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PROCEEDINGS
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good morning, Your Honor. We're on the record for Criminal Case 21-582, United States of America vs. Michael Sussmann.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everybody. Just give me a second to get situated up here.
(Pause)
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Just to enter our appearances: Andrew DeFilippis, Brittain Shaw, Jonathan Algor, and Michael Keilty for the government this morning.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, everybody.
Mr. Durham, welcome. I didn't say hello yesterday.

MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Good morning.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, just a couple of preliminary matters from the government.

One is we wanted to inform the court and the defense that we learned last evening that Dr. Manos Antonakakis, who is on our witness list, has decided to invoke his Fifth Amendment right, and so we will not be calling him as a witness.

We also just wanted to flag for the Court that Ms. Kori Arsenault, our paralegal who will be sitting at
counsel table throughout the trial, will likely serve as a summary witness, and so we just want to get the Court's permission, without objection from the defense, that she can both serve as a summary witness and sit at counsel table.

THE COURT: That's fine.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
All right. I think we still have a couple of straggler jurors. With 16 that may be more of a problem than usual.

All right. There are a couple of evidentiary issues that are on my plate. Who wants to address the expert supplemental notifications?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, very briefly, these are the issues that the defense has flagged. First, I think the main issue that they addressed in their motion is that they object to testimony from Special Agent Martin to the effect that what -- to the -- testimony that would describe what it is that DNS data or look-ups can allow one to conclude and what they cannot allow one to conclude.

We intend, through Special Agent Martin, to keep that discussion completely unconnected to the facts of this particular case. So, for example, Your Honor, we expect that Special Agent Martin will say that by looking at a DNS look-up alone one cannot tell whether an email was actually
sent, whether a communication actually occurred. And that, Your Honor, is not in any way controversial. It's not opining on the facts of this case, or even on any particular data.

All it's doing, Your Honor, is to explain to the jury what DNS data is and what a person can conclude from the existence of that data alone. And I think that's important for them to understand.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't hear the defense to object to that; in other words, Subcategories 1 through 3. It's sort of 4 through 9, which deal with a concept or several different concepts.

And as I understand it, you know, there are -there's an almost infinite amount of DNS traffic in the world; and if someone collects a sample data set of traffic to or from a particular domain name, the conclusions that can be drawn from that data set will depend upon how that sample size compares to the universe of DNS data that is out there. And that strikes me as a matter of statistics, whether the sample size is representative enough to draw conclusions from. I think I get that.

You know, if you wanted to know how many threepointers Seth Curry hit in a season, you'd want access to all of his games, not just 10 games or 20 games or home games, right?

And so, you know, that doesn't sound terribly controversial to me, but I guess the question for this case is, you know, how is that rooted in what the FBI actually included or looked at or drew conclusions from in this case?

I mean, I take it that the ultimate goal is to show that the visibility or the data coverage or the sample size somehow affected the trajectory of the investigation. Is that ultimately what this is going to be used to show?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: So I think -- and you're right, Your Honor, that was the -- we understood them to flag the first, but also this issue.

I think all we expect Special Agent Martin to do is explain the concept of visibility to the jury. And the reason why he needs to explain that for the jury to evaluate materiality is because whenever the Bureau investigates data that it has received -- and particularly DNS data -- the insight or lack of insight one has into the visibility of that data -- in other words, you know, is this 2 percent of available traffic or 90 percent? -- in evaluating the data itself, that is a concept that the Bureau has to consider. And so it goes to the materiality of the origins of that data.

THE COURT: Well, but isn't the question here whether a case agent -- is your case agent later going to testify that that was something that the FBI looked at or
wanted to look at in this case and was unable to do so, and that that negatively affected the FBI's investigation in some way?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Yes, and I expect Special Agent Hellman, who will testify likely today, Your Honor, I expect that that is a concept that he will say was relevant to the determination that -- determinations he was making as he drafted analysis of the data that came in.

And, again, I don't think we -- for example, another way in which this comes up is that the FBI routinely receives DNS data from various private companies who collect that data, and it is always relevant sort of the breadth of visibility that those companies have. So it's relevant generally, but also in this particular case the fact that the FBI did not have insight into the visibility or lack of visibility of that data certainly affected steps that the FBI took.

THE COURT: Okay. But Mr. Sussman has not been accused of misrepresenting who the source is. He's simply -- but rather who the client is. So how do you link that to the materiality of the alleged false statement?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Because, Your Honor, I think we view them as intertwined. It was because -- it was in part because Mr. Sussman said he didn't have a client that made it more difficult for the FBI to get to the bottom of the
source of this data or made it less likely they would, and so -- and, again, I don't think we expect to dwell for a long time on this, but $I$ think the agents and the technical folks will say that that is part of why the origins of the data are extremely relevant when they took investigative steps here.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: And I would note one more thing --

THE COURT: There's also a reference to testimony about spoofing of data. Is there going to be any testimony that this data was spoofed or that the FBI analyzed the data and concluded that because it was spoofed it undermined the support for the allegation?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Yes. So, today, Your Honor, we -- Special Agent Hellman --

THE COURT: And tell me what "spoofed" means in lay terms.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: So "spoofed," Your Honor, refers to the concept that it's always a possibility, when you look at DNS data, that it was intentionally created to create the appearance of look-ups or transactions between two computers or two IP addresses, but that those did not, in fact, occur.

And Special Agent Hellman, when he testifies today -- now, Your Honor's ruling we understand to permit us
to put into evidence anything about what the FBI analyzed and concluded as its investigation unfolded because that goes to the materiality of the defendant's statement. So Special Agent Hellman -- through Agent Hellman we will offer into evidence a paper he prepared when the data first came in, and among its conclusions is that the data might -- he doesn't use the word "spoof" -- but might have been intentionally generated and might have been fabricated. That was the FBI's initial conclusion in what it wrote up.

So in order for the jury to understand the course of the FBI's investigation and the conclusions that it drew at each stage, those concepts are at the center of it.

THE COURT: Did the FBI ultimately determine that the data was fabricated in any way?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: It ultimately did not reach a conclusion on that.

You know, as you know, the CIA --
THE COURT: So that did not bear on its conclusion that the allegations were not substantiated?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, I think we'll have to -- we'll ask Agent Hellman that. I think it certainly was part of the mix.

The lack of visibility into the authenticity of that data -- in other words, the lack of confidence they were able to establish that it was real data -- certainly
contributed to the final conclusions of the investigation. THE COURT: We spent a lot of time, Counsel, talking about data accuracy, and this strikes me as now getting into whether data was falsified or not. And with the defense's representation that it will not suggest that there was a link based on the data, I thought that at least -- that sounds, to me, out of bounds.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Okay. Your Honor, I'm sorry. We understood your ruling to be that the FBI's conclusions as it went along were okay as long as we weren't asserting the conclusion that it was, in fact, fabricated.

You know, I mean, it's difficult to chart the course of the FBI's investigation unless we can elicit at each stage what it is that the FBI concluded.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bosworth. I'm sorry, Mr. Bosworth.

MR. BOSWORTH: Yes, Your Honor. And I think the colloquy you were just having gets to the central concern, which is based on the proof that we think that the government is trying to elicit, including what they're now trying to elicit from the expert. They're using the ruling that they can get into the ultimate conclusions the FBI drew as a back door to showing why the data was inaccurate.

The concern here is that if they can start offering expert testimony on when data can be fabricated or
not, if they can start offering testimony on, you know, how strong the data is, if they can elicit from an agent --

THE COURT: Just on the sample size strength of the data.

MR. BOSWORTH: Yes.
THE COURT: I mean, do you contest that? Those seem pretty uncontroversial propositions.

MR. BOSWORTH: It is uncontroversial, and the FBI never asked about it.

So it is true, right, that the strength of the conclusions would depend on the volume of the data, where the data came from. The FBI never asked. They never asked Mr. Sussman. They never said, "Who are these cyber experts? Where did they get this stuff from?"

So it is true, and it is an uncontestable proposition, but they never asked about it here.

And obviously, if Your Honor lets in that testimony, we can deal with it on cross-examination and argument, but it is a little curious now with, you know, this range of expert testimony about the strength, you know, of the conclusions you can draw based on the sample size of the DNS data. To have that argument when that was never anything that they looked into during the investigation just feels a little weird.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll allow the testimony about
the statistical shortcomings or contours of the DNS data. I will not allow him to talk about whether it's fabricated or spoofed. I think that definitely encroaches on the Court's order regarding the data, and I think it's a little inconsistent with how the government has represented previously that it was not challenging or would not be contending that the data was false. And so I don't want to get into that.

But in terms of the statistical significance and how that might relate to the weakness or the strengths of the conclusions that one can draw from the data, I think that's fair game.

All right. On -- go ahead.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, just --
THE COURT: And the defense can deal with that in cross.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Yes. Logistically, Your Honor, we do have the paper I referenced, which the agent prepared, which we intended to offer into evidence. I guess we would propose, then, that the portion of the paper that discusses that issue, the potential fabrication or spoofing, we would redact?

THE COURT: Yes.
And is there any objection to the paper coming in?
MR. BERKOWITZ: Your Honor, we had raised this
issue with Mr. DeFilippis last night. It may actually be worthwhile for the Court to take a look at it. It's about a two-and-a-half-page paper.

The high-level conclusions we certainly have no objections coming in, too; in other words, the top of it and the fact that they draw certain conclusions and close it out and pass it along.

There's some level of detail that $I$ want to review closer. We had raised the fabrication point, and why don't we take a crack at seeing if we can agree --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BERKOWITZ: -- as to what it looks like; and if not, we'll raise it with you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sounds good.
MR. BERKOWITZ: Wonderful.
THE COURT: All right. And on Mr. Steele?
MR. DeFILIPPIS: I'm sorry, Your Honor, did you
want to hear from the government?
THE COURT: Yes, just a few questions.
I guess the question -- the basic question is what testimony do you want to elicit about him; and what documents, if any, do you want to try to introduce and through whom?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Yes.
THE COURT: I know there's been a lot of talk
about the general topic, but what is it exactly you want to get in?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: So I think it would come down mainly to this, Your Honor. First, the defendant, in his testimony before Congress, described his meeting with Mr. Steele at Perkins Coie, so when we read in his testimony into evidence, likely pursuant to a stipulation, we would propose to cover that portion of the testimony.

Second, when Mr. Priestap testifies, the same page of notes that contains the notes we're all familiar with about the Alfa-Bank matter also contains a series of notes reflecting the receipt of the Steele dossier information by FBI headquarters on the same day.

THE COURT: And when you say "the Steele dossier information," do you mean the entire dossier or just the parts of the dossier that relate to Alfa-Bank?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: So I think what we would elicit through him is that -- so the dossier's drafting continued after September 19th and actually continued even after the election, so it was a portion of the dossier.

We would intend only to elicit from Mr. Priestap the fact that the dossier or some portion of the dossier came into FBI headquarters on that day. I don't think we would offer --

THE COURT: So you're not offering the dossier or
a redacted version of the dossier. You just want to connect the dots between Mr. Sussman and Mr. Steele through the meeting, and the fact that the FBI received similar allegations in the form of a dossier?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Correct. And I think, Your Honor, we -- in that testimony, we probably would not even have Mr. Priestap testify to the specific content of any dossier report, just to reflect its receipt. And I think the notes reflect that they were aware that it was prepared by an opposition research firm, Fusion GPS, at the behest of a law firm, so we would elicit that sort of --

THE COURT: And the evidentiary purpose would be to bolster your motive?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: I think motive, Your Honor. Also materiality. Because the notion is that if the Bureau knew that the same campaign and the same law firm and the same investigative firm were presenting the Alfa-Bank matter and the Steele matter at essentially the same time, it would have affected their views of those materials and the steps they took.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: And then we may, Your Honor -with Mr. Elias today, we may elicit broadly Mr. Elias's role in, of course, retaining Fusion GPS, but also the Steele dossier's role in that broader project. Again, without
going into any specifics of any reports.
And then finally, Your Honor, we would -- likely through an FBI agent -- seek to either elicit or offer into evidence the dossier report that references Alfa-Bank, but no other dossier reports.

THE COURT: And is this the same dossier report that Mr. Priestap received?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, I would have to check which reports came in on which day, but I don't think he would be able to speak to the granularity of that either. In other words, I don't think he will know whether that report came in on a particular day.

I mean, it does bear a -- it has a date on it, I think, of September 14th, but --

THE COURT: And is that report the same as White Paper 3?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: No. In fact, it doesn't speak to data or even a secret server. What it speaks to is Alfa-Bank's reported ties to the Kremlin.

THE COURT: Mr. Berkowitz?
MR. BERKOWITZ: Judge, this would be an incredibly prejudicial and damaging line of questioning and evidence that is wholly disconnected from relevance. The facts that will come in at trial are as follows:

Mr. Sussman, on or about July 29th of 2016, was
asked to, quote, vet Mr. Steele in a meeting at Perkins Coie's offices. I believe he testified largely to that before Congress.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I understand that.
MR. BERKOWITZ: Yes.
THE COURT: But he met with him.
MR. BERKOWITZ: Correct.
THE COURT: And the government may suggest that the purpose of the meeting was other than to vet. And so why isn't that -- at least the meeting and any activities that Mr. Sussman and Mr. Steele were involved in together or that Mr. Sussman was knowledgeable of, why isn't that the subject of cross-examination?

MR. BERKOWITZ: So, first of all, which witness are we going to cross-examine about that? Mr. Steele is not testifying.

There is no evidence, that I'm aware of, that will come in that says what they spoke about or that Alfa-Bank even came up in that meeting. No evidence.

Number two, the evidence related to the Steele dossier that they say arrived in Mr. Priestap's --

THE COURT: Was Mr. Elias at the meeting?
MR. BERKOWITZ: I don't -- I believe Mr. Elias's
testimony will be he doesn't recall being at that meeting.
Number two, Mr. Priestap's undated notes
suggesting receipt from a foreign intelligence source of a Steele dossier are accurate. What they are trying to do is to suggest that it was somehow coordinated.

What Mr. DeFilippis left out is that, in unrelated testimony that will not come in in this court, Mr. Steele has talked about the fact that he was a British intelligence agent known as Crown who provided the information to British intelligence in his capacity as a confidential source for them, and British intelligence passed it along to the FBI several days before or weeks before, and it landed on Mr. Priestap's desk on or around the same time.

THE COURT: And you can't get that in?
MR. BERKOWITZ: We can't get it in. Neither can they. And so the suggestion that there was some coordinated effort is actually inconsistent with what we believe the evidence is.

If Mr. Steele were here, it would be a different kettle of fish, but the suggestion that there is this -that the Steele dossier was part of some larger conspiracy is just not true, number one.

And more importantly, there's not any evidence, other than inference, that Mr. Sussman met on one day with Mr. Steele and all of a sudden all of the work that Mr. Steele does that has any Alfa issues all of a sudden becomes relevant in the trial against Mr. Sussman for motive
evidence.
And the absence of their ability to tie it up and establish a direct connection is not prejudicial, but will leave a misleading impression on the jury of the connections.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to reserve on this. Don't open on Steele. I will likely allow you to ask Mr. Elias about that meeting to the extent that he remembers.

I'm not inclined to let in the dossier, and I want to go back and read the testimony regarding how the information came to the FBI, okay?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, I apologize. Just two very quick factual points because I just want to make sure the Court has an accurate understanding.

It is not the case that the dossier came to the FBI through British intelligence. Mr. Steele gave it to an FBI agent in Rome, and it made its way from that agent to FBI headquarters. Mr. Steele was, we understand, in communication with Fusion GPS about that, but it did not come through British intelligence.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me just ask this question. Can the government proffer any evidence that the report was given to Mr. Priestap as part of the oppo research effort that we've all been talking about as opposed to through

British intelligence or another source?
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, I think what we --
THE COURT: And is the jury just going to speculate about how it got there?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Two things, Your Honor.
One, Ms. Seago, who will testify either today or tomorrow, will say that she met with Christopher Steele. So certainly there will be evidence in the record that this was part of Fusion GPS's opposition research. They, in fact, hired Mr. Steele.

And secondly, the very same testimony that Mr. Berkowitz just cited of Christopher Steele in an overseas proceeding, in that same testimony he said that the first time he learned about the Alfa-Bank secret server allegations was in that meeting with Mr. Sussman when, number one, he said Mr. Sussman told him about the allegations; and, number two, he testified that immediately after that meeting Fusion GPS tasked him to write a paper, a dossier report, about Alfa-Bank.

