendants, if he has any at all. I think he is a member of the Proud Boys. That might be the

1 only nexus with the case. 2 So --3 MR. HULL: Your Honor, I can help a little there. 4 There was a footnote in -- this will take a second. There 5 was a footnote in the Government's pleading on Mr. Thaxton. 6 And it said: Should Mr. Hull call Mr. Thaxton -- in other 7 words, if we suppose that he wasn't on the witness list now, but I called him later. 8 9 The decision not to call Jay Thaxton was made for 10 reasons completely unrelated to me about two days before the witness list was due. 11 12 So unless the Government calls him, he will not 13 appear. 14 THE COURT: Okay. So again, I think what I 15 explained previously as to why I don't see there being a 16 Rule 1.9 issue with Mr. Pepe applies with probably greater 17 force to the situation with regard to Mr. Thaxton. I don't 18 think there's any further inquiry I need to make of the 19 parties or colloquies I need to make with any Defendant. 20 The last I think -- and again, I know we're in 21 a -- I think this is all part of a publicly available 22 transcript -- but it has to do with Mr. Bertino. 23 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, good afternoon. Moore for the United States. Just one thing. 24 25 We think it might be prudent, with regards to

Mr. Thaxton, just to get a brief colloquy from Mr. Biggs
that he is aware, given Mr. Hull's prior representation of
Mr. Thaxton, that he wouldn't be able to use information he
learned through the course of that representation in
representing Mr. Biggs in this matter, just in an abundance
of caution, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Out of an abundance of
caution, Mr. Biggs, you heard the colloquy I had. You and I
have had a similar colloquy like this before.

DEFENDANT BIGGS: Roger that.

THE COURT: And you've heard the colloquy I had
with Mr. Pezzola a moment ago. Correct?

DEFENDANT BIGGS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you understand, from hearing that colloquy, that in theory an issue could arise in this case that relates to confidentiality. A defendant in a criminal case has the right to have his communications with his counsel and any other secrets that that lawyer learns in the course of the representation kept confidential.

You've heard of the attorney-client privilege; and, generally speaking, if a defendant tells his lawyer something in connection with his case, a lawyer cannot share what was said with anyone else, including co-defendants, without the defendant's express permission.

Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT BIGGS: Roger that, your Honor.

THE COURT: I want you to be aware of the potential complication that could arise -- that could arise when one lawyer represents a defendant in a case that is substantially related to one in which the lawyer used to represent another defendant.

The complication is that when a client shares information with his lawyer, the lawyer may only share it with others if the former client gives permission for that to occur.

And if that information is particularly helpful to a lawyer's current client in a criminal case at the expense of his former client, there is the problem of the lawyer having divided loyalties. It may be appropriate for the lawyer to share that information with his other client only if the former client gives permission for that to happen.

So even though -- so do you understand all that, sir?

DEFENDANT BIGGS: Roger that.

THE COURT: And do you understand that if Mr. Hull has confidential information that he learned from Mr. Thaxton, but Mr. Thaxton did not give him permission to share that with you or to use it on your behalf, then Mr. Hull might not be able to represent you as well as if he were permitted to share that information with you? Do you

```
1
       understand that?
                 DEFENDANT BIGGS: Fully understand.
2
 3
                 THE COURT: And do you understand that Mr. Thaxton
 4
       might have told Mr. Hull something that you would want to
 5
       know, but Mr. Hull would not be able to tell you under those
 6
       circumstances? Do you understand that?
 7
                 DEFENDANT BIGGS: Yes, your Honor.
 8
                 THE COURT: All right. And knowing about these
 9
       potential conflicts, do you still want Mr. Hull to represent
10
       you, sir?
11
                 DEFENDANT BIGGS: Roger that.
12
                 THE COURT: Is that a yes?
13
                 DEFENDANT BIGGS: Yes, your Honor.
14
                 THE COURT: All right.
15
                 DEFENDANT BIGGS: Affirmative.
16
                 THE COURT: All right. So now we turn to
17
       Mr. Bertino.
18
                 I think -- is there any reason -- let me just ask
19
       the Government, since they've been, as compared to the
20
       Defendants, more sensitive to issues about being under seal.
21
       I don't think any of this needs to be discussed under seal,
22
       but let me ask -- okay. I see that the Government is
23
       nodding no.
24
                 MR. HULL: No, your Honor. As the Government
25
       knows, do I think that should be under seal [sic].
```

THE COURT: All right. The second issue the Government raised presents a different kind of concern. So when Mr. Bertino testified before the January 6th Committee, he represented that he considered hiring Mr. Hull to represent him.

They -- according to the transcript, they discussed the possibility, and Mr. Bertino contacted Mr. Hull for sort of initial advice before the FBI apparently searched his residence. But Mr. Bertino never formally became Mr. Hull's client, and another lawyer ended up representing him at his Committee deposition.

So this implicates a couple of related rules.

Under Rule 1.1(a), a person who discusses with a lawyer the possibility of forming a client-lawyer relationship with respect to a matter is a prospective client. Section (b) -- Subsection (b) further provides that even if no attorney-client relationship ultimately comes to pass, the attorney still may not use or reveal information learned in the consultation with the prospective client except as allowed under Rule 1.6.

And except in those circumstances, the lawyer shall not represent a client with interests materially adverse to those of a prospective client in the same or a substantially related matter if the lawyer received a confidence or secret from the prospective client.

Under Rule 1.6(b), a confidence refers to information protected by the attorney-client privilege under applicable law and a secret is other information gained in the professional relationship that the client has requested be held inviolate or the disclosure of which would be embarrassing or would likely be detrimental to the client.

So it seems, based on the deposition testimony, that Mr. Bertino was Mr. Hull's prospective client, and the cases are obviously substantially related to each other.

That being so, I think the cause for concern here is that, given that Mr. Bertino -- that the Government anticipates calling Mr. Bertino as a witness against Mr. Biggs, then Mr. Biggs's interests would be materially adverse to Mr. Bertino's.

So I think the first question I have to resolve here is whether Mr. Hull ever did receive a confidence or secret, as I've defined them, from Mr. Bertino. If not, then Rule 1.18 poses no barrier to Mr. Hull's representation of Mr. Biggs here.

Indeed, Comment 4 to that rule provides that,

quote, "In order to avoid acquiring confidences and secrets

from a prospective client, a lawyer considering whether or

not to undertake a new matter may limit the initial

interview only to information that does not constitute a

confidence or secret if the lawyer can do so and still

determine whether a conflict of interest or other reason for nonrepresentation exists."

So one possibility is Mr. Hull did not receive a confidence or secret from Mr. Bertino. We proceed.

But I think, if it turns out that Mr. Hull did obtain a confidence or secret from Mr. Bertino, then I think we'll need to do one of two things: The first option would be to see if Mr. Biggs and Mr. Bertino both waive the conflict, which that rule allows, 1.18, by providing informed consent to the representation. And in theory, we could also discuss the possibility that I could appoint separate independent counsel to cross-examine Bertino and take care of any other matter that would implicate the conflict.

But the question first, I think, analytically is whether Mr. Hull received any confidence or secret from Mr. Bertino. That's the first question.

The second question is, then, could we get
Mr. Hull and Mr. Bertino to waive any related conflict?

So before I -- so I think -- I think what it makes sense for me to do is discuss this with Mr. Hull, with no one else present, for him to make representations about whether he received a confidence or secret from Mr. Bertino and then take the next step if we need to.

Let me just ask, does any party think that's not

```
1
       the way we should proceed?
                 MR. HULL: Your Honor, if I may, Dan Hull for Joe
2
 3
       Biggs.
 4
                 We can, of course, do what your Honor wants.
 5
       could put -- tell you right now a couple of things that
 6
       don't need to be under seal that might shortcut this a
7
       little bit with respect to the nature of the relationship I
       had with Mr. Bertino. Is that fair?
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: If -- if there's something you feel
10
       comfortable saying --
                 MR. HULL: Very comfortable.
11
12
                 THE COURT: -- on the -- on the record, then
13
       that's fine.
14
                 MR. HULL: Sure.
15
                 I spent a lot of my career turning down work.
16
       Work comes in all the time. We took ourselves out of the
17
       Yellow Pages at one point.
                 When Mr. Bertino called --
18
19
                 THE COURT REPORTER: Can you pull the microphone
20
       away from you, please, counsel?
21
                 MR. HULL: I apologize. This is my second
22
       warning, I think.
23
                 THE COURT: We just can't get the distance between
24
       our mouths and the microphone right. Everyone is either too
25
       far or too close.
```

1 MR. HULL: This is a tough courtroom. 2 Mr. Bertino was, I think, put in touch with me by 3 Henry Tarrio. I'm not sure. I can tell you that the idea 4 was for me to find someone who could represent him before 5 the House Committee, because there was an inquiry. And I 6 did not want to represent anybody but Mr. Tarrio. 7 However, Mr. Thaxton was someone in need. Not a lot of people would do these kinds of cases. So we entered 8 9 into an agreement where he paid me a nominal sum for me to 10 represent him in his deposition, which I actually stopped 11 near the end, and there's some question in my mind whether 12 or not it was completed. 13 However --14 THE COURT: Let's keep focused on Mr. --15 MR. JAUREGUI: Judge, Jauregui on behalf of 16 Tarrio. 17 I think, if there's going to be any discussion at 18 all about my client and anything that he said, this should 19 be sealed. I don't think we should be getting into this. 20 MR. HULL: We're not going to talk about Enrique 21 anymore. 22 MR. JAUREGUI: Okay. 23 MR. HULL: So with respect to them -- the 24 transcript, I've seen parts of it. And it was done after 25 the first two depositions done by the House Committee by the same people who I had a relationship with.

To make a long story short, certainly anytime when I try to get people lawyers, it takes a while, and it particularly takes a long time with Proud Boys. And so the notion was that I would try to find him somebody.

I did not. And while I was in the course of doing that, I believe there was a search and seizure of his home, and I asked him to get in touch with somebody near there.

But he was calling a lot.

Mr. Bertino and I had a very short-lived relationship. We were like oil and water. He found me crazy and arrogant. I found him very emotional and skittish. But I was never able to find a House Committee lawyer for him.

I'm glad he was represented. I didn't read anything in the transcript with respect to his relationship with me that was true except for the fact that I did talk to him and had a -- had an attorney-client relationship, certainly would have to have had that open. But no attorney-client information was exchanged, if that makes sense.

So the attorney-client relationship was certainly there for a short time, but nothing went through it.

THE COURT: So you think it was not a prospective -- I thought of your relationship with him as a

1 prospective relationship, given that you never really -- you 2 were exploring either finding someone else or seeing if you 3 would represent him, but you never took on the 4 representation? 5 MR. HULL: No. I think definitely I did not. 6 I think every time I agree to, like, find a lawyer for 7 somebody, I have that relationship. 8 The question is: Does anything, you know, go into 9 the conduit? And I've done it hundreds and hundreds of 10 times. And I tell them that now we do have this 11 relationship and you can tell me things, but I'll try to get 12 you -- we have an attorney-client relationship, but I will 13 try to find you a lawyer. You can get things to me and I'll 14 get things to that person. 15 And that's been a big part of my career, my 16 profession. 17 THE COURT: Okay. So you don't think I need to 18 have a colloquy -- your representation is that you did not 19 receive any confidences or secrets in the course of 20 whether -- however you want to characterize your -- these 21 preliminary discussions? 22 MR. HULL: Absolutely not. It was more just lots 23 of phone calls, very many, some fairly emotional coming from 24 his end. And it was more like social work. But he 25 eventually got an attorney other than ones that I would come

```
1
       up with.
                 THE COURT: Let me ask the Government what their
2
 3
       view of the record is at this point.
 4
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: So, your Honor, I think just one
 5
       thing that we wanted to flag for the Court is just the
 6
       concern about the statement that Mr. Hull made about
 7
       Mr. Bertino being skittish and describing this other
 8
       assessment of his posture.
 9
                 Certainly it would seem to be issues that go to
10
       impeachment and seem to be issues that Mr. Hull may be now
11
       kind of a percipient witness to.
12
                 We're doing this on the fly, your Honor, I mean,
13
       kind of hearing that and trying to assess what that means.
14
       I think if we can -- I don't know that a short break is
15
       going to resolve it, but I would ask to take a -- a brief
16
       break just to assess -- and, again, let me be very clear:
17
       I'm not sure that we will have any further information after
18
       the break, but I do want to take -- pause for a beat, if we
19
       can, please, and assess what the ramifications of that are.
20
                 MR. HULL: That's fair, your Honor.
21
                 If I may add something which I forgot. And I
22
       think this might be partially --
23
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull, why don't we -- I think --
24
       why don't I -- I don't mean to cut you off --
25
                 MR. HULL: Okay.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: -- but I don't necessarily want to
2
       have you address this topic any more in open court than we
 3
       need to.
                 So why don't I have --
 4
 5
                 MR. HULL: I would like to mention, your Honor,
 6
       though, that Bertino's current counsel has represented to
 7
       the defense team that there was no confidential information,
       you know, transmitted between Mr. Bertino and me. And I
 8
 9
       think the Government made some overtures like that, or
10
       consistent with that, in one of the pleadings it's filed.
11
                 Is that right?
                 THE COURT: I don't recall -- is that consistent?
12
13
       I don't recall that, but I may be wrong.
14
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Your Honor, if we can --
15
                 MR. HULL: Go under seal.
16
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull, please.
17
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Your Honor, I'd like to just also
18
       move for kind of the imposition of kind of your Honor's
19
       order on decorum here. I think we're getting to a point
20
       where we're going to have a jury in front of us, and this
21
       just -- we need to take this up a couple of levels.
22
                 Your Honor, we'd ask for five minutes so we can
23
       consider this.
24
                 THE COURT: That's fine. That's fine.
25
       probably are -- we're maybe not quite there, but we're
```

```
1
       coming up on a court reporter break. So let's take ten
2
       minutes. We'll be back.
 3
                 (Thereupon a recess was taken, after which the
 4
       following proceedings were had:)
 5
                 MR. JAUREGUI: Judge, the Government is still
 6
       huddled in their office. I just wanted to let your Honor
7
       know. They're working on those issues.
 8
                 THE COURT: Okay.
 9
                 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I should have spoken up
10
       earlier, but I feel I need to put something on the record
11
       because no one else is speaking up --
12
                 THE COURT: Why don't you wait until the
13
       Government is here.
14
                 MR. SMITH: Okay.
15
                 (Thereupon, Government counsel entered the
16
       courtroom and the following proceedings were had:)
17
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, we're back on
18
       the record in Criminal Matter 21-175, United States of
19
       America versus Ethan Nordean, et al.
20
                 THE COURT: All right. I see, when I took the
21
       bench, we didn't have the Government with us. I don't know
22
       if that means I interrupted your meeting before you had
23
       reached a verdict. But the Government asked for this brief
24
       pause.
25
                 What's the Government's view about where we are
```

here?

MR. McCULLOUGH: So, your Honor, I think -- your Honor had kind of used -- it's kind of laid out a framework in terms of kind of the way to analyze this information, and you had used the term, kind of -- "secret," whether there's a secret.

We have had a communication with Mr. Bertino's attorney. We understand the facts and circumstances around the communication between Mr. Bertino and Mr. Hull to have taken place around the time of the execution of the search warrant on Mr. Bertino's home.

We understand that -- from that conversation that -- we understand from our conversation with Mr. Bertino's current attorney that there were communications that were made by Mr. Bertino or statements made by Mr. Bertino during that communication that he would have expected would be kept in confidence.

And I think the kind of issue here is that is a fundamental one, whether there were communications that were made that the person making them to a prospective attorney believed that they were to be kept in confidence. So that's kind of threshold issue one.

And perhaps -- well, I think that's threshold issue one.

Second, as I noted before the break, one concern

that has come up, based on the colloquy here, is that Mr. -based on the way that I heard it -- and I don't have the
benefit of the transcript, and I was not taking close
notes -- but based on the way that we heard it, we
understood Mr. Hull to be representing that the statements
that Mr. Bertino had made to the House Select Committee
about the nature of their relationship were not accurate.
And that gives us pause from the perspective of, as I said,
kind of making Mr. Hull a potential kind of witness to some
sort of impeachment.

So the idea that Mr. Hull or, frankly, any counsel, now that this kind of -- these statements have been made, could cross-examine Mr. Bertino on the veracity of his statements with respect to Mr. Hull's prior -- their prior communications about prospective representation is of concern.

And so those are the two issues that we are seeing. And I think that -- I think one issue here, as your Honor had raised at the outset, is whether there needs to be a second counsel involved at least with respect to anything related to Mr. Bertino. The follow-on to that would be whether there's anything that needs to be addressed with respect to cross-examination with respect to the nature, veracity and truth of any communications between Mr. Hull and Mr. Bertino as they're reflected in either the House

1 transcript or -- or anywhere else. 2 That last part, I genuinely -- I think that's 3 where we're kind of sorting through. 4 So Issue No. 1, the factual issue: I don't think 5 "secret" is the right standard. I think the right standard 6 is whether there was something communicated in confidence to 7 somebody who was a prospective lawyer. The nature and circumstances, the timing of that communication suggests 8 9 that they were. The representation that we've just received 10 from Mr. Bertino's current counsel indicates that there 11 were. 12 The second issue is this potential impeachment 13 witness that Mr. Hull may have made himself with respect to 14 the communications that Mr. -- or the testimony that 15 Mr. Bertino gave to the House Select Committee, and whether 16 that second -- well, that's it. I've laid it out. 17

THE COURT: So as to the first issue, it seems to me the next step, then, is to see if Mr. Biggs and Mr. Bertino would waive -- would waive. Right? That -because that would cure at least the first issue. I don't know whether you raised that with his attorney or not. But that's -- that would be the next question to solve on that front. Correct?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McCULLOUGH: That is correct. I think that is the next issue.

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I don't mean to complicate 3 this further, and I don't intend to offer any opinion, but 4 I've heard something that can't be left off of the record, 5 your Honor. 6 We called J.P. Davis, the counsel for Mr. Bertino, 7 and we asked, among other questions, Mr. Davis point-blank whether they believed there were any privileged 8 9 communications -- I can't remember if I used the word 10 "confidence" or "privilege" -- between Mr. Hull and his 11 client. 12 He responded in two ways. The first he said is: 13 We don't believe there are any. 14 The second, your Honor, which I think is 15 particularly pertinent, is that they informed the Government 16 of this over a week before the Government's filing -- latest 17 filing related to Mr. Hull's potential conflicts. 18 So I am a little bit puzzled. I mean, granted, 19 this person -- the lawyer, J.P. Davis, was speaking on a 20 speakerphone. There was a cell phone. I'm fairly confident 21 that's what I heard him saying. 22 And now I think you're hearing from the Government 23 something that's 180 degrees from what he informed us. 24 So unless there is a new counsel or --25 THE COURT: I don't know why his lawyer would

```
1
       change his story like that. I agree.
2
                 MR. SMITH: Yeah. So --
 3
                 THE COURT: I mean, you know, it's an open issue
      before me right now. So I agree with you.
 4
 5
                 All right. So that's -- number one, it seems to
 6
      me, I guess, Mr. Smith, your point is right that we need to
 7
      get at the heart of what the truth is. I'm not saying
 8
       anybody is not telling the truth. But we need to get a
 9
       representation from his lawyer. And maybe we can -- so
10
       that's number one.
                 Number two: If there is -- if, indeed, there was
11
12
       some sort of issue here, to see if both of them will waive.
13
      Right? To see if Mr. Biggs and Mr. Bertino will waive. And
14
       then that issue is solved.
15
                 And that's Mr. -- Mr. Hull, I think -- just let me
16
       finish.
17
                 And then the second issue you raised,
18
      Mr. McCullough, it seems to me -- I don't have -- I also
19
      don't recall with precision what was said. I didn't
20
      necessarily -- and maybe if Mr. Hull wants to clarify what
21
      he said -- I -- he may have characterized certain things.
22
       I'm not sure I heard him say Mr. Bertino didn't tell the
23
       truth in front of the Committee. Of course, that would --
24
       if that were the case, and Mr. Hull had let that stand,
25
       that's another layer to the issue.
```

```
1
                 But I did not -- I didn't hear that, but that
       doesn't mean it wasn't said.
2
 3
                 So, Mr. Hull, do you want to --
                 MR. HULL: I do. And I apologize. It's the third
 4
 5
       notice.
 6
                 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Mr. Hull, for the
 7
       integrity of the record, I'm going to ask you to please
 8
       allow the judge to complete his statement before you
 9
       begin --
10
                 MR. HULL: I apologize --
11
                 THE COURT REPORTER: Speaking.
12
                 MR. HULL: -- to you both.
13
                 THE COURT: Also, let the court reporter finish
14
       speaking before you speak, Mr. Hull.
15
                 MR. HULL: Can you hear me?
16
                 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.
17
                 MR. HULL: Let me first say that, to clarify the
18
       transcript in case -- what I said earlier about Mr. Bertino,
19
       what I said was, and what I intended to say, was that
20
       Mr. Bertino, who was deposed by the same people who I had
21
       been dealing with in two previous depositions and did not,
22
       by that time, have the best relationship with, didn't say --
23
       this is Mr. Bertino -- didn't say anything about me that was
24
       true or about our interactions that was true.
25
                 I didn't read his whole transcript. I haven't
```

gotten to it yet. But I have seen -- it has been released.

