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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | John M. Leventhal, Esquire | 1 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Mr. Kamins will speak to |
| 2 | Barry Kamins, Esquire | 2 | that Your Honor. |
| 3 | Respondent's Counsels | 3 | MR. KAMINS: Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. |
| 4 |  | 4 | We just wanted in addition to what we have in our |
| 5 |  | 5 | papers, I just wanted to respond very briefly to |
| 6 | Mr. Rudolph W. Giuliani | 6 | something that Disciplinary Counsel had put in their |
| 7 | Respondent | 7 | response to -- their latest response to our motion. |
| 8 |  | 8 | And Disciplinary Counsel states in their last |
| 9 |  | 9 | response that we are basically conflating Mr. |
| 10 |  | 10 | Sanderson's strong language on behalf of his client |
| 11 |  | 11 | with his own personal views. |
| 12 |  | 12 | And we agree that you know representing a |
| 13 |  | 13 | client does not necessarily constitute approval of |
| 14 |  | 14 | the client's views or activities, but if all we had |
| 15 |  | 15 | was Mr. Sanderson's letter that he wrote as counsel, |
| 16 |  | 16 | it might be difficult -- might, to separate his |
| 17 |  | 17 | views from the views of his client, although there |
| 18 |  | 18 | are some statements in there that certainly appear to |
| 19 |  | 19 | be personal. |
| 20 |  | 20 | However, we have much more than that just |
| 21 |  | 21 | the letter that was submitted on behalf of his |
| 22 |  | 22 | client. We have these personal comments that he made |
|  | Page 52 |  | Page 54 |
| 1 | PROCEEDINGS | 1 | in his Tweet account, some of which, or most of |
| 2 | 11:32 a.m. | 2 | which, I'm going to attach to our exhibits. And just |
| 3 | CHAIR BERNIUS: This is a prehearing | 3 | briefly, I just want to point out when he says -- and |
| 4 | conference in the matter of Rudolph W. Giuliani. | 4 | these are his tweets, "Rudy might have some liability |
| 5 | Docket Number 22-BD-027. Would the parties please | 5 | for failing to tell the truth. Did the Venezuelans |
| 6 | identify themselves for the record beginning with | 6 | get to Rudy and John too? |
| 7 | Disciplinary Counsel. | 7 | Team Trump again in Pennsylvania. "Is |
| 8 | MR. FOX: Hamilton Fox and Jason Horrell | 8 | this the least successful litigation ever?" And then |
| 9 | for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. | 9 | on January 7 of 2021, he states, "Is there anyone |
| 10 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Barry Kamins and John | 10 | whose standing in society has fallen more over the |
| 11 | Leventhal for Respondent. | 11 | last year than Rudy Giuliani? Bill Cosby maybe." |
| 12 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Good morning everybody. | 12 | And then finally in an article that I |
| 13 | There's been a flurry of filings in this case, and I | 13 | found recently that's not attached, there was an |
| 14 | thought it would be more expeditious for us to have a | 14 | article by someone named Dareh Gregorian, and this |
| 15 | conference to talk through some of these issues, and | 15 | was regarding the litigation to challenge the |
| 16 | resolve them to the extent that we can. And let me | 16 | election. Mr. Sanderson says, "It's as dysfunctional |
| 17 | just lead off with the issues that I think have been | 17 | a litigation strategy as I've ever seen." And this |
| 18 | proposed by, or posited by the parties. | 18 | is a person who is being called ostensibly as an |
| 19 | And the first one is the Respondent's | 19 | expert to give an unbiased opinion on the |
| 20 | motion to disqualify Matthew Sanderson. Mr. Kamins | 20 | litigation. |
| 21 | and Mr. Leventhal do you have anything to add to your | 21 | So we think that these comments reflect an |
| 22 | motion? | 22 | animus that is personal. Mr. Sanderson is not just |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | repeating his client's views. These are his own |  | proceeding, not necessarily admitted into evidence in |
| 2 | personal views, and this is one of those rare cases | 2 | the hearing, but of this proceeding, and I think if |
| 3 | in which in advance of a proceeding, a party is | 3 | anybody reads that you would see that that is a |
| 4 | proposing an expert who has demonstrated an actual | 4 | straightforward expert report based on the law, and |