So while we are not going to call Mr. Steele at trial, in terms of proffering to the Court, we certainly have strong suggestion that it was, at least in part, very much part of the Fusion GPS opposition research effort.

THE COURT: Okay. And does the Court have that foreign testimony?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: I don't think you do, Your Honor, but we are happy to get it to you.

THE COURT: If you could give that to me.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Sure, sure.
MR. BERKOWITZ: And, Your Honor, we'll provide you with the public document that we were referring to in terms of his acting as a British intelligence source and so forth, so you'll have that as well.

THE COURT: Please do. Thank you.
All right. Is the jury ready?
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes.
THE COURT: We're going to bring them in. I will give them the standard preliminary instructions. There was one small dispute in the parties' suggestions with respect to the instructions.

Mr. DeFilippis, you don't want me to say that the indictment alleges that he was acting on behalf of specific clients and then name those clients? Isn't that exactly what the indictment alleges?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, if we had such an objection, we'll drop it.

THE COURT: Very well. Okay.
You can bring them in.
(Jury enters courtroom)
THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

JURORS IN UNISON: Good morning.
THE COURT: You all came back. I hope you had a good evening and are ready to go.

Before we begin opening statements in the case, I'd like to give you a few preliminary instructions just to explain how the trial will work and some of the ground rules that we'll follow for the next two weeks. These instructions are no substitute for the detailed legal instructions that $I$ will give you at the end of the trial, but, again, they're just intended to give you a sense of what will be going on in the courtroom and what your responsibilities as jurors will be.

Now, the first thing you should notice is that each one of you has been given a notebook. Some jurors find it useful to take notes; some find it distracting. It is entirely up to you whether to take notes or not. If you do take notes, feel free to write down whatever you'd like.

The notebooks will be locked in the courtroom during recesses and overnight and will be destroyed at the end of trial, so you should not worry about anyone ever seeing what you write in your notebook.

As I noted yesterday, there are 16 of you, but only 12 of you will wind up deliberating in this case. Usually there are only two alternates, but, because of the COVID risks and some other factors, we have decided to
expand that number to four alternates for this particular trial. The four alternate seats were randomly selected before we picked the jury. I will not disclose to anyone who the alternates are until the end of my final instructions and before the jury begins its deliberations.

And any of the seats could be alternate seats. It could be the far four over there, the far four over here, or any number in the middle. So because any seat could be the alternate seat, you should think of yourselves as regular jurors and give this case your fullest and most serious attention during trial.

As I explained yesterday, this is a criminal case that began when a grand jury issued an indictment. The defendant, Michael Sussmann, is being tried on a single criminal charge: that he willfully and knowingly made a materially false, fictitious, and fraudulent statement or representation in a matter before the Federal Bureau of Investigation; namely, that Mr. Sussman stated to the general counsel of the FBI that he was not acting on behalf of any client in conveying particular allegations, when, in fact, he was acting on behalf of two specific clients, namely Rodney Joffe and the Hillary Clinton Campaign.

Mr. Sussman has pled not guilty to that charge.
At the end of the trial, you will have to decide whether or not the evidence presented has convinced you
beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Sussman committed this offense.

To prove the offense, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the charged offense. I will give you instructions on those elements at the end of the case.

You should understand that the indictment that I just summarized is not evidence. The indictment is just a formal way of charging a person with a crime in order to bring him or her to trial. You must not think of the indictment as evidence of the guilt of the defendant just because he has been indicted. And, again, at the end of the trial you will have to decide whether the government has proven each element beyond a reasonable doubt.

Every defendant, including Mr. Sussman, is presumed to be innocent. This presumption remains throughout the trial unless and until he is proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden is always on the government.

If the government proves each element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt, it is your duty to find Mr. Sussman guilty of the offense. But if you find the government has not proven one or more element of the offense, you must find Mr. Sussman not guilty.

Now, throughout the trial you will hear me refer
to the government or the Special Counsel. When I do that, I mean the prosecution team or one of the lawyers from the Special Counsel's Office. And I know they introduced themselves yesterday, but why don't we have Ms. Shaw introduce the prosecution team again.

MS. SHAW: Thank you, Your Honor.
Good morning. My name is Brittain Shaw. I'm joined at counsel table with Andrew DeFilippis, Jonathan Algor, Michael Keilty, John Durham, and Kori Arsenault. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And when I refer to the defense, I mean the defendant or defense counsel or any other member of the defense team.

Mr. Berkowitz?
MR. BERKOWITZ: Good morning. Nice to see everybody again.

As I said yesterday, my name is Sean Berkowitz, and I, along with Michael Bosworth, Natalie Rao, and Catherine Yao have the privilege of representing Michael Sussmann, who is present in court at the end of the table. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. So the trial will proceed over the next couple of weeks in four stages.

First will be opening statements. The government will begin with its opening statement, and I believe the
defendant will give an opening statement thereafter. The opening statements by the lawyers are not evidence. They are intended simply to give you a roadmap or a preview of what the evidence or what each side thinks the evidence will show.

The second stage is the presentation of evidence. The government will begin with what we call its case-inchief. They will call witnesses. An attorney will conduct a direct examination of a witness, followed by crossexamination by the other side, and a brief redirect examination by the government.

After the government's case, the defense may, but is not required to, put on its case-in-chief. If it does, it will follow the same order: direct examination, crossexamination, and redirect.

The government may then choose to bring a brief rebuttal case.

During the presentation of evidence, the lawyers will be asking questions. Like their opening statements, their questions are not evidence. The only evidence is the sworn testimony of witnesses and exhibits or documents admitted into evidence.

The third stage of the case will be instructions on the law, and that's when $I$ will give you detailed instructions that you will use during your deliberations.

The fourth stage will be closing arguments, again, in the same order: the government, the defense, and then a brief rebuttal by the government. Like the other arguments, closing arguments are not evidence. They are only intended to help you understand what the evidence has shown from each side's perspective.

I will then give you a few final instructions, and you will begin your deliberations.

My responsibilities are to run a fair and efficient trial, to rule on legal questions that arise during the trial, and to instruct you on the law. It is your sworn duty to accept the law as I instruct.

For your part, you -- and only you -- are the ultimate deciders of the facts in this case. You will weigh the evidence, and you will judge the credibility and the believability of the witnesses.

You are likely to hear me sustain an objection -or occasionally attorneys will object to questions by the other side or the admission of evidence by the other side. Occasionally I will sustain an objection. If I do that, the question must be withdrawn, and you must not speculate what the witness's answer would be.

If the witness has already answered a question, an objection to which I have sustained, I will strike that answer from the record, and you are to disregard what the
witness said.
If I overrule an objection, that means the question stands, and the witness must answer the question.

When the parties object to a question or to the admission of evidence, they are simply doing their jobs. Do not fault one side or the other for objecting more or less to the other side's questions.

As I will continue to remind you throughout the trial, it is very important that you not discuss the case with anyone, including your fellow juror members. Also avoid listening to or reading anything about the case.

We're all going to be in the same courthouse for the next couple of weeks, and it seems like a big building, but you are likely to run into folks in the hall. There are lots of parties in this case. You may run into the defendant or into one or more of the lawyers or into folks on my staff. If the attorneys or anyone avoid contact with you, they are not being rude; they're just trying to observe the rules of the Court, so don't take any offense from that.

If you hear a conversation about the case in your presence, please let Ms. Jenkins or one of the marshals know, and we'll figure out how to deal with that.

I hope and expect not, but it is possible that you might be approached during trial by a member of the media. You are not to speak with anyone about the trial, including
the media, while the trial is ongoing. If you are approached, and it makes you feel uncomfortable saying no, please let me know that that has happened.

Once the trial is over, it will be up to you whether to talk about the trial and with whom.

Again, no independent research about the case or social media postings about the case.

Ms. Moreira here is our crack court reporter. She will be taking down everything that is said in open court, but you will not have a transcript of the trial back in the jury room when you begin your deliberations. You must rely on your memories and your notes, if you choose to take them.

All right? So with that, ladies and gentlemen, please pay close attention, and we will begin with the opening statement from, I believe, Ms. Shaw.

MS. SHAW: Thank you, Your Honor.
The evidence will show that this is a case about privilege: the privilege of a well-connected D.C. lawyer with access to the highest levels of the FBI; the privilege of a lawyer who thought that he could lie to the FBI without consequences; the privilege of a lawyer who thought that for the powerful the normal rules didn't apply, that he could use the FBI as a political tool.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, on September 19, 2016, the defendant, Michael Sussmann, a high-powered D.C.
lawyer, went to the FBI bringing serious allegations about a presidential candidate on the eve of the election, serious allegations about secret communications with a foreign adversary. But when the defendant walked into FBI headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue, the evidence will show that he bypassed normal channels. He went straight to the FBI general counsel's office, the FBI's top lawyer. He then sat across from that lawyer and lied to him. He told a lie that was designed to achieve a political end, a lie that was designed to inject the FBI into a presidential election.

What was the lie? The defendant told the FBI general counsel that he was bringing them information about a presidential candidate on his own, not on behalf of any client, but as a good citizen.

But the evidence will show that that wasn't true. The defendant wasn't there as a concerned citizen. He was doing it not for one client, but for two: the opposing presidential campaign and an Internet executive. The defendant lied to direct the power and resources of the FBI to his own ends and to serve the agendas of his clients.

Now, as the judge has just told you, the defendant is charged with one count of making false statements to the FBI; that is, for willfully and knowingly making a materially false statement to the general counsel of the FBI. And the government's evidence will show you beyond a
reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of that charge.

So let me briefly tell you what the evidence will show.

The evidence will show that on Sunday, September 18th, the defendant, a powerful attorney at a major D.C. law firm, texted his friend, James Baker, who was the FBI's general counsel; like I said, its top lawyer. He texted Baker on Baker's personal cell phone, and he asked to meet Baker the next day. He told Baker he had something timesensitive and sensitive he wanted to give to the FBI.

The defendant went on to write in this text that he was, quote, coming on his own, not on behalf of any client or company, unquote, and that he just wanted to, quote, help the Bureau, end quote.

You will see the text for yourselves. You will see that these are the defendant's own words.

Now, Baker had known the defendant since they served together at the Department of Justice years before, and so he agreed to meet with him on short notice. He agreed to meet with him on an urgent basis because he trusted him.

The evidence will further show that when the defendant met with the general counsel of the FBI, that that is when he committed the crime charged here.

The defendant lied to the FBI official's face. When they met, he told Baker again that he was not there on behalf of any client, that he just wanted to help the FBI. That is the false statement that's charged in the indictment.

The evidence will show that the defendant then proceeded to tell Baker that he had received information and data that supposedly showed a secret channel of communication between the Trump organization and a Russian bank called Alfa-Bank. The defendant told Mr. Baker that some cyber researchers had come upon this secret channel and that a major news outlet was set to run the story within days.

The evidence will show that the defendant gave Mr. Baker two thumb drives containing that data as well as white papers that describe the allegations. He gave him these thumb drives, and he left.

Now, you will hear from James Baker that after that meeting he came away thinking that Mr. Sussman had given this information to him as a good citizen, not on behalf of any client. You will learn that Baker and other high-ranking FBI officials promptly opened a case and directed FBI resources to investigate these serious allegations. They opened an investigation, an investigation that would later find that the server was merely a spam
email server used for sending out marketing emails. The server did not reflect a crime, nor was it a threat to national security.

But there was a crime in all of this: the defendant's lie to the FBI's general counsel. He lied to the FBI's general counsel saying he was not acting on behalf of any client.

The evidence will also show that the defendant was there not on behalf of just one client, but on two clients: the Hillary Clinton Campaign and an Internet executive named Rodney Joffe.

Now, before I talk about the evidence, let me address the proverbial elephant in the room.

Some people have very strong feelings about politics and about Russia, and many people have strong feelings about Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. But we are not here because these allegations involve either of them, nor are we here because the defendant's client was the Clinton Campaign.

We are here because the FBI is our institution that should not be used as a political tool for anyone; not Republicans, not Democrats, not anyone. So whatever your political views might be, they can't be brought to your decisions that you will be asked to make in this courtroom.

Your task in this trial is straightforward. As

Judge Cooper explained to you, your role is to consider the evidence and apply the law as he instructs you. And I expect that one of the laws he will instruct you about is that under the law of the United States, if you make a knowingly materially false statement to the FBI, that's a crime. It's that simple.

So what will the evidence show? The evidence will show that defendant's lie was all part of a bigger plan, a plan that the defendant carried out in concert with two clients, the Hillary Clinton Campaign and Internet executive Rodney Joffe. It was a plan to create an October surprise on the eve of the presidential election, a plan that used and manipulated the FBI, a plan that the defendant hoped would trigger negative news stories and cause an FBI investigation, a plan that largely succeeded.

How did the defendant execute this plan? Through his two clients.

First, the Clinton Campaign. You're going to hear that in the summer of 2016, as the presidential election was heating up, the defendant was working at a major D.C. law firm which was acting as legal counsel for the Clinton Campaign. You're also going to find as part of -- hear that as part of their campaign efforts they were hired and were paying an investigative firm called Fusion GPS that was hired to do what's called opposition research.

Now, opposition research is something that happens in politics, and it has for years. Republicans do it. Democrats do it. There's nothing illegal about it.

You're going to learn that Fusion GPS was doing opposition research on behalf of the campaign, and through this their investigators and researchers were digging up any dirt they could find about the opposing candidate, Donald Trump. And when they found something that was dirty, they would plant it in the press and, ultimately, with the FBI. This brings us to the defendant's second client, Rodney Joffe.

You're going to hear around the same time that Joffe and others were conducting their own kind of opposition research, but it was a different kind. The evidence will show that Joffe was a high-ranking executive at an Internet company and also had interests in other Internet companies. You will learn that Joffe and one of his companies used the defendant as their lawyer, and that they paid the defendant and his firm over a million dollars per year.

The evidence will show that given his position at these various Internet companies, Joffe had access to vast amounts of Internet traffic and data. That included what's known as DNS data, which stands for Domain Name System data. You will learn that DNS data is basically the digital trail
that's created when computers look each other up on the Internet in an effort to communicate. It's part of the trail that we all leave when we send emails or surf the Internet.

The evidence will show that in the summer of 2016, Joffe and others started using their access to huge amounts of Internet traffic to conduct opposition research. They started looking at the Internet for any information about the online activities of Trump, his associates, and certain family members.

The evidence will show that later Joffe gave this DNS data to the defendant. This was the data they would later claim showed that the Trump organization was supposedly using a secret email server to communicate with the Russian bank called Alfa-Bank.

The evidence will show that Joffe and the defendant knew that the server was a spam email server, but they also claimed that it was being used as a secret communication channel between the Trump organization and Russia.

Now, the evidence will show that the defendant saw this supposed data as a golden opportunity to deliver a big win for both of his clients and to influence a political election, and so he brought together his two clients, Joffe and the Clinton Campaign.

You will learn that the defendant put Joffe in touch with the top lawyer for the Clinton Campaign, and he also connected Joffe with the Fusion GPS research firm, which was also being paid by the Clinton Campaign. He arranged calls and meetings between the two.

That's where the defendant's plan took shape, and the evidence will show that the plan had three parts: a look, a leak, and a lie.

First the look.
The evidence will show that as Sussmann and Joffe met and coordinated with representatives of the Clinton Campaign and Fusion GPS, they looked for more data. You will hear that Joffe instructed people at his companies to scour Internet traffic for any derogatory information they could find about Trump or his associates' online Internet activities, including potential ties to Alfa-Bank or to Russia. And you will see that Fusion GPS did the same using their access to other information.

Second, the leak. You will hear from the evidence that the defendant and Joffe then leaked the Alfa-Bank allegations to a reporter at the New York Times with the hope and expectation that he would run a story about it.

Third, the lie. You will see that when the reporter didn't publish this story right away, the defendant and others decided to bring this information to the FBI and
to create a sense of urgency, to also tell the FBI that a major news organization was running a story within days. That's when the defendant requested the meeting with the FBI general counsel and told him that he was not doing this for any client.

The evidence will show you that the defendant had at least two reasons to lie.

First you're going to hear that the defendant was a cyber security lawyer who had been hired earlier that year by the Democratic National Committee to represent them in relation to a computer hack where they'd been the victim. Because of this, the defendant was in frequent contact with the FBI about the hack investigation. They considered him to be the DNS -- I mean, the DNC attorney for that matter. Because they viewed him as the DNC lawyer for the hack, the defendant knew that if he came in and told them that he was representing a political candidate at this time, weeks before an election, they might not meet with him right away, let alone open an investigation.