I have seen the excerpts of it. It did not -- it was not very flattering to me, but I think I kind of get it.

But no, we did not have any -- we had a relationship that I've had with many different people, most of whom I cannot remember the names of, where I was going to try to get them somebody. And that was a protracted exercise when anybody came to me and asked for Proud Boy counsel. I mean, that's how I met Mr. Biggs. I was like a conduit.

But the statements, again, were only about the things that he had said in those four or five pages where he mentioned Dan Hull and, as a human being, I thought I should make that clear.

I should also make it clear that the calls I was talking about that came in were calls because he wasn't quite sure what to do. And I think I advised him to get local counsel in that area. And I might have suggested one, but he eventually came up with one.

Again, he was looking for somebody for the House Committee. I was trying to find someone. And then this search issue came up. I think it was the same day that Mr. Tarrio was arrested, so there was a lot of national coverage about it.

The other thing I would say that's consistent with

what Mr. Smith just said, and very inconsistent with what Mr. McCullough just said, is that you have recently been presented with a pleading which was filed under seal which says the exact opposite of what Mr. McCullough just told you with respect to whether or not there was an attorney-client relationship between me and Mr. Bertino.

So I think that's concerning. And I think that's consistent with what I was told by my colleague Mr. Smith a couple of days ago.

I actually would go -- I actually don't believe that I had no attorney-client privilege. The conversation that I was -- that was reported to me two days ago was that Mr. Bertino and I did not have an attorney-client relationship and, two, nothing -- you know, ergo, nothing in any event was exchanged that would be a confidence or a secret between the two of us.

And just a matter of, you know, my thinking, I think anytime I'm trying to get somebody a lawyer, I do have -- you know, A, I do have at least a relationship; but if nothing is -- you know, if it's filled with nothing, as was true in this case, again, you know, there is no -- there's no harm, there's no conflict, and I'm still a conflict-free counsel. And that has usually worked out that way in the past.

But I wanted to make it very clear that what I

```
1
       was, number one, complaining about with respect to his
       veracity is what he said about me.
2
 3
                 Second, that, you know, the calls that came in
       were calls because he was in crisis, and I did the best I
 4
 5
       could for him.
 6
                 THE COURT: All right. All right, Mr. Hull.
 7
       don't think we need any further --
                 MR. HULL: Do -- do you understand what I'm
 8
 9
       saying? Do you have any other questions?
10
                 THE COURT: Yes. Yes, I do.
11
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Your Honor, if I may. And --
12
             I again apologize.
       sorry.
13
                 In terms of the sequence of events here that's
14
       been addressed -- so I think the Government's representation
15
       was that it was under the understanding that Mr. Bertino had
16
       no attorney-client relationship with Mr. Hull. That
17
       continues to be the case. That is our understanding.
18
       that was the prior representation that we made.
19
                 We made that representation based on the
20
       communications that we had approximately one week ago with
21
       Mr. Bertino's current counsel.
22
                 THE COURT: And just because -- just to, I think,
23
       get where you're going, just because -- as the rule
24
       contemplates, you can share a confidence or secret with
25
       someone and not have a full-blown attorney-client
```

1 relationship with someone. That's what the rule contemplates and that, at least in theory, could explain the 2 3 difference -- where we are here. MR. McCULLOUGH: That's correct, your Honor. 4 5 And I think that the other thing that I would add, 6 just in terms of the sequence, is that we saw the transcript 7 of Mr. Bertino's testimony. And we then raised that for Mr. Bertino's counsel. And we just noted what we saw: 8 9 Based on what he had said, no attorney-client relationship. 10 We wanted to say, will you just please confirm whether there 11 is any potential conflict here, because we wanted to get 12 this right. 13 And at the time, he communicated to us that he had 14 had a conversation with defense counsel, that he had not yet 15 had an opportunity to review the transcript, and that he was 16 going to talk to Mr. Bertino about it. 17 And we said: Great. 18 I think -- if we had another communication with 19 Mr. Davis in the interim, it did not relate to this at all. 20 The next communication that we had with Mr. Davis 21 was -- with respect to this issue was just now, during the 22 break. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Look, I think at the end of the 24 day -- and I'll hear from the parties what they think about 25 this. I mean, I think at the end of the day we need to

break right now to give you all the chance to sort of run down the facts here.

I mean, I want to get at -- I guess it's a couple of things -- to get at whatever the facts are. I'm getting different representations about the state of the relationship and whether anything that could fall into the secrets or confidences basket was shared.

So we'll nail whatever the parties' positions are and whatever -- you all can talk to Mr. Bertino's lawyer and, you know, by the time tomorrow rolls around, I would think -- you'll all be on the same page at least as to what his position is and you can explore with him the possibility that this conflict is waived.

Mr. Hull, you can explore with Mr. Biggs the possibility -- whether the conflict is waived.

And then we can get to the other issue you mentioned, Mr. McCullough. You know, it's an ancillary kind of issue. I mean, it's -- it's a real thing to think about. On the other hand, even if -- I mean, let's put it this way: I don't think it would be proper -- whether there was an attorney-client relationship, not an attorney-client relationship, whether Mr. Hull made the statements today he made or did not, I don't think, under any circumstances, it would be proper cross-examination in the trial.

So we should all just think about that issue. We

1 should think about that issue. And I'll see what the 2 parties' positions on it are tomorrow. 3 The worst part of where we are right now is that, given the status here, the question is what to do with the 4 5 jury, who are coming in tomorrow. I know. I know. Nothing 6 we can do. 7 What is the parties' positions on whether -- I mean, one possibility is we're able to resolve all this in 8 9 the morning and we could actually begin in the afternoon. 10 You know, look, nobody wants to move forward -- we all want 11 to. 12 Is that what the parties think we should plan on? 13 Look, if it doesn't happen, it doesn't happen. But we try 14 to resolve this issue first thing tomorrow morning and be 15 prepared. Look, it doesn't really matter what we decide 16 right now anyway. They're coming in. So -- and we can't 17 turn them around at this point, given the timing. 18 So if we can -- I think the best thing is for the 19 parties to simply be prepared to go if we can resolve this. 20 And -- and if we have to put the brakes on for some other 21 reason, we will. 22 MR. HULL: Your Honor, if I may, Dan Hull for 23 Mr. Biggs.

I'm not sure I understand why we can't resolve this issue today and open tomorrow. And it may just be me,

24

25

1 but it doesn't seem to me to be an insurmountable issue. 2 MR. McCULLOUGH: The --3 MR. HULL: I'm not sure that -- I'm getting the 4 impression here that -- and we want no continuance. No 5 Defendant, I know, wants a continuance. And it almost seems 6 like there's been an angling to make us do that, or have his 7 Honor do that where none is appropriate and we seem to be 8 slowing down the pace of everything to a point where even I, 9 who am not suspicious of anything, is kind of wondering 10 what's going on. We would like to resolve this issue if we could. 11 12 If we can't -- I'm not good at thinking about issues that 13 involve me. But if we can do it, I think --14 THE COURT: So a break --15 MR. HULL: -- it's insignificant compared to -- I 16 mean, it doesn't take that much time to resolve -- and open 17 tomorrow, full speed ahead. And we've got five, possibly 18 six, openings and we can do them -- fit them all in. 19 THE COURT: So is the idea that -- again, all I --20 and, believe me, no one wants to go full speed ahead more 21 than I do. 22 The question is whether you think an extended 23 break now, and coming back before the end of the day, is the 24 thing that makes sense. 25 MR. SMITH: Yes, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Government? 2 MR. McCULLOUGH: We agree, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. MR. McCULLOUGH: And I think -- based -- I can't 4 5 represent that he will remain available. But the defense 6 counsel for -- counsel, rather, for Mr. Bertino was 7 available moments ago. We believe he would be available to 8 address your Honor. 9 So we may be able to -- if your Honor would like 10 to hear directly from that counsel, that may be kind of the 11 next step here, kind of in terms of this inquiry, and then 12 we may be able to kind of resolve at least -- we will then 13 have -- or your Honor will have the facts and we'll be able 14 to kind of proceed at that point. 15 THE COURT: All right. It doesn't necessarily 16 resolve that secondary issue. So why don't we -- and I'm 17 happy to hear from -- maybe we do have to get that person on 18 the phone, although if you all speak with him jointly and 19 you all have the same representation, I'm not so sure it's 20 necessary as long as the parties are united and you're 21 representing this is what the lawyer is telling us about 22 this. 23 So why don't we do this: Why don't we just leave 24 it open-ended. I'll -- we'll be in recess. When you all 25 have had time to work through as much of this as possible,

```
1
       we'll come back. Obviously, we can't come back -- you know,
2
       the latest we would want to come back is, say, around 5:30.
 3
       But as soon as you feel it makes sense for me to take the
 4
       bench again, you can let us know and I'll do it. But --
 5
       that's fine. If you think that would be productive.
 6
                 MR. PATTIS:
                              Judge, I would like to get a ruling
 7
       on my motion to withdraw before the day's end, if possible.
 8
                 THE COURT: So given -- Mr. Pattis, I know.
 9
       You've been patient the whole day.
10
                 What is the position of the parties about whether
11
       I should grant Mr. Pattis's motion at the moment?
12
                 MR. PATTIS: Judge, to let you know, I spoke to
13
       Mr. Biggs at the lunch break. He was unaware of issues that
14
       have arisen. He knows what's been unfolding during the
15
       week, but didn't know what had occurred overnight. I think
16
       his desire is that I remain, but I've become a side issue.
17
       And, you know, while I think you have the power to cure
18
       this, should you decide to do so, and I'm prepared to argue
19
       that, I'm -- I don't want to be in a position where I become
20
       an issue in the case, and I've become one. And so, from my
21
       perspective, I think the simple and elegant solution is for
22
       me to say farewell.
23
                 THE COURT: Understood.
24
                 MR. PATTIS: Thank you.
25
                 THE COURT: So let me hear from the Government.
```

1 What's the Government's view? I am reluctant -- given, at 2 this moment, where we are on some of these other issues, I'm 3 reluctant to let you out of the case at this moment. 4 I understand you want the ruling. And if we 5 didn't have this roiling conflicts issue, I would have taken 6 it up first thing and gotten you out of here. 7 MR. PATTIS: You know, I've been a gentleman about 8 this, but, I mean, the fact is I am counsel for Mr. Biggs 9 right now. 10 THE COURT: Well --11 MR. PATTIS: Well, I am, as a matter of law. And 12 you've not -- you've sidelined me, and nobody has raised the 13 issue. And that's fine. 14 But there are some Sixth Amendment issues. 15 you know, my view is that this is a relatively complicated 16 proceeding that can be done. I think issues arose last 17 night as between counsel that suggest irreconcilable differences between Mr. Hull and I. 18 19 And that's not something I'd want to address in 20 open court. 21 But Mr. Hull was Mr. Biggs's counsel of choice. 22 Mr. Hull brought me in to assist. And if my assistance 23 isn't required and I've become an obstacle to the Court, I 24 think, as your officer, I'm prepared to leave. And I would

25

request permission to do so.

```
1
                 THE COURT: What's the Government's view?
2
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Your Honor, our reaction is the
 3
       same as yours, just that there is -- at the moment, your
 4
      Honor may want to just decline ruling on this. The motion
 5
      may remain pending. But I think, while your Honor has not
 6
      articulated the reasons, I think that -- well, I shouldn't
 7
       say that. Your Honor alluded to the reason being the
 8
       conflicts issue. You have not expounded on that. I think
 9
      we share the same potential issue here that we would like to
10
       just make sure is resolved.
11
                 THE COURT: Mr. Pattis, my anticipation would be
12
       to get you a ruling by -- by the time we leave here today.
13
                 MR. PATTIS: Thank you, Judge.
14
                 THE COURT: All right.
15
                 MR. HULL: Dan Hull for Mr. Biggs, your Honor.
16
                 You just heard from Mr. Pattis -- and this has
17
      been part of the problem. It's a complete falsehood.
18
      Mr. Biggs has been well aware of this issue since this
19
      morning. We've had a breakdown in the relationship --
20
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull -- Mr. Hull, is this
21
      necessary?
22
                 MR. HULL: Yes. It is necessary.
23
                 THE COURT: Why is it --
24
                 MR. PATTIS: If it is, Judge, then I'd ask for a
25
       sealed courtroom because --
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull --
2
                 MR. SMITH: I would ask --
 3
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull, it's not -- if -- before the
 4
       end of the day, if you feel you need to put something on the
 5
       record, we can do it. We don't need to do it now. What the
 6
       parties need to do is work on the other two problems that
 7
       will -- could prevent us from moving forward as
       expeditiously as possible. That's what we're going to do.
 8
 9
       We're going to be in recess until the parties let me know I
10
       should retake the bench.
                 MR. HULL: Your Honor, I just want to point out --
11
12
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull, I'm not recognizing you. I
13
       do not want to hear you further on this.
14
                 MR. HULL: Your Honor --
15
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull --
16
                 MR. HULL: -- I want to make it clear --
17
                 THE COURT: Mr. --
18
                 MR. HULL: -- that --
19
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hull, take your seat, sir.
20
                 MR. HULL: Thank you, your Honor.
21
                 THE COURT: We'll be in recess.
22
                 (Thereupon a recess was taken, after which the
23
       following proceedings were had:)
24
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: We are back on the record
25
       in Criminal Matter 21-175, the United States of America
```

versus Ethan Nordean, et al.

THE COURT: All right. We are back. What can -does either side want to tell me about where things stand
right now with regard to the important representations about
confidences or secrets, at least from the Bertino side of
things?

MR. McCULLOUGH: So the representation by

Mr. Bertino's counsel during a phone call that I believe

all -- there was a representative for all Defendants on the

call -- and I'm confirming that --

MR. HULL: That is correct.

MR. McCULLOUGH: -- Mr. Davis explained that he did not believe that there was any attorney-client relationship that had formed between Mr. Bertino and Mr. Hull. However, he did acknowledge having had a conversation with Mr. Smith during which he had represented during that conversation that he did not know of any confidential communications.

Subsequent to that, he was alerted to the House transcript which describes -- where Mr. Bertino describes reaching out to Mr. Hull on the day of the search.

Mr. Davis then explained that he took that opportunity to speak with Mr. Bertino about that issue, and he apologized profusely to defense counsel for not having remembered that issue and not having covered that issue in answering defense

counsel's question.

He described that, based on his conversations with Mr. Bertino, that he -- subsequent to reading the House transcript, that he understood that there were confidences exchanged on the day of and that he understood that there were multiple -- was more than one phone call during that day.

So it does appear that we've crossed kind of that first threshold in terms of the 1.18 issue with respect to confidential communications with a prospective attorney.

There was then a further discussion about kind of what could be done about that issue. And defense counsel kind of sought to look to what kind of remedies could be effected here.

And what was explored was the ability to obtain a limited waiver which would seek to wall off any examination related to the day of the search. There was a discussion about limiting that waiver -- the limited waiver to wall off any examination by Mr. Hull.

There was further discussion about there would be any derivative issues. Mr. Davis mentioned, "I would not want" -- and I think -- it doesn't matter who he said -- but he said he wouldn't want X other attorney to be able to ask questions based on the information that Mr. Hull had provided.

He indicated that he had not had that conversation with Mr. Bertino about this limited waiver. He indicated that he believed that Mr. Bertino would be inclined to follow whatever his recommendation was on this issue and he indicated that he would want to kind of evaluate the language and consider and present that issue to Mr. Bertino.

So I think that's where we are on factual representations.

Our view of this -- I mean, I think this is a circumstance where, frankly, the devil is in the details because we are talking about at least with respect to Mr. Bertino some charges that he has resolved, which charges arose out of the search. As your Honor knows, there's a firearm charge, 922(g) charge, as part of this. So it is not a kind of nothingburger issue to say: Okay. We'll just take the date of search out, and everything is fine.

I think your Honor needs to kind of evaluate what that waiver is; and obviously, Mr. Bertino needs to make a knowing understanding as to what that waiver is and we need to kind of have, I believe, a ruling on kind of what the kind of scope of appropriate examination of Mr. Bertino is.

I don't think this is any kind of -- I don't think this is kind of a nontrivial issue. I appreciate that others may characterize it in a different way. I don't know if they will. But we are talking about a case in which we

1 are -- had potential cooperators where defense has indicated 2 they intend to call into question their credibility. These 3 are real issues. 4 So the Government's view is we need to nail these 5 down and nail them down correctly before we proceed. And I 6 think that is -- that's our position. 7 THE COURT: But it sounds like you're relatively 8 optimistic that can be -- there's a pathway of doing that, 9 it sounds like, to me? 10 MR. McCULLOUGH: It certainly seems like -- your 11 Honor, yes. It certainly seems like based on the 12 representation of Mr. Davis that there is a path forward. 13 Like I said, I think that the devil's in the details here. 14 And as much as we can all kind of aspirationally hope this 15 all gets kind of resolved immediately, I think it is 16 important to get this right. I think this is the reason why 17 we raised these issues in the first instance. 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, we'd like to add a couple 20 of facts to Mr. McCullough's recitation of the call. 21 I would characterize Mr. Davis's demeanor as very 22 relaxed about this issue. Mr. McCullough indicated that he 23 apologized to counsel for Nordean for not having even 24 remembered that these -- for not having known that this

was -- these conversations took place. I'll represent that

25

when this subject was broached in the defense room, Mr. Hull did not even appear to recall that he had phone calls on this date and thought it was another lawyer who might have been having the calls with Mr. Bertino.

Mr. Davis took the position that it would not affect other counsel in this case even if there were confidences exchanged with Mr. Hull except to the extent that Mr. Hull had discussed those confidences with other counsel. I can represent that he has not discussed any confidences he may have exchanged with Mr. Bertino with me. So that was the position of Mr. Davis.

THE COURT: But, Mr. Smith, just to be clear, that's not what the rule -- I mean, he can have that position. But that's not reflective of what the rule -- what it would take to satisfy the rule.

MR. SMITH: So, your Honor, I'm not -- the rule deals with -- not with co-counsel.

THE COURT: Right. But my point is just whatever Mr. Davis's position is is really on that -- doesn't really have anything to do with anything.

MR. SMITH: On. I'm just -- that was one fact he stated that was -- so he asked the parties to send him some language tonight that would reflect the walled-off waiver on the confidences subjects that Mr. McCullough referenced.

And he thought that he could turn around his client's

response pretty shortly, soon.

You know, his -- just his general characterization of the issue was that it was not a terribly important issue. That was -- so I mean, this is something that -- we're talking about something where the lawyer for the witness did not know about it until he indicated that the prosecution actually reminded him.

That was one other point that he said -- I forgot about this until I think he said Mr. Kenerson might have reminded him that this was a subject. But then, your Honor, he said that, you know, I really don't think this is -- I believe my client will grant a waiver for any subject outside of the two -- the confidences that were exchanged on the day of the search.

So, your Honor, we would propose sending -having the parties send Mr. Davis some language tonight and
seeing whether we can get a response from the witness
tomorrow.

THE COURT: Listen, I think we're all -- although it may have -- there was the suggestion earlier that one side or the other or me didn't want the case to move forward quickly. You know, I think we are all on the same page about this.