| 5 | bias, or animus towards the subject of the | 5 | facts of this case. |
| 6 | proceeding, and that's the reason we're moving to | 6 | In any event, I would suggest that the |
| 7 | disqualify. | 7 | appropriate thing to do would be to defer this, |
| 8 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. Mr. Fox any | 8 | unless and until we call Mr. Sanderson, which I say I |
| 9 | response? | 9 | think is extremely unlikely. But bias is not a |
| 10 | MR. FOX: Just very briefly. As I said in | 10 | disqualifying thing. I mean Plaintiffs testify |
| 11 | my pleadings, we were aware that Mr. Sanderson in | 11 | against Defendants. They are biased. |
| 12 | representing his client, had made the comments about | 12 | It is obviously something to assess in |
| 13 | Mr. Giuliani on behalf of the clients that he made, | 13 | terms of credibility. So if you have any doubts |
| 14 | and for that reason our primary witness, and we | 14 | about the straightforwardness of the report, I would |
| 15 | engaged an additional witness, and the primary | 15 | suggest looking at Exhibit 41, and making it an |
| 16 | witness is Professor Ortiz. | 16 | exhibit to these proceedings. But I also say yes, |
| 17 | I think it is extraordinarily unlikely | 17 | the appropriate thing is to defer this because I |
| 18 | that we will call Mr. Sanderson. We exchanged | 18 | think it may well not be an issue. |
| 19 | witness lists simultaneously here, and so I did not | 19 | MR. KAMINS: Mr. Chair if I could just |
| 20 | know at the time I put my witness list in, who the | 20 | respond? |
| 21 | Respondent's witnesses would be, and accordingly I | 21 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. |
| 22 | thought out of an abundance of caution that I ought | 22 | MR. KAMINS: I would disagree respectfully |
|  | Page 56 |  | Page 58 |
| 1 | to name Mr. Sanderson since we had provided an expert | 1 | with what Mr. Fox said. I think that perhaps |
| 2 | report from Mr. Sanderson to the Respondent, in the | 2 | potential bias may not be disqualification, but |
| 3 | event that we wish to call him as a rebuttal witness. | 3 | actual bias I think has been held to be a |
| 4 | There's no sense, he is not a witness that | 4 | disqualification, and it goes to the views of someone |
| 5 | we intend to call in our case in chief. Having now | 5 | who was supposed to be, and should have to be |
| 6 | seen the witness list from the Respondent, I think it | 6 | impartial in giving his opinion. And so I do think |
| 7 | is unlikely that we would call Mr. Sanderson, but I | 7 | that actual bias is a disqualification. |
| 8 | don't want to necessarily foreclose doing so should | 8 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. First of all |
| 9 | something arise that I don't anticipate. | 9 | there's no jury here. We're talking about a panel of |
| 10 | Now with respect to bias, I think one of | 10 | three people. And the issue and the balancing of |
| 11 | the things -- I guess there are two things. Bias is | 11 | interest is a little different in that context. As |
| 12 | not a disqualifying factor. It is personal, and I | 12 | far as Mr. Sanderson's testimony, I took a quick skim |
| 13 | think the comments that Mr. Kamins just alluded to in | 13 | through his opinion. I didn't read the whole thing, |
| 14 | the tweets were comments that were not personal. | 14 | but I got the gist of it. |
| 15 | They were based on the witness's, or the Respondent's | 15 | And it seems to me that it's a legal |
| 16 | litigation strategy. | 16 | analysis. It's a lawyer taking a look at legal |
| 17 | But in any event, you know bias is not a | 17 | filings, and rendering his own opinion. I'm not sure |
| 18 | disqualifying factor, and certainly all is relevant | 18 | how probative that is frankly, and whether it you |
| 19 | to credibility. We have included in our exhibits, I | 19 | know, how much it advances the ball. That being said |
| 20 | think it's Exhibit 41, Mr. Sanderson's report, which | 20 | Mr. Kamins, there's an issue that I have to deal |
| 21 | is 70-some pages long, and I think anybody, and you | 21 | with, and that's Rule 11.3 that says that relevant |
| 22 | may wish to make that part of the record of this | 22 | evidence that's not privileged, not cumulative, must |
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| 1 | be admitted. | 1 | qualifications, so I'm content with respect to that. |