Second, the defendant knew that if he could get the FBI to investigate the matter and reach out to the press to try to stop the story, that that would make the story more attractive to the press, and they would report on it.

Now, all the while, ladies and gentlemen, the evidence will show that the defendant was billing his time
on this project to the Clinton Campaign. You will see the billing records that show that instead of being a good citizen, the defendant was billing his time to a client. The campaign was footing the bills.

And so when the defendant walked these allegations into the FBI and said he wasn't doing this for any client, that was false. It was false because the defendant personally billed his time to the Clinton Campaign, and it was false because he was also bringing these allegations on behalf of his other client, Rodney Joffe.

You are also going to hear that the defendant doubled down on his lie. Just five months later, the defendant got himself another meeting with a government agency. This time the CIA. At the CIA he brought the same allegations about Alfa-Bank along with some other allegations.

You will hear that in setting up that meeting, the defendant told a retired CIA employee that he was seeking a meeting on behalf of a client; but you will also hear that during the actual meeting he told the CIA he was not there on behalf of any client, the same lie the defendant told James Baker. And so in doing so, he confirmed the lie that he made to James Baker.

This was not a mistake or a slip of the tongue. It was a concerted effort to conceal his clients.

Finally, I also expect that you're going to hear that the defendant actually got caught in his lies when he was required to testify under oath before Congress in December 2017, and when he testified under oath, he was specifically asked about the meetings with the FBI and the CIA.

During that testimony, the defendant admitted that he'd carried out both of these meetings on behalf of a specific anonymous client. He was referring to Joffe. In other words, the defendant gave Congress something that he hadn't given the FBI, something that he hid from them.

But the evidence will show that the defendant hid something from Congress, too, which is when he approached the FBI's general counsel that day with the Alfa-Bank allegations. As the election was approaching, he billed his time on that matter not to the unnamed client, but rather to the Clinton Campaign. His own sworn testimony will prove to you that he lied to the FBI and that he's guilty in this case.

So what is the evidence? How are we going to prove to you that the defendant lied to the FBI?

Let me first mention, you may hear some of this evidence out of order. Testimony from witnesses might not be chronological. Just dealing with scheduling conflicts, complications from COVID, and so forth, it's a little like
air traffic control. But you will hear all the evidence, not just in this order I'm about to tell you.

Go back to the evidence.
You're going to have three types of evidence: documents, physical evidence, and, of course, witness testimony.

What will the documents show you?
You're going to see that the defendant put his lie in writing.

You're going to see his 42 -word text to Baker the night before the meeting where he said he wasn't coming on behalf of any client or company.

You're going to see in black and white his billing records that show that the defendant billed his work on this project to the Clinton Campaign.

You're going to see emails and phone records that show that beginning in the summer of 2016 the defendant worked with Fusion GPS to develop the Trump/Alfa story and plant it in the press.

You will also see internal FBI records and emails, records that will show you that the defendant's lie mattered, how it misled the officials into thinking he was acting as a good citizen, causing them to take steps and devote resources to what was ultimately a spam email server and not a national security threat.

You're also going to hear from a number of witnesses.

You will hear from James Baker, the FBI general counsel to whom the defendant made this false statement.

You're also going to hear from two other officials who Baker briefed after his meeting with the defendant, the very same day it happened, and who memorialized what was said in their notes.

You will hear from the agents who investigated these allegations, what they did and what they found.

And you will hear from an FBI cyber expert who is going to explain to you the basics of DNS data and some of the terminology you might hear in the witness's testimony here.

You will also hear from employees of Joffe's company who Joffe tasked to search the Internet in support of defendant's plan.

You will hear from an employee of Fusion GPS who will tell you about Fusion's work on these issues.

And you will hear from an employee of the defendant's former law firm, who will help explain the firm's billing practices, procedures, and help you to understand the billing records you might see.

Finally, we have several pieces of physical evidence.

First, you're going to have a chance to review the handwritten notes of the two officials who met with James Baker the day of the meeting and who wrote down the defendant's lie based on a conversation with Baker.

Next you're going to have the two thumb drives the defendant gave to James Baker and the FBI that day, the two thumb drives he bought for the meeting, the two thumb drives he loaded with the data in the white papers, the two thumb drives which the evidence will show he charged to the Clinton Campaign.

Now, before I sit down, I want to go back to where I began.

This is a case about privilege. No one should be so privileged as to have the ability to walk into the FBI and lie for political ends.

Ladies and gentlemen, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, whether we hate Donald Trump or like him, we have to agree that some things have to be above politics. One of those things is our law enforcement agencies, and the other is the truth.

After you have heard all the evidence here, you will know the truth here; that the defendant lied to the FBI, and that it wasn't a trivial matter or a mistake. The evidence will show that this was a breach of trust between a citizen and a law enforcement agency whose mission is to
protect us from enemies both foreign and domestic. The FBI should never be used as a political pawn.

Thank you very much for your attention, and thank you for serving on this jury.

The government is going to have the opportunity to come back and speak with you again at closing argument, and you will hear Judge Cooper explain the law to you. At that time we will ask you to consider all of the evidence.

If you carry out your duties as Judge Cooper instructs you, we are confident that you will return the only verdict that is consistent with the law and consistent with the facts, that the defendant is guilty.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Shaw.
Mr. Bosworth.
MR. BOSWORTH: Good morning.
JURORS IN UNISON: Good morning.
MR. BOSWORTH: And may it please the Court.
Michael Sussmann didn't lie to the FBI. Michael Sussmann wouldn't lie to the FBI. If we're thinking about the FBI as our institution, there is nobody who would agree with that statement more than Michael Sussmann.

Michael Sussmann is a serious national security and cyber security lawyer. For over a decade he worked right alongside the FBI as a federal prosecutor. For over
the next decade he worked alongside the FBI as a national security lawyer in private practice. For over two decades he had a top secret clearance, because that's how much the FBI trusted him.

And in the summer of 2016, this serious national security lawyer got information that raised serious national security concerns at a time when questions were swirling about Donald Trump's connections to Russia. One of his long-time clients, Rodney Joffe, who you heard a little bit about, came to him with information showing another potential connection between Trump and Russia, a connection that showed weird contacts between Donald Trump's business organizations and a Russian bank owned by Vladimir Putin's closest associates. And Mr. Sussman took that seriously because it came from Rodney Joffe.

Rodney Joffe is no Internet executive. Rodney Joffe is one of the world's leading cyber experts. He's one of the leading experts on DNS data, the very stuff that is at issue in this case. He is so trusted that our government, our institution, the FBI, made him -- asked him to be a confidential informant for the FBI. That's how much they trusted him. That's how much they relied on him.

And you think Mr. Sussman got a million dollars of business from Rodney Joffe's companies? Rodney Joffe got tens of millions of dollars from the federal government
giving them advice, selling them DNS data.
Rodney Joffe knew DNS data inside and out, and when he came to Michael Sussmann with that information, Michael Sussmann took it seriously. And Mr. Sussman agreed with Mr. Joffe to make this public.

The plan from the start was to go public with serious information so that the American people could decide for themselves what it showed. That was the plan, to go to the press.

And that's what they did. They went right to the top.

What you didn't hear is they took that information to a Pulitzer-Prize-winning reporter at the New York Times, and he was going to write a story about it. He met with Mr. Sussman. He met with Mr. Joffe. He researched the things that reporters do, and he was going to go with the story. He was going to go public with a big story about it.

And if Michael Sussmann hadn't spent a career working alongside the FBI, if Michael Sussmann didn't care about the FBI, we wouldn't be here because, at the last minute, when Mr. Sussman knew and heard and believed that a story was going to run about this, what did he do? He didn't keep his mouth shut. He didn't let the story come out. He went to the FBI.

And he went to the FBI to give them a heads up
that the story was coming. He gave them -- he went to the FBI so that -- to tell them that this story was coming so they wouldn't be caught flat-footed, so they wouldn't be caught by surprise. He went to the FBI to help the FBI, which is exactly what Mr. Sussman said in the text message he sent to Mr. Baker that started this whole thing off. Now, you heard the evidence is going to show that this meeting was all about the Clinton Campaign. You will hear the meeting with the FBI is the exact opposite of what the Clinton Campaign would have wanted.

Was the Clinton Campaign generally one of Mr. Sussman's clients? Yes.

Was the Clinton Campaign a client on this effort to get a story in the press? Yes. There's nothing secretive about that.

But this FBI meeting was something very different. The FBI meeting was something that they didn't authorize, that they didn't direct him to do, and that they wouldn't have wanted him to do. Because you know what happened? As the evidence will show, when Mr. Sussman went to the FBI to tell them about this story, the FBI effectively shut it down. The exact opposite of what the Clinton Campaign would want. They'd want a big story that hurts Trump and helps them, and Mr. Sussman, by going to the FBI, shut that all down. He was there to help the FBI.

So what are we doing here? The government's theory doesn't make sense. The evidence will not support this charge, and today I want to walk through that evidence with you. I want to talk to you about what I think the evidence will show and what I think the evidence will not show, and I want to do it by focusing on four key questions. First, what did Michael Sussmann actually say to the FBI? I'll answer that. Second, is what he said false? Third, did he intend to say something false? Fourth, did it matter?

And I want to go through those one by one.
To convict Mr. Sussman here, the government has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the answers to each of these questions. They've got to jump over each and every one of these hurdles. And I submit to you that they're going to stumble at every turn.

So here's how I want to use my time. I want to briefly talk through the story line and tell you some of the relevant evidence so you can get a better feel for what happened and why it was that Mr. Sussman ultimately met with the FBI. And then I want to walk through these four questions: What did he truly say? Was it false? Did he intend to say something false? Did it matter?

So let's get started, and let's get started with
two of the people who are most key here.
First, Mr. Sussman. Now, I told you a little bit about him, but I want you to hear a little bit more so you understand how nonsensical this charge is.

Put aside that Mr. Sussman's a good man or a family man. You will hear that Mr. Sussman is an honest man. He spent over 12 years working for the United States Department of Justice prosecuting crimes under Democrats and Republicans alike. Then he went to Perkins Coie, a private law firm that is one of the top hundred firms in the country that's been around for over a hundred years. And at Perkins Coie, Mr. Sussman became a prominent national security and cyber security lawyer, advising all sorts of clients about all sorts of issues.

Through that work he interacted with the FBI, the CIA, the government at the top levels. He trusted them, and they trusted him. That's why he had a top secret clearance. That's why he had a special badge that enabled him to walk in and out of the FBI and the CIA just like he was an employee. His whole livelihood depended on his credibility with these agencies, and he'd never throw that away.

You know who else had a relationship with the government? Rodney Joffe, the Internet executive who was the world's leading cyber expert, the world's leading expert on DNS data, who was an FBI confidential informant, who had
relationships up and down the government, who got paid tens of millions of dollars for DNS data, for his advice, because that's how much the government trusted him. That's how much they relied on him.

So in the summer of 2016, Mr. Joffe, this expert, came to Mr. Sussman for help. Again, at a time when there were all sorts of questions in the world about Donald Trump's ties to Russia, Mr. Joffe presented evidence that there was another tie, that there were these weird look-ups. And so basically it's just one computer trying to find where another computer lives on the Internet, and it tries to look up the address, and there's a record of one computer trying to find another. That's what DNA data is in my nonexpert understanding.

And all this evidence showed that there were weird connections between Mr. Trump's business, the Trump organization, and Alfa-Bank, this Russian bank.

And Mr. Joffe came to Mr. Sussman with this information, and Mr. Sussman agreed to help him out, to help him figure out how to get this public.

Why would he help?
Well, one, it's his job. He's a lawyer. You help clients.

Two, he knew and trusted Mr. Joffe. He was someone he worked with for years, and Mr. Sussman was well
aware of Mr. Joffe's credibility and reliability in the eyes of the federal government.

And third, Mr. Sussman had his own experience with Russian interference in the 2016 election. A few months before, in the spring of 2016, the Russians hacked the Democratic party servers, the Democratic National Committee, the DNC.

A lot of initials in this case. Those are some of them.

And you're going to hear when the Russians hacked DNC servers, the DNC hired Mr. Sussman to be their lawyer, and he interacted with the FBI on their behalf. And the FBI knew full well that Mr. Sussman was a lawyer for the Democratic party itself.

So what happened? After Mr. Sussman agreed to help, Mr. Joffe and cyber experts that he was working with pulled together the data, analyzed the data.

Now, was Mr. Sussman involved in the data gathering? No. The evidence will show Mr. Sussman wasn't involved in the analysis of the data. Mr. Sussman didn't know that there was a spam server.

This is what DNS looks like. You'll see during trial. And it should be on your monitors, if it's not -it's not.

THE COURT: Can everyone see?

MR. BOSWORTH: Whether you can see it or not, you still can't make sense of it. It's a jumbo of numbers and letters. And what is at issue in this case is thousands of pages of this kind of gobbledygook. It takes a cyber expert to understand this. In fact, as you heard, it's so complicated the government is calling a special expert at this trial to explain it to you. That's how complicated it is.

Mr. Sussman wasn't involved in any of this.
What he was involved in was helping to make this public. So he went to Mr. Elias -- you heard about that; Mr. Elias is one of his law firm partners who was the general counsel for the Clinton Campaign -- and he told him, hey, I'm working on this story, you know. And you'll hear about that.

And Mr. Sussman knew that the Clinton Campaign would benefit from this story. The Clinton Campaign was one of his clients. And because the Clinton Campaign would benefit from this story, because they were aware, he treated them as his client, and he billed to them as his client.

There's nothing remarkable about lawyers billing to clients. That's how it works.

And by the way, the reason that these bills show up with Mr. Sussman's entries to the Clinton Campaign is because Mr. Sussman himself billed those entries. He showed

I'm doing work for the Clinton Campaign. Hardly the sort of thing you would do if you're trying to keep it all a big secret.

So then what happened?
You'll hear -- there's not much left on the story part -- that right around Labor Day Mr. Sussman went to the New York Times to pitch this story. He reached out to Eric Lichtblau, a Pulitzer-Prize-winning reporter who we expect you'll hear from in this case, and he arranged to meet with Mr. Lichtblau. He had meetings with Mr. Lichtblau. He introduced Mr. Joffe to Mr. Lichtblau. And Mr. Lichtblau, a serious esteemed reporter, was working on a story and was about to publish it.

And that's when we get to the FBI. At that moment. Not when he's frustrated the story's not coming out. When he believes the story is imminent, it's about to come out.

You will see that on September 18th, Sunday, September 18th, Mr. Sussman received an email with information suggesting that the Trump campaign was freaking out about a story about Russia and Trump that was about to come out in The New York Times. The story seemed imminent. And what happens two hours later? That's when the text goes out. That's when Mr. Sussman realizes he has to reach out to the $F B I$ to give them a heads up that this story
is coming so that they're not caught off guard. And he tells the FBI, he tells Mr. Baker in the context of that text, that he wants to help the Bureau, which is exactly what he did.

So the next day Mr. Sussman meets with Mr. Baker for less than 30 minutes. Mr. Baker didn't take any notes of the meeting. You'll hear Mr. Baker didn't record the meeting. Mr. Baker didn't write a report of the meeting, which is what FBI agents live to do. Nothing. And there's no one else present in the meeting either.

And at that meeting Mr. Sussman told Mr. Baker this big story's about to come out in a news organization. I want you to understand it. Here's the information it's based on. And he didn't ask for anything in return.

And that meeting was only the first of multiple interactions that Mr. Baker and Mr. Sussman had that week.

And I want to, before I get into that, just say one thing. There was talk of the relationship between Mr. Baker and Mr. Sussman. This clip gives you a good sense of what that relationship was like. This is a short clip from an interview of Mr. Baker that Mr. Sussman did in the months before this meeting in September, and it's at a conference for privacy professionals where Mr. Sussman interviewed Mr. Baker.
(Video clip being played)

MR. BOSWORTH: Privilege?
Relationships. Relationships matter, especially in the small world of national security lawyers.

And ask yourselves, after you hear the evidence and you see Mr. Baker: Do you think Mr. Sussman would throw his career away, his life away, to tell a lie to that guy?

So they have this meeting on September 19th, that Monday. There are no notes, no recordings, no reports. And that's one of a series of interactions that occur that week.