So, look, it sounds to me like -- then the question, though, would be whether -- I guess I could just

1 get him on the phone. If you did get some sort of waiver 2 signed, I guess I haven't thought through whether the 3 parties think I would need to hear from him directly or 4 whether I could just rely on something signed. But it seems 5 to me like I probably have to have him, you know, on the 6 phone and have a colloquy with him about it. 7 Again, not -- that could be done tomorrow, if the 8 issue is resolved that quickly, you know, tomorrow morning. 9 MR. McCULLOUGH: Your Honor, I think that's right. 10 I think that you -- I think that it makes sense to receive a 11 colloquy from the attorney to -- for him to describe what 12 his understanding -- for him to communicate fully what his 13 understanding in terms of the scope of the waiver is so that 14 your Honor can fully police it. I think setting some --15 THE COURT: Well, if it's in writing, that's a 16 better -- yes. 17 MR. McCULLOUGH: Without question. I think the 18 writing will evidence kind of what it is. But let's be 19 clear that we are not -- I mean, no one as of at least ten 20 minutes ago was putting pen to paper on this issue. 21 THE COURT: Right. 22 MR. McCULLOUGH: And it's not -- as I said, I 23 don't think it's a kind of trivial issue in terms of what 24 the scope of that waiver is. Right? Because I think, like

I said, at least one of the charges on which he could be

25

1 cross-examined relates to the day of the search. So there's 2 that. 3 Yeah. And I think the other component of this, of 4 course, is -- so that limits kind of Mr. Hull's examination 5 based on kind of anything that comes up with respect to that 6 attorney-client communication. 7 The second part of this would be -- I think as your Honor was describing at the end of our last session the 8 9 need to restrict any cross-examination related to the 10 veracity with respect to Mr. Bertino's testimony before the House as it relates to Mr. Hull. I think that that issue 11 12 based on what we've heard needs to be restricted and your 13 Honor could kind of need to rule on that to ensure that 14 we -- I think your Honor was inclined to kind of take that 15 out of the scope here as kind of improper and nonrelevant in any event. 16 17 THE COURT: Right. 18 MR. JAUREGUI: Judge, Jauregui for Tarrio. 19 I just want to make sure that other defense 20 counsel are not restrained in any way in cross-examining 21 Bertino. 22 THE COURT: Well, not with regard to information 23 about -- that Mr. Bertino said about Mr. Hull in that 24 transcript. Right? I mean --25 MR. JAUREGUI: Well, I don't know, Judge. I've

```
1
       got to see how things develop on his direct testimony.
2
                 THE COURT: Well, then, if that's the case, then
 3
       there's a good chance -- if you all can't -- I think you all
 4
       should take the evening to look at the rule on impeachment
 5
       on collateral matters. I mean, if you can't agree on that,
 6
       then we might have an insurmountable problem. So I can see
 7
       why at that point -- you all are going to have to think
       about that.
 8
 9
                 My knee-jerk reaction is I wouldn't allow it
10
       anyway, so you're not dealing away something that I would
11
       have allowed in the first place. Right? If none of it --
12
       if we hadn't been talking about this at all, if this had
13
       just come up and all of a sudden you wanted to cross-examine
14
       him because you believed that something he'd said about
15
       Mr. Hull was -- I wouldn't have allowed that
16
       cross-examination.
17
                 So --
18
                 MR. JAUREGUI: I just don't like it when the
19
       Government starts using terms of limiting a
20
       cross-examination.
21
                 THE COURT: Sure.
22
                 MR. JAUREGUI: It concerns me. That's all.
23
                 THE COURT: I understand.
24
                 Look, I don't --
25
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor?
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: I think we're probably burning more --
       I think we're burning all of your time. If we want to get
2
       this show on the road tomorrow, all of your time is best
 3
       spent addressing this issue and not us describing the issue
 4
 5
       to me here today.
 6
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: So, your Honor --
 7
                 MR. HULL: Dan Hull.
                 Briefly --
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: Mr. Hernández asked to be heard first.
10
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Sorry. The only question I would
11
       have on this issue that Mr. Jauregui raised was if we needed
12
       to cross-examine, couldn't we do it without mentioning
13
       Mr. Hull? You know, we could avoid that particular conflict
14
       as long as we didn't say, "Your attorney, Mr. Hull, was
15
       there" or something like that.
16
                 THE COURT: Cross-examining him about information
17
       he said about Mr. Hull in the transcript?
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: No. I didn't think that's what we
18
19
       were talking about.
20
                 THE COURT: That is --
21
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: I thought we were talking about
22
       cross-examining him about what he testified to at the House
23
       Committee -- before the House Committee.
24
                 THE COURT: I don't think that's what the
25
       Government is seeking. That's not what the Government
```

testified to about the substance -- about things other than what we're talking about.

Is that right, Mr. McCullough? I mean, I don't know why -- whether there's an open door to crossing him on whatever he said to the Committee is not affected by anything we've been discussing here today. Maybe that would be proper; maybe it would not. I'm not ruling one way or the other.

But I don't think it has anything to do with what we've talked about here today.

MR. McCULLOUGH: Your Honor, I think that is exactly right. And I just -- but I will just point out that this is -- I mean, this is where kind of the devil is in the details, since we're all on the same page.

Here's what I would say: It does relate to his
House testimony insofar as he provided testimony with
respect to his dealings with Mr. Hull, which is a short
sequence. But that -- your Honor, Mr. Hull has represented
that what Mr. Bertino said to the House about his dealings
with Mr. Hull is -- and I don't remember the word he used,
but false, not accurate.

Defense counsel -- set aside whether that's even -- whether we're even in the realm of what's appropriate.

Defense counsel should not be able to then use

that information to cross-examine Mr. Bertino on those elements of his testimony. Beyond the scope of that, his description of other things that don't relate to his conversations and communications and dealings with Mr. Hull, that would seem to be fair game.

I think that's what I understand you to be saying.

But I want to be very clear about that, that there is a

cabined portion of the House testimony in which he describes

his interactions with Mr. Hull.

THE COURT: Understood.

It just strikes me as his interactions with someone he's potentially reached out to for representation, like how that would be part of this trial. It seems to me -- look, that strikes me as not something that would be part of our trial. And if we can all agree that that's the case, then this would get much easier.

So I don't know. It's kind of interesting.

MR. HULL: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I understand the Government being careful. On the defense side, we've got, it seems like, a bunch of different takes.

Look, again, I think the best use of our time right now is to assume we're going to open tomorrow. You all try to go solve this problem. Have the folks available that I'll need to talk to tomorrow, counsel and Bertino.

1 This is the same issue. 2 And then with regard to -- so I'd assume I'd have 3 to have a similar conversation with Mr. Biggs, not unlike 4 the conversation I've had with you, with other folks, about 5 confidences that your attorney might not be able to use on 6 your behalf. Similar to Mr. Thaxton -- Thaxton? Is that 7 the name? Similar to some of the other folks we've talked about. 8 9 It would essentially be the same thing: Are you 10 comfortable, even though there might be some information 11 that Mr. Hull -- even if he had it and it was to your 12 benefit, he wouldn't be able to use it for you? 13 So I think probably, again, maybe my initial 14 reaction before was the right one: I'll let you all go and 15 do all that. We'll come back at 9:00 tomorrow. I think --16 come back at 9:00. And, look, we'll go as fast as we can. 17 Mr. Hull? I've kept Mr. Hull waiting. 18 MR. HULL: Briefly. And I appreciate it, your 19 Honor. 20 Can you hear me okay with the microphone like 21 this? 22 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir. 23 MR. HULL: First of all, the comment -- this may 24 seem intemperate, and I apologize for it -- about 25 Mr. Bertino's comments about me were not meant to raise

1 impeachment issues. In fact, I can stipulate that that 2 would never --3 THE COURT: It doesn't matter what you meant, Mr. Hull, though. 4 5 MR. HULL: No, no. It's not intended to be an 6 impeachment issue. It's not what it was raised for. 7 raised it because I didn't like it. No one would. The second issue is that under no circumstances 8 9 would I ever be doing the cross-examination of Bertino if in 10 fact that occurred from Team Biggs. And that would be -- I 11 mean, there will be at some point -- you know, I will have 12 another trial partner. That's an outlying issue. But I 13 quess the point is, Dan Hull was never going to 14 cross-examine him. And that's still the rules. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Hull, I guess I would say it's not 16 at all clear that I would admit someone in the middle of the 17 trial to join you, number one. 18 And, number two, if the cross-examination issue 19 became an issue, there is authority for me to appoint 20 someone for a limited purpose to do that cross-examination 21 if that were appropriate. 22 This is a case, of course, where you've got four 23 other Defendants. You might think whatever 24 cross-examination they could do would be sufficient and 25 there wouldn't be sort of a particularized cross for

Mr. Biggs's benefit that would need to be given. But -MR. HULL: Your Honor, it may also be possible for
one -- I'm not sure which would be decided upon -- for
someone from the defense team to do that rather than you
having to appoint someone.

THE COURT: It may be. It may be.

Look, I think we're best -- unless someone disagrees, I think we are best served by you all going and doing -- it sounds like this is mostly an issue the Government is concerned about. So you all doing your homework, trying to get us to a place where in the morning we have a solution. And I'll take it up, and hopefully it will be one that I will agree solves the issue and we all agree solves the issue. And then we'll move right ahead.

As I said, the jurors are coming in. So we have them here. And we'll hopefully go forward as soon as we resolve this.

Is there anything else anyone else thinks we can accomplish here tonight other than me mentioning, Mr. Hull, the back-and-forth we had right before we broke before, that's not going to happen again with any counsel in this case.

So everyone take note: You talk over me and contempt will be coming down the line the next time any exchange like that happens. It's going to be a long trial.

```
1
       It's fair warning. I don't want to have lawyers talking
       over me repeatedly. It won't happen anymore. I will find
2
 3
      you in contempt.
 4
                 MR. HULL: Understood.
 5
                 THE COURT: Anything further that either side
 6
      thinks --
 7
                 Mr. Pattis, I think for one more day I may be
      holding your motion in abeyance. Look, I am --
 8
 9
                 MR. PATTIS: If you're going to do that, that
10
      means that there's some active possibility you'll have me
11
       remain. I don't know whether Mr. Hull and I can patch
12
       things up. I know that that's Mr. Biggs's desire.
13
                 But I think you have the authority to act. And I
14
      want to -- may I take two minutes of your time, three
15
      minutes?
16
                 THE COURT: You may take two minutes.
17
                 MR. PATTIS: Thank you.
18
                 The Connecticut trial court denied the stay this
19
       afternoon that we had discussed. We're on our way to the
20
      state supreme court. Certain formalities need to be
21
       observed because it proceeds by way of writ of error,
22
      service and whatnot. We expect to get it to that court
23
       tomorrow afternoon. We expect a decision Friday.
24
                 Having said that, you know, I've looked at the
25
       local rules. I do think you have the authority to rule to
```

1 permit me to come in, and it's in the following way: 2 are a number of ways to analyze the statute or rule, as you There's textual, structural and its policy. 3 I think that the simultaneous admission rule 4 5 pertains to a waiver; and that -- thus, I was able to waive 6 into this jurisdiction upon the strength of the Connecticut 7 license. 8 Once I'm here, the rule is a little less clear, 9 and once I've been here for a while, because it's in the 10 disjunctive. Structurally, you could say that that's the 11 intention. But policy, it makes no sense. And it makes no 12 sense because the purpose of the rule was to assure that I 13 could waive in. Having waived in, if I had moved here, 14 would the Court say, Well, unless I kept a Connecticut 15 office I couldn't practice here? And that would be an 16 absurd and unworkable result. 17 So from my perspective, you have the authority as 18 the bench to make a ruling of extraordinary circumstances. 19 And on Mr. Biggs's behalf, should you do so, I will remain. 20 But if you don't, you know, I won't. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Pattis, given that I'm not 22 granting your motion today, you have my commitment. I'll 23 look at that --24 MR. PATTIS: Thank you. 25 THE COURT: -- again.

1 MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, scheduling? I had a question. Are we sitting on Friday? Is the Court sitting 2 3 on Friday? And how long? 4 THE COURT: Ms. Hernández, I announced earlier 5 this week, and nothing has changed, that we have a half --6 that we have a half day. I think I have the first matter 7 set for 12:30. So I will have at least at this point, I believe, a hard stop at 12:28. 8 9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. 10 THE COURT: Is that not right? I'm kidding. Ms. Harris, I'm kidding about that. I know we have to stop 11 12 earlier. 13 Ms. Harris needs to have lunch. 14 MS. HERNANDEZ: And tomorrow, if we swear the jury 15 in and all of that, what's the Court's closing time? 16 THE COURT: You know, that would be a day when we 17 would try to go as long as possible. So if we really got up 18 and running, obviously, it's going to be between 5:30 and 19 6:00. I'm not going to -- if one Defendant -- if it's 5:40 20 and one Defendant has stopped and the next Defendant thinks 21 they're going to be going on for quite a bit, I won't start 22 the next opening. 23 MS. HERNANDEZ: Just to be clear, my understanding 24 of the Court's directions is that if this gets resolved 25 early enough tomorrow, we're going to go right into opening

```
1
       statements. Is that what the Court just decided?
                 THE COURT: I don't know what "right into" exactly
2
 3
      means.
 4
                 As soon as we resolve this issue to everyone's
 5
       satisfaction, we'll go right into closings. Whether we take
 6
      a ten-minute -- I mean, openings. Whether that means a
 7
       ten-minute break, whether that means it's after lunch, I
      don't know.
 8
 9
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah.
10
                 THE COURT: But there will be no other delay. I
      have to instruct them and swear them. That's it.
11
12
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: I was just wondering in terms of
13
       scheduling. Is it possible that the Court will have, like,
14
       the Government and three defense and then the other two the
15
       following day or something like that? I'm just trying to
16
       figure out what the Court is --
17
                 THE COURT: It is certainly possible. Yes.
18
                 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.
19
                 THE COURT: Mr. McCullough, you look confused.
20
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: No. Your Honor, sorry. I was
21
      processing. My apologies.
22
                 I did have two other items.
23
                 THE COURT: Was there anything confusing about
24
              I only understood Ms. Hernández to be saying we might
25
       not complete all the openings on one day, and that's all.
```

```
1
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Correct. My understanding is we
2
       should all come here tomorrow prepared to open.
 3
                 THE COURT: Absolutely.
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Because we may open midmorning
 4
 5
       and we might get through all defense counsel, and the
 6
      Government should be prepared with its witness tomorrow.
 7
                 THE COURT: Sure. Yes.
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Correct?
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: Yes.
10
                 MR. McCULLOUGH: Yes.
11
                 So, your Honor, two other items: One,
12
      Mr. Smith -- sorry -- Nordean had moved to exclude the
13
      Government's exhibits. We'd ask that your Honor deny that
14
       request or that motion. We can obviously address that more
15
       fully. But the Government has provided the updated exhibit
16
       list, identified all the new exhibits. I think we've all
17
      had now time to kind of process all of that.
18
                 I'd ask for a ruling on that so that we know
19
       importantly the scope of our case.
20
                 THE COURT: Well, let's put it this way:
                                                           I want
21
       to get you all out of here to go get solving this other
22
      problem. It doesn't affect anything you had in your
23
       opening, I think, except the video of the debate, maybe.
24
       Does that seem right?
25
                 Let me put it this way: To the extent that we've
```

litigated the opening slides, I've ruled on all of that. I will give you a ruling on this tomorrow after giving you all an opportunity to be heard on it. But I think rather than rule on it now, I want you all to get to this issue so that we can take off tomorrow. Not take off; meaning have the trial take off.

MR. McCULLOUGH: The only other issue is one that I had raised about the prospect of having individuals who -- and particularly agents who might attend the opening statements. And I don't know if defense has had an opportunity to reflect and consider that, but that was the only remaining issue I would like to advise them.

THE COURT: Yes. If you all could confer on that.

Are there a defined number of people that you all are talking about or whether it's an open-ended request? Look,

I'd ask the parties to confer about that question, about whether agents who worked on the case would be permitted in the courtroom during openings.

MR. McCULLOUGH: It's bound -- the number is four for us. That would be four agents who would be testifying who would also be in the courtroom.