| 2 | And so I would suggest that Rule 11.3 is | 2 | And so that leaves, I think only, and I |
| 3 | going to be determinative here, but I'm not going to | 3 | think this is a Ms., but if not I apologize, and I'm |
| 4 | reach a decision today. I'll punt until the hearing. | 4 | sure I'll butcher the name, Ayyadruai, |
| 5 | I would though say to Respondent that you should be, | 5 | A-Y-Y-A-N-D-R-U-A-I. And all I have about this |
| 6 | if he's called, you should be prepared to | 6 | person, I'm not even sure if it's a man or a woman, |
| 7 | cross-examine Mr. Sanderson, and I suspect there's a | 7 | but will testify as to the statistical analysis as to |
| 8 | fair amount of material for you to use in that | 8 | voting results. |
| 9 | cross-examination. | 9 | You know it's going to be a complete |
| 10 | So I'll deny the motion without prejudice, | 10 | surprise as to what this person testifies to when he |
| 11 | but a strong signal that if he's put on I'll allow | 11 | or she gets on the stand because that's all I have. |
| 12 | him to testify because of Rule 11.3. Okay. Now we | 12 | I don't even know if it's a summary witness who is |
| 13 | have Disciplinary Counsel's objections to witnesses, | 13 | providing -- is summarizing voluminous information. |
| 14 | and the request as I take it Mr. Fox, did you want us | 14 | I'm entitled to the voluminous information in order |
| 15 | to -- do you want me to order Respondents to provide | 15 | to cross-examine them. If the person is an expert I |
| 16 | a written report for any -- | 16 | need more than that. I mean it's just not fair. |
| 17 | MR. FOX: I'm sorry, I interrupted | 17 | How am I going to deal with that you know |
| 18 | somebody I apologize. | 18 | cross-examine one -- prepare to cross-examine based |
| 19 | CHAIR BERNIUS: The issue of your asking | 19 | on that one sentence? I had understood, and I |
| 20 | for a written report from Respondents for their | 20 | probably didn't read it as carefully as I should |
| 21 | expert testimony, I have to say that the language in | 21 | have, your Order to require expert reports. You've |
| 22 | that order said written report if any shall be | 22 | now said that you didn't mean it that way, and I |
|  | Page 60 |  | Page 62 |
| 1 | disclosed. And my intention was not to require a | 1 | accept that, but I do think that I ought to be |
| 2 | Respondent to go out and pay an expert for a 72 page | 2 | entitled to something more than that -- than a phrase |
| 3 | written expert opinion, or report. | 3 | before I prepare to cross-examine this witness. |
| 4 | I don't think that's appropriate in a | 4 | CHAIR BERNIUS: First of all Mr. Fox, it's |
| 5 | disciplinary hearing. So the order itself did not | 5 | music to my ears to hear you say the word "moot", and |
| 6 | require preparation of a written report, and so I | 6 | that you are happy with certain things. And my |
| 7 | don't, you know, do you have any other basis to say | 7 | objective here is to keep everyone happy, or at least |
| 8 | that there should be a written report here provided | 8 | equally miserable. Mr. Kamins, let me ask you -- |
| 9 | to you? | 9 | MR. KAMINS: I think Mr. Leventhal is |
| 10 | MR. FOX: Well, first of all I think some | 10 | going to respond on this point. |
| 11 | of this may be moot Mr. Bernius. My understanding is | 11 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. Mr. Leventhal, |
| 12 | that from the Respondent's counsel that Colonel | 12 | other than this Dr. Shiva Ayyadruai, are there any |
| 13 | Waldron, Mr. Navarro and Mr. Ramslen are not going to | 13 | other experts that you intend to present at the |
| 14 | testify. | 14 | hearing? |
| 15 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Right. | 15 | MR. LEVENTHAL; So if I may, you know, we |
| 16 | MR. FOX: And so if they're not going to | 16 | contacted these witnesses, or through their |
| 17 | testify, you know, there's no reason to talk about | 17 | attorneys. And some of these witnesses as we've |
| 18 | that. The only other -- that leaves Mr. Droes, who | 18 | indicated, are reluctant to come forward, although |
| 19 | has provided something of a report, and I have said | 19 | they want to, but on the advice of counsel they're |
| 20 | that I would you know live with that. And if I had | 20 | not coming forward. |
| 21 | some indication of his qualifications and they have | 21 | We haven't given up on Mr. -- Colonel |