The text happens Sunday. The meeting happens Monday. There's a phone call on Wednesday. There's a phone call on Thursday. Contact, contact, contact.

And notably, none of that contact was recorded. There are no notes of any of that. No reports of any of that. No witnesses to any of that.

You heard that after Mr. Baker met with Mr. Sussman some other people took notes. They're not going to be able to explain them. You'll see those notes for yourselves. But there are no notes for any of these other phone calls. There are no notes for the other interactions. More on that in a moment.

So the FBI investigation.
So after Mr. Sussman meets with them, two things happen.

One, the FBI decides we do want to investigate,
and they reach out to The New York Times, and they ask them to hold the story. This story that was supposed to be a help to the Clinton Campaign, that was going to be good for the Clinton Campaign, gets shut down. That's the first thing that happens.

The second thing that happens is the FBI investigates. And you will hear that they did the things that the FBI can do that private citizens like Rodney Joffe can't do. They issued subpoenas. They interviewed witnesses. They got extra data. They did the things necessary to figure out whether this evidence of potential communication between the Trump organization and Alfa-Bank was real or not. And they ultimately found, nope, nothing to worry about here.

Mr. Sussman said there might be smoke. They looked and said, no fire. Which is what they do with tips they get day after day after day. That's what the FBI does. That's the story. So now let's go into the questions. The first question: What did Michael Sussmann actually say? Well, you know about the text message that Sunday. But what about the meeting on Monday and the phone calls later that week?

Now, you've heard, well, Mr. Baker's going to come in here, and he will tell you Mr. Sussman said that he was
not meeting with me on behalf of a client. But with respect, Ms. Shaw didn't tell you all that Mr. Baker has said.

What else has Mr. Baker said? What hasn't he said?

You will hear that in 2018 Mr. Baker testified under oath that he had no memory whatsoever of whether Sussmann was there on behalf of a client.

You'll hear in 2019 he testified under oath that Sussmann did talk about clients.

You'll hear that in 2020 he told the Special Counsel that the topic of whether there was a client never came up.

Now, they want you to believe Mr. Baker's memory is clear, but you will see Mr. Baker's memory is clear as mud. And is that all that surprising? How many of you can remember a conversation you had at work six years ago that you didn't take notes of, that you didn't record, and that no one else was there for? Hard to do. Hard to remember what you did yesterday, let alone what someone specifically said to you six years ago. And nothing that the government introduces into evidence here will show you -- will prove to you exactly what was said in the conversations that Mr. Sussman had with Mr. Baker.

And here's why that matters. The claim here is
that Mr. Sussman told Mr. Baker he wasn't there on behalf of a client, and the FBI itself said the exact opposite.

In a meeting just months later, the FBI -- I think you can see that -- was asked to brief the senior officials at the Department of Justice in the Trump administration, and the FBI at the highest level got together a briefing for DOJ for the Acting Attorney General handling this matter to talk through all the different Russia investigations, and they gave a briefing about this Alfa-Bank investigation. And where did they say that the allegations came from? They said -- you can see it crystal clear in black and white -an attorney brought to FBI on behalf of his client.

Mr. Sussman is charged here with saying the exact opposite. But the FBI said no, he was there on behalf of his client.

Now, this is an important meeting. This wasn't a casual get-together. This is a briefing of the senior-most officials of our institution, the FBI, to the Department of Justice. And what did they say? That when it came to this case, the allegations were brought by an attorney on behalf of his client. The exact opposite of what Mr. Sussman is charged with lying about here.

And you know what else you'll learn? You know who was at that meeting where the FBI at the highest levels said this came from an attorney on behalf of his client? Jim

Baker himself, the man who will say, nope, Sussmann never said that; of course not; he wasn't there on behalf of a client.

This shows the opposite. It shows that the FBI thought, as of that point, that the information did come from an attorney on behalf of his client. So either by then Baker believed it, too, or Baker didn't care, because none of it mattered in the first place. That's reasonable doubt if there ever was.

Next, is what Mr. Sussman said false? Well, if you don't know what he said, you can't know that it's false. But here, even assuming that the government is able to prove what they claim Mr. Sussman said -- and you should have serious reasonable doubt that they can -- is what he said false?

Well, this goes down to why Mr. Sussman was at the FBI in the first place. And you will see, and the evidence will show, Mr. Sussman did not go to the FBI to do the Clinton Campaign's bidding. This meeting was the opposite of what they wanted. No one told him to go. No one authorized him to go. No one wanted him to go.

And also, use your common sense. If the Clinton Campaign really wanted to send in an attorney who could conceal his relationship with them, Mr. Sussman is the last person they'd send in. He was someone the FBI knew
represented partisan clients.
The FBI knew that he represented the Clinton Campaign that summer. The FBI knew he was an attorney for the DNC, the Democratic party itself. The FBI knew -- on the very day that Michael Sussmann spoke to Jim Baker on the phone, the FBI wrote a memo calling him the Clinton Campaign's lawyer. That's not the kind of person you'd send in to conceal a relationship with the Clinton Campaign on the Alfa-Bank stuff.

And Mr. Joffe wasn't there to promote -Mr. Sussman wasn't there to promote Mr. Joffe's interests either.

As the FBI itself will tell you in this trial, Mr. Joffe had nothing to gain from this meeting; and, if anything, if Mr. Sussman had told the FBI about Mr. Joffe, they would have taken all of this more seriously, not less, given who Mr. Joffe is.

Third -- I'm speeding up, because I want to finish up -- did Mr. Sussman intend to make a false statement? That's another important hurdle that the government has to leap over here to convict Mr. Sussman, and they can't.

Ask yourselves: What would Michael Sussmann gain by lying to Mr. Baker? Nothing.

What would he lose? Everything. He'd lose his credibility, his relationship with Baker, his security
clearance, his livelihood. For what?
And ask yourselves: Are these the actions of someone who is trying to lie, who is trying to do something deceitful?

If he was trying to hide who was behind the AlfaBank allegations, why would he tell Jim Baker that he, himself, got the information from cyber experts?

If he was trying to dupe the FBI, why give them the data that they could evaluate for themselves and make whatever conclusions they wanted about whether it was good or bad?

And if he wasn't motivated by a genuine interest in national security, why did he go to the CIA -- you heard about this -- in February of 2017, months after the election, when there wasn't even a Clinton Campaign in existence anymore?

Because, you will learn, he had a genuine interest in national security and doing the right thing.

And you know what else shows Mr. Sussman's good intent? What he actually said to the CIA. Unlike the FBI, which seems not to have taken notes of all these important conversations, the CIA took a lot of notes.

When Mr. Sussman met with that former CIA employee to set up the meeting, did he say, "No, I'm just here as a good citizen. I'm trying to just do the right thing here"?

No. He said, "I do have a client." You'll see the memo that that former CIA employee wrote.

Client, client, client, client, client, client, client.

This is not the effort of someone trying to hide the existence of a client. He told them. And then a week and a half later, when that guy, who knew he had a client, set up a meeting, Mr. Sussman went in and said, well, look, I'm not representing the client for the purpose of this meeting, because he was trying to do the right thing. He was trying to help the CIA, just like he was trying to help the FBI, by bringing information -- that is, national security concerns -- to their attention, and by this point it was a different set of information all together.

And you'll see at that meeting Sussmann said I'm not representing a particular client, knowing that he had just told the guy setting up the meeting there was a client. You can have a client but not go to a meeting for that client. He said he wasn't expecting anything in return. He said, "Look, I'm a partisan" -- just FYI, something he didn't have to say to the FBI because they knew it full well -- and he said, "If you want to speak to the guy behind all this, let me know. It's on the table."

Not the words or deeds of someone trying to hide something.

The last question: Did this matter? Did what Mr. Sussman say about his client matter?

The government's theory here is that by concealing his relationship with the Clinton Campaign, that affected the investigation. They didn't investigate, you know, with an assumption that there was politics involved. The evidence shows the exact opposite. They knew from the beginning, no matter what Mr. Sussman said, that there could be politics afoot. They knew that he was a lawyer for the Democratic national party, DNC, the Democratic National Committee. They knew he was a lawyer for the Clinton Campaign.

And you can see it. You will see it. The notes from this investigative file, the notes of what the FBI did after they got the Alfa-Bank allegations are littered with references to Mr. Sussman as being a DNC lawyer, a political lawyer, a Democratic lawyer, a lawyer for the Clintons. These are just a few of the examples.

He's essentially a lawyer representing the Democratic National Committee and Clinton, and they're saying that his political affiliations were hidden. They were out and about, loud and clear for everyone to see.

And you're also going to see one other thing. There are going to be witnesses from the FBI who are going to testify here, and they're going to come and tell you it
was so important to know who Mr. Sussman's clients were. It is so important to know the motivations of the source, like Mr. Sussman, walking in the door giving information, so important for us to know that.

Judge the FBI by what they did, not by what they're saying now. If the motivation of a source was so important, you would think they would have interviewed Michael Sussmann himself during this investigation.

These are just some of the people involved in the investigation. They're the main players, and most of them are going to testify here. How many of these people interviewed Michael Sussmann about his motivations? Zero. None.

If they cared so much about the motivations of the people supplying the data, well, Mr. Sussman told them he got this data from cyber experts. How many of these people investigating this case so thoroughly interviewed the cyber experts to ask them, "Hey, why are you doing this? Do you have a motivation that we should know about, some bias we need to hear about?" Zero. Not one.

No one interviewed Mr. Sussman, no one interviewed the cyber experts, because no one cared about the motivations of him or his cyber experts, let alone his clients.

And do you know why? You will hear it's because
what mattered was the data. They could look at the data and see is it good, is it bad. And who did they get the data from? That guy.

At the end of the day, it's going to be clear that no one cared about the motivations of Mr. Sussman or his cyber experts, let alone his clients. That's what they're saying now, but judge them by what they did then, not what they're saying now.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm concluding now, and I appreciate your patience listening to the opening statement on behalf of Mr. Sussman and for your patience listening to the opening on behalf of the government.

It is essential that you are here because you are here to give the government a fair trial, and you're here to give Mr. Sussman a fair trial. And you can do that by focusing on the key questions that this case turns on.

What did he say?
Was it false?
Did he intend for it to be false?
Did any of this matter?
And I'd ask that you keep an open mind as the trial goes on. You're going to hear from one witness and believe one thing, and then hear the opposite from a different witness and maybe believe another. You'll hear something on direct and something on cross; something in the
government's case, something in the defense case.
You don't reach a conclusion until all the evidence is in and the government can come back and talk to you about what it shows and Mr. Berkowitz can come back to you and talk to you about what it shows.

And I'll leave you with this: As jurors, you have the extraordinary responsibility to do justice in this case, and as jurors, you have the extraordinary responsibility to prevent injustice. This case is an injustice, and I suspect, when all the evidence is in, you will agree.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bosworth.
All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take our morning break. We will generally break for about 15 or 20 minutes every morning depending on where the witness testimony is. So why don't we come back ready to go at 11:00 a.m.

Ms. Jenkins, should they leave their notes in their chair or take them with them?

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Leave them in the chair.
THE COURT: You can leave your notes in the chair, and we're going to exit out the back door here.
(Jury exits courtroom)

THE COURT: All right. We'll see you in 15
minutes.
(Recess taken)
THE COURT: Welcome back, everyone. Please be seated, and I believe we are ready for the government's first witness.

Ms. Shaw.
MS. SHAW: Thank you, Your Honor. The United States calls Special Agent David Martin.

THE COURT: All right. Step right up, sir. Please have a seat or remain standing and raise your right hand.
(Witness sworn)
THE COURT: You can feel free to remove your mask, if you'd like.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Please proceed.
SPECIAL AGENT DAVID MARTIN, Sworn
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. SHAW:
Q. Good morning, Agent Martin. Could you please introduce yourself for the jury, and spell your last name for the court reporter.
A. My name is David Martin, M-A-R-T-I-N.
Q. And Agent Martin, where is it that you work?
A. I'm a Supervisory Special Agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Q. And what is your title there? What unit are you the Supervisory Special Agent for?
A. I'm the chief of the Cyber Technical Analysis Unit.
Q. Okay. And how long have you been with the FBI?
A. I've been with the FBI for about 13 years, since July of 2009.
Q. Okay. Before we get into your career at the FBI, what's your educational background?
A. Oh, I have a bachelor of science degree in computer science and psychology with minors in business and math from the University of Denver. And then I have a master's degree in information security and engineering with a specialization in digital forensics and incident response from the Sands Technology Institute.
Q. And before you joined the Bureau, did you work anywhere else?
A. Yes. I had positions as a computer crime specialist for the Colorado Bureau of Investigation and as a police officer for the City of Littleton, Colorado.
Q. So you mentioned you've been with the Bureau for about 13 or so years. Why don't we walk through some of the positions that you've had there. How did you start out at the FBI?
A. My first assignment is I was assigned to the Detroit Field Office in the Detroit Cyber Task Force.
Q. And what sort of cases would you do at the Cyber Task Force?
A. I primarily worked computer intrusion cases, and then also intellectual property rights and child exploitation cases.
Q. All right. And would it be fair to say that those investigations involved examining or looking at what's called DNS data?
A. Yes. The investigations often involved examining and analyzing network traffic, and DNS data was one of the key parts of that.
Q. And when we say "network traffic," are we referring to the Internet?
A. Computer -- yes, various kinds of computer networks, the Internet being probably the most largest -- the most largest and well known of them.
Q. So after being a special agent in the cyber division, did you -- where did you go next within the Bureau?
A. So after that I took a job at FBI Cyber Division at headquarters in the cyber -- in the Technical Operations Unit.
Q. And where is that located? It's not in Detroit, right?
A. No. It's in Chantilly, Virginia.
Q. Okay. And how did your responsibilities change in that position?
A. So in that position I managed technical operations, which basically affected network traffic to help facilitate our investigations, did things like decoding network traffic, and helping to respond to computer intrusion incidents. So hacking, basically.
Q. So would it be fair to say it was the same array of cyber investigations that you'd worked on as a special agent that you were now supervising?
A. Yes. It was a very -- very similar kind of cases.
Q. And, again, would it be fair to say that it included analysis and review of DNS data?
A. Yes, frequently.
Q. Okay. And after that position, did you progress to another position within the Bureau?
A. So after that I spent four years running our Cyber Incident Response Team, which is known as CAT [sic].

Basically that team would respond to major computer intrusions all over the country and the world, and we would investigate those.
Q. And about how many agents were you supervising within that unit?
A. So we had about 50 agents scattered throughout the field that were all part of that unit or as part of that team. Q. And would they consult with you about issues that arose within the investigations they were conducting?
A. Yes, frequently.
Q. And would it be fair to say that those included DNS data and Internet traffic?
A. Without -- basically every investigation involves that in some way.
Q. And then your next position with the Bureau?
A. So after that I moved to the Cyber Technical Analysis Unit where I managed the Advanced Digital Forensics program. Q. And in very general terms for those of us that may not be specialists, what does the advanced forensics group do? A. So basically it's a group of technical specialists that analyze very complex computer forensics cases, so examining hard drives and phones and things like that to see if they've been hacked. They also do what they call reverseengineering of malware; so basically take apart computer viruses and figure out how they work.
Q. And when you say "malware," are you talking about what most of us would say is a virus?
A. Yes, virus or a Trojan or -- they have a lot of different terms for them.
Q. Okay. And then, in your current position, how have your responsibilities changed?
A. So I was then promoted to unit chief of the Cyber Technical Analysis Unit, so I manage about 70 or so contractors and government employees who do the same
intrusion forensics and malware analysis as well as a group that does the --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm going to ask you to slow down.

THE WITNESS: Okay, sorry.
A. It manages our network traffic analysis and handles our subscriptions to different data sets, so things like passive DNS and other data sets out there.
Q. All right. Well, we'll get to passive DNS in a little bit.