THE COURT: So, look, the Government is representing that there are four agent witnesses who will be testifying, they expect to testify, who they would like to be present during the opening arguments. So I'd ask the

```
1
       defense to hear from the Government -- discuss with the
2
       Government who those witnesses are and whether there would
3
       be an objection to them being present during the openings.
4
       And we can talk about it tomorrow before the openings begin.
5
                 Until tomorrow at 9:00, we'll be adjourned.
 6
                 (Proceedings concluded.)
7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, LISA EDWARDS, RDR, CRR, do hereby
4	certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate
5	transcript of my stenographic notes, and is a full, true,
6	and complete transcript of the proceedings produced to the
7	best of my ability.
8	
9	
10	Dated this 11th day of January, 2023.
11	
12	<u>/s/ Lisa Edwards, RDR, CRR</u> Official Court Reporter
13	United States District Court for the  District of Columbia
14	333 Constitution Avenue, Northwest Washington, D.C. 20001
15	(202) 354-3269
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	T	1	1	
1	<b>209</b> [1] - 2:12	ability [8] - 9:16,	adversely [2] - 11:3,	ancillary [1] - 58:17
	<b>21-00175</b> [1] - 1:4	13:16, 13:19, 15:19,	12:3	angling [1] - 60:6
	<b>21-175</b> [3] - 4:2,	21:10, 21:17, 67:15,	adversity [3] - 22:17,	ankle [1] - 20:25
/s [1] - 88:12	47:18, 65:25	88:7	24:8, 27:9	announced [1] - 83:4
	<b>21-491</b> [1] - 23:4	able [21] - 4:6, 11:19,	advice [1] - 38:8	answer [1] - 28:22
0	<b>2:09</b> [1] - 1:7	13:2, 13:9, 18:16,	advise[1] - 86:12	answering [1] -
		18:22, 26:8, 31:13,	advised [2] - 22:17,	66:25
	3	35:3, 36:24, 37:5,	54:17	anticipates [1] -
<b>06511</b> [1] <b>-</b> 2:7	3	43:13, 59:8, 61:9,	advocacy [2] - 16:8,	39:12
	_	61:12, 61:13, 67:23,	16:16	anticipation [1] -
1	<b>33012</b> [1] - 2:15	76:25, 78:5, 78:12,	affect [4] - 13:19,	64:11
	<b>33014</b> [1] - 2:13	82:5	15:18, 70:6, 85:22	anytime [2] - 43:2,
<b>1</b> (4) <b>5</b> 0:4	<b>333</b> [2] - 3:3, 88:14	absolutely [4] -	affected [4] - 11:4,	
<b>1</b> [1] - 50:4	<b>354-3269</b> [2] - 3:4,	13:25, 28:22, 44:22,	29:13, 31:12, 76:5	55:18
<b>1.0</b> [1] - 7:21	88:15	85:3		anyway [2] - 59:16,
<b>1.1(a</b> [1] - 38:13	<b>383</b> [1] - 2:6	absurd [1] - 82:16	affecting [1] - 12:3	74:10
<b>1.10</b> [2] - 10:15,	000[1] 2.0	abundance [4] -	afford [1] - 16:24	anyways [1] - 19:25
10:23	4		afternoon [5] - 4:4,	apologies [1] - 84:21
<b>1.10(a</b> [1] - 22:7	7	11:13, 12:10, 35:5,	34:23, 59:9, 81:19,	apologize [5] -
<b>1.10(a)(1</b> [1] - 11:24		35:7	81:23	41:21, 53:4, 53:10,
<b>1.18</b> [3] <b>-</b> 39:18, 40:9,	<b>4</b> [1] <b>-</b> 39:20	access [2] - 9:19,	AFTERNOON[1] -	56:12, 78:24
67:9	<b>45</b> [1] - 15:6	9:23	1:12	apologized [2] -
<b>1.6</b> [1] - 38:20	<b>49th</b> [1] - 2:15	accessing[1] -	agent [1] - 86:23	66:23, 69:23
<b>1.6's</b> [1] - 11:7		28:15	<b>agents</b> [3] - 86:9,	appear [6] - 24:23,
<b>1.6(b</b> [1] - 39:1	5	accompanied [1] -	86:17, 86:20	33:22, 34:13, 67:8,
<b>1.7</b> [3] <b>-</b> 8:1, 8:7, 32:6		30:13	<b>ago</b> [9] - 9:21, 30:4,	70:2
<b>1.7's</b> [1] - 30:23		accomplish [1] -	31:15, 35:12, 55:9,	aPPEARANCES[1] -
<b>1.7(b</b> [1] - 10:22	<b>555</b> [1] - 1:19	80:19	55:12, 56:20, 61:7,	1:15
<b>1.7(b)(4</b> [1] - 11:1	<b>59047</b> [1] - 2:21	according [1] - 38:6	72:20	APPEARANCES[1] -
<b>1.7(c)</b> [1] - 11:21	<b>5:30</b> [2] <b>-</b> 62:2, 83:18	accurate [4] - 20:7,	<b>agree</b> [9] - 32:5,	2:1
<b>1.9</b> [10] <b>-</b> 8:1, 8:7,	<b>5:40</b> [1] - 83:19	49:7, 76:21, 88:4	44:6, 52:1, 52:4, 61:2,	appeared [1] - 20:15
10:22, 21:22, 22:8,		acknowledge [1] -	74:5, 77:15, 80:13,	applicability [1] -
22:12, 23:20, 31:1,	6	66:15	80:14	30:23
32:6, 34:16		acquiring [1] - 39:21	agreement [1] - 42:9	applicable [1] - 39:3
<b>100</b> [1] - 19:17	0.40	act [1] - 81:13	ahead [3] - 60:17,	applies [3] - 18:6,
<b>10010</b> [1] - 1:23	<b>6175</b> [1] - 2:12	Action [1] - 1:3	60:20, 80:14	18:9, 34:16
<b>10016</b> [1] - 2:19	<b>6706</b> [1] - 3:3	active [1] - 81:10	<b>al</b> [3] - 4:3, 47:19,	appoint [3] - 40:11,
<b>1014</b> [1] - 2:15	<b>6:00</b> [1] <b>-</b> 83:19	activity [1] - 9:15	66:1	79:19, 80:5
<b>10th</b> [1] - 23:5	<b>6th</b> [9] - 5:4, 14:14,	actual [1] - 9:20	alcohol [1] - 15:18	appointed [3] -
<b>11</b> [1] - 1:7	15:10, 29:18, 29:23,	add [3] - 45:21, 57:5,	alerted [2] - 29:25,	16:24, 30:4, 31:22
<b>1123</b> [1] - 1:22	29:25, 30:6, 33:19,	69:19	66:19	apportioned [1] - 9:6
<b>113</b> [1] - 2:21	38:3	addition [1] - 32:8	<b>allow</b> [2] - 53:8, 74:9	appreciate [3] - 8:25,
11th [1] - 88:10	_	address [8] - 4:23,	allowed [4] - 20:15,	68:23, 78:18
<b>12</b> [1] - 1:11	7	4:24, 28:7, 30:4, 46:2,	38:20, 74:11, 74:15	appropriate [6] -
<b>12:28</b> [1] - 83:8		61:8, 63:19, 85:14	<b>allows</b> [1] - 40:9	18:2, 36:14, 60:7,
<b>12:30</b> [1] - 83:7	<b>7166</b> [1] - 2:9	addressed [4] -	alluded [1] - 64:7	68:21, 76:24, 79:21
<b>1420</b> [1] - 83.7	7 100 [1] - 2.0	13:20, 30:3, 49:22,	almost [2] - 19:16,	area [2] - 30:10,
	0	56:14	60:5	54:18
153rd [1] - 2:12	9	addresses [1] -	alone [1] - 7:25	argue [2] - 32:22,
<b>180</b> [1] - 51:23		10:12	Amendment [1] -	62:18
2	<b>909</b> [1] - 1:23	addressing [3] - 8:3,	63:14	arguments [3] -
2	<b>922(g</b> [1] - 68:14	11:14, 75:4	<b>AMERICA</b> [1] - 1:3	6:17, 32:21, 86:25
· · ·	<b>99</b> [1] - 2:18	adequately [1] -	America [3] - 4:3,	arise [13] - 7:21,
<b>20</b> [1] - 12:16	<b>9:00</b> [3] - 78:15,	10:11	47:19, 65:25	14:15, 17:3, 17:16,
<b>20001</b> [2] - 3:4, 88:14	78:16, 87:5	adjourned [1] - 87:5	ample [1] - 32:1	27:8, 31:5, 31:8, 32:6,
<b>20005</b> [1] - 2:4		admission [1] - 82:4	analysis [3] - 22:13,	32:13, 32:21, 35:15,
<b>200</b> 3 [1] - 2.4 <b>202</b> [2] - 3:4, 88:15	Α	admit [1] - 79:16	25:12, 30:23	36:3
<b>2021</b> [1] - 23:5	^	adverse [8] - 11:18,	analytically [1] -	arisen [1] - 62:14
		22:5, 22:15, 22:16,	40:15	arising [1] - 29:15
<b>2023</b> [2] - 1:7, 88:10	<b>ABA</b> [3] - 22:17, 23:4	23:11, 23:17, 38:23,	analyze [2] - 48:4,	Armchair [1] - 8:17
20520 11 4.00				ALDEDARD A A T
<b>20530</b> [1] - 1:20 <b>20777</b> [1] - 2:9	abeyance [1] - 81:8	39:14	82:2	arose [2] - 63:16,

32:7, 32:10, 32:12,

32:18, 32:19, 32:22,

35:8, 39:13, 39:19,

40:8, 41:3, 50:18,

52:13, 54:9, 58:14,

59:23, 62:13, 63:8,

64:15, 64:18, 78:3,

Biggs's [5] - 39:13,

bit [6] - 19:15, 19:23,

63:21, 80:1, 81:12,

**Bill** [2] - 19:17

20:20, 41:7, 51:18,

blank [1] - 51:7

blown [1] - 56:25

bottom [1] - 31:7

bound [1] - 86:19

Boys [2] - 33:25,

brakes [1] - 59:20

break [11] - 45:14,

45:16, 45:18, 47:1,

48:25, 57:22, 58:1,

60:14, 60:23, 62:13,

Boy [1] - 54:8

79:10

82:19

83:21

43:4

33:1, 33:5, 35:1, 35:5,

68:13 arrangement [1] arrested [1] - 54:23 arrogant [1] - 43:12 articulated [1] - 64:6 aside [1] - 76:22 aspirationally [1] -69:14 assert [2] - 28:3, 28:5 assess [4] - 23:9, 45:13, 45:16, 45:19 assessment [1] -45:8 assist [1] - 63:22 assistance [1] -63:22 associated [3] -7:24, 12:25, 15:25 assume [3] - 22:12, 77:23, 78:2 assure [2] - 14:14, 82:12 attacking [1] - 22:19 attained [1] - 11:10 attempt [1] - 25:19 attend [1] - 86:9 attention [3] - 4:14, 7:9, 33:13 attorney [32] - 14:16, 17:7, 19:10, 27:16, 35:20, 38:17, 38:18, 39:2, 43:18, 43:20, 43:22, 44:12, 44:25, 48:8, 48:14, 48:20, 50:21, 55:5, 55:11, 55:13, 56:16, 56:25, 57:9, 58:21, 66:13, 67:10, 67:23, 72:11, 73:6, 75:14, 78:5 ATTORNEY'S [1] attorney-client [18] -17:7, 35:20, 38:17, 39:2, 43:18, 43:20, 43:22, 44:12, 55:5, 55:11, 55:13, 56:16, 56:25, 57:9, 58:21, 66:13, 73:6 attorney-clientprivileged [1] - 19:10 August [1] - 8:22 authority [4] - 79:19, 81:13, 81:25, 82:17 automatically [1] available [5] - 34:21, 61:5, 61:7, 77:24 Avenue [3] - 2:18,

3:3, 88:14 avoid [2] - 39:21, 75:13 aware [5] - 17:15, 25:5, 35:2, 36:2, 64:18

#### В

**B.A**[1] - 1:16 back-and-forth [1] barrier [1] - 39:18 **based** [12] - 39:7, 49:1, 49:2, 49:4, 56:19, 57:9, 61:4, 67:2, 67:24, 69:11, 73:5, 73:12 **basic** [1] - 15:4 basket [1] - 58:7 beat [2] - 25:21, became [2] - 38:10, 79:19 become [4] - 62:16, 62:19, 62:20, 63:23 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:12 begin [5] - 14:22, 23:12, 53:9, 59:9, 87.4 behalf [8] - 11:3, 16:9, 18:16, 22:20, 36:23, 42:15, 78:6, 82.19 believes [2] - 11:19, 31:13 belt [2] - 11:22, 11:23 bench [4] - 47:21, 62:4, 65:10, 82:18 benefit [6] - 11:10, 13:2, 16:9, 49:3, 78:12, 80:1 Bertino [63] - 29:20, 29:22, 34:22, 37:17, 38:3, 38:7, 38:9, 39:8, 39:11, 39:12, 39:17, 40:4, 40:6, 40:8, 40:12, 40:17, 40:19, 40:23, 41:8, 41:18, 42:2, 43:10, 45:7, 46:8, 48:9, 48:15, 48:16, 49:6, 49:13, 49:21, 49:25, 50:15, 50:19, 51:6, 52:13, 52:22, 53:18, 53:20, 53:23, 55:6, 55:13,

56:15, 57:16, 61:6,

66:5, 66:14, 66:20,

66:23, 67:3, 68:2, 84:7 68:3, 68:6, 68:12, breakdown [1] -68:18, 68:21, 70:4, 64:19 70:10, 73:21, 73:23, bridge [2] - 27:12, 76:19, 77:1, 77:25, 27:13 79:9 **brief** [3] - 35:1, Bertino's [13] -45:15, 47:23 39:14. 46:6. 48:7. **briefly** [2] - 75:8, 48:11, 48:14, 50:10, 78:18 56:21, 57:7, 57:8, bring [1] - 6:10 58:9, 66:8, 73:10, **bringing** [1] - 27:10 78:25 brings [1] - 29:9 best [9] - 19:12, broached [1] - 70:1 53:22, 56:4, 59:18, **Broadway** [1] - 1:22 75:3, 77:22, 80:7, broke [1] - 80:20 80:8, 88:7 brought [3] - 7:8, better [2] - 15:3, 33:13, 63:22 72:16 bunch [1] - 77:21 between [13] - 16:12, burning [2] - 75:1, 16:15, 41:23, 46:8, 75:2 48:9, 49:24, 51:10, business [2] - 15:12, 55:6, 55:16, 63:17, 20:6 63:18, 66:14, 83:18 **BY** [1] - 3:1 beyond [1] - 77:2 **big** [2] - 5:22, 44:15 C bigger [1] - 22:14 **BIGGS** [11] - 1:6, 2:3, 35:10, 35:13, 36:1, cabined [1] - 77:8 cannot [3] - 11:9, 36:19, 37:2, 37:7, 37:11, 37:13, 37:15 35:22, 54:6 Biggs [30] - 29:15, capacity [1] - 8:21 31:4, 31:19, 31:22,

care [1] - 40:13 career [2] - 41:15, 44:15 careful [1] - 77:20 **CARMEN**[1] - 2:8 case [54] - 5:12, 5:16, 7:5, 7:10, 7:17, 9:17, 9:19, 9:20, 10:2, 13:5, 14:10, 15:22, 16:4, 16:13, 17:4, 17:10, 17:17, 19:15, 19:18, 20:16, 20:17, 20:20, 22:15, 22:25, 23:18, 24:11, 26:7, 26:11, 26:19, 27:15, 27:17, 28:16, 33:7, 34:1, 35:15, 35:17, 35:22, 36:4, 36:12, 52:24, 53:18, 55:21, 56:17, 62:20, 63:3, 68:25, 70:6, 71:21, 74:2, 77:16, 79:22, 80:22, 85:19, 86:17 cases [11] - 10:2, 10:6. 10:20. 12:6. 14:12, 19:20, 22:11, 29:19, 30:7, 39:9, 42:8 categories [1] - 7:5

category [1] - 7:14 caused [1] - 23:2 caution [4] - 11:14, 12:10, 35:6, 35:8 cell [1] - 51:20 certain [2] - 52:21, 81:20 certainly [8] - 24:7, 43:2, 43:19, 43:22, 45:9, 69:10, 69:11, 84:17 CERTIFICATE[1] certify [1] - 88:4 chance [3] - 6:21, 58:1, 74:3 change [2] - 5:17, 52:1 changed [1] - 83:5 channel [2] - 20:14, 20:15 channels [1] - 10:1 characterization [1] - 71:2 characterize [3] -44:20, 68:24, 69:21 characterized [1] -52:21 charge [2] - 68:14 charged [2] - 24:10, 26.13 charges [4] - 15:21, 68:12, 72:25 check [1] - 28:18 choice [1] - 63:21 chose [1] - 5:13 circle [1] - 7:18 circumstance [1] -68:10 circumstances [7] -37:6, 38:21, 48:8, 50:8, 58:23, 79:8, 82.18 civil [5] - 10:3, 29:19, 30:7, 30:9, 31:9 claimed [1] - 23:6 clarification [2] - 9:1, 28:11 clarified [1] - 32:24 clarify [2] - 52:20, 53:17 clear [15] - 11:12, 14:23, 28:17, 32:10, 45:16, 54:14, 54:15, 55:25, 65:16, 70:12, 72:19, 77:7, 79:16, 82:8, 83:23 **client** [64] - 5:5, 7:25, 11:1, 11:3, 12:3, 16:9,

17:7, 17:20, 17:22,

17:25, 18:1, 18:3, 18:4, 19:10, 22:2, 22:5, 22:6, 22:19, 22:20, 22:24, 31:9, 31:14, 35:20, 36:7, 36:9, 36:12, 36:13, 36:15, 36:16, 38:10, 38:14, 38:15, 38:17, 38:19, 38:22, 38:23, 38:25, 39:2, 39:4, 39:6, 39:8, 39:22, 42:18, 43:18, 43:20, 43:22, 44:12, 51:11, 55:5, 55:11, 55:13, 56:16, 56:25, 57:9, 58:21, 66:13, 71:12, 73:6 client's [2] - 23:8, 70:25 client-lawyer [1] -38.14 **clients** [7] - 16:3, 16:8, 16:12, 16:13, 16:15, 31:2, 31:12 close [3] - 8:25, 41:25, 49:3 closely [1] - 33:20 closer [1] - 10:14 closing [3] - 32:21, 32:25, 83:15 **closings** [1] - 84:5 **co** [5] - 17:11, 24:10, 32:12, 35:23, 70:17 **Co** [3] - 7:19, 14:8, 24:10 co-conspirators [1] -24:10 co-counsel [2] -32:12, 70:17 Co-Defendant [2] -7:19, 14:8 Co-Defendants [1] -24:10 co-defendants [2] -17:11, 35:23 **collateral** [1] - 74:5 colleague [1] - 55:8 college [1] - 15:8 **colloquies** [5] - 31:3, 32:9, 33:5, 33:10, 34:19 colloquy [12] - 4:9, 12:13, 12:21, 35:1, 35:8, 35:9, 35:11, 35:15, 44:18, 49:1, 72:6, 72:11 **COLUMBIA** [2] - 1:1, 1:18 Columbia [2] - 3:2, 88:13

comfortable [5] -27:6, 32:17, 41:10, 41:11, 78:10 coming [7] - 44:23, 47:1, 59:5, 59:16, 60:23, 80:15, 80:24 Comment [1] - 39:20 comment [1] - 78:23 comments [1] -78:25 commercial [1] -15:11 commitment [1] -82:22 Committee [17] -29:18, 29:23, 29:25, 30:6, 33:19, 38:3, 38:11, 42:5, 42:25, 43:13, 49:6, 50:15, 52:23, 54:21, 75:23, 76:5 communicate [1] -72:12 communicated [2] -50:6, 57:13  $\textbf{communication} \ [7] \ \textbf{-}$ 48:7, 48:9, 48:16, 50:8, 57:18, 57:20, 73:6 communications [12] - 17:4, 35:17, 48:15, 48:19, 49:15, 49:24, 50:14, 51:9, 56:20, 66:18, 67:10, 77:4 company [1] - 8:17 compared [2] -37:19, 60:15 competent [5] -13:16, 13:19, 21:10, 21:17, 31:14 competently [1] -11:20 complaining [1] complete [4] - 53:8, 64:17, 84:25, 88:6 completed [1] -42:12 completely [7] - 6:5, 10:4, 19:16, 21:13, 30:19, 34:10 complicate [1] - 51:2 complicated [1] -63:15 complication [4] -17:16, 17:20, 36:3, 36:7

component [1] -

73:3

computers [1] - 29:4 concern [6] - 6:2, 38:2, 39:10, 45:6, 48:25, 49:16 concerned [1] -80:10 concerning [1] -55.7 concerns [2] - 14:19, 74.22 **concluded** [1] - 87:6 concrete [1] - 23:2 conditions [1] -20:25 Conduct [1] - 7:21 conduct [2] - 12:12, 25:23 conducted [2] - 31:3, 32:9 conduit [2] - 44:9, 54:10 confer [3] - 12:18, 86:13, 86:16 confidence [15] -11:8, 38:25, 39:1, 39:16, 39:25, 40:4, 40:6, 40:16, 40:23, 48:17, 48:21, 50:6, 51:10, 55:15, 56:24 confidences [12] -11:10, 39:21, 44:19, 58:7, 66:5, 67:4, 70:7, 70:8. 70:10. 70:24. 71:13, 78:5 confident [1] - 51:20 confidential [8] -13:7, 17:6, 18:13, 35:19, 36:21, 46:7, 66:18, 67:10 confidentiality [2] -17:3, 35:16 confirm [1] - 57:10 confirmed [1] - 9:18 confirming [1] -66:10 conflict [34] - 7:3, 7:20, 8:3, 8:6, 9:4, 11:15, 11:18, 11:23, 11:25, 13:11, 16:5, 16:11, 18:6, 18:8, 21:13, 22:8, 22:9, 23:21, 25:23, 26:24, 31:5, 32:20, 40:1, 40:9, 40:14, 40:19, 55:22, 55:23, 57:11, 58:13, 58:15, 75:13 conflict-free [1] -55:23 conflicts [30] - 4:6, 6:7, 7:2, 7:4, 7:6,

7:14, 7:22, 8:25, 10:21, 10:23, 14:15, 18:25, 19:1, 21:21, 28:5, 29:14, 30:4, 30:5, 30:22, 30:24, 31:8, 31:11, 31:21, 31:23, 32:1, 37:9, 51:17, 63:5, 64:8 confused [1] - 84:19 confusing [1] - 84:23 Connecticut [4] -2:7, 81:18, 82:6, 82:14 connection [3] -7:16, 17:9, 35:22 **CONOR** [1] - 1:17 consent [12] - 11:16, 14:21, 22:6, 23:22, 24:15, 27:20, 27:21, 30:13, 31:12, 31:20, 32:11, 40:10 consented [2] - 32:6, 32:18 consequences [1] -11:18 consider [3] - 46:23, 68:6, 86:11 **considered** [1] - 38:4 considering [1] -39:22 consistent [4] -46:10, 46:12, 54:25, 55:8 conspirators [1] -24:10 constitute [1] - 39:24 constitutes [1] - 88:4 Constitution [2] -3:3, 88:14 consultation [1] -38:19 CONT'D [1] - 2:1 contacted [1] - 38:7 contemplated [2] -29:19, 29:22 contemplates [2] -56:24, 57:2 contempt [2] - 80:24, 81:3 continuance [2] -60:4, 60:5 **continue** [1] - 27:16 continues [1] - 56:17 contract [1] - 8:17 conversation [10] -15:19, 48:12, 48:13, 55:11, 57:14, 66:16, 66:17, 68:1, 78:3, 78:4 conversations [3] -