| 22 | provided me with some indication of his | 22 | Waldron, and that's why we wanted to keep this alive. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And we haven't given up on Russell Ramslen, and | 1 | Order also said that the parties should disclose the |
| 2 | that's why I didn't want to say definitively that | 2 | substance of witness testimony, and this is my bad. |
| 3 | they're not going to testify. Mr. Fox has been very | 3 | It should have been more -- I should have in this |
| 4 | fair, and we've been talking to one another, and it | 4 | case been more fulsome in that Order. |
| 5 | may very well be that they won't testify, but we're | 5 | I want Respondents to take a peek at Rule, |
| 6 | not giving up on that. | 6 | D.C. Supra Rule 26-A2(b), which -- |
| 7 | I doubt Mr. Shiva Ayyadruai, I think | 7 | MR. LEVENTHAL: I'm sorry, 26-A2(b)? |
| 8 | that's how you pronounce his name, Dr. Shiva | 8 | CHAIR BERNIUS: A2(b), which is a list of |
| 9 | Ayyadruai, will come forward. We spoke to him. He | 9 | the disclosures that need to be made in connection |
| 10 | hasn't gotten back to us that he's going to testify, | 10 | with expert reports or expert testimony. And we |
| 11 | although he had indicated earlier through our team | 11 | don't need to have the expert prepare a written |
| 12 | that he was going to, or someone that he was going to | 12 | report, but I need you to supplement with respect to |
| 13 | testify. | 13 | everybody who is going to testify as an expert. I |
| 14 | But if he does come in I will try to give | 14 | want you to supplement your disclosure to address the |
| 15 | Mr. Fox some more information. | 15 | issues that are set out in Rule 26 A-2(b). |
| 16 | MR. BROZOST: Mr. Chair, can I ask a quick | 16 | Now that doesn't mean -- use your |
| 17 | question? | 17 | judgement. Do a realistically efficient disclosure, |
| 18 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Sure. | 18 | sufficient to put Disciplinary Counsel on notice as |
| 19 | MR. BROZOST: Mr. Navarro was at one time | 19 | to what these people are going to talk about, or |
| 20 | an expert, and he's not going to testify, but there | 20 | testify about, and the basis for their opinion. I |
| 21 | is an exhibit, the amended deception, is that -- are | 21 | also, and there's another with respect to Dr. Shiva |
| 22 | you considering that an expert report? | 22 | Ayyadruai, I'm not going to allow experts to testify |
|  | Page 64 |  | Page 66 |
| 1 | MR. LEVENTHAL: I'm considering, well it's | 1 | to documents that aren't base opinions on |
| 2 | up to what you consider it to be actually, but in my | 2 | documentation that isn't in evidence. |
| 3 | estimation the information contained in there, a lot | 3 | If it's not in evidence there not going to |
| 4 | of that was given, and our client responded, was | 4 | be able to offer their opinion based on something in |
| 5 | aware of some of that information, and it goes to | 5 | the outside world, so keep that in mind. And also, I |
| 6 | his state of mind, even though Mr. Navarro will not | 6 | need you if there's any -- are there any open issues |
| 7 | testify. | 7 | on contact information Mr. Fox? |
| 8 | We've been told by his attorney on the | 8 | MR. FOX: Well yes, I don't have any |
| 9 | advice of counsel he cannot testify. | 9 | contact information. Now in fairness, we've been -- |
| 10 | MR. BROZOST: So, okay. And it's not | 10 | Respondent's counsel has been very cooperative, and I |
| 11 | necessarily an expert report. | 11 | haven't broached it with him, and it wouldn't |
| 12 | MR. LEVENTHAL: I think well I can't just | 12 | surprise me if they would provide me with contact |
| 13 | put something in without him testifying as an expert | 13 | information. And if they're willing to do that I |
| 14 | report. | 14 | don't think we need to take that up here. |
| 15 | MR. BROZOST: Right. | 15 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. |
| 16 | MR. LEVENTHAL: But I think the | 16 | MR. FOX: But I don't know how to contact |
| 17 | information that's contained therein, if our | 17 | any of these people, no. |
| 18 | Respondent can say that he was aware of much of this | 18 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. I would like |
| 19 | information, it should go to his state of mind. | 19 | Respondents to do that, supply the contact |