How many investigations, about, would you say that you're sort of overseeing at any one time in your current position?
A. We're probably supporting close to a dozen different investigations in the field at any given time.
Q. And approximately how many agents?
A. So most of my -- most of my unit is professional support, so it's mostly computer scientists and contract technical specialists.
Q. And do you review and consult with them on their findings and developments in their investigations?
A. Yes. So I do technical reviews of their reports.
Q. So in addition to your work at the Bureau, have you gone through any professional training related to cyber security or cyber attacks like you've spoken about?
A. Yes. I've taken approximately 20 continuing education classes on various topics ranging from network traffic analysis, malware analysis, digital forensics and incident response, and similar subjects to that.
Q. And in addition to those trainings, have you received any professional certifications?
A. Yes. I have about a dozen professional certifications in the same sort of subject areas, including the GIAC security expert certification.
Q. So you said GIAC. Is that G-I-A-C?
A. That's right. It's G-I-A-C. It's the Global

Information Assurance Certification group, I guess.
Q. And tell us just generally what that certification means.
A. So it's basically -- it's considered one of the most difficult-to-obtain certifications in information security. It basically -- you have to demonstrate knowledge in a lot -- a wide range of subjects in computer security and these technical fields.
Q. And do you have an idea of how many people receive that certification?
A. I believe there are less than 200 people with that certification in the world.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. I believe there are less than 200 people with that
certification in the world.
Q. In the world. Okay. Thank you.

In addition to your certifications, have you received any awards for your work at the Bureau?
A. Yes. I've received a few awards of different
commendations from the Bureau as well as the Attorney
General's Award for Excellence in information technology, and U.S. Attorneys awards.
Q. And in addition to awards, have you published any articles or given presentations in your area of specialization?
A. Yes. As part of my master's program, I published several peer-reviewed articles, one of which was on the topic of network traffic analysis.

MS. SHAW: Your Honor, at this time I would ask for Agent Martin to be certified as an expert.

THE COURT: In the area...?
MS. SHAW: In the area of cyber security and DNS.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. BOSWORTH: No objection.
THE COURT: Okay. The Court will qualify Agent Martin as an expert to provide testimony in the area of cyber security and DNS data analysis.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are generally two types of witnesses that you might hear from. There are lay
witnesses who have some involvement in the facts of this particular case, but there is also a category of witnesses called expert witnesses who the attorneys sometimes call to help the jury understand scientific or technical areas based on their professional or academic expertise. And Agent Martin has been qualified as an expert for this trial, okay? MS. SHAW: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MS. SHAW:
Q. So Agent Martin, in preparation for your testimony today, did you prepare a slide show or tutorial that you might want to show the jury?
A. Yes. I prepared a set of slides to illustrate some of the -- some of the concepts of DNS and the network called The Onion Router or TOR.
Q. And if I could show you Government's Exhibit 1700, do you recognize what Government's Exhibit 1700 is?
A. That's my PowerPoint presentation.

MS. SHAW: Your Honor, I'd move to admit
Government's 1700.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. BOSWORTH: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved.
MS. SHAW: Okay. If we could move to the second page.

Third page, I guess. Let's stop here.

BY MS. SHAW:
Q. So let's start with DNS or Domain Name System. What is that?
A. So DNS is basically a way to map human readable names of things like Google.com or Yahoo.com to numerical IP addresses. And it works kind of the same way -- it's a bit more complex, but it works kind of similarly to a phone book where it maps a person's name to a numerical telephone number.
Q. And before we get into the right side of the demonstrative, how did this DNS or Domain Name System come about? What was the origin of this?
A. So the origin is that the Internet was first developed essentially in research -- like in a research setting, at universities and research labs where it was used on a fairly small scale, and people could just use numerical IP addresses to communicate. So they would remember that 1.2.3.4 was one server and 1.2.3.5 was another server. Obviously, as there got to be a lot more of these and people started using them more widely, it got really hard to remember all those different numbers. And so instead of having to try and memorize hundreds or thousands of numbers, they came up with a way of mapping names to numbers; and that was where DNS came from.
Q. So on the slide on the right, you have a comparison of
phone book and DNS. Maybe you could describe for the jury what that's about?
A. Yes. So the phone book you have -- you have a set of names on the left-hand side of different people. You have a set of numbers on the right-hand side. And for most people, myself included, names are easier to remember than numbers. So you can look in the phone book. If you know you're trying to talk to Mr. Smith, you can go down and find his number [sic] and look over and find his phone number. Q. And with respect to DNS, I see there's a different format, but it's the same concept?
A. Yes. It's very similar. Basically you have a numerical IP address, which is what your computers use to talk to one another. So your computer will use an IP address to talk to a web server when you're going to a website or using your email or something like that.

And trying to memorize a lot of these numbers is very difficult. I mean, there's very few IP addresses that even I memorize. It's a lot easier to remember I want to go to Google.com or Yahoo.com or YouTube or something like that.

MS. SHAW: If we could have the next slide, please.
Q. Okay. If you could walk us through how a DNS request or -- actually, let me back up.

Is a DNS request the same as what we might call a
look-up?
A. Yes. They're synonymous.
Q. All right. If you can start walking us through what we're seeing here.
A. My apologies. You can actually ignore the thing that says "http" right there. That was a glitch in my slides. That doesn't come into play until the very end.

What we have here is we have our user on the lefthand side. And let's say, for argument's sake, this is my great aunt who has never used Google before. On the righthand side you have a picture of the world with a bunch of lines around it. This is basically -- this represents the Internet. So this is a bunch of different wires and fiberoptic cables and satellites and all of the other things that use the Internet to communicate around the world.

And our user over here on the left-hand side, my great aunt, has her laptop, and though she doesn't know this, her computer has an IP address, and that's that 108.18.158.20, and we're going to say for argument's sake this is a -- or, sorry, it's a Verizon FiOS. So it's a -THE COURT: Agent Martin, you need to slow down just a little bit for the court reporter, particularly when you're clicking through numbers.

Go ahead.
A. So she has a Verizon FiOS IP at her house. She's plugged into her home Internet connection. And she's decided she'd like to visit Google.com.
Q. Next slide, please.
A. So she goes through her browser, and she types in

Google.com. And everything that happens from this point on is pretty much transparent to her. She has no idea her computer is doing this, but her computer is.

So the first thing the computer is going to do is -- again, she's never used Google.com before, so it's going to look it up in its own sort of internal address book. And it's going to say, "Do I already know the IP address for Google.com?"

So next.
Q. Next slide, please.
A. And so this is what they call local DNS, and that's just basically a directory of IP addresses and domains that the computer already knows about. And so in this case she doesn't -- her computer doesn't know the address for Google, so it's going to ask its -- what they call the default DNS server.
Q. Next slide, please.
A. And this -- in this case, it's basically a DNS server from Verizon, so it's for -- Internet service provider has this DNS server. And she's going to ask that server what
the IP address is for Google.com.
Q. And let me just stop you there. And, again, she's typed in "Google," but this is a sort of a numeric inquiry from your aunt to the Verizon DNS server?
A. Yes. This is all being transmitted without her being able to -- I mean, as a user, you don't see any of this happening behind the scenes.
Q. Sorry. Go ahead.
A. So let's say in this example that the FiOS DNS server doesn't know Google.com's IP.
Q. Next slide.
A. So it's going to check with what they call the root DNS servers. And the root DNS servers are -- they're basically a group of 13 logical servers out there, that their IP addresses never really change, and all the other DNS servers in the world know that's the first place to stop when you're trying to look up a new item -- a new address.
Q. Could you just give us an example of some of these root servers. Are they, you know, some for com and some for biz, like different suffixes?
A. So these are actually a level above that. So these know the address to the .com server and -- the server for .com, and there's a server for .net, and there's a server for .us and things like that. So those are the only addresses that this server knows.
Q. Okay. And so this root server is asking for the IP?
A. Yeah. So the FiOS DNS server, what's called a recursive resolver, makes a request and asks the root DNS server what the IP address is for Google.com, and it says that it's asking on behalf of my great aunt.
Q. All right. Next slide, please.
A. So the root DNS server doesn't store this kind of information. So it says to go ask what they call the TLD or the Top Level Domain server for .com, because it ends in .com. So it's going to say, all right, go to C. -- this string of servers -- and that's the .com name server.
Q. And, again, this is all behind the scenes when you type it in?
A. Yes, this is all behind the scenes.
Q. Next slide, please.
A. So then it goes to the -- they're going to go to the .com server, and the .com server, they're going to ask it the same question: What's the IP address for Google.com? Q. Okay.
A. Next.

And then -- so the .com server doesn't know the IP address for Google.com, but it does know who can give a definitive or an authoritative answer to that, so it knows what server knows Google.com's IP address for sure, and that's -- in this case it's NS1.Google.com.
Q. And just so we're clear, this is sort of an exaggerated series of look-ups for purposes of illustrating all the possible steps. Would it be fair to say that many of these steps might be -- in our heavily Internet-intensive world, we don't have to even get this far?
A. Yes. It's -- I mean, in most cases you're going to -if you look up Google.com, it's going to look on your local PC, and you've probably resolved that at some point in the past, so it's already going to know the IP address. And if not, almost certainly your Internet service provider will know the IP address.

So it may not have to work its way all the way through this chain, but it can, if it has to.
Q. And before I move on, again, if you can, TLD, that stands for Top Level Domain?
A. Yes, and so that's basically the last thing in the domain. So the .com or the .net or the .biz, or whatever the last portion of an IP -- or the DNS or domain name is. Q. Next slide, please.
A. So finally it's going to reach the authoritative Google DNS server. And this is -- this is a server that's run by Google itself, and it knows for sure what the IP address for www. Google.com is, and so it's going to provide that answer back to the user.
Q. Next slide, please.
A. So it can say I can authoritatively say that this is the IP address for it. So then it's going to return that back across -- across the wire.
Q. Next slide.
A. And so now the web browser knows that Google.com equals this IP address.

So at this point the DNS look-up and request is complete. Your computer now knows what the address for Google.com is. But it hasn't taken any other steps yet. It hasn't actually connected to Google.com.

So the DNS query is done. The DNS query doesn't connect to the www.Google.com IP address. It returns that answer to the web browser, and then the web browser reaches out and makes another connection.
Q. Next slide.
A. So then the web browser, now knowing what the right IP address is to connect to Google, it makes what they call an http or what's commonly known as a web request for the web server for Google.com, and you see the following web page. Next.

And there is the old familiar Google web page.
So basically in the time that it's taken to enter Google.com and hit the enter key, within probably less than a second, all of this has happened on the backside, completely invisible to the user. And then you've made a
connection to Google, and you have the web page that you're looking at.
Q. And would this -- going back to your phone analogy, would it be similar to when we dial into our phone? We don't see all of the cell towers connecting, but eventually we get through to the pizza place or wherever it is we're trying to reach?
A. Yes. That's a similar kind of thing. There's a lot of things that happen behind the scenes to make it happen, but to the user it's kind of abstracted away so you don't see it.
Q. Next slide, please.

All right. This slide's entitled "Passive DNS." As simply as you can, explain for all of us, what is passive DNS?
A. So passive DNS is basically capturing a copy of DNS queries that are happening on the Internet at a certain place or series of places.
Q. And when you say "queries," would that be a look-up?
A. Yes, so look-up or a query.
Q. All right. So what are we looking at in this slide? I see we have -- is this your aunt again?
A. This is my great aunt again.

So she's over here making -- making different look-ups. We have the same DNS server for her Internet
service provider there, and then we have a couple different DNS servers for illustrations. I picked Yahoo, Google, and Facebook.
Q. All right. And I see that you have something that -two things that are labeled "Passive DNS Sensor." What can you tell us about passive DNS sensors?
A. So passive DNS sensors are set up at different -usually at a place that -- usually at companies that provide DNS services, and they are run by commercial services that make -- that basically make an agreement with the different DNS providers to make a copy of any DNS requests that come across, and then the answers to those questions, and then report that back to their -- back to their company.
Q. And you said that these were commercial. Who might be some of the clients of these commercial passive DNS collectors?
A. A lot of them are used on information security, so people who are doing network defense, trying to block spammers, trying to identify hackers or compromise computers.
Q. And could you -- do you know a few names of some of the companies that might collect this passive DNS?
A. Yes, so some of them would be companies like Farsight, Packet Forensics, or Neustar.
Q. Okay. So why don't you pull up the next slide, please.

All right. So if you could walk us through what's happening here?
A. So here we've made a -- it's going to be a simplified DNS look-up, so the same sort of process in the last slide happened. The request went through to the Google DNS server, and you got the answer back, found out the IP address for Google.com, and there were no passive DNS sensors at the server, the DNS server that returned that answer. And so there's -- there's nothing recorded in the passive DNS log.
Q. And when you say "passive DNS log," you're indicating the section -- the heading on the left of the demonstrative?
A. That's correct. It will get populated here shortly.
Q. And tell us a little bit more about this straight route to the Google sensor. Is that unusual?
A. No. It's -- obviously there are a lot of different DNS servers in the world, and none of the passive DNS companies have sensors at all of them. I don't know how many thousands or millions of DNS sensor -- or DNS servers there may be in the world, but there are -- the passive DNS data is not being collected at all of them.
Q. So would it be fair to say that those are kind of gaps within the collection of passive DNS?
A. Yes. So passive DNS kind of works on the principle that there is a -- that they're taking a sampling of the total

Internet traffic in the world and trying to draw conclusions based on that.
Q. Okay. The next slide, please.
A. One more click. There we go.

All right. So we have another connection. So
this time there's a DNS query for Yahoo, and in this case it does go through one of these passive DNS sensors. And when the query is made, the DNS sensor makes a copy of that -makes a copy of that query and it puts it into this format here. And this particular format is called JSON, and it's -- it's a format that can store a lot of information, and it's very easy for a lot of computer programs to read. It's somewhat less easy for humans to read.
Q. And when you're referring to the format, you're referring to the data that's right underneath "Passive DNS Logs" on the visual?
A. So yes, so it's the data that begins with "Date," and it has a lot of brackets and colons.
Q. And that is recording the fact that your great aunt looked up the IP for Yahoo and it went through the Yahoo server?
A. Yes. So it records several different pieces of information. So it says what time the query was made, who made the query, who answered the query, so which DNS server answered the query, and then what the answer to that query
was, among a few other different pieces of information. Q. Next slide.
A. So then we have another similar kind of look-up. They look up the IP address for Facebook. There's a passive DNS sensor in this path, too, and so it makes another entry here in the logs, and it shows the same information: who looked it up, where did they look it up, what was the answer, and when was the query made.
Q. So in looking at these logs, is there another format that might be a little more user friendly --
A. Yes, oftentimes these are converted into a format that's called a comma-separated or tab- or type-separated value format. And it's basically designed to be turned into a spreadsheet so it's a little bit easier to read either just looking at it as a text file or putting it into something like Excel.
Q. Ready for the next slide?
A. And so this here is an example of one of these kind of formats. So they've taken a subset of the fields.

So in this case the fields that are listed are the time that the query was made, and then there's this little separator character here that tends to be referred to as a pipe. There's what domain was queried for. And then the third field is who made the query, who looked it up.
Q. Now, you indicated that the different fields refer to
different things, but this looks like a lot less information than we had on the last screen. How does that translate to this? Do you pick and choose which data fields you want to put into this log?
A. Yes. So depending on how you export the data from sort of the raw format that it started with, you can pick to export every field, or you can decide that you're only interested in a certain subset of those fields here. And in this case there was a certain subset of fields chosen. Q. And just looking at this, for example, if you sent this --

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you speak into the microphone, please.

MS. SHAW: Oh, sure. Sorry. Sorry. I'm challenged between my eyesight and the microphone.
Q. So in terms of the categories that were selected here, would I automatically know that that's the date, and that's the IP, or would I have said -- have to write back and say, "Agent Martin, what are the column headers, or what's the key for this?"
A. Yes, because, I mean, it's hard to tell from this whether -- which -- I mean, the time field is pretty easy to figure out, that that's probably a time there saying the 6th of May of this year at 8:14 in the morning.

The domain name field, it might be kind of hard to
see what that actually represents. And with the IP address, you can wonder whether is that the user's IP? Is that the DNS server's IP? Is that Yahoo's IP?

So generally, when you -- when you export data to this format, you put what they call a header at the top. So these are like your -- when you have it in Excel Workbook, you'll have the column header at the top of each one to say what each one of these fields means.
Q. Okay. Is there another slide on DNS before we move on to --
A. I think that's it.
Q. Before we move on to the next topic, I just wanted to ask you a few questions about what we just reviewed in the slides with respect to DNS.