67:2, 69:25, 77:4 cooperators [1] -69:1 correct [12] - 8:10, 8:13, 8:14, 23:14, 30:15, 35:12, 50:23, 50:24, 57:4, 66:11, 85:1, 85:8 correctly [3] - 28:13, 28:14, 69:5 counsel [45] - 14:1, 17:5, 26:14, 26:24, 30:4, 30:22, 31:23, 32:2, 32:12, 35:18, 40:12, 41:20, 46:6, 47:15, 49:12, 49:20, 50:10, 51:6, 51:24, 54:9, 54:18, 55:23, 56:21, 57:8, 57:14, 61:6, 61:10, 63:8, 63:17, 63:21, 66:8, 66:24, 67:12, 69:23, 70:6, 70:9, 70:17, 73:20, 76:22, 76:25, 77:25, 80:21, 85:5 counsel's [2] -31:21, 67:1 couple [6] - 38:12, 41:5, 46:21, 55:9, 58:3, 69:19 course [9] - 17:6, 35:4, 35:19, 41:4, 43:6, 44:19, 52:23, 73:4, 79:22 Court [20] - 3:1, 3:2, 4:21, 4:23, 5:10, 6:4, 6:11, 6:13, 6:14, 6:15, 45:5, 63:23, 82:14, 83:2, 84:1, 84:13, 84:16, 88:12, 88:13 **COURT** [163] - 1:1, 4:4, 4:19, 4:24, 5:19, 6:6, 6:9, 6:16, 6:19, 7:2, 8:19, 8:23, 10:7, 10:11, 12:17, 12:21, 13:25, 14:4, 14:25, 15:3, 15:7, 15:9, 15:13, 15:17, 15:21, 15:24, 16:2, 16:20, 16:23, 17:2, 17:15, 18:12, 18:20, 18:25, 19:4, 19:6, 19:8, 20:3, 20:6, 20:10, 20:17, 21:8, 21:15, 21:20, 24:13, 25:11, 25:16, 26:1, 26:4, 26:15, 26:25, 27:14, 27:25, 28:6, 28:21, 29:1, 29:8, 29:11, 30:17, 30:20, 34:14, 35:7,

dealings [3] - 76:17,

deals [2] - 31:1,

debate [1] - 85:23

decide [2] - 59:15,

decided [2] - 80:3,

decision [2] - 34:9,

decline [2] - 28:2,

decorum [1] - 46:19

defendant [10] -

16:4, 16:15, 17:3,

17:9, 17:17, 17:19,

35:16, 35:21, 36:4,

DEFENDANT[32] -

1:21, 2:2, 2:8, 2:11,

2:17, 14:23, 15:2,

15:6, 15:8, 15:11,

15:16, 15:20, 15:23,

16:1, 16:19, 16:22,

17:1, 17:14, 18:11,

18:19, 18:24, 19:3,

19:5, 35:10, 35:13,

36:1, 36:19, 37:2,

37:7, 37:11, 37:13,

7:19, 14:8, 25:10,

25:12, 25:17, 34:19,

60:5, 83:19, 83:20

**Defendant** [11] - 4:9,

37:15

76:19, 77:4

70:17

62.18

84:1

81:23

64:4

36:6

35:11, 35:14, 36:2, 36:20, 37:3, 37:8, 37:12, 37:14, 37:16,
38:1, 41:9, 41:12,
41:19, 41:23, 42:14, 43:24, 44:17, 45:2,
45:23, 46:1, 46:12,
46:16, 46:24, 47:8, 47:12, 47:20, 50:17,
51:1, 51:25, 52:3, 53:6, 53:11, 53:13,
53:16, 56:6, 56:10,
56:22, 57:23, 60:14, 60:19, 61:1, 61:3,
61:15, 62:8, 62:23, 62:25, 63:10, 64:1,
64:11, 64:14, 64:20,
64:23, 65:1, 65:3, 65:12, 65:15, 65:17,
65:19, 65:21, 66:2, 69:7, 69:18, 70:12,
70:18, 71:19, 72:15,
72:21, 73:17, 73:22, 74:2, 74:21, 74:23,
75:1, 75:9, 75:16, 75:20, 75:24, 77:10,
77:19, 78:22, 79:3,
79:15, 80:6, 81:5, 81:16, 82:21, 82:25,
83:4, 83:10, 83:16, 84:2, 84:10, 84:17,
84:19, 84:23, 85:3, 85:7, 85:9, 85:20,
86:13, 86:22
<b>court</b> [8] - 25:3, 46:2, 47:1, 53:13, 63:20,
81:18, 81:20, 81:22 <b>Court's</b> [2] - 83:15,
83:24
<b>COURTROOM</b> [3] - 4:1, 47:17, 65:24
<b>courtroom</b> [5] - 42:1, 47:16, 64:25, 86:18,
86:21 <b>coverage</b> [1] - 54:24
covered [1] - 66:25 crazy [1] - 43:12
create [1] - 27:8
credibility [1] - 69:2 criminal [5] - 15:14,
16:4, 17:4, 35:16, 36:12
Criminal [4] - 1:3,
4:2, 47:18, 65:25 <b>crisis</b> [1] - 56:4
<b>crop</b> [2] - 24:11, 24:14
<b>cross</b> [28] - 22:23, 25:24, 26:2, 26:6,
25:24, 26:2, 26:6, 27:12, 27:22, 32:15,

40:12, 49:13, 49:23, 58:24, 73:1, 73:9, 73:20, 74:13, 74:16, 74:20, 75:12, 75:16, 75:22, 77:1, 79:9, 79:14, 79:18, 79:20, 79:24, 79:25 cross-examination [10] - 26:2, 49:23, 58:24, 73:9, 74:16, 74:20, 79:9, 79:18, 79:20, 79:24 cross-examine [7] -32:15, 40:12, 49:13, 74:13, 75:12, 77:1, 79:14 cross-examined [1] - 73:1 cross-examining [4] - 22:23, 73:20, 75:16, 75:22 crossed [1] - 67:8 crossing [1] - 76:4 CRR [3] - 3:1, 88:3, 88:12 cure [2] - 50:20, 62:17 current [11] - 17:25, 22:20, 23:2, 24:8, 24:12, 31:9, 36:12, 46:6, 48:14, 50:10, 56:21 cut [1] - 45:24

## D

Defendant's [1] -32:10 **D.C** [6] - 1:6, 1:20, defendant's [2] -2:4, 3:4, 7:21, 88:14 17:11, 35:24 Dan [6] - 41:2, 54:13, Defendants [10] -59:22, 64:15, 75:7, 1:8, 14:2, 24:10, 79:13 31:25, 32:3, 32:6, danger [1] - 19:25 33:24, 37:20, 66:9, date [2] - 68:16, 70:3 79:23 dated [1] - 23:5 defendants [2] -Dated [1] - 88:10 17:11, 35:23 **DAVID**[1] - 1:22 defense [21] - 25:9, Davis [12] - 51:6, 25:22, 25:23, 26:8, 51:7, 51:19, 57:19, 46:7, 57:14, 61:5, 57:20, 66:12, 66:22, 66:24, 66:25, 67:12, 67:21, 69:12, 70:5, 69:1, 70:1, 73:19, 70:11, 71:16 76:22, 76:25, 77:20, **Davis's** [2] - 69:21, 80:4, 84:14, 85:5, 70:19 86:10, 87:1 **DAY**[1] - 1:11 define [1] - 22:16 day's [1] - 62:7 defined [2] - 39:17, days [3] - 34:10, 55:9, 55:12 definitely [1] - 44:5 dealing [2] - 53:21, degrees [1] - 51:23 74:10 delay [1] - 84:10

delivering [1] - 32:25 demeanor [1] - 69:21 demonstrable [2] -23:7, 23:19 demonstrative[1] -5:14 denied [2] - 30:12, 81:18 deny [1] - 85:13 deposed [1] - 53:20 deposition [4] -33:19, 38:11, 39:7, 42:10 depositions [2] -42:25. 53:21 **DEPUTY** [3] - 4:1, 47:17, 65:24 **derivative** [1] - 67:21 describe [2] - 19:11, 72:11 described [2] - 19:1, 67:2 describes [3] -66:20, 77:8 describing [3] - 45:7, 73:8, 75:4 description [1] -77:3 desire [2] - 62:16, 81:12 detail [1] - 32:5 details [3] - 68:10, 69:13, 76:14 **Detectives** [1] - 8:18 **determine** [1] - 40:1 detriment [2] - 23:2, detrimental [1] -39:6 develop [1] - 74:1 developments [1] -29:13 devil [2] - 68:10, 76:13 **devil's** [1] - 69:13 difference [1] - 57:3 differences [1] -63:18 different [10] - 6:13, 10:1, 10:2, 10:14, 16:13, 38:2, 54:5, 58:5, 68:24, 77:21 diligent [5] - 13:16, 13:20, 21:10, 21:17, 31.14 diligently [1] - 11:20 direct [1] - 74:1 directions [1] - 83:24

directly [2] - 61:10,

72:3

disagree [1] - 26:15 disagrees [1] - 80:8 disbarred [1] - 7:12 disclose [1] - 11:8 disclosure [2] -11:17, 39:5 disconnected [1] -8:15 discovered[1] -33:16 discuss [7] - 14:5, 14:11, 14:19, 32:1, 40:11, 40:21, 87:1 discussed [7] -20:18, 31:4, 37:21, 38:7, 70:8, 70:9, 81:19 discusses [1] -38:13 discussing [1] - 76:6 discussion [5] -14:1, 42:17, 67:11, 67:17, 67:20 discussions [1] -44:21 disjunctive[1] -82:10 disqualify [2] -24:17, 27:2 distance [1] - 41:23 **DISTRICT**[4] - 1:1, 1:1, 1:13, 1:18 district [1] - 88:13 **District** [3] - 3:2, 3:2, 88:13 divided [4] - 16:12, 16:15, 18:2, 36:14 divulging [1] - 19:9 **DOMINIC** [1] - 1:7 done [14] - 4:11, 19:14, 19:16, 21:21, 22:20, 28:9, 30:16, 42:24, 42:25, 44:9, 63:16, 67:12, 72:7 door [1] - 76:4 double [1] - 28:18 double-check [1] -28:18 doubt [1] - 21:12 doubts [1] - 21:19 down [6] - 41:15, 58:2, 60:8, 69:5, 80:24 **Drive** [1] - 2:21 drugs [1] - 15:18 due [1] - 34:11 during [12] - 4:13, 32:21, 48:16, 57:21, 62:14, 66:8, 66:16, 66:17, 67:6, 86:18,

51:17

68:16

29:10

fit [1] - 60:18

52:16, 53:13

86:25, 87:3
E
early [1] - 83:25 easier [1] - 77:16 East [1] - 2:21 Edwards [1] - 88:12 EDWARDS [2] - 3:1,
88:3 effected [1] - 67:14 either [11] - 19:14, 23:14, 23:15, 24:24, 31:5, 33:22, 41:24, 44:2, 49:25, 66:3, 81:5
elegant [1] - 62:21 elements [1] - 77:2 Eleventh [1] - 1:19 eliminate [1] - 26:6 embarrassing [1] - 39:6
emotional [2] - 43:12, 44:23 emotions [1] - 5:12 employ [2] - 9:3, 29:2
employed [1] - 8:17 employee [2] - 8:16, 8:24 end [8] - 42:11, 44:24, 57:23, 57:25, 60:23, 62:7, 65:4, 73:8
ended [6] - 8:8, 8:12 32:14, 38:10, 61:24, 86:15 engage [2] - 20:4,
33:9  ENRIQUE [1] - 1:7  Enrique [1] - 42:20  ensure [1] - 73:13  entered [2] - 42:8,  47:15
entire [1] - 21:3 entitled [1] - 16:4 ergo [1] - 55:14 Erik [1] - 24:3 ERIK [1] - 1:16 error [1] - 81:21
especially [1] - 12:10 ESQ [12] - 1:16, 1:16 1:17, 1:17, 1:21, 2:2, 2:5, 2:8, 2:11, 2:14, 2:17, 2:20 essentially [1] - 78:9
et [3] - 4:3, 47:19, 66:1 ETHAN [1] - 1:6

86:25, 87:3

Ethan [3] - 4:3,

25:24

56:13

84:2

75:22

85:23

80:25

10:15

85:15

85:16

22:18, 22:22, 24:8,

28:24, 40:2

47:19, 66:1 ethics [2] - 14:13, evaluate [3] - 24:6, 65.8 68:5, 68:17 evening [1] - 74:4 36:12 event [4] - 27:14, 30:21, 55:15, 73:16 15:14 events [2] - 14:14, eventually [2] -44:25, 54:19 evidence [6] - 5:14, 66:22 5:15, 6:22, 32:22, 32:23, 72:18 58:14 evolve[1] - 28:7 exact [1] - 55:4 exactly [2] - 76:12, examination [14] -35:24 26:2, 49:23, 58:24, 67:16, 67:19, 68:21, 73:4, 73:9, 74:16, 74:20, 79:9, 79:18, 79:20, 79:24 85:25 examine [7] - 32:15, 40:12, 49:13, 74:13, 82:18 75:12, 77:1, 79:14 examined [1] - 73:1 examining [4] -22:23, 73:20, 75:16, example [1] - 32:13 except [5] - 38:19, 38:21, 43:17, 70:7, **exception** [1] - 4:16 excerpts [1] - 54:2 exchange [2] - 14:5, exchanged [6] -43:20, 55:15, 67:5, 70:7, 70:10, 71:13 exchanges [1] exclude [1] - 85:12 19:23 excruciating [1] **execution** [1] - 48:10 exercise [1] - 54:8 41:25 exhibit [2] - 6:24, exhibits [2] - 85:13, exist[1] - 22:24 existence [1] - 11:17 exists [6] - 11:13,

expect [4] - 28:3, 81:22, 81:23, 86:24 expected [1] - 48:17 expeditiously [1] expense [2] - 17:25, experience [1] **explain** [2] - 15:3, explained [5] - 32:4, 32:19, 34:15, 66:12, **explore** [2] - 58:12, explored [1] - 67:15 exploring [1] - 44:2 **expounded** [1] - 64:8 express [2] - 17:12, extended [1] - 60:22 extent [8] - 5:2, 19:11, 21:3, 21:7, 28:24, 29:1, 70:7, extraordinary [1] -

# F

filed [4] - 21:2,

five [3] - 46:22, 54:12, 60:17 flag [1] - 45:5 fact [7] - 7:9, 33:7, **flattering** [1] - 54:3 43:17, 63:8, 70:21, Floor [3] - 1:19, 2:6, 79:1, 79:10 2:18 facts [5] - 48:8, 58:2, flooring [1] - 15:12 58:4, 61:13, 69:20 Florida [2] - 2:13, factual [3] - 28:11, 2:15 50:4. 68:7 flow [1] - 21:22 failing [1] - 24:16 fly [2] - 20:23, 45:12 fair [4] - 41:8, 45:20, focused [1] - 42:14 77:5, 81:1 folks [3] - 77:24, fairly [3] - 30:3, 78:4, 78:7 44:23, 51:20 follow [2] - 49:21, fall [1] - 58:6 68.4 falling [1] - 19:23 follow-on [1] - 49:21 falling-out [1] following [5] - 47:4, 47:16, 65:23, 82:1, false [1] - 76:21 84:15 falsehood [1] - 64:17 footnote [2] - 34:4, far [3] - 15:7, 19:16, 34:5 FOR [8] - 1:1, 1:16, farewell [1] - 62:22 1:18, 1:21, 2:2, 2:8, fast [1] - 78:16 2:11, 2:17 FBI [1] - 38:8 force [1] - 34:17 February [1] - 23:5 foregoing [1] - 88:4 fee [1] - 9:6 forgot [2] - 45:21, few [1] - 31:15 71:8 figure [1] - 84:16 formalities [1] -

81:20

31:16, 46:10, 55:3 formally [1] - 38:10 files [2] - 29:5, 29:9 format [2] - 5:22, filing [2] - 51:16, 5:23 formed [1] - 66:14 filled [1] - 55:20 former [16] - 14:8, 17:22, 18:1, 18:4, financial [1] - 23:1 fine [6] - 41:13, 22:5, 22:6, 22:19, 46:24, 62:5, 63:13, 22:20, 22:23, 22:24, 23:7, 31:2, 31:9, 36:9, 36:13, 36:16 finish [3] - 12:17, formerly [3] - 14:17, 21:25, 22:1 firearm [1] - 68:14 forming [1] - 38:14 firm [14] - 7:13, 7:24, 8:7, 8:11, 8:16, 8:21, forth [1] - 80:20 8:24, 9:3, 9:25, 12:1, forward [8] - 13:21, 12:4, 18:6, 18:7, 24:20, 27:6, 59:10, 65:7, 69:12, 71:21, 80:16 firm's [4] - 13:14, 21:9, 21:16, 29:4 four [5] - 54:12, First [1] - 2:6 79:22, 86:19, 86:20, 86:23 first [21] - 7:3, 15:4, 20:12, 39:15, 40:7, Fourth [1] - 1:19 40:15, 40:17, 42:25, **framework** [1] - 48:3 50:17, 50:20, 51:12, frankly [2] - 49:11, 53:17, 59:14, 63:6, 68:10 67:9, 69:17, 74:11, free [1] - 55:23 75:9, 78:23, 83:6 Friday [3] - 81:23, firsthand [1] - 9:11 83:2, 83:3 front [4] - 7:3, 46:20, 50:23, 52:23 full [6] - 5:23, 11:16, 56:25, 60:17, 60:20, 88:5 full-blown [1] - 56:25 fully [4] - 37:2, 72:12, 72:14, 85:15 fundamental [1] -48:19

#### G

gained [1] - 39:3 game [1] - 77:5 general [1] - 71:2 generally [4] - 17:8, 22:24, 30:24, 35:21 gentleman [1] - 63:7 gentlemen [1] - 13:8 genuinely [1] - 50:2 given [14] - 5:12, 9:2, 9:4, 24:9, 32:19, 35:2, 39:11, 44:1, 59:4, 59:17, 62:8, 63:1, 80:1, 82:21 glad [1] - 43:15 governing [1] - 16:3 GOVERNMENT[1] -Government [39] -

69:19, 70:16, 71:10,

71:15, 72:9, 72:14,

5:8, 5:13, 5:15, 6:21, 24:1, 27:5, 27:10, 29:21, 29:25, 33:13, 33:15, 33:17, 34:12, 37:19, 37:22, 37:24, 38:2, 39:11, 45:2, 46:9, 47:5, 47:13, 47:15, 47:21, 47:23, 51:15, 51:22, 62:25, 74:19, 75:25, 77:19, 80:10, 84:14, 85:6, 85:15, 86:22, 87:1, 87:2 government [1] -61.1 Government's [8] -34:5, 47:25, 51:16, 56:14, 63:1, 64:1, 69:4, 85:13 governs [1] - 30:23 grant [2] - 62:11, 71:12 granted [2] - 30:11, 51:18 granting [1] - 82:22 graphic [1] - 5:8 gray [1] - 30:10 great [1] - 57:17 greater [1] - 34:16 guess [9] - 11:22, 19:20, 24:3, 52:6, 58:3, 71:25, 72:2, 79:13, 79:15 guy [1] - 21:6

## Н

half [2] - 83:5, 83:6 hand [3] - 4:14, 15:1, 58:19 handled [1] - 19:18 happy [1] - 61:17 hard [2] - 24:5, 83:8 harm [4] - 23:7, 23:19, 55:22 Harris [2] - 83:11, 83:13 HASSAN[2] - 2:11, 2:11 Haven [1] - 2:7 hear [14] - 4:23, 9:14, 23:23, 25:16, 53:1, 53:15, 57:24, 61:10, 61:17, 62:25, 65:13, 72:3, 78:20, 87:1 heard [16] - 14:11, 17:7, 28:13, 28:14, 35:8, 35:11, 35:20, 49:2, 49:4, 51:4,

51:21, 52:22, 64:16, 73:12, 75:9, 86:3 hearing [4] - 32:3, 35:14, 45:13, 51:22 hearings [1] - 31:16 heart [1] - 52:7 held [1] - 39:5 help [3] - 13:7, 18:14, 34:3 helpful [2] - 17:24, 36:11 helping [1] - 33:1 Henry [1] - 42:3 hereby [1] - 88:3 HERNANDEZ [21] -2:8, 4:18, 4:20, 5:10, 6:2, 6:8, 6:10, 6:17, 6:23, 74:25, 75:6, 75:10, 75:18, 75:21, 83:1, 83:9, 83:14, 83:23, 84:9, 84:12, 84:18 Hernández [4] - 6:6, 75:9, 83:4, 84:24 Hialeah [1] - 2:15 Highland [1] - 2:9 himself [1] - 50:13 hinder [3] - 13:15, 21:10, 21:16 hire [1] - 16:21 hiring [1] - 38:4 hold [1] - 24:1 holding [1] - 81:8 Hollow [1] - 2:9 home [2] - 43:7, 48:11 homework [1] -80:11 honest [1] - 6:1 Honor [82] - 4:1, 4:18, 4:20, 7:1, 13:24, 14:3, 14:24, 18:19, 19:3, 24:3, 25:18, 26:12, 26:20, 27:23, 28:10, 30:15, 34:3, 34:23, 35:6, 35:13, 36:1, 37:7, 37:13, 37:24, 41:2, 41:4, 45:4, 45:12, 45:20, 46:5, 46:14, 46:17, 46:22, 47:6, 47:9, 47:17, 48:2, 48:3, 49:19, 51:2, 51:5, 51:14, 56:11, 57:4, 59:22, 60:7, 60:25, 61:2, 61:8, 61:9, 61:13, 64:2, 64:4, 64:5, 64:7, 64:15, 65:11, 65:14, 65:20,

68:13, 68:17, 69:11,

73:8, 73:13, 73:14, 74:25, 75:6, 76:11, 76:18, 77:18, 78:19, 80:2, 83:1, 84:20, 85:11, 85:13 Honor's [1] - 46:18 HONORABLE [1] -1:12 hope [1] - 69:14 hopefully [2] - 80:12, 80:16 House [15] - 42:5, 42:25, 43:13, 49:6, 49:25, 50:15, 54:20, 66:19, 67:3, 73:11, 75:22, 75:23, 76:16, 76:19, 77:8 huddled [1] - 47:6 hull [1] - 70:7 HULL [43] - 2:2, 2:3, 30:15, 30:18, 34:3, 37:24, 41:2, 41:11, 41:14, 41:21, 42:1, 42:20, 42:23, 44:5, 44:22, 45:20, 45:25, 46:5, 46:15, 53:4, 53:10, 53:12, 53:15, 53:17, 56:8, 59:22, 60:3, 60:15, 64:15, 64:22, 65:11, 65:14, 65:16, 65:18, 65:20, 66:11, 75:7, 77:18, 78:18, 78:23, 79:5, 80:2, 81:4 Hull [82] - 29:12, 30:10, 31:12, 32:14, 32:21, 32:25, 33:2, 34:6, 36:20, 36:24, 37:4, 37:5, 37:9, 38:4, 38:8, 39:16, 40:3, 40:5, 40:16, 40:19, 40:21, 41:2, 45:6, 45:10, 45:23, 46:16, 48:9, 49:5, 49:9, 49:11, 49:24, 50:13, 51:10, 52:15, 52:20, 52:24, 53:3, 53:6, 53:14, 54:13, 56:6, 56:16, 58:14, 58:22, 59:22, 63:18, 63:21, 63:22, 64:15, 64:20, 65:1, 65:3, 65:12, 65:15, 65:19, 66:15, 66:21, 67:19, 67:24, 70:1, 70:8, 73:11, 73:23, 74:15, 75:7, 75:13, 75:14, 75:17, 76:17, 76:18, 76:20,

77:4, 77:9, 78:11, 78:17, 79:4, 79:13, 79:15, 80:19, 81:11

Hull's [18] - 29:15, 29:17, 30:5, 30:8, 31:9, 32:7, 32:12, 32:18, 32:20, 33:14, 33:18, 35:2, 38:10, 39:8, 39:18, 49:14, 51:17, 73:4

human [1] - 54:13

hundreds [2] - 44:9