| 20 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. I think I have | 20 | information for the witnesses that you have, and we |
| 21 | enough. First of all Mr. Fox in terms of a written | 21 | can move on. Hopefully that will be taken care of. |
| 22 | report, I'm going to deny your application. But my | 22 | MR. LEVENTHAL: May I ask a question Mr. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | information. I certainly don't object to it. | 1 | I think that might be a fair compromise. |
| 2 | And I don't see how anybody could really | 2 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Well you're going to have |
| 3 | be harmed by it. There's got to be an -- I mean | 3 | to do that in any event, so. |
| 4 | there had to be some cases somewhere where social | 4 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Okay. |
| 5 | security numbers and birth dates, or they're actually | 5 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Let me reserve on that |
| 6 | evidence, and surely if that's the situation we have | 6 | question, and we'll -- I'll issue an Order. But I |
| 7 | now, I would think they ought to be able to offer | 7 | may help with things, because as I understand it this |
| 8 | that into evidence. | 8 | -- the underlying lawsuit is against two counties in |
| 9 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Well you know, I don't | 9 | Pennsylvania. |
| 10 | want to appear to be the quintessential bureaucrat, | 10 | And I was going through the -- your |
| 11 | but this is the God's honest truth. Three months | 11 | witness list, and it talks about Catherine Freeze is |
| 12 | ago, you know I'm retired now, but I did a little | 12 | going to talk about what she observed at Pittsburgh. |
| 13 | project for a client, non-paying, pro-bono client who | 13 | Somebody else is going to talk about what |
| 14 | needed to get a death certificate to prove the death | 14 | he observed in Philadelphia, and you know you're |
| 15 | of somebody that was born 175 years ago. | 15 | going to have to convince me that things that |
| 16 | So, you know, if I tell you this. We'll | 16 | happened in Pittsburgh and in Philadelphia, in |
| 17 | take a look at the rule, and if there's a way to get | 17 | Harrisburg, Atlanta, Chattanooga, had anything to do |
| 18 | around it I think that's -- I'll go in that | 18 | with the price of eggs in those states. |
| 19 | direction. And I was thinking about you know just | 19 | I mean if these dead people supposedly |
| 20 | redacting everything but the year of birth, and the | 20 | voted in the two counties that they sued fine. |
| 21 | year of death. I'm not sure that's going to help. I | 21 | That's relevant evidence, but dead people voting in |
| 22 | don't know how many dead bodies are we talking about | 22 | the abstract in New York, or anywhere in |
|  | Page 72 |  | Page 74 |
| 1 | here gentlemen? | 1 | Pennsylvania, is just not relevant to the issues in |
| 2 | MR. LEVENTHAL: We have in one of our | 2 | this case. So that may help you determine how I |
| 3 | exhibits, we have 1,082 people who cast ballots who | 3 | would approach these various redactions. |
| 4 | were shown to be dead out of the I think it's 112 | 4 | MR. BROZOST: Mr. Bernius, can I just |
| 5 | years old. And there was a whole myriad of other | 5 | follow-up on that. I looked at those exhibits, and |
| 6 | people who were still registered, and I think | 6 | they're just lists of the individuals. I couldn't |
| 7 | Pennsylvania -- and correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Fox, | 7 | tell when it was prepared and who prepared it, and I |
| 8 | but I think Pennsylvania may have after this | 8 | think the letter is important. And I think that |
| 9 | election, taken tens and tens and tens of thousands | 9 | should be addressed, certainly for authenticity and |
| 10 | of dead people off the voter rolls. | 10 | admissibility. But there's no indication on the |
| 11 | One of the exhibits helps Mr. Fox actually | 11 | exhibit at all. |
| 12 | because one of the exhibits shows that the people | 12 | MR. LEVENTHAL: I think Mr. Fox has |
| 13 | died shortly after -- some of the people, died | 13 | reserved his right to object to authenticity and |
| 14 | shortly after they cast their early ballot. So I | 14 | admissibility at the time of the hearing. I don't |