What does a DNS look-up tell us in most basic terms?
A. A DNS look-up tells you that one computer looked up the IP address for a particular domain name.
Q. And I realized I didn't ask you. The IP address, does that stand for "Internet protocol"?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, does the existence of a DNS look-up, such as what we might see in these logs, mean that there was an actual connection between the computer, your great aunt's computer, and Facebook?
A. No, it doesn't -- there are two separate processes. You can conduct a DNS look-up as -- basically as a way to -- as the first step of another connection, or you can look up -do a DNS look-up entirely on its own.
Q. And similarly, would a DNS look-up be able to tell you whether there were, in fact, communications such as emails between the two IP addresses?
A. No, a DNS look-up on its own cannot tell you that.
Q. Okay. And similarly, does it -- would an IP look-up be able to tell you any substance that was passed between that IP address and the look-up -- the one that was looked up? A. No. You would have to have a different source of data. So you would have to -- you would have to have another source of data to establish whether there was an actual connection or what occurred during that connection.
Q. So other than the look-up that was illustrated in these slides, is there anything else that can trigger an IP lookup?
A. There actually -- there's multiple different things it can do at a time. A lot of -- there are some utilities that are just designed to look up IP addresses. There's a command in Linux that's called DIG, D-I-G, just kind of like digging a hole, and it's designed to -- it takes an IP -- or it takes a domain name and it brings back the IP address for it. And it's just used for -- system administrators and
people like that use it to look up domain names.
You also have a lot of security appliances, things like spam filters or firewalls or things that are supposed to -- that are trying to block cyber attacks on networks that will look up IP -- or look up domain names to try and find out where they are or if they match; like in the case of email, whether the domain matches with the IP.

So if you're getting a phishing email that says this is coming from Amazon, your account has been suspended, but if they look up the domain name that it's coming from and it's not really Amazon, then the spam filter may choose to block it that way.
Q. Okay. And one more vocab term. What does "visibility" mean when we talk about DNS?
A. So it's -- particularly with passive DNS, it just means what -- which servers -- which DNS servers a particular passive DNS server can see.

So let's say, just for a completely contrived example, if there are a thousand DNS servers on the Internet, and there are passive DNS sensors for a particular company on ten of them, then they'd have 10 percent visibility over the total Internet. Q. And how does visibility affect an analyst's understanding of DNS data?
A. So it basically -- like analysts have to take into
consideration that any -- any passive DNS data that they're seeing represents a portion of all the DNS look-ups on the Internet. But there are obviously DNS queries that are happening that are not being picked up by that passive DNS source.

So if you see something in the passive DNS records, you know that that query had been made; however, you can't prove that a query was not made by it not being in the DNS record or the passive DNS records.
Q. So would it be fair to say that the collection source and its visibility would be something that would be important for the analyst to know in addressing this kind of data?
A. It's something that's good to know, although it's very hard to -- like you can't tell how -- I mean, no one knows exactly how many total DNS servers are on the Internet, so it's hard to say what percentage of visibility you actually do have for many of these commercial passive DNS services. Q. Okay. All right. Can $I$ have the next slide, please. Okay. TOR, can you tell us what TOR is.
A. So "TOR" is an acronym for The Onion Router, and it's a -- it's basically a network that's designed to help people stay anonymous on the Internet.
Q. And if you could, explain how it helps people stay anonymous on the Internet.
A. All right. So it's operated by a group call The TOR Project. It's a nonprofit Internet privacy organization, and it's basically run -- they run a network of computers that are operated by different volunteers who agree to participate in the network. And at the most basic level it -- every time you connect to a website or a resource on the Internet, it routes that connection through a random path.

So instead of going directly from your Internet service provider to the website you're visiting, it's going to route through a random series of other servers on the Internet, oftentimes even in different countries. So you may start here in Northern Virginia, end up in a server in the U.K., back down to South America, and then come out in Egypt before coming back to Google.
Q. Before going on to the demonstration of how that works, you indicate that there's a published list of TOR exit nodes. Tell us about that.
A. Yes, so The TOR Project keeps a list of all the different IPs that were used as TOR exit nodes over time, and they have this data published on the Internet, and it's available back to February of 2010.
Q. So if I were to have an IP address, I could go to The TOR Project and look up whether it's on there and as a TOR exit node?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. Next slide, please.

Help us understand TOR a little bit better. What are we seeing here?
A. All right. So this is a -- this is a graphic -- a pretty good infographic that we got from the Electronic Frontier Foundation, which is another nonprofit that's committed to Internet privacy, and it shows basically how to -- how the TOR connection works.

So the first step is that we have Alice here, and she'd like to browse through a particular website, and she'd like to do it anonymously, for whatever reason. And so the first thing she does is she goes to a server run by Dave here and has -- the server's part of the TOR network -- and gets a list of all the TOR nodes from that server, and it's called a directory server.
Q. Next slide.
A. So sort of the next step is that Alice's TOR client on her computer -- it's usually part of a web browser. So they have a thing called the TOR browser. It kind of automates a lot of this process. And so she -- the TOR software picks a random path out of all the different $T O R$ nodes that it knows of, it picks three random nodes and then sends the traffic through it in such a way that each node only knows the next node.

So the first -- the first computer here knows Alice's IP, and it knows the second node's IP.

The second node knows the first and the third, but not Alice or Bob.

And then the third knows the middle node and Bob, but not any of the other ones.
Q. And if you were to search on TOR like Alice is doing, was it going to go through the same path every time?
A. No, it's not going to.
Q. Next slide, please.
A. So here is a connection. So now Alice is going to -she's done looking at Bob's website. She's now going to be going to Jane's website, and so in this case she picks a new path for this new connection. It picks three different nodes in a different order, and then it makes the connection to Jane's website, and Alice is able to browse that.
Q. And would Alice know the path that it took?
A. I believe Alice could -- her software would know the path that it took, but, like, anybody on the other side wouldn't know the path.
Q. Is there a next slide?
A. I believe that's the end of it.
Q. Okay. So let's go back to the --

MS. SHAW: Keep the TOR up.
Q. So what's the purpose -- we talked about the encryption
that happens between these. What's the purpose behind this TOR routing system?
A. It's basically just to make sure it's -- it's to make it difficult to determine who is actually visiting a particular site.

There's a number of reasons that people will do this. Sometimes it's because they're in a country that restricts freedom of speech, and they want to get around government censorship in one of those kind of countries. It can also be used just because people want to browse anonymously because they're concerned with privacy. And it's also used by a lot of malicious actors to do things like connecting to -- like hacking computers and doing things like that. So it can be used for a whole variety of reasons.
Q. So you mentioned that it takes a random path and that the exit node will be different, potentially, each time you use TOR. Would you ever have it set up so that the exit node was at the same place every time?
A. No. I don't know if it's even possible to configure -it might be possible to force $T O R$ to do this somehow by messing with the software, but that would actually decrease your security to do that, because you would then be coming -- you'd basically be turning TOR into just a simple proxy.

Where -- a proxy server is where you send your traffic to a server, and then it comes out from another predictable place every time. So things like -- people will use them sometimes if they want to -- these simple proxies will use them to stream Netflix from a different country or something like that. But you wouldn't want to do that sort of thing through TOR because it's significantly slower than a regular connection because you -- for privacy, it has to jump through three different servers before it gets to where it's going.
Q. And then you mentioned privacy. So, for example, the bottom computer there next to Bob, if I were to set that up and say that that was going to be my $T O R$ exit node -- let's just assume that I could -- how would that affect my ability to stay private with what $I$ was doing on the Internet using TOR?
A. It would make you a lot easier to spot because if you're -- you're consistently connecting to a place, and you're trying to -- you consistently connect to a server without revealing who you are. If you're constantly coming out of the same TOR exit node, it's a lot easier to figure out it's the same person coming back over and over again, as opposed to if you're using $T O R$ the way it's supposed to work and that it does work and coming out of random exit nodes every time, it's very hard to tell whether -- whether any
two TOR connections are in any way related.
MS. SHAW: Thank you, Agent Martin.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. BOSWORTH:
Q. Good morning, Special Agent Martin.
A. Good morning.
Q. We've never met before, correct?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. So this is pretty complicated stuff, this DNS business? I'm envious.
A. It can be, yes. There are a lot of nuances behind it.
Q. And you're an expert in this, right?
A. I use it -- I use it and analyze DNS traffic quite frequently.
Q. And you became an expert because of your education and experience leading to today, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. So you studied computer science in college?
A. That's correct.
Q. You got a master's degree?
A. Yes.
Q. You got training for what seems like hundreds of hours?
A. Yes, quite a few.
Q. And you got all these certifications in various cyber
security and DNS subject matters?
A. Yes, in multiple cyber security matters.
Q. And so all that education and training is what enables you today to understand this and explain this to the jury and to walk us through how DNS works, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you testified on direct examination about what a DNS look-up is. Is it fair to say that at the most elemental level it's just one computer trying to find out where another server is on the Internet?
A. Yes; at a very basic level, yes.
Q. That's the only level $I$ can do it.

It doesn't, for example, show that one computer is, in fact, sending an email to another computer?
A. That's correct. They're -- like in order to send an email, it will do a DNS look-up, but the fact that there was a DNS look-up doesn't mean that an email was sent.
Q. And similarly, just because there was a look-up doesn't mean that one particular computer connected to the website of another computer, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And it doesn't show the content of any emails that might have been exchanged between one computer and another computer?
A. That's correct. It simply shows the domain name was
looked up.
Q. And that's a basic fact about DNS data. It shows a potential connection, but it doesn't show the actual connection or what's going on in the interaction between one computer and another?
A. Yes. I mean, so in the most strictly technical sense, a DNS look-up is a connection in and of itself, but any connection to the IP that was returned by the DNS look-up is not in the DNS data so...
Q. Got it.
A. In that regard, the look-up is totally separate from any kind of substantive communication after the fact.
Q. Got it.

So it is a basic fact that the look-up is different from the substantive communication?
A. That's correct.
Q. And any cyber expert would know that fact, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the FBI's cyber experts would know that fact?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And to actually figure out if one computer is connecting to the other computer, an investigator would need to do more, right, would need more information? Is that fair to say?
A. Yes. There would have to be an additional investigation
to determine that.
Q. So, for example, you could get a search warrant to figure out what's going on at a server, correct?
A. Potentially. There are multiple different techniques you could use depending on the context.
Q. Okay. And you could use subpoenas to try to get information, right?
A. Yes. Subpoenas can be used to get information from different service providers.
Q. Okay. And you could interview people at a service provider who are at a server, correct?
A. Potentially you could, depending on what level of knowledge and access they had.
Q. Okay. And those are things that the FBI can do, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Those are things that a private citizen like me couldn't do, right?
A. There are -- I mean, people -- yes, you can't -- a private citizen can't get a search warrant or a subpoena or any of those sorts of legal processes.
Q. I can't force a server to give me information about what's going on with someone's communications, correct? A. No, not without a court issuing an order. I mean, as an attorney relevant to a case, I'm sure that you could get a subpoena or get a court order for information.
Q. And those steps that we just discussed are steps that only law enforcement officers can take, getting a search warrant, getting a subpoena? Yes or no.
A. They are -- I mean, there are other ways of getting a subpoena. For example, in a civil -- in a civil case, different litigants can -- and their attorneys can get court orders and subpoenas for information relevant to the case. But in general, in a criminal investigation, law enforcement would go to the U.S. Attorney's Office or to the prosecuting authority to get the Court to issue that process.
Q. Okay. Let me just do it again so we get a clear yes or no, if you can.

So law enforcement officers can issue search warrants to figure out if one computer is, in fact, communicating with another, correct?
A. Law enforcement officers can request search warrants and serve them, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. But the judge issues the search warrant.
Q. They can request a search warrant. They can't get a search warrant.
A. Correct. They can request a search warrant from a judge and then serve that search warrant to get the information. Q. You testified on direct examination about visibility into the source of DNS data. Do you remember that
testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Just to be clear, the FBI doesn't have access to all the DNS data in the world, correct?
A. Certainly not.
Q. And the FBI gets access to data sometimes by purchasing DNS data; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And fair to say the more the government pays for DNS data, the more valuable it is to the government?
A. Not necessarily. There -- having multiple sort of passive DNS sources is useful because there's a different -each set of data has a different sort of area of visibility. So having a couple or a few different passive DNS providers can be valuable, but I don't know that it's necessarily -how that value scales with price.
Q. But you get what you pay for, right?
A. It is a paid service. You don't get it for free.
Q. Okay. Do you know a man by the name of Rodney Joffe?
A. I've met him before.
Q. You met him before?
A. Yes.
Q. So I take it you know him?
A. I wouldn't say I know him. I've met him on -- related to a case.
Q. And he's someone who is a DNS expert, too, right?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. He's someone who is highly respected and trusted in the cyber security community, correct?
A. He's well known in the cyber security community.
Q. Are you aware that he and his companies maintain contracts with the U.S. government resulting in payments of tens of millions of dollars for services including DNS data?
A. Not specifically. I know that there are some contracts, but I don't know the specifics of the contracts with Neustar.
Q. Were you aware that Rodney Joffe had patents in DNS data?
A. I believe I had heard that before.
Q. And he founded companies that specialize in DNS data?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was someone that the $F B I$ in the 2016 time period respected. Fair to say?
A. As far as I know.
Q. And he's someone that the FBI relied on, correct?
A. I would say that the -- I don't know --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, sir. What was your last answer?

THE WITNESS: What's that?
THE COURT: What was your last answer?

THE WITNESS: Martin.
THE COURT: Your last answer.
THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
THE COURT: As far as $I$ know?

THE WITNESS: As far as I -- sorry, the last
question was...?
MR. BOSWORTH: I can rephrase it.
THE COURT: Repeat the last question.
MR. BOSWORTH: Yes, sir. Let me withdraw it and
rephrase it.
BY MR. BOSWORTH:
Q. Are you aware that Rodney Joffe was a confidential human source for the FBI?
A. I was told that after the fact.
Q. I want to go back to some of the questions about visibility.

So you were asked: Would it be good to know about the collection and source of DNS data that's provided to the government? Do you remember those questions?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you said it would be good to know that.
A. Yes, it would be good to know the source.
Q. And if you cared about the data, and you wanted to know and have visibility, then you would want to know where the data came from, correct?
A. Yes, I would like to know where the data came from.
Q. And if you really cared about having visibility into the data, you'd want to speak to that source to figure out where, in the DNS landscape, they were getting this stuff from, correct?
A. So I would want to -- I would want to know where the -so any time that we're using a data source, we want to know what the provenance of that data is, so we want to know whether -- whether -- like I said, what company we purchase that data from or if it had been provided to us by a witness or a victim or someone of that nature, whether that -whether that data -- like basically where they got that data from.

So basically data that we, as the FBI, purchased, I would have to be able to cite what the source of that data was. And then if it was data provided by a third party, a victim or a witness, we'd want to know where that data came from.
Q. Okay. Let me try to ask this as a yes or no question. If you cared about having visibility into DNS data in the possession of the government, you would want to know what the source of that data is, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And finally, you know, this is a case against

Mr. Sussman sitting at the table over there. You don't know

Mr. Sussman, correct?
A. I believe I met him one time, but I don't recall specifically.
Q. Okay. You weren't part of the FBI team that investigated allegations of links between Alfa-Bank and the Trump organization, correct?
A. No, I was not part of that team.
Q. You don't know what Mr. Sussman knows about DNS data, correct?
A. I have no base -- I have the documentary evidence that was provided and nothing more.
Q. Okay. So just to be clear, you don't know what

Mr. Sussman does or doesn't know about DNS data, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you weren't at the meeting Mr. Sussman had with

Mr. Baker on September 19, 2016, correct?
A. No, I was not at the meeting.
Q. Not part of the follow-up calls between Mr. Baker and

Mr. Sussman in September 2016?
A. No.
Q. No idea what they talked about during those conversations?
A. No.

MR. BOSWORTH: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Very briefly, Your Honor.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. SHAW:
Q. So Special Agent Martin, Mr. Bosworth was asking you about search warrants, things that the FBI can do that a private citizen couldn't do with respect to DNS -- finding evidence about DNS data. During the presentation you talked about the passive DNS sensors and the companies that own those.

Would someone at those companies be able to access their own -- the DNS data that they were collecting?
A. Yes, definitely.
Q. All right. And with respect to the FBI, when it's
looking to do an investigative step such as a search warrant, would it typically want to have information about the source and the reliability of the source to be able to tell the judge so that he or she could evaluate that search warrant?
A. Yes. That's critical information for applying for legal process.
Q. Okay. Mr. Bosworth asked you about Rodney Joffe. Do you know whether Mr. Joffe is still a CHS?

MR. BOSWORTH: Objection.