hypothetical [1] - 28:4

I idea [4] - 12:13, 42:3, 49:11, 60:19 identifiable [1] - 23:1 identified [1] - 85:16 identify [1] - 22:25 II [1] - 2:17 immediately [1] -69:15 impact [1] - 12:9 impacts [1] - 26:23 impeachment [6] -45:10, 49:10, 50:12, 74:4, 79:1, 79:6 implicate [1] - 40:13 implicates [1] -38:12 important [4] -25:11, 66:4, 69:16, 71:3 importantly [1] -85:19 imposition [1] -46:18 **impression** [1] - 60:4 **improper** [1] - 73:15 imputation [2] -11:6, 22:7 impute [3] - 9:4, 11:24, 12:1 imputed [3] - 7:22, 10:23, 12:24 inclined [2] - 68:3, 73:14 include [1] - 11:7 included [1] - 30:22 including [2] - 17:11, 35.23 inconsistent [1] -55:1 indeed [2] - 39:20,

independent [3] -

69:22, 71:6 indicates [1] - 50:10 indictment [2] - 21:6, 24:10 individual [5] -27:20, 27:21, 29:24, 33:18 individuals [4] -7:16, 12:8, 30:25, 86.8 influence [1] - 15:17 information [39] -4:8, 11:13, 12:23, 12:24, 13:1, 13:7, 13:10, 17:21, 17:24, 18:3, 18:14, 18:18, 19:10, 19:24, 25:5, 25:6, 25:15, 26:17, 31:18, 33:1, 35:3, 36:8, 36:11, 36:15, 36:21, 36:25, 38:18, 39:2, 39:3, 39:24, 43:20, 45:17, 46:7, 48:4. 67:24. 73:22. 75:16, 77:1, 78:10 informed [7] - 11:16, 22:6, 31:12, 31:20, 40:10, 51:15, 51:23 initial [3] - 38:8, 39:23, 78:13 inquired [1] - 25:8 inquiry [3] - 34:18, 42:5, 61:11 insignificant [1] -60:15 insofar [1] - 76:16 installation [1] -15:12 instance [1] - 69:17 instances [1] - 22:22 instruct [1] - 84:11 insurmountable [2] -60:1, 74:6 integrity [1] - 53:7 intemperate [1] -78:24 intend [2] - 51:3, intended [2] - 53:19, 79:5 intending [1] - 24:25 intends [2] - 23:16, 25:12 intent [1] - 30:19 intention [1] - 82:11 interactions [3] -53:24, 77:9, 77:11

30:4, 31:22, 40:12

68:2, 68:5, 69:1,

indicated [6] - 68:1,

KENERSON [4] -

1:16, 24:3, 27:7,

28:11

interest [5] - 12:2, 16:6, 16:11, 23:17, interesting [1] -77:17 interests [7] - 11:4, 22:4, 22:5, 22:15, 23:8, 38:22, 39:13 interim [1] - 57:19 interrupted [1] -47:22 interview [1] - 39:24 introduce [1] - 6:24 introduction [1] - 7:4 inviolate [1] - 39:5 invoke [1] - 28:2 involve [1] - 60:13 involved [1] - 49:20 involvement [7] -10:19, 12:6, 21:9, 21:16, 32:20, 33:14, 33:24 irreconcilable [1] -63:17 issue [82] - 4:6, 6:7, 6:11, 10:12, 13:4, 13:21, 17:2, 25:21, 25:24, 26:4, 28:5, 33:6, 33:17, 33:20, 33:21, 34:16, 35:15, 38:1, 48:18, 48:22, 48:24, 49:18, 50:4, 50:12. 50:17. 50:20. 50:25, 52:3, 52:12, 52:14, 52:17, 52:25, 54:22, 57:21, 58:16, 58:18, 58:25, 59:1, 59:14, 59:25, 60:1, 60:11, 61:16, 62:16, 62:20, 63:5, 63:13, 64:8, 64:9, 64:18, 66:23, 66:25, 67:9, 67:12, 68:4, 68:6, 68:15, 68:23, 69:22, 71:3, 72:8, 72:20, 72:23, 73:11, 75:4, 75:11, 78:1, 79:6, 79:8, 79:12, 79:18, 79:19, 80:9, 80:13, 80:14, 84:4, 86:4, 86:7, 86:12 **Issue** [1] - 50:4 issues [22] - 14:12, 21:23, 29:12, 29:21, 31:24, 32:5, 32:13, 33:14, 37:20, 45:9, 45:10, 47:7, 49:17, 60:12, 62:13, 63:2, 63:14, 63:16, 67:21, 69:3, 69:17, 79:1

item [1] - 5:2 items [2] - 84:22, 85:11 IV [1] - 2:2

47:5, 53:8, 62:12,

Judge [5] - 30:11,

62:6, 64:13, 64:24,

**JUDGE** [1] - 1:13

jurisdiction [1] -

**jurors** [2] - 5:13,

**JURY** [1] - 1:11

justice [1] - 15:15

keep [1] - 42:14

**KELLY** [1] - 1:12

Kenerson [2] - 24:4,

K

jury [4] - 6:3, 46:20,

judgment [1] - 11:2

73:18

73:25

82:6

80:15

71:9

59:5, 83:14

kept [6] - 17:6, 35:19, 48:17, 48:21, J 78:17, 82:14 kidding [2] - 83:10, 83:11 **J.P** [2] - 51:6, 51:19 kind [47] - 28:4, 38:2, January [11] - 1:7, 45:11, 45:13, 46:18, 5:4, 14:14, 15:10, 48:3, 48:4, 48:5, 29:18, 29:23, 29:25, 48:18, 48:22, 49:9, 30:6, 33:19, 38:3, 49:12, 50:3, 54:3, 88:10 58:17, 60:9, 61:10, **JASON**[1] - 1:16 61:11, 61:12, 61:14, Jauregui [3] - 42:15, 67:8, 67:11, 67:13, 73:18, 75:11 68:5, 68:15, 68:17, JAUREGUI [9] -68:20, 68:21, 68:22, 2:14, 2:14, 42:15, 68:23, 69:14, 69:15, 42:22, 47:5, 73:18, 72:18, 72:23, 73:4, 73:25, 74:18, 74:22 73:5, 73:13, 73:14, Jay [3] - 29:23, 73:15, 76:13, 77:17, 33:18, 34:9 85:17 jerk [1] - 74:9 kinds [1] - 42:8 Jerry [1] - 29:22 knee [1] - 74:9 Joe [1] - 41:2 knee-jerk [1] - 74:9 John [7] - 7:15, 8:16, knowing [3] - 19:1, 8:20, 9:25, 19:19, 37:8, 68:19 21:2, 29:9 knowingly [1] - 7:24 **JOHN** [1] - 2:2 knowledge [3] join [2] - 8:11, 79:17 19:12, 21:3, 33:23 joined [2] - 7:19, 8:7 known [2] - 29:12, joint [2] - 20:4, 20:8 69:24 jointly [1] - 61:18 knows [5] - 5:10, Jonathon [1] - 7:9 30:2, 37:25, 62:14, **JOSEPH** [1] - 1:6 68:13 judge [5] - 42:15,

## L

laid [2] - 48:3, 50:16

Lake [1] - 2:21 Lakes [1] - 2:13 language [3] - 68:6, 70:23, 71:16 Las [1] - 20:24 last [7] - 9:13, 10:15, 20:22, 34:20, 50:2, 63:16, 73:8 last-minute [1] -20:22 latest [2] - 51:16, 62:2 LAW [3] - 2:11, 2:14, 2:20 law [10] - 7:15, 10:16, 13:6, 14:7, 14:16, 16:2, 17:18, 18:6, 39:3, 63:11 lawyer [60] - 4:10,

9:21, 11:1, 12:4, 14:7, 16:5, 16:7, 16:11, 16:13, 16:16, 16:17, 16:21, 16:24, 17:5, 17:8, 17:9, 17:10, 17:16, 17:21, 18:1, 18:2, 18:5, 18:7, 18:8, 19:17, 21:25, 22:1, 22:18, 22:23, 25:23, 35:18, 35:21, 35:22, 36:4, 36:5, 36:8, 36:13, 36:15, 38:10, 38:13, 38:14, 38:21, 38:24, 39:22, 39:25, 43:14, 44:6, 44:13, 50:7, 51:19, 51:25, 52:9, 55:18, 58:9, 61:21, 70:3, 71:5 lawyer's [8] - 11:2, 11:4, 11:25, 16:8, 16:14, 17:18, 17:25, 36:12 lawyers [8] - 7:23, 12:1, 16:3, 24:17, 25:22, 27:4, 43:3, 81:1 lay [1] - 4:7 layer [2] - 18:5, 52:25 learned [5] - 8:15, 12:23, 35:4, 36:21, 38:18 learns [2] - 17:5, 35:18 least [16] - 7:11, 7:16, 12:24, 24:24, 29:14, 49:20, 50:20, 55:19, 57:2, 58:11,

# 16:14, 18:2, 36:14 lunch [3] - 62:13, 83:13, 84:7 M

loyalties [4] - 16:12,

33:23, 34:7, 34:11,

listen [1] - 71:19

lived [1] - 43:10

local [2] - 54:18,

**LLC** [1] - 2:5

litigated [1] - 86:1

litigating [1] - 22:18

litigation [2] - 23:10,

**Livingston** [1] - 2:21

look [21] - 6:14, 6:19,

10:14. 57:23. 59:10.

59:13, 59:15, 67:13,

71:24, 74:4, 74:24,

80:7, 81:8, 82:23,

77:14, 77:22, 78:16,

84:19, 86:15, 86:22

looked [4] - 5:19,

looking [3] - 23:25,

looks [1] - 30:10

loyal [1] - 16:7

5:23, 6:13, 81:24

33:19, 54:20

85:16

25:1

81:25

Maryland [1] - 2:9 material [6] - 22:17, 23:1, 23:7, 23:19, 24:7, 27:8 materially [7] - 22:5, 22:15, 22:16, 23:11, 23:17, 38:22, 39:13 materials [4] - 9:16, 9:19, 28:16, 29:3 matter [20] - 7:19, 9:5, 10:19, 11:2, 12:11, 22:2, 22:4, 22:21, 23:18, 35:5, 38:15, 38:24, 39:23, 40:13, 55:17, 59:15, 63:11, 67:22, 79:3, 83:6 Matter [3] - 4:2, 47:18, 65:25 matters [4] - 30:9, 30:25, 31:9, 74:5 McCullough [34] -1:16, 45:4, 46:14, 46:17, 48:2, 50:24, 52:18, 55:2, 55:4, 56:11, 57:4, 58:17, 60:2, 61:2, 61:4, 64:2,

61:12, 66:5, 68:11, 72:19, 72:25, 83:7 **leave** [3] - 61:23, 63:24, 64:12 left [1] - 51:4 legal [1] - 23:1 less [2] - 31:10, 82:8 levels [1] - 46:21 license [1] - 82:7 light [1] - 33:6 likely [2] - 22:11, 39:6 limit [1] - 39:23 limited [5] - 26:1, 67:16, 67:18, 68:2, 79:20 limiting [2] - 67:18, 74:19 limits [1] - 73:4 line [1] - 80:24 LISA [2] - 3:1, 88:3 Lisa [1] - 88:12

list [6] - 24:24, 25:9,

66:7, 66:12, 69:10, 69:22, 70:24, 72:9, 72:17, 72:22, 76:3, 76:11, 84:19, 84:20, 85:1, 85:4, 85:8, 85:10, 86:7, 86:19 McCullough's [1] -69:20 McGUIRE [1] - 2:3 mean [28] - 5:19, 6:16, 10:13, 26:4, 45:12, 45:24, 51:2, 51:18, 52:3, 53:2, 54:9, 57:25, 58:3, 58:18, 58:19, 59:8, 60:16, 63:8, 68:9, 70:13, 71:4, 72:19, 73:24, 74:5, 76:3, 76:13, 79:11, 84:6 meaning [2] - 29:16, means [7] - 16:8, 45:13, 47:22, 81:10, 84:3, 84:6, 84:7 meant [2] - 78:25, 79:3 medication [1] -15:18 meeting [1] - 47:22 Mehta [1] - 30:11 member [1] - 33:25 memo [1] - 6:18 mention [1] - 46:5 mentioned [5] -14:18, 31:1, 54:13, 58:17, 67:21 mentioning [2] -75:12, 80:19 met [1] - 54:9 **METCALF** [9] - 2:17, 2:17, 12:16, 12:20, 13:24, 19:7, 25:6, 25:14 Metcalf [1] - 13:22 Miami [1] - 2:13 microphone [3] -41:19, 41:24, 78:20 mid [2] - 27:12, 27:13 mid-trial [2] - 27:12, 27:13 middle [1] - 79:16 midmorning [1] might [34] - 12:23, 12:24, 13:1, 13:9, 16:16, 17:2, 18:16, 19:14, 21:16, 26:8, 27:2, 27:11, 27:12, 31:5, 31:8, 32:5,

32:13, 32:20, 33:25, 34:25, 36:24, 37:4, 41:6, 45:22, 54:18, 70:3, 71:9, 74:6, 78:5, 78:10, 79:23, 84:24, 85:5, 86:9 mind [2] - 6:10, 42:11 Mink [1] - 2:9 minute [3] - 20:22, 84:6, 84:7 minutes [6] - 46:22, 47:2, 72:20, 81:14, 81:15, 81:16 modify [1] - 20:25 moment [11] - 8:2, 10:3, 12:18, 13:23, 20:2, 24:2, 35:12, 62:11, 63:2, 63:3, moments [1] - 61:7 monitor [1] - 21:1 Montana [1] - 2:21 months [1] - 30:3 Moore [1] - 34:24 MOORE [2] - 1:17, 34:23 morning [7] - 6:15, 6:18, 59:9, 59:14, 64:19, 72:8, 80:11 Moseley [13] - 7:9, 8:2, 8:7, 8:15, 9:5, 9:15, 9:18, 10:12, 28:12, 28:15, 28:19, 29:1, 29:5 Moseley's [2] - 8:6, most [4] - 4:11, 4:15, 10:5, 54:5 mostly [2] - 10:3, motion [11] - 20:22, 20:24, 21:1, 30:12, 62:7, 62:11, 64:4, 81:8, 82:22, 85:14 mouths [1] - 41:24 move [8] - 6:21, 13:21, 24:20, 33:10, 46:18, 59:10, 71:21, moved [4] - 30:11, 33:8, 82:13, 85:12 moving [1] - 65:7 MR [123] - 8:14, 8:20, 9:18, 10:10, 12:16, 12:20, 13:24, 14:3, 19:7, 19:13, 20:5, 20:8, 20:11, 20:21,

21:12, 21:19, 24:3,

25:6, 25:14, 25:18,

26:3, 26:12, 26:20, 27:7, 27:23, 28:1, 28:10, 28:11, 28:22, 29:5, 29:9, 30:15, 30:18, 34:3, 37:24, 41:2, 41:11, 41:14, 41:21, 42:1, 42:15, 42:20, 42:22, 42:23, 44:5, 44:22, 45:4, 45:20, 45:25, 46:5, 46:14, 46:15, 46:17, 47:5, 47:9, 47:14, 48:2, 50:24, 51:2, 52:2, 53:4, 53:10, 53:12, 53:15, 53:17, 56:8, 56:11, 57:4, 59:22, 60:2, 60:3, 60:15, 60:25, 61:2, 61:4, 62:6, 62:12, 62:24, 63:7, 63:11, 64:2, 64:13, 64:15, 64:22, 64:24, 65:2, 65:11, 65:14, 65:16, 65:18, 65:20, 66:7, 66:11, 66:12, 69:10, 69:19, 70:16, 70:21, 72:9, 72:17, 72:22, 73:18, 73:25, 74:18, 74:22, 75:7, 76:11, 77:18, 78:18, 78:23, 79:5, 80:2, 81:4, 81:9, 81:17, 82:24, 84:20, 85:1, 85:4, 85:8, 85:10, 86:7, 86:19 **MS** [21] - 4:18, 4:20, 5:10, 6:2, 6:8, 6:10, 6:17, 6:23, 34:23, 74:25, 75:6, 75:10, 75:18, 75:21, 83:1, 83:9, 83:14, 83:23, 84:9, 84:12, 84:18 MULROE [1] - 1:17 multiple [1] - 67:6 must [2] - 16:7, 16:9

## Ν

Nadia [1] - 34:23 NADIA [1] - 1:17 nail [3] - 58:8, 69:4, 69:5 name [2] - 20:12, 78:7 named [2] - 19:17, 33:18 names [1] - 54:6 national [1] - 54:23 nature [5] - 11:17, 41:7, 49:7, 49:23, 50:7 2.11 near [2] - 42:11, 43:8 necessarily [4] -10:18, 46:1, 52:20, 61:15 necessary [4] - 33:6, 61:20, 64:21, 64:22 need [37] - 4:8, 4:13, 4:14, 9:4, 23:9, 23:14, 24:15, 24:17, 25:2, 25:4, 25:16, 33:9, 34:18, 34:19, 40:7, 40:24, 41:6, 42:7, 44:17, 46:3, 46:21, 47:10, 52:6, 52:8, 56:7, 57:25, 65:4, 65:5, 65:6, 68:19, 69:4, 72:3, 73:9, 73:13, 77:25, 80:1, 81:20 needed [1] - 75:11 needs [7] - 37:21, 49:19, 49:22, 68:17, 68:18, 73:12, 83:13 negatively [1] - 12:9 negligible [2] -10:19, 12:6 negotiating [1] -22:18 never [13] - 6:10, 20:11, 20:15, 20:16, 20:17, 21:6, 38:9, 43:13, 44:1, 44:3, 79:2, 79:13 New [5] - 1:23, 2:7, 2:19 new [6] - 17:25, 26:13, 33:14, 39:23, 51:24, 85:16 next [10] - 25:20, 40:24, 50:18, 50:22, 50:25, 57:20, 61:11, 80:24, 83:20, 83:22

nexus [1] - 34:1

night [1] - 63:17

63:12

74:11

32:7

73:15

[1] - 40:2

**NICHOLAS** [1] - 1:21

nobody [2] - 59:10,

nominal [1] - 42:9

none [6] - 7:24,

10:10, 15:16, 60:7,

nonetheless [1] -

nonrelevant [1] -

nonrepresentation

**nice** [1] - 21:6

**NAYIB** [2] - 2:11,

nontrivial [1] - 68:23 Nordean [6] - 4:3, 25:18, 47:19, 66:1, 69:23, 85:12 nORDEAN [1] - 1:22 NORDEAN [1] - 1:6 NORMAN [1] - 2:5 Northwest [5] - 1:19, 2:3, 2:12, 3:3, 88:14 note [5] - 24:22, 30:8, 32:8, 33:7, 80:23 noted [3] - 27:10, 48:25, 57:8 notes [2] - 49:4, 88:5 **nothing** [8] - 5:4, 43:23, 55:14, 55:20, 59:5, 83:5 nothingburger [1] -68:15 notice [4] - 9:7, 9:9, 9:10, 53:5 notion [1] - 43:5 November [1] - 31:4 number [11] - 24:15, 30:3, 52:5, 52:10, 52:11, 56:1, 79:17, 79:18, 82:2, 86:14, 86:19

# 0

object [2] - 6:21, objection [2] - 4:22, 87:3 objections [1] - 4:21 obligation [1] - 11:7 observed [1] - 81:21 **obstacle** [1] - 63:23 obtain [2] - 40:6, 67:15 obvious [1] - 32:13 obviously [12] - 6:20, 9:10, 10:7, 19:9, 24:13, 27:11, 29:16, 39:9, 62:1, 68:18, 83:18, 85:14 occur [2] - 17:23, 36:10 occurred [2] - 62:15, 79:10 occurs [1] - 16:11 **OF** [6] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:11, 1:18, 2:11, 2:20 offer [1] - 51:3 **OFFICE** [1] - 1:18 office [2] - 47:6, 82:15

19:20, 19:21

40:25

parts [1] - 42:24

party [5] - 11:5,

22:25, 23:23, 33:9,

pass [1] - 38:17

past [1] - 55:24

patch [1] - 81:11

path [1] - 69:12

pathway [1] - 69:8

patient [1] - 62:9

Pattis [8] - 32:11,

32:24. 33:7. 62:8.

64:11, 64:16, 81:7,

officer [1] - 63:24 **OFFICES** [2] - 2:11, official [1] - 88:12 Official [1] - 3:1 often [1] - 5:20 oil [1] - 43:11 old [1] - 15:5 once [2] - 82:8, 82:9 one [67] - 4:15, 4:25, 5:22, 6:14, 7:8, 7:25, 12:11, 13:8, 13:22, 14:13, 16:7, 17:16, 17:18, 18:5, 23:25, 24:9, 24:15, 24:24, 25:22, 26:24, 27:9, 27:16, 31:23, 32:13, 33:17, 34:24, 36:4, 36:5, 40:3, 40:7, 40:22, 41:17, 45:4, 46:10, 47:11, 48:19, 48:22, 48:24, 48:25, 49:18, 52:5, 52:10, 54:18, 54:19, 56:1, 56:20, 59:8, 60:20, 62:20, 67:6, 70:21, 71:8, 71:20, 72:19, 72:25, 76:7, 78:14, 79:7, 79:17, 80:3, 80:13, 81:7, 83:19, 83:20, 84:25, 85:11, 86:7 ones [2] - 4:25, 44:25 open [13] - 25:3, 43:19, 46:2, 52:3, 59:25, 60:16, 61:24, 63:20, 76:4, 77:23, 85:2, 85:4, 86:15 open-ended [2] -61:24, 86:15 opening [7] - 5:16, 83:22, 83:25, 85:23, 86:1, 86:9, 86:25 openings [6] - 60:18, 84:6, 84:25, 86:18, 87:3, 87:4 operating [1] - 5:5 opinion [3] - 23:4, 51:3 opportunity [4] -57:15, 66:22, 86:3, 86:11 opposed [2] - 5:22, 20:4 opposite [1] - 55:4 optimistic [1] - 69:8 option [1] - 40:7 Orange [1] - 2:6 order [3] - 31:15,

39:21, 46:19 otherwise [2] - 5:11, 23:24 ourselves [1] - 41:16 outlying [1] - 79:12 outset [1] - 49:19 outside [1] - 71:13 overnight [1] - 62:15 overrule [1] - 5:1 overtures [1] - 46:9 own [2] - 15:11, 16:21 owned [1] - 15:11

# Р

82:21 **PATTIS** [12] - 2:5, 2:5, 62:6, 62:12, P.A [2] - 2:11, 2:14 62:24, 63:7, 63:11, **P.C** [2] - 2:3, 2:17 64:13, 64:24, 81:9, p.m [1] - 1:7 81:17, 82:24 pace [1] - 60:8 Pattis's [1] - 62:11 page [3] - 58:11, **Paul** [7] - 7:17, 14:9, 71:22, 76:14 20:19, 20:20, 20:23, Pages [1] - 41:17 21:4, 21:7 pages [1] - 54:12 pause [3] - 45:18, paid [1] - 42:9 47:24, 49:8 paper [1] - 72:20 pen [1] - 72:20 papers [1] - 24:5 penalties [1] - 15:25 paralegal [5] - 7:12, pending [1] - 64:5 8:8, 8:12, 8:17, 29:6 people [6] - 42:8, Park [1] - 2:18 43:1, 43:3, 53:20, part [18] - 4:15, 5:19, 54:5, 86:14 9:6, 10:5, 10:8, 26:6, Pepe [25] - 7:17, 26:8, 29:6, 30:1, 7:18, 10:18, 11:7, 34:21, 44:15, 50:2, 11:10, 13:6, 13:15, 59:3, 64:17, 68:14, 14:8, 18:13, 18:14, 73:7, 77:13, 77:15 18:21, 19:12, 19:15, part-time [1] - 29:6 19:18, 20:9, 20:14, partially [1] - 45:22 20:16, 21:9, 21:24, particular [1] - 75:13 23:10, 23:12, 23:21, particularized [1] -24:21, 27:8, 34:16 79:25 Pepe's [6] - 14:12, particularly [5] -20:12, 20:17, 22:11, 17:24, 36:11, 43:4, 22:16, 24:15 51:15, 86:9 percent [1] - 19:18 parties [19] - 4:9, percipient [1] - 45:11 7:8, 14:17, 23:14, perhaps [1] - 48:23 25:2, 26:11, 27:11, permission [10] -34:19, 57:24, 59:12, 13:9, 17:12, 17:22, 59:19, 61:20, 62:10, 18:4, 18:15, 35:24, 65:6, 65:9, 70:22, 36:9, 36:16, 36:22, 71:16, 72:3, 86:16 63:25 parties' [3] - 58:8, permit [1] - 82:1 59:2, 59:7 permitted [3] partner [6] - 7:15, 18:17, 36:25, 86:17 13:6, 14:7, 14:17, person [8] - 5:5, 5:6, 17:18, 79:12 22:3, 38:13, 44:14, partners [3] - 10:17, 48:20, 51:19, 61:17 18:9, 20:6 person's [1] - 22:4 partnership [2] perspective [3] -