THE COURT: Basis?

Overruled.

To the extent you know.
THE WITNESS: Huh?
THE COURT: You may answer to the extent that you know.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
A. No, I have no idea.
Q. Are you aware that Mr. Joffe was closed for cause as a source?
A. No.

MS. SHAW: I have nothing further.
THE COURT: All right. Agent Martin, thank you very much for your testimony. You are excused. Please don't discuss your testimony with anyone until the case is over, okay? Have a good day.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, feel free to stand up and stretch, if you'd like. I know those chairs aren't always as comfortable as they can be.

All right. Are you all set?
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, the government calls Special Agent Scott Hellman.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hellman.

Okay. Step right up, sir. Feel free to remove your mask, remain standing, and raise your right hand to be
sworn.
(Witness sworn)
THE COURT: Please have a seat.
SPECIAL AGENT SCOTT HELLMAN, Sworn

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. DeFILIPPIS:
Q. Good morning, Special Agent Hellman.
A. Good morning, sir.
Q. Could you state and just spell your name for the record.
A. Scott Hellman, spelled S-C-O-T-T, H-E-L-L-M-A-N.
Q. Agent Hellman, where do you currently work?
A. I work for the FBI.
Q. What's your position there?
A. I'm a Supervisory Special Agent.
Q. And what is a Supervisory Special Agent?
A. I don't lead my own investigations any longer; I lead a team of investigators who investigate cyber crime.
Q. Now, over the course of your career at the FBI, generally speaking, what kinds of work have you done?
A. I've spent all 14 years of my time in the FBI
investigating cyber crime, and then a small amount of that
time investigating intellectual property rights crimes.
Q. And geographically where have you been located while you're working at the FBI?
A. Most of my time has been spent investigating in San

Francisco, and then I spent three years at FBI headquarters in the D.C. area.

THE COURT: Sir, would you mind explaining to the jury briefly what cyber crime is and what intellectual property crime is.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
So in the FBI -- so cyber crime for us is investigating different types of hacking crimes. So someone gains unauthorized access into a computer or a computer network and maybe takes things or looks at things, a computer system that they don't have the authority to gain access to, and that would be for cyber crime.

Intellectual property rights crimes could be copyrights violations or you're stealing something that's considered a trade secret or maybe a trademarks violation, something along those lines.

THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. DeFILIPPIS:
Q. And Agent Hellman, is the FBI divided into divisions and units?
A. Yes.
Q. And is there something called the cyber division?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is -- what does the cyber division do?
A. So cyber division investigates a wide range of different
cyber crimes from maybe financially motivated crimes, people stealing information to make money, or maybe it could be coming from a foreign country that's trying to hack into government systems or sensitive systems to steal
information. A wide range of different types of cyber crimes.
Q. Is there another division of the FBI called the counterintelligence division?
A. Yes.
Q. And, briefly, what does the counterintelligence division do?
A. Counterintelligence. It's certainly not my area of expertise, but the brunt of it is they're going to be looking at foreign countries trying to gain information about the United States through a variety of means.
Q. And are there cases in which the cyber division and the counterintelligence division collaborate or work together?
A. Yes.
Q. Over the course of your career, have you done cyber investigations that involved national security matters?
A. Yes.
Q. How familiar or unfamiliar are you with what is known as DNS or Domain Name System data?
A. I know the basics about DNS.
Q. And in your understanding, on a very basic level, what
is DNS?
A. DNS is basically how one computer would try and communicate with another computer. It wouldn't have to be a communication, but, for example, if I'm interested in going to website XYZ.com, my computer needs to know the IP address of XYZ, so it's going to ask a question to DNS servers. And the question would be: Tell me what the IP address is for website XYZ.com.

And so DNS is the process of translating a domain name or a website name to that IP address so the two computers can transmit information back and forth.
Q. What was your position at the FBI in 2016?
A. Midway through 2016 I moved to FBI headquarters, and I was a program manager in cyber division.
Q. What does a program manager do?
A. So I worked with different field offices whose responsibility it was to investigate cyber crimes, so I facilitated -- tried to help those different offices coordinate together.
Q. Physically or geographically, where were you based?

Where was your office?
A. I was based in Chantilly, Virginia.
Q. And how far or close is that from FBI headquarters in Washington, D.C.?
A. It's about an hour away.
Q. Now, did there come a time when you learned about information that the FBI received concerning a supposedly secret channel of communications between the Trump organization and a Russian bank called Alfa-Bank?
A. Yes.
Q. When was that?
A. That was in September of 2016.
Q. Do you remember beginning, end of the month? Do you remember a date?
A. September 19th of 2016.
Q. Now, in getting ready to testify today, have you reviewed documents, records, emails, and the like?
A. Yes.
Q. And so when you testify to dates, are you basing that on your refreshed recollection of that review?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you learned of this information that had come into the FBI, what, if anything, did you learn about who took it in, who at the FBI received it?
A. I learned that the information was provided to then-FBI General Counsel James Baker.
Q. And who alerted you to this information? Was it

Mr. Baker, or was it someone else?
A. No, it was my supervisor at the time, Special Agent Nate Batty.
Q. Okay. And he was your supervisor in the cyber division?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Agent Hellman, are you familiar with the term "chain of custody"?
A. Yes.
Q. And in FBI terms, what does "chain of custody" mean?
A. So chain of custody is a mechanism by which, when you collect a piece of evidence, you want to make sure you can track exactly who had custody over that evidence; and so it's essentially a piece of paper that you're going to sign or someone's going to sign when they first collect it.

And then if they hand the evidence to somebody else, then that person's going to need to sign it, and the next person's going to need to sign it. So if at some point you need to use that evidence, say at a trial, you have a record of everyone who has had custody over that evidence. Q. Is that commonly done when evidence is collected by the FBI?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in the case of this information $I$ was just asking you about -- the Alfa-Bank/Trump organization information -did you play a role in any chain-of-custody process there?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was your role?
A. My role was to obtain signatures from people who had had
custody over the evidence, which were some thumb drives.
Q. Now, did you do that by yourself or with others?
A. I did it in coordination with multiple other people.
Q. Okay. And who were those people, to the extent you remember?
A. It would have been Nate Batty, who was my supervisor at the time, and another FBI employee named Jordan Kelly.
Q. Did you do all of that on the day the evidence or materials came into the FBI on September 19th or another day?
A. No. We obtained signatures for the chain of custody the next day, on September 20th.
Q. Why was that?
A. The thumb drives presumably were at FBI headquarters, and we were in Chantilly, and so we drove out the next -the subsequent day to obtain the thumb drives and obtain the signatures for the chain.
Q. And when you say "we drove out," who drove out?
A. It was me and my supervisor, Nate Batty.
Q. Special Agent Hellman, I'm going to show you on the screen there what's been premarked Government Exhibit 282. Do you see that document?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recognize what it is?
A. I do.
Q. And what is it?
A. It's the chain of custody that we -- or I and multiple other people obtained signatures for for the evidence that -- the evidence in question.
Q. And do you recognize it from your involvement in actually preparing the chain and obtaining those signatures? A. Yes.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, the government offers Government Exhibit 282.

MR. BERKOWITZ: No objection. THE COURT: So moved.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: And, Ms. Arsenault, if we could publish that to the jury.
Q. Special Agent Hellman, there are a number of boxes and lines on the chain of custody. Do you see those?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in the upper right of the chain of custody form we see it says "Signature of Seizing Individual." Can you just describe what that means.
A. That's basically the first person to receive a piece of evidence.
Q. And so in this case who was that?
A. James Baker, general counsel for the FBI.
Q. Is that the individual you mentioned before as the person you understood had received this Alfa-Bank/Trump-
related information?
A. Yes.
Q. And then just describe for us how does one interpret who, in order, would have taken custody of the evidence at issue? In other words, what's the order along the form?
A. So you're going to read the form after the initial receipt. It's going to be reading left to right. So you have someone with the initial receipt, and then you would skip to the next to the left. You would go down one row to the left.

So it says "Relinquished Custody." Whoever that person is would have handed it off to someone else. So in this case it would be Baker relinquishing it to Peter Strzok. So you would look to the right, and it would say "Accepted Custody," and you would continue down that path. So one person hands it off to somebody else. You're going to have one person relinquish, and then the next person accepts it. And both have to sign, and so forth and so on.
Q. Okay. So in this case it looks like it started with Mr. Baker, and then he relinquished custody there on the top left; is that right?
A. Second row on the left he relinquished custody, yes.
Q. And to whom did Mr. Baker relinquish custody?
A. Peter Strzok.
Q. Do you recall what position Peter Strzok had at the FBI?
A. I believe he was in the counterintelligence division, but I don't remember what his position was.
Q. Okay. And then the next person to whom Mr. Strzok relinquished custody?
A. To Eric Sporre.
Q. And who is Eric Sporre?
A. Eric Sporre was senior executive in cyber division. He was the deputy assistant director at the time for cyber division.
Q. And then, according to this chain of custody, who did

Mr. Sporre give the materials to?
A. To Nate Batty.
Q. And was that your supervisor who you mentioned before?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then presumably, if we follow the rest, we would see who else handled the materials; is that right? A. Yes.
Q. What is your understanding of the materials that came in? What did they consist of?
A. So the materials that came in were basically broken into two parts. One was some technical data, so numbers and website names or domain names; and then the other was a narrative presumably explaining -- giving a summary of that data and explaining some conclusions about whoever wrote the
summary, their conclusions based upon their analysis of the data.
Q. And returning to the chain of custody, did you actually go to Mr. Baker's office to get his signature on this form?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And which -- did you then go to others to get their signatures, or was that handled by others?
A. I was able to get a signature from Mr. Baker as well as Mr. Sporre; but Peter Strzok was not available, and someone else obtained his signature.
Q. And when you went to Mr. Baker's office, do you remember what, if anything, was said during that discussion or during that interaction?
A. I remember being in the office, but I don't distinctly recall what the conversation was.

I do remember after the fact, though, that I was frustrated that I was not able to identify who had provided these thumb drives, this information to Mr. Baker. He was not willing to tell me.
Q. And if you look on the chain of custody form, is there a place on the form where you have to write where it came from, or no?
A. Not on this form, no.
Q. Okay. And is there another form that sometimes records that?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is that form called?
A. It's typically called a green sheet, and it's basically whenever you seize something, whether someone provides it to you voluntarily or you seize it through a court order, you write down the date and the time where you got it and where you got it from. And usually that's so at the end of the case, when you need to return pieces of evidence, you know who to return it to.
Q. So was it your testimony before that at the end of this process you were not able to determine where the thumb drives and the materials came from?
A. That's correct.
Q. And was that -- did you otherwise speak to Mr. Baker in connection with this case?
A. No.
Q. And so do you know whether or not Mr. Baker told others where he obtained the materials from?
A. I do not know.
Q. Now, once the materials had been logged and the chain of custody was created, were you asked to do anything in particular to analyze or otherwise do something with the materials?
A. Yes. I was asked to perform two tasks in tandem with Special Agent Batty, and our tasks were, number one, to look
at this data, look at the data and look at the narrative that it came with and identify were there any what's known as cyber equities. And by that it was, was there any allegation of a hacking. That's what cyber division does. We investigate hacking. So was there an allegation that somebody or some company or some computer had been hacked. That was first.

And then the second was to review the data with our technical background and provide some assessment as to what we thought about the data and what we thought about the narrative that it came with.
Q. And who, if anyone, assisted you or collaborated with you in that effort?
A. It was me and Nate Batty.
Q. That's your supervisor?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, what principally, from the materials, did you rely on to do your analysis?
A. So it was really two things. It was looking at the data, the technical data itself. There was a summary that it came with. And then also we were comparing what we saw in the data, sort of the story that the data told us, and then looking at the narrative that it came with and comparing our assessment of the data to the narrative. Q. If I could show you what's been premarked as Government

Exhibit 217, which should appear on your screen there.
A. Yes. It says 247.
Q. Okay. So looking at Government Exhibit 217, do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is this?
A. This is essentially the summary or narrative that came along with the technical data.
Q. And you recognize it from having looked at it at the time?
A. Yes.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, the government offers Government Exhibit 217.

MR. BERKOWITZ: No objection.
THE COURT: 217's admitted.
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Ms. Arsenault, if we could
publish that one.
BY MR. DeFILIPPIS:
Q. So Agent Hellman, I just want to direct your attention to the top level portion of that paper. What is the title of this paper?
A. "White Paper \#1 - Auditable V3."
Q. Okay. And then below that, there's a heading that says
"Findings." Do you understand this paper to be what you testified earlier, the document that set out the narrative
of allegations that Mr. Baker received?
A. Yes.
Q. And under "Findings," would you just read for the jury that section there.
A. Absolutely.
"The Trump Organization is using a very unusuallyconfigured 'secret' email server in Pennsylvania for current and ongoing email communications with Alfa Bank (Moscow), and with Alfa Bank (Moscow) through another unusuallyconfigured server (a 'TOR exit node') at Spectrum Health in Michigan.
"These servers are configured for direct communications between the Trump organization and Alfa Bank to the exclusion of all other systems.
"The only plausible explanation for this server configuration is that it shows the Trump Organization and Alfa Bank to be using multiple sophisticated layers of protection in order to obfuscate their considerable recent email traffic."
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Does that accord with what you remember the gist of the allegation was that you were analyzing?
A. Yes. That was the brunt of the allegation that came along with the data.
Q. And in connection with that analysis, did you also take
a look at the data itself that was underlying this paper? A. Yes.
Q. And if $I$ could show just to you on your screen what's been marked Government Exhibit 208.

And Agent Hellman, this is about an 18- or 19-page
document. But you just see the first page here. Do you recognize this?
A. It appears to be a portion of the technical data that came along with the narrative.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: All right. Your Honor, the government offers Government Exhibit 208.

MR. BERKOWITZ: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved.
Q. And if we look at that first page there, Agent Hellman, what kind of data is this?
A. It appears to be -- as far as I can tell, it looks to be -- it's log data. So it's a log that shows a date and a time, a domain, and an IP address. And, I mean, that's -just looking at this log, there's not too much more from that.
Q. And do you understand this to be at least a part of the DNS data that was contained on the thumb drives that $I$ think you testified about earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if you look towards the center of the fields of
data there, there's a part that says
"mail1.trump-email.com."
A. Yes.
Q. What do you understand that to be?
A. The allegation that came along with this technical data was that there was a secret communication channel -- I'm trying to -- pardon me if I'm paraphrasing -- a secret communication channel between a domain controlled by the Trump organization, and that would be the maill.trumpemail.com, and that was to be the domain that was alleged to be communicating with Alfa-Bank.
Q. Okay. And then $I$ just want to draw your attention back to the paper we had seen, Government Exhibit 217.
A. Yes.
Q. So when this paper said in the portion you read that
"The Trump Organization is using a very unusually-configured
'secret' email server in Pennsylvania," did you understand the server to be the maill.trump-email.com server?
A. That's what was being alleged in the document, yes.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: And, Ms. Arsenault, if we could go to the third page of that document to the footnote. Q. It says there, Agent Hellman, that "maili.trumpemail.com is hosted by a Pennsylvania-based company, Listrak, which is a reasonably well known CRM" -- or customer relationship management -- "company that provides
large-scale distribution of marketing emails (usually sending emails to thousands of recipients hundreds of times a day)."

What do you understand that to be referring to, the CRM concept?
A. This particular piece is not something that we -- I don't really have a strong recollection of us talking through this piece considerably.
Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the notion of spam email?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you understand this to be similar or equivalent to spam servers?
A. I don't know that I would have couched this necessarily as a spam server, but perhaps something that's being used for marketing or sending marketing emails.
Q. Got it. But you said you didn't focus particularly
strongly on that piece of this paper?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So tell us how you went about doing your analysis with Mr. Batty.
A. As I mentioned, the first piece was we had to identify was there any real allegation of hacking; and there was not. That was our first task by our supervisor. There was not. The allegation was that someone purported to find
a secret communication channel between the Trump organization and Russia. And so we identified first that, no, we didn't think that there was any cyber equity, meaning that there was probably nothing more for cyber to investigate further, if there was no hacking crime.

And then the second piece was really just looking at the data, getting an understanding of what story does this data tell me, and then comparing it against the narrative that it came along with.
Q. And so did you and Mr. Batty do that together?
A. We did.
Q. And what did your analysis, generally speaking, find? A. We did not agree with the conclusion in the paper. We did not agree that this data represented the finding of a secret channel of communication between the Trump organization and Russia.
Q. What were some of the reasons for that?
A. First, $I$ felt that whoever had written that paper had jumped to some conclusions that were not supported by the technical data.