49:8, 62:21, 82:17 pertaining [1] - 10:1 pertains [1] - 82:5 pertinent [1] - 51:15 **PEZZOLA** [20] - 1:7, 2:17, 14:23, 15:2, 15:6, 15:8, 15:11, 15:16, 15:20, 15:23, 16:1, 16:19, 16:22, 17:1, 17:14, 18:11, 18:19, 18:24, 19:3, 19:5 Pezzola [27] - 7:7, 7:19, 10:9, 10:22, 11:11, 11:15, 11:20, 12:9, 12:13, 12:14, 12:19, 12:22, 13:7, 13:17, 13:18, 13:23, 14:4, 21:11, 21:13, 21:18, 22:9, 24:16, 25:10, 25:22, 26:23, 27:15, 35:12 Pezzola's [4] - 7:18, 13:2, 22:14, 23:17 phone [9] - 21:5, 44:23, 51:20, 61:18, 66:8. 67:6. 70:2. 72:1. 72:6 photograph [3] -4:22, 5:3, 5:4 **picture** [1] - 5:13 piece [2] - 5:14, 23:13 Pierce [17] - 7:15, 8:16, 8:21, 9:25, 11:9, 12:25, 13:6, 14:8, 18:7, 18:13, 18:21, 19:13, 19:19, 19:25, 21:2, 22:8, 29:10 pierce [4] - 10:14, 10:16, 10:17, 10:21 Pierce's [4] - 11:6, 12:8, 19:11, 21:23 place [5] - 24:20. 48:10, 69:25, 74:11, 80:11 **Plaintiff** [1] - 1:4 **plan** [3] - 5:21, 12:12, 59:12 **platform** [1] - 9:25 play [1] - 10:8 played [1] - 20:20 pleading [2] - 34:5, pleadings [1] - 46:10 PLLC [1] - 1:22 pocket [1] - 24:19 point [21] - 4:12, 6:15, 14:25, 24:9,

24:13, 41:17, 45:3,

46:19, 51:7, 52:6, 59:17, 60:8, 61:14, 65:11, 70:18, 71:8, 74:7, 76:12, 79:11, 79:13, 83:7 point-blank [1] -51:7 points [1] - 4:8 police [1] - 72:14 **policy** [2] - 82:3, 82:11 portion [1] - 77:8 posed [1] - 30:5 poses [1] - 39:18 position [10] - 24:7, 26:18, 58:12, 62:10, 62:19, 69:6, 70:5, 70:11, 70:14, 70:19 positions [4] - 23:10, 58:8, 59:2, 59:7 possibility [15] -16:14, 24:14, 26:5, 27:20, 27:24, 31:5, 31:17, 38:7, 38:14, 40:3, 40:11, 58:12, 58:15, 59:8, 81:10 possible [11] - 11:18, 11:23, 26:20, 26:21, 61:25, 62:7, 65:8, 80:2, 83:17, 84:13, 84:17 possibly [2] - 13:10, 60:17 posture [1] - 45:8 potential [21] - 7:20, 11:17, 14:6, 14:15, 17:16, 19:1, 21:21, 29:14, 30:5, 31:8, 32:1, 33:14, 33:17, 36:3, 37:9, 49:9, 50:12, 51:17, 57:11, 64:9, 69:1 potentially [1] -77:12 power [2] - 28:5, 62:17 practice [2] - 12:25, 82:15 **practicing** [1] - 7:25 precision [1] - 52:19 preliminary [1] -44:21 prepare [1] - 33:1 prepared [7] - 6:20, 59:15, 59:19, 62:18, 63:24, 85:2, 85:6 present [5] - 12:2, 40:22, 68:6, 86:25, 87:3 presented [2] - 7:9,

66:14

63:3

relatively [2] - 63:15,

relaxed [1] - 69:22

release [1] - 20:25

released [1] - 54:1

reluctant [2] - 63:1,

rely [1] - 72:4

81:11, 82:19

remain [6] - 26:8,

remaining [1] - 86:12

remedies [1] - 67:13

remember [4] - 32:4,

61:5, 62:16, 64:5,

51:9, 54:6, 76:20

66:24, 69:24

71:10

31:7

53:13

88:12

remembered [2] -

reminded [2] - 71:7,

remove [1] - 20:25

report [2] - 30:21,

repeatedly [1] - 81:2

**REPORTED**[1] - 3:1

reported [1] - 55:12

reporter [2] - 47:1,

**Reporter** [2] - 3:1,

REPORTER [5] -

41:19, 53:6, 53:11,

7:15, 7:24, 10:22,

11:1, 11:20, 13:10,

16:3, 16:25, 17:19,

18:17, 19:2, 21:13,

22:3, 33:3, 36:6,

36:24, 37:9, 38:5,

38:22, 42:4, 42:6,

42:10, 44:3, 61:5,

representation [52] -

7:6, 8:8, 8:12, 10:9,

13:14, 13:17, 13:20,

21:11, 21:17, 21:23,

11:16, 12:3, 12:8,

17:6, 19:11, 20:8,

23:3. 23:22. 25:3.

29:3. 29:15. 29:16.

29:17, 29:18, 29:20,

29:22, 29:23, 30:5,

30:9, 30:24, 31:14,

31:20, 32:7, 32:18,

33:18, 35:2, 35:4,

35:19, 39:18, 40:10,

44:4, 44:18, 49:15,

56:18, 56:19, 61:19,

50:9, 52:9, 56:14,

69:25, 70:9

represent [27] - 7:10,

53:16, 78:22

55:3 22:19, 22:23, 38:15, 14:9, 18:12, 18:14, 65:22 presents [1] - 38:2 38:19, 38:23, 38:25, 18:20, 19:12, 19:15, recitation [1] - 69:20 39:8, 39:22, 43:25, 20:23, 21:4, 21:7, pretty [3] - 14:23, recognizable [1] -44:1, 48:20, 49:15, 21:16, 21:24, 22:10, 5:2 24:23, 71:1 prevent [1] - 65:7 50:7, 67:10 22:11, 23:10, 24:22, recognize [1] - 6:7 previous [1] - 53:21 protected [1] - 39:2 25:1, 25:5, 25:8, recognizing [1] protocols [1] - 9:8 25:19, 26:13 previously [2] - 9:21, 65:12 protracted [1] - 54:7 Rae's 131 - 14:12. 34:15 recommendation [3] 20:20, 22:15 Proud [3] - 33:25, privilege [7] - 17:8, - 30:21, 31:21, 68:4 raise [2] - 4:13, 43:4, 54:8 recommendations 28:2, 28:4, 35:20, 78:25 provide [9] - 13:16, 39:2, 51:10, 55:11 [1] - 31:7 13:19, 16:4, 16:17, raised [14] - 7:6, privileged [3] record [18] - 4:2, 19:10, 31:18, 51:8 21:10, 21:17, 26:19, 29:21, 33:17, 38:2, 9:13, 14:1, 16:23, 49:19, 50:21, 52:17, probabilities [1] -31:12, 31:13 24:6, 24:8, 24:12, 57:7, 63:12, 69:17, provided [5] - 30:22, 26:12 27:6, 28:6, 33:23, 75:11, 79:6, 79:7, 31:20, 67:25, 76:16, probability [1] -41:12, 45:3, 47:10, 86.8 85.15 47:18, 51:4, 53:7, 26:21 ramifications [1] provides [6] - 7:23, 65:5, 65:24 probable [1] - 28:1 11:16, 11:25, 21:25, 45:19 referenced [1] problem [6] - 18:1, rather [3] - 61:6, 38:16, 39:20 70:24 36:13, 64:17, 74:6, 80:4, 86:3 providing [1] - 40:9 77:24, 85:22 refers [1] - 39:1 prudent [1] - 34:25 RDR [3] - 3:1, 88:3, problematic [2] reflect [2] - 70:23, publicly [1] - 34:21 86:11 6:12, 33:20 reached [2] - 47:23, reflected [1] - 49:25 problems [2] - 14:6, **pull** [1] - 41:19 77:12 65:6 purpose [3] - 12:21, reflective [1] - 70:14 reaching [1] - 66:21 79:20, 82:12 regard [8] - 12:14, proceed [9] - 4:5, reaction [3] - 64:2, purposes [2] - 8:25, 13:12, 24:22, 30:1, 4:16, 8:23, 14:21, 74:9. 78:14 28:7, 40:4, 41:1, 22:12 34:17, 66:4, 73:22, read [3] - 21:6, 61:14, 69:5 put [12] - 5:1, 9:13, 78:2 proceeding [1] -25:9, 26:17, 41:5, 43:15, 53:25 regarding [2] -42:2, 47:10, 58:19, reading [1] - 67:3 10:12, 33:14 63:16 reaffirmed [1] - 33:2 regards [1] - 34:25 Proceedings [1] -59:20, 65:4, 85:20, real [2] - 58:18, 69:3 85:25 **REHL** [2] - 1:7, 2:9 87:6 proceedings [4] putting [1] - 72:20 really [9] - 6:6, Rehl [12] - 4:22, 47:4, 47:16, 65:23, puzzled [1] - 51:18 26:18, 26:23, 44:1, 7:10, 8:8, 8:12, 9:4, 59:15, 70:19, 71:11, 88.6 9:7, 9:10, 9:14, 9:21, 83:17 Q 10:13, 28:20, 29:3 proceeds [1] - 81:21 realm [1] - 76:23 relate [3] - 57:19, process [2] - 30:2, reason [9] - 14:4, 76:15, 77:3 85:17 qualify [1] - 23:11 21:8, 21:15, 29:2, processing[1] related [20] - 9:16, questioned [2] -37:18, 40:1, 59:21, 84:21 17:18, 22:4, 22:12, 32:3, 32:16 64:7, 69:16 produced [1] - 88:6 22:21, 29:3, 29:19, questions [8] reasonable [2] productive [1] - 62:5 30:6, 30:9, 30:25, 13:13, 14:20, 14:22, 24:20, 27:24 31:16, 36:5, 38:12, profession[1] -15:4, 17:13, 51:7, reasonably [3] -38:24, 39:9, 40:19, 44:16 56:9, 67:24 11:3, 11:19, 31:13 49:21, 51:17, 67:17, professional [2] quick [1] - 12:12 reasons [4] - 5:7, 11:2. 39:4 quickly [2] - 71:22, 33:4, 34:10, 64:6 relates [6] - 17:3, Professional [1] -72:8 receive [6] - 9:10, 28:16, 28:19, 35:16, 7.21 quite [4] - 21:20, 16:16, 39:16, 40:3, 73:1, 73:11 proffer [1] - 5:2 46:25, 54:17, 83:21 44:19, 72:10 relationship [28] profusely [1] - 66:24 quote [5] - 7:23, received [4] - 38:24, 38:14, 38:17, 39:4, prohibited [1] - 8:1 12:2, 22:1, 22:18, 40:16, 40:23, 50:9 41:7, 43:1, 43:11, proper [3] - 58:20, 39.21 43:16, 43:18, 43:22, receives [1] - 9:7 58:24, 76:7 recent [2] - 7:4, 43:25, 44:1, 44:7, propose [1] - 71:15 R 44:11, 44:12, 49:7, 29.13 prosecution [1] -53:22, 54:5, 55:6, recently [4] - 8:15, 71:6 55:14, 55:19, 56:16, 29:21, 33:15, 55:2 prospect [2] - 32:16, Rae [27] - 7:17, 57:1, 57:9, 58:6, recess [5] - 47:3, 86.8 10:17, 11:7, 11:10, 58:21, 58:22, 64:19, 61:24, 65:9, 65:21, prospective [14] -12:12, 13:5, 13:15,

66:7, 69:12, 77:12 representations [6] -7:11, 20:4, 40:22, 58:5, 66:4, 68:8 representative [1] represented [15] -12:5, 14:7, 14:8, 14:16, 14:17, 16:5, 22:1, 22:2, 31:25, 32:2, 38:4, 43:15, 46:6, 66:16, 76:18 representing [10] -9:3, 10:17, 18:8, 22:8, 32:12, 35:5, 38:11, 49:5, 61:21, 86:23 represents [3] -16:13, 17:17, 36:4 request [3] - 63:25, 85:14, 86:15 requested [1] - 39:4 required [1] - 63:23 requirement [1] -11:8 requires [1] - 9:9 residence [1] - 38:9 resolve [12] - 39:15, 45:15, 59:8, 59:14, 59:19, 59:24, 60:11, 60:16, 61:12, 61:16, 80:17, 84:4 resolved [5] - 64:10, 68:12, 69:15, 72:8, 83:24 respect [19] - 11:2, 23:21, 38:15, 41:7, 42:23, 43:16, 49:14, 49:20, 49:23, 50:13, 55:5, 56:1, 57:21, 67:9, 68:11, 73:5, 73:10, 76:17 responded [2] -32:17, 51:12 response [2] - 71:1, 71.17 responsibilities [1] -11:4 restrained [1] -73:20 restrict [1] - 73:9 restricted [1] - 73:12 result [3] - 14:6, 16:15, 82:16 retake [1] - 65:10 retirement [1] - 29:7 reveal [1] - 38:18 review [2] - 6:14, 57:15 reviewing [1] - 32:8 risk [4] - 12:2, 12:7,

23:7, 23:19 risks [3] - 14:6, 14:15, 14:19 road [1] - 75:3 Road [1] - 2:9 Roger [4] - 35:10, 36:1, 36:19, 37:11 ROGER [2] - 2:20, 2:20 **roiling** [1] **-** 63:5 role [1] - 20:20 rolls [1] - 58:10 room [2] - 6:3, 70:1 Room [1] - 3:3 Roots [41] - 7:4, 8:4, 8:10, 9:5, 9:12, 10:16, 10:19, 10:24, 11:9, 11:19, 11:24, 12:5, 12:11, 12:13, 12:23, 12:24, 13:1, 13:6, 13:8, 13:9, 13:12, 13:13, 13:18, 13:22, 14:7, 18:9, 18:13, 18:15, 18:16, 18:21, 18:22, 19:2, 19:8, 22:9, 24:17, 25:8, 26:8, 27:2, 28:9, 28:16, 28:18 **ROOTS** [18] - 2:20, 2:20, 8:14, 8:20, 9:18, 10:10, 14:3, 19:13, 20:5, 20:8, 20:11, 20:21, 21:12, 21:19, 28:10, 28:22, 29:5, 29:9 Roots's [6] - 7:6, 7:12, 7:15, 7:20, 11:7, 28:15 Rule [20] - 7:21, 10:15, 10:23, 11:1, 11:7, 11:21, 11:24, 21:22, 22:7, 22:8, 22:12, 23:20, 30:23, 31:1. 34:16. 38:13. 38:20, 39:1, 39:18 rule [24] - 7:22, 7:23, 9:9, 11:25, 21:25, 22:7, 22:16, 31:1, 39:20, 40:9, 56:23, 57:1, 70:13, 70:14, 70:15, 70:16, 73:13, 74:4, 81:25, 82:2, 82:4, 82:8, 82:12,

ruled [3] - 4:21, 4:22,

**Rules** [4] - 8:1, 8:7,

rules [8] - 9:6, 10:25,

14:13, 16:2, 31:11,

10:21, 32:6

38:12, 79:14, 81:25
ruling [9] - 62:6,
63:4, 64:4, 64:12,
68:20, 76:7, 82:18,
85:18, 86:2
run [1] - 58:1
running [1] - 83:18

S

SABINO [1] - 2:14
sailing [1] - 29:7
satisfaction [1] 84:5
satisfied [1] - 13:19
satisfy [1] - 70:15
saw [2] - 57:6, 57:8
scenario [2] - 27:15
27:17

**SABINO** [1] - 2:14 **satisfied** [1] - 13:19 **satisfy** [1] - 70:15 saw [2] - 57:6, 57:8 scenario [2] - 27:15, scheduling [2] -83:1, 84:13 school [1] - 15:7 scope [6] - 68:21, 72:13, 72:24, 73:15, 77:2, 85:19 screen [2] - 9:15, 10:18 **screened** [1] - 9:5 screening [1] - 9:7 seal [9] - 4:11, 4:13, 31:16, 37:20, 37:21, 37:25, 41:6, 46:15, 55:3 sealed [3] - 31:17, 42:19. 64:25 search [9] - 43:7, 48:10, 54:22, 66:21, 67:17, 68:13, 68:16, 71:14, 73:1 searched [1] - 38:9 **seat** [1] - 65:19 second [15] - 7:14, 29:11, 34:4, 38:1, 40:18, 41:21, 48:25, 49:20, 50:12, 50:16, 51:14, 52:17, 56:3, 73:7, 79:8 secondary [1] -61:16 seconds [1] - 12:16 secret [13] - 38:25, 39:3, 39:17, 39:25, 40:4, 40:6, 40:16, 40:23, 48:5, 48:6, 50:5, 55:16, 56:24 secrets [8] - 11:8,

17:5, 19:9, 35:18,

39:21, 44:19, 58:7,

66:5

Section [1] - 38:15 see [19] - 5:25, 23:11, 23:13, 23:16, 23:25, 24:12, 26:23, 33:20, 34:15, 37:22, 40:8, 47:20, 50:18, 52:12, 52:13, 59:1, 74:1, 74:6 seeing [3] - 44:2, 49:18, 71:17 **seek** [2] - 24:15, 67:16 seeking [1] - 75:25 seem [7] - 45:9, 45:10, 60:1, 60:7, 77:5, 78:24, 85:24 **segregate** [1] - 9:15 seizure [1] - 43:7 Select [2] - 49:6, 50:15 send [2] - 70:22, 71:16 sending [1] - 71:15 sense [8] - 18:18, 40:21, 43:21, 60:24, 62:3, 72:10, 82:11, 82:12 sensitive [2] - 31:18, 37:20 **separate** [1] - 40:12 sequence [3] -56:13, 57:6, 76:18 served [1] - 80:8 service [1] - 81:22 session [1] - 73:8 **SESSION** [1] - 1:12 set [5] - 7:3, 31:8, 31:15, 76:22, 83:7 setting [1] - 72:14 shall [4] - 7:24, 11:1, 22:2, 38:22 share [13] - 13:9, 17:10, 17:21, 18:3, 18:15, 18:17, 35:22, 36:8, 36:15, 36:23, 36:25, 56:24, 64:9 shared [2] - 19:20, 58:7 **shares** [2] - 17:20, 36.7 sharing [1] - 32:25 Shipley [4] - 19:17, 19:19, 20:1 short [6] - 9:22, 43:2, 43:10, 43:23, 45:14, 76:17 short-lived [1] -43:10 shortcut [1] - 41:6 shortly [1] - 71:1

show [1] - 75:3 sic] [1] - 37:25 side [9] - 23:15, 23:16, 24:24, 62:16, 66:3, 66:5, 71:21, 77:20, 81:5 side's [1] - 33:22 **sidelined** [1] - 63:12 sign [1] - 23:15 signed [2] - 72:2, 72:4 significant [1] - 12:2 similar [6] - 14:13, 27:7, 35:9, 78:3, 78:6, 78:7 similarly [1] - 32:19 **simple** [1] - 62:21 simply [2] - 12:22, 59:19 simultaneous [2] -30:24, 82:4 sitting [2] - 83:2 situation [4] - 10:13, 19:15, 21:22, 34:17 **six** [1] - 60:18 Sixth [2] - 2:18, 63.14 **skip** [1] - 25:20 skittish [2] - 43:13, Slack [2] - 10:1, 20:14 slack [1] - 10:1 slide [1] - 6:11 slides [3] - 5:21, 5:24, 86:1 slightly [1] - 10:14 slowing [1] - 60:8 small [5] - 5:22, 5:23, 5:25, 12:11, 20:20 **Smith** [6] - 52:6, 55:1, 55:8, 66:16, 70:12, 85:12 **SMITH** [18] - 1:21, 1:22, 2:5, 25:18, 26:3, 26:12, 26:20, 27:23, 28:1, 47:9, 47:14, 51:2, 52:2, 60:25, 65:2, 69:19, 70:16, 70:21 so.. [1] - 5:18 social [1] - 44:24 **solution** [2] - 62:21, 80:12 solve [2] - 50:22, 77:24 solved [1] - 52:14 solves [2] - 80:13, 80:14 solving [1] - 85:21

<b>someone</b> [15] - 4:12,
14:9, 25:9, 42:4, 42:7,
44:2, 54:21, 56:25,
57:1, 77:12, 79:16,
79:20, 80:4, 80:5,
80:7
soon [4] - 62:3, 71:1,
80:16, 84:4
T
<b>sorry</b> [6] <b>-</b> 6:8, 53:6,
56:12, 75:10, 84:20,
85:12
<b>sort</b> [10] - 5:24,
19:19, 29:7, 32:11,
38:8, 49:10, 52:12,
58:1, 72:1, 79:25
sorting [1] - 50:3
sought [1] - 67:13
sounds [7] - 8:24,
20:3, 27:19, 69:7,
69:9, 71:24, 80:9
<b>sources</b> [1] - 31:6
speakerphone [1] -
51:20
speaking [6] - 17:8,
35:21, 47:11, 51:19,
53:11, 53:14
special [1] - 32:2
<b>specific</b> [1] - 23:1
specifically [1] -
4:25
speed [2] - 60:17,
60:20
spent [2] - 41:15,
75:4
split [1] - 16:12
spoken [1] - 47:9
stand [2] - 52:24,
66:3
standard [2] - 50:5
start [1] - 83:21
starts [1] - 74:19
<b>state</b> [2] - 58:5,
81:20
statement [2] - 45:6,
53:8
statements [9] -
E-17 10-1E 10-E
5:17, 48:15, 49:5,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 STATES [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 States [7] - 3:2, 4:2,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 STATES [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 States [7] - 3:2, 4:2,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 STATES [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:18 States [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 status [3] - 25:1,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 <b>status</b> [3] - 25:1, 30:8, 59:4
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 STATES [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:18 States [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 status [3] - 25:1,
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 <b>status</b> [3] - 25:1, 30:8, 59:4 <b>statute</b> [1] - 82:2
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 <b>status</b> [3] - 25:1, 30:8, 59:4 <b>statute</b> [1] - 82:2 <b>stay</b> [1] - 81:18
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 <b>status</b> [3] - 25:1, 30:8, 59:4 <b>statute</b> [1] - 82:2 <b>stay</b> [1] - 81:18 <b>stem</b> [1] - 8:6
49:12, 49:14, 54:11, 58:22, 84:1, 86:10 <b>STATES</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 <b>States</b> [7] - 3:2, 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 <b>status</b> [3] - 25:1, 30:8, 59:4 <b>statute</b> [1] - 82:2 <b>stay</b> [1] - 81:18