Number two, I felt that the methodology that they used to do their analysis was -- the methodology they chose was questionable to me, or it was not a way that $I$ would have chosen to do it and felt like it was a roundabout way to go about doing it, so it was questionable.

And number three, just overall looking at the overall conclusion they had come to was that they had found a secret communication between Trump, the Trump organization, and Russia, and that just didn't make sense to us because we're looking at a domain. Why would a presidential candidate put their own name in the domain name, the supposedly secret domain, in a domain name that was easily connectible to the organization; and then why would it be -- that computer be connecting directly to another computer in Russia, if this was all supposed to be a secret communication. So that piece of it just didn't ring true at all.
Q. And when you testified earlier, $I$ think your first reason was that some of the conclusions put forth you disagreed with or -- can you explain that a little bit more? A. Yes. So in one example, I believe the researchers or whoever wrote that paper said that they had attempted to connect with this Trump email server, or purported Trump email server, and that the Trump email server returned an error message basically -- returned an error message. And from that, they were assuming that that Trump email server would only communicate with certain devices and not with theirs.

And that didn't make sense to me. It was sort of like if I knocked on your door, and you told me to go away,

I don't want to talk to you, I'm then going to assume that you're only willing to talk to other people. I can't make that assumption. I don't know if you're willing to talk to anybody.

But that's what they had done. When they received an error message, they assumed that that computer wasn't willing to talk to them, but it was willing to talk to others, and there was no evidence to suggest that.

So assumptions like that is what $I$ was referring to.
Q. And, Special Agent Hellman, putting aside the authenticity of the data or where the data might have come from, if you assume the data was real, did you agree with the paper's conclusions in terms of what that data showed? A. No.
Q. Why was that?
A. The data itself, it just -- there was not enough data there to make the conclusion that there was, A, any communication or, B, any secret communication between the Trump organization and Russia.
Q. Okay. If I could show you what's been marked Government Exhibit 247, which will show up on your screen. Do you recognize that document, Agent Hellman?
A. It's not on the screen yet.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. What are you looking at there?
A. This is the summary document that Special Agent Batty and I drafted together. It was our summary of the data.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, the government offers Government Exhibit 247.

MR. BERKOWITZ: No objection, subject to the agreement we had about what's in there, correct? MR. DeFILIPPIS: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. So moved. So we'll publish that to the jury.

BY MR. DeFILIPPIS:
Q. Special Agent Hellman, how long would you say it took you and Special Agent Batty to write this up?
A. Inside of a day.
Q. Inside of a day, you said?
A. Yes.
Q. And any particular reason why it was done so quickly?
A. Our job was to analyze the data, draft this sort of summary, and then we were to pass our summary and the thumb drives on to the Chicago division for further analysis.
Q. Okay. Now, let me direct your attention to the top line of the paper there, the top paragraph.

Could you just read that first paragraph there.
A. "Assessment of the provided white paper and supporting
document on (2) thumb drives.
"SUMMARY - ECOU 1 assess there is no CyD equity in this report and that the research conducted in the report reveals some questionable investigative steps taken and conclusions drawn. This opinion is drawn from the following observations."
Q. Okay. First on terminology, what is "ECOU 1"?
A. So ECOU was the unit $I$ was in in cyber headquarters. In stands for Eurasian Cyber Operations Unit. And we basically helped to manage field offices who were investigating cyber threats coming from Eurasia, mostly Russia.
Q. And then when the paper says "there is no CyD equity," CyD?
A. Right. "CyD" is cyber division. And so we're saying we did not identify any allegation of hacking, so there is nothing else for CyD or cyber division to investigate further.
Q. It then says that "the research conducted in the report reveals some questionable investigative steps and conclusion" -- "taken and conclusions drawn. This opinion is drawn from the following observations."

Is that what you referred to before about the methodology for the author of this paper?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let me ask you, were you able to determine from any
of these materials who had actually drafted the paper alleging the secret channel?
A. No.
Q. In other words, was it contained anywhere in the documents?
A. No.
Q. Let me direct your attention to a later part of that paper, which is the last page.

THE COURT: And ladies and gentlemen, you will notice that a portion of this document has been redacted. You are probably going to see that with other documents that are introduced throughout the trial. And there are lots of reasons why a certain portion of a document cannot be shown to a jury, so you are not to speculate at all as to what's behind those redactions. And it will be a pretty common occurrence in this case. Okay?

Go ahead.
Q. Special Agent Hellman, if you would just start reading where it says "it appears" at the end of that first paragraph there.
A. "Furthermore, it appears suspicious that the presumed suspicious activity began approximately three weeks prior to the stated start of the investigation conducted by the researcher."
Q. What did you mean there?
A. We found it to be very -- conveniently coincidental that someone was presumably looking for suspicious activity between two computers, and they started looking, and they found that the activity had just started three weeks prior. So the timing of when their investigation started and when the suspicious activity started seemed to be coincidentally close in time in proximity.
Q. Okay. Now, let me direct you to the next paragraph there. Just read the first sentence beginning "Finally."
A. "Finally, it appears abnormal that a presidential candidate, who wanted to conduct secret correspondence with the Russian government (or a Russian bank), would (1) name his secret server 'mail1.trump-email.com', (2) use a domain (trump-email.com) registered to his own organization, and then (3) communicate directly to the Russian bank's IP address (as opposed to using TOR or proxy servers)."
Q. So I think you testified a bit to this earlier, but what did you mean to say there?
A. That that -- those facts don't suggest secret communication of any sort.
Q. And in what respect?
A. That the connections to the people alleging or the organization allegedly having the secret communications were very overt. The name "Trump" was in the domain. The domain was registered to an organization associated with Trump. So
that doesn't suggest -- to me did not suggest secret communications.
Q. Okay. And the last sentence of that paragraph, what does that say?
A. "ECOU 1 also assesses Russian state-sponsored technical sophistication to exceed the OpsSec of that suggested in the report."
Q. The term -- so ECOU 1 we know. OpsSec, what is OpsSec?
A. "OpsSec" stands for operation security.
Q. And what does "operation security" mean?
A. It's basically either you or your organization's capability of protecting -- it could be protecting communications, protecting information, obfuscating or hiding your ability to hide secret information. Q. Okay. And in what sense did you conclude that Russian state-sponsored technical sophistication to exceed -- ECOU assesses that Russian technical sophistication exceeds the OpsSec of that suggested in the report. What does that mean?
A. It means that this alleged communication was having -was happening fairly directly between this Trump domain and this Russian domain, and that having worked or -- having worked investigations involving Russian state-sponsored cyber capability, we believe that Russia would have a much more technical capability to hide communications; and if
they were to be secret, that Russia would have the ability to hide those communications. They wouldn't be so overt and direct between this Trump domain and this Russian domain. Q. Now returning to the first page of your analysis.

So we looked at the top part, which set out your top-line conclusion. You then have a portion of the paper that says, "The investigators who conducted the research appear to have done the following."

Now, Special Agent Hellman, it appears to be a pretty technical discussion, but can you just tell us, in that first part of the paper, what did you set out and what did you conclude?
A. It looks to be that they were looking for domains associated with Trump, and the way that they did that was they looked at a list of sort of all domains and looked for domains that had the word "Trump" in them as a way to narrow down the number of domains they were looking at.

And then they wanted to find, well, which of that initial set of Trump domains, which of them are email servers associated with those domains. And the way they did that was to search for terms associated with email, like "mail" or other email-related terms to then narrow down their list of domains even further to be Trump-associated domains that were email servers.
Q. And did you opine on the soundness of that methodology?

In other words, did you express a view as to whether this was a good way to go about this project?
A. We did not -- I did not feel that that was the most expeditious way to go about identifying email servers associated with the domain.
Q. And why was that?
A. You can name an email server anything you want. It doesn't have to have the words "mail" or "SMTP" in it. And so by -- if you're just searching for those terms, I would wager to guess you would miss an actual email server because there are other -- there are other more technical ways that you can use -- basically look-up tools, Internet look-up tools where you can say, for any domain, tell me the associated email server. That's essentially like a registered email server.

But the way that they were doing it was they were just looking for key terms, and I think that it just didn't make sense to me why they would go about identifying email servers that way as opposed to just being able to look them up.
Q. Was there anything else about the methodology used here by the writer or writers of this paper that you found questionable or that you didn't agree with?
A. I think just the overall assumptions that were being made about that the server itself was actually communicating
at all. That was probably one of the biggest ones.
Q. And what, if anything, did you conclude about whether you believed the authors of the paper or author of the paper was fairly and neutrally conducting an analysis? Did you have an opinion either way?

MR. BERKOWITZ: Objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Basis?
MR. BERKOWITZ: Objection on foundation. He asked him his opinion. He's not qualified as an expert for that. THE COURT: I'll overrule it.
A. Sorry, can you please repeat the question?
Q. Sure. Did you draw a conclusion one way or the other as to whether the authors of this paper seemed to be applying a sound methodology or whether, to the contrary, they were trying to reach a particular result? Did you --
A. Based upon the conclusions they drew and the assumptions that they made, I did not feel like they were objective in the conclusions that they came to.
Q. And any particular reasons or support for that?
A. Just the assumption you would have to make was so far reaching, it didn't -- it just didn't make any sense.
Q. And then -- okay.

Now, once this paper was drafted, what, if anything, did you and Mr. Batty do with it?
A. We drafted it, and then we sent it on to Chicago where
there was another FBI -- numerous other FBI individuals or employees that were performing additional analysis and investigation.
Q. And going back -- before we get to Chicago, going back to your ultimate conclusions here, to what extent were you and Mr. Batty jointly comfortable that the paper you wrote reflected sound analysis?
A. We both drafted this paper together, and we felt very comfortable that both of us came to the same ultimate conclusion, that we did not agree with the narrative that came along with it.
Q. And to what extent were you comfortable that you and Mr. Batty had reached your conclusions independent of any personal views or any other bias or other factors?
A. Very, very confident.
Q. Why --
A. I'm sorry, go ahead.
Q. Why is that?
A. Special Agent Batty and I were -- he was my supervisor, but we were also close friends, spoke regularly. And so I know that he and I shared very different views on a wide range of different topics, and as a result, we both felt very proud of the work that we did. Despite the fact that we had drastically differing views on various topics, we both came to the same conclusion when we were drafting this
assessment.
Q. Now, you mentioned FBI Chicago. How did they come to get involved in this?
A. I don't know, other than all $I$ was told at the time was that Chicago was performing some -- they called it like a special or special investigation, and they were going to be doing some further analysis, and we were to provide our analysis and the thumb drives to them.
Q. And is it fair to say that the cyber division, which you talked about before, they passed on this or decided not to investigate it?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. Why was that?
A. There was no cyber equity. There was no allegation of hacking, so there was no hacking crime for us to investigate further.
Q. Is it your understanding that the FBI opened an investigation into this matter?
A. I believe that's true.
Q. And was that Chicago, FBI Chicago?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. Now, did you have any subsequent involvement in any investigation that was done?
A. Certainly no involvement in the investigation. I did have some communication with some of the agents in Chicago
briefly after this event.
Q. To the extent you recall, what were the name or names of those agents?
A. Primarily it was Allison Sands, Special Agent Allison Sands, and then one or two emails with Special Agent Curtis Hiede.
Q. Generally speaking, what was the nature of your interactions after you had done this paper, interactions with them?
A. Primarily with Allison, it was to discuss our assessment of this document or assessment of this technical data, and to get an understanding of whether she and Chicago had come to the same conclusions that we had.
Q. And over the course of your discussions, what did you find about that or hear about that?
A. That Chicago had looked at the data further and had agreed with our assessment that they also did not concur with this idea that there was a secret communication channel between the Trump organization and Russia.
Q. When the FBI opens an inquiry or some kind of investigation, are there different levels or types of investigations?
A. There are.
Q. And can you just explain to the jury what those levels are.
A. So there's basically three levels. We have assessments and preliminary investigations and full investigations, and you have to have a certain amount of data and facts before you can open one of those various different levels.
Q. Could you just explain to the jury the levels in order of sort of least expansive and most expansive and what might affect the level of an investigation?
A. Sure. So if you have specific articulable facts that a crime has occurred, then you can open a full investigation. If you've got an allegation that something's happened, that this crime has occurred, as opposed to very specific facts, then you could open a preliminary.

I don't remember the specific language for an assessment, but essentially the assessment is the lowest form of investigation.

And the different -- the main difference between them is once you open one of those up, you have different investigative tools that you're allowed to use.

For the lowest level, you only have a very small number of things you can do. For example, if $I$ only opened an assessment, I can't go and perform a search warrant or go into someone's home; whereas, if you open a full investigation, you have many more investigative tools that you're allowed to use. But, of course, that has to be predicated on specific facts that you believe -- that you
believe in that show that a crime has occurred.
Q. And does the FBI, in your experience, sometimes take information to trigger investigations from individuals outside the FBI?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And in determining what level of investigation would be triggered, how, if at all, can it be relevant the motivation of whoever is giving you the information?
A. The motivation of whoever is giving me the information is very relevant because it's going to provide context for me to decide how much I trust or believe in that information.

So if I believe that information, $I$ believe it's a fact, then $I$ might be able to then justify opening a full investigation. But if $I$-- depending upon where it's coming from, if I feel, hmm, the motive that they have suggests that I may not believe in the information or I might need more information to help me understand how truthful it is, I may not be able to open that full investigation.
Q. And if someone has motivations that the FBI might consider suspect or not fully neutral or pure, how might, if at all, that affect whether an assessment, a preliminary, or a full investigation is opened?
A. If someone has motives that are not -- that are very questionable, I may not open that full investigation. I
might want to collect more independent data to support whatever the allegation is, so I might open a lower-level investigation initially, if at all.
Q. In this case, the Alfa-Bank --

THE COURT: Mr. DeFilippis, how much longer?
MR. DeFILIPPIS: Your Honor, I'd say less than five minutes.

THE COURT: Okay.
Q. In the case of the Alfa-Bank allegations, do you know what kind of investigation was opened or not?
A. I think it was a full, but I didn't know at the time.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you this: Would it have mattered to you to know where this data came from?
A. It would, yes.
Q. Why?
A. It would have mattered -- well, I think on one hand it would not have mattered from the technical standpoint. If I'm looking at technical data, the data's going to tell me whatever story the data's going to tell me independent of where it comes from. So I still would have done the same technical analysis.

But knowing where the data comes from helps to tell me -- it gives me context regarding how much I believe in the data, how authentic it is, do I believe it's real, and do I trust it.
Q. Now, would it have mattered to you or not whether the data came from someone with a political affiliation or motivation? To what extent would that matter to you?
A. It would matter for the same reasons; that it's going to be a data point that I take into consideration when -- if I were to be the person to open a case, in this case it wasn't me, but I would use that as a data point to help me determine what my sort of initial steps are going to be. Q. To what extent would it matter to you whether the data came from someone who had a business interest or relationship with the U.S. government?
A. For the same reasons, I would want to know. It's going to have the same impact. I'm going to look at it, and it's going to give me some context to help me understand how truthful the data might be.
Q. And to what extent would it have mattered, if at all, if the person giving you the data was doing it on their own behalf or someone else's behalf?
A. It would be a data point that $I$ would want to know.
Q. And why is that?
A. Well, if someone is providing the data on someone else's behalf, I'm going to want to know who that someone else is so I can understand what their motivations might be for providing the data.

MR. DeFILIPPIS: Okay. Thank you very much,

Special Agent Hellman.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take our lunch break. We'll take about an hour and ten minutes, so if you could reconvene at 2:00. Feel free to eat in the cafeteria or walk outside.

No discussion about the case. No research about the case. Have a nice lunch, and we'll be ready to go at 2:00.
(Jury exits courtroom)
THE COURT: Agent Hellman, you can step down. Please don't discuss your testimony over the lunch hour, okay?

All right. We're adjourned. See you at 2:00, unless there's something -- have a seat everybody.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: There's nothing.
THE COURT: Mr. Bosworth, do you have something?
MR. BOSWORTH: Yes, Your Honor, briefly. Either now or after lunch, whatever the Court's preference is.

THE COURT: Let's do it when we get back.

MR. BOSWORTH: Okay.
(Lunch recess taken)
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