```
21:23, 31:5
 stenographic [1] -
88:5
 step [3] - 40:24,
50:18, 61:11
 STEVEN [1] - 2:17
 still [8] - 19:2, 32:25,
37:9, 38:18, 39:25,
47:5, 55:22, 79:14
 stipulate [1] - 79:1
 stop [2] - 83:8, 83:11
 stopped [2] - 42:10,
83:20
 story [2] - 43:2, 52:1
 Street [5] - 1:19, 2:3,
2:6, 2:12, 2:15
 strength [1] - 82:6
 strikes [2] - 77:11,
77:14
 structural [1] - 82:3
 structurally [1] -
82:10
 stuff [1] - 10:5
 subject [3] - 70:1,
71:10, 71:12
 subjects [1] - 70:24
 submitted [4] - 6:14,
6:18, 21:1, 25:7
 Subsection [1] -
38:16
 subsequent [2] -
66:19, 67:3
 substance [1] - 76:1
 substantial [1] - 12:7
 substantially [8] -
17:17, 22:3, 22:11,
22:21, 30:25, 36:5,
38:24, 39:9
 sudden [1] - 74:13
 suffice [1] - 23:8
 sufficient [1] - 79:24
 suggest [2] - 26:17,
63:17
 suggested [1] -
54:18
 suggestion [1] -
71:20
 suggests [2] - 5:4,
 Suite [2] - 1:23, 2:12
 sum [1] - 42:9
 suppose [1] - 34:7
 supposed [1] - 16:17
 supreme [1] - 81:20
 suspenders [2] -
11:22, 11:23
 suspicious [1] - 60:9
 swear [2] - 83:14,
```

84:11

system [1] - 15:15

# Т tangential [1] - 7:16 **Tarrio** [21] - 29:17, 29:18, 30:1, 30:2, 30:6, 30:9, 31:4, 31:8, 31:19, 31:22, 32:9, 32:14, 32:16, 32:20, 32:23, 33:6, 42:3, 42:6, 42:16, 54:23, 73:18 **TARRIO**[2] - 1:7, Tarrio's [1] - 30:13 Team [1] - 79:10 team [3] - 26:9, 46:7, 80:4 ten [4] - 47:1, 72:19, 84:6, 84:7 ten-minute [2] -84:6, 84:7 term [1] - 48:5 terms [11] - 20:2, 26:12, 48:4, 56:13, 57:6, 61:11, 67:9, 72:13, 72:23, 74:19, 84:12 terribly [1] - 71:3 testified [3] - 38:3, 75:22, 76:1 testify [2] - 28:2, 86:24 testifying [3] - 32:14, 86:20, 86:24 testimony [10] -

26:19, 39:7, 50:14, 57:7, 73:10, 74:1, 76:16, 77:2, 77:8 textual [1] - 82:3 Thaxton [16] - 29:24, 33:11, 33:18, 33:22, 34:5, 34:6, 34:9, 34:17, 35:1, 35:3, 36:22, 37:3, 42:7, 78:6 **THE** [174] - 1:1, 1:12, 1:16, 1:18, 1:21, 2:2, 2:8, 2:11, 2:17, 4:1, 4:4, 4:19, 4:24, 5:19, 6:6, 6:9, 6:16, 6:19, 7:2, 8:19, 8:23, 10:7, 10:11, 12:17, 12:21, 13:25, 14:4, 14:25, 15:3, 15:7, 15:9, 15:13, 15:17, 15:21, 15:24, 16:2, 16:20, 16:23, 17:2, 17:15, 18:12, 18:20, 18:25, 19:4, 19:6, 19:8, 20:3, 20:6, 20:10, 20:17, 21:8, 21:15, 21:20, 24:13, 25:11, 25:16, 26:1, 26:4, 26:15, 26:25, 27:14, 27:25, 28:6, 28:21, 29:1, 29:8, 29:11, 30:17, 30:20, 34:14, 35:7, 35:11, 35:14, 36:2, 36:20, 37:3, 37:8, 37:12, 37:14, 37:16, 38:1, 41:9, 41:12, 41:19, 41:23, 42:14, 43:24, 44:17, 45:2, 45:23, 46:1, 46:12, 46:16, 46:24, 47:8, 47:12, 47:17, 47:20, 50:17. 51:1. 51:25. 52:3, 53:6, 53:11, 53:13, 53:16, 56:6, 56:10, 56:22, 57:23, 60:14, 60:19, 61:1, 61:3, 61:15, 62:8, 62:23, 62:25, 63:10, 64:1, 64:11, 64:14, 64:20, 64:23, 65:1, 65:3, 65:12, 65:15, 65:17, 65:19, 65:21, 65:24, 66:2, 69:7, 69:18, 70:12, 70:18, 71:19, 72:15, 72:21, 73:17, 73:22, 74:2, 74:21, 74:23, 75:1, 75:9, 75:16, 75:20, 75:24, 77:10, 77:19, 78:22, 79:3, 79:15, 80:6, 81:5, 81:16, 82:21, 82:25, 83:4, 83:10, 83:16, 84:2, 84:10, 84:17, 84:19, 84:23, 85:3, 85:7, 85:9, 85:20, 86:13, 86:22 theoretical [2] - 24:6, 27:9 theory [4] - 14:9, 35:15, 40:10, 57:2

35:15, 40:10, 57:2
thereafter [1] - 22:2
therefore [2] - 11:6,
11:9
therefrom [1] - 9:6
Thereupon [3] 47:3, 47:15, 65:22
they've [2] - 19:22,
37:19
thinking [4] - 8:21,
24:1, 55:17, 60:12
thinks [6] - 4:12,
23:23, 33:9, 80:18,
81:6, 83:20

third [4] - 11:5, 14:17, 29:23, 53:4 thorough [1] - 30:22 thoroughly [1] - 30:3 three [3] - 29:14, 81:14, 84:14 threshold [3] -48:22, 48:23, 67:9 **throughout** [1] - 5:16 timing [2] - 50:8, 59:17 **TIMOTHY**[1] - 1:12 to.. [1] - 24:2 today [10] - 8:5, 15:17, 15:19, 58:22, 59:25, 64:12, 75:5, 76:6, 76:10, 82:22 together [1] - 5:5 tomorrow [22] -58:10, 59:2, 59:5, 59:14, 59:25, 60:17, 71:18, 72:7, 72:8, 75:3, 77:23, 77:25, 78:15, 81:23, 83:14, 83:25, 85:2, 85:6, 86:2, 86:5, 87:4, 87:5 tonight [3] - 70:23, 71:16, 80:19 took [6] - 41:16, 44:3, 47:20, 66:22, 69:25, 70:5 top [1] - 11:23 topic [1] - 46:2 totally [1] - 10:4 touch [2] - 42:2, 43:8 tough [1] - 42:1 transcript [17] - 32:9, 34:22, 38:6, 42:24, 43:16, 49:3, 50:1, 53:18, 53:25, 57:6, 57:15, 66:20, 67:4, 73:24, 75:17, 88:5, TRANSCRIPT[1] -

1:11
transmitted [1] 46:8
TRIAL [1] - 1:11
trial [10] - 27:12,
27:13, 58:24, 77:13,
77:15, 79:12, 79:17,
80:25, 81:18, 86:6
tries [1] - 6:21
trivial [1] - 72:23
true [6] - 43:17,
53:24, 55:21, 88:4,
88:5
truth [4] - 49:24,
52:7, 52:8, 52:23

try [10] - 6:24, 15:3,

43:3, 43:5, 44:11, 44:13, 54:7, 59:13, 77:24, 83:17 trying [5] - 45:13, 54:21, 55:18, 80:11, 84:15 turn [5] - 27:5, 29:11, 37:16, 59:17, 70:25 turned [1] - 32:11 turning [1] - 41:15 turns [1] - 40:5 two [31] - 5:7, 7:5, 7:15, 14:17, 16:13, 24:16, 25:21, 26:23, 27:4, 29:19, 29:20, 30:25, 33:13, 34:10, 40:7, 42:25, 49:17, 51:12, 52:11, 53:21, 55:12, 55:14, 55:16, 65:6, 71:13, 79:18, 81:14, 81:16, 84:14, 84:22, 85:11 type [1] - 15:9 typically [1] - 9:9

#### U

ultimately [1] - 38:17 unaware [1] - 62:13 under [28] - 4:11, 4:13, 9:6, 10:21, 10:23, 10:25, 11:25, 14:12, 15:17, 22:7, 22:12, 31:11, 31:16, 32:6, 37:5, 37:20, 37:21, 37:25, 38:13, 38:20, 39:1, 39:2, 41:6, 46:15, 55:3, 56:15, 58:23, 79:8 understood [9] -30:20, 33:2, 49:5, 62:23, 67:4, 67:5, 77:10, 81:4, 84:24 undertake [1] - 39:23 unfair [1] - 5:8 unfolding [1] - 62:14 **UNITED**[4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:13, 1:18 united [2] - 3:2, 61:20 United [6] - 4:2, 24:4, 34:24, 47:18, 65:25, 88:13 unless [6] - 22:6, 33:9, 34:12, 51:24, 80:7, 82:14 unlike [1] - 78:3 unreasonable [1] -28:3

unrelated [2] - 10:4, 34:10
unscathed [1] - 4:7
untethered [1] - 23:6
unworkable [1] - 82:16
up [20] - 6:10, 24:11, 24:14, 27:10, 32:14, 38:11, 45:1, 46:21, 47:1, 47:9, 47:11, 49:1, 54:19, 54:22, 63:6, 73:5, 74:13, 80:12, 81:12, 83:17
updated [1] - 85:15
uses [1] - 9:25

# ٧

Vegas [1] - 20:24

veracity [4] - 49:13, 49:24, 56:2, 73:10 verdict [1] - 47:23 versed [1] - 31:24 version [1] - 5:25 versus [3] - 4:3, 47:19, 66:1 video [4] - 6:11, 6:12, 6:13, 85:23 view [8] - 9:16, 45:3, 47:25, 63:1, 63:15, 64:1, 68:9, 69:4 virtue [1] - 18:9 vis-à-vis [1] - 23:10 vs [1] - 1:5

## W

wait [1] - 47:12 waiting [1] - 78:17 waivable [2] - 11:15, 31:11 waive [9] - 28:4, 40:8, 40:19, 50:19, 52:12, 52:13, 82:5, 82:13 waived [3] - 58:13, 58:15, 82:13 waiver [12] - 67:16, 67:18, 68:2, 68:18, 68:19, 70:23, 71:12, 72:1, 72:13, 72:24, 82:5 waives [1] - 13:18 walk [2] - 4:6, 10:25 wall [2] - 67:16, 67:18 walled [7] - 10:4, 10:5, 28:15, 28:18, 28:23, 28:25, 70:23

walled-off [1] - 70:23 wants [5] - 41:4, 52:20, 59:10, 60:5, 60:20 warning [2] - 41:22, 81:1

warrant [1] - 48:11 Washington [5] -1:6, 1:20, 2:4, 3:4, 88:14

water [1] - 43:11 wave [1] - 15:1 ways [2] - 51:12, 82:2

weaker [1] - 32:22 wedding [1] - 20:23 week [5] - 9:13, 51:16, 56:20, 62:15, 83:5

weeks [1] - 31:15 well-versed [1] -31:24 West [1] - 2:15

whatnot [1] - 81:22 whatsoever [2] -10:10, 21:14 whole [2] - 53:25, 62:9

William [1] - 7:17 withdraw [4] - 30:11, 30:19, 33:8, 62:7 withdrawal [1] -30:14

witness [18] - 14:9, 22:25, 23:16, 24:24, 25:9, 25:13, 25:19, 28:1, 33:23, 34:7, 34:11, 39:12, 45:11, 49:9, 50:13, 71:5, 71:17, 85:6

**witnesses** [2] **-** 86:23, 87:2

wondering [2] - 60:9, 84:12 word [3] - 20:14,

51:9, 76:20 **words** [1] - 34:7

works [1] - 29:6 worst [3] - 27:15, 27:17, 59:3

worst-case [2] - 27:15, 27:17 worth [1] - 11:14

writ [1] - 81:21 writing [2] - 72:15, 72:18

writings [1] - 25:7 written [2] - 9:9, 30:13 Υ

year [1] - 9:21 Yellow [1] - 41:17 York [4] - 1:23, 2:19

Ζ

**ZACHARY**[1] - 1:7 **zealous**[1] - 16:16