| 15 | guess the team is investigating if these people were | 15 | have you know Mr. Kerik on. I know this was being |
| 16 | in extreme illness and someone filled out their | 16 | prepared as the litigation was going. I don't know |
| 17 | ballots. But there are -- I really don't think | 17 | when it was finalized, but I think -- and correct me |
| 18 | that's going to harm anyone. I agree with Mr. Fox. | 18 | if I'm wrong, Mr. Chair. I think seven counties were |
| 19 | I don't think anyone will be harmed by this. | 19 | being sued, not just two. |
| 20 | If you wanted me to -- and you're worried | 20 | And I also, you know I also think you know |
| 21 | about someone stealing someone's identity, I could | 21 | -- well I don't want to go into our burden now, we're |
| 22 | just strip those columns away on the social security. | 22 | not having the hearing. But I think our burden is |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | not to win the case that there's fraud, but to show | 1 | that's okay with you. |
| 2 | that there's information that he had, and he had a | 2 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Well I mean I just want to |
| 3 | reasonable belief and inference to bring this | 3 | make sure that you comply with the rule. If the rule |
| 4 | litigation in the timeframe that when he came on, and | 4 | doesn't require it, then you don't have to do it. |
| 5 | then what time was available in this election | 5 | MR. LEVENTHAL: I just wanted some |
| 6 | proceeding. | 6 | direction, that's it. |
| 7 | MR. BROZOST: Well I agree with that. And | 7 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Mr. Fox any other |
| 8 | that's why I think it's so important to find out when | 8 | comments? |
| 9 | these lists were compiled. | 9 | MR. FOX: No. I have nothing further. |
| 10 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Right. | 10 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Can I just make one |
| 11 | MR. KAMINS: Well, we intend to have | 11 | comment? |
| 12 | someone testify as to that. | 12 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Yes. |
| 13 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. I just, all right, | 13 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Mr. Fox and Judge Kamins |
| 14 | seven counties, I just gave that as a heads up, and | 14 | and I -- Mr. Kamins and I are having good |
| 15 | it's something I've been thinking about as we | 15 | professional relationship in this case. |
| 16 | approach the hearing because this is not going to be | 16 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Good. Glad to hear it. |
| 17 | a worldwide, nationwide hearing on voting fraud. | 17 | MR. LEVENTHAL: I don't know if Fox will |
| 18 | It's going to be a hearing addressed to a specific | 18 | agree with that, that's what I say. |
| 19 | lawsuit, the basis for it, and the facts you want | 19 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Mr. Fox doesn't agree with |
| 20 | opinions for. | 20 | many things you know. |
| 21 | MR. LEVENTHAL: We understand that Your | 21 | MR. FOX: Extremely fair, yeah. |
| 22 | Honor. | 22 | CHAIR BERNIUS: You know apparently you've |
|  | Page 76 |  | Page 78 |
| 1 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Okay. Anything else from | 1 | charmed the beast. I congratulate you. |
| 2 | the Respondents? | 2 | MR. FOX: It's a rare occasion when that |
| 3 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Yes. Just one last | 3 | happens. |
| 4 | question. As to the fourth exhibit where we have the | 4 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Anything else gentlemen? |
| 5 | addresses both in Pennsylvania, and I'm looking at | 5 | MR. LEVENTHAL: No, Mr. Chairman. So |
| 6 | the -- give me one second. I want to look at the | 6 | we'll hear from you about what we have to do with the |
| 7 | rule, which I have here. I'm sorry, I'm sitting at | 7 | redactions, et cetera? |
| 8 | my dining room table because I have a medical | 8 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Yes. |
| 9 | appointment right after we get off this Zoom, so I | 9 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Okay. Thank you very |
| 10 | have everything spread out. | 10 | much. |
| 11 | I'm looking at 18-G. | 11 | CHAIR BERNIUS: Thank you very much. |
| 12 | CHAIR BERNIUS: 19.8G. | 12 | MR. LEVENTHAL: And thank you very much |
| 13 | MR. LEVENTHAL: Thank you, Your Honor. | 13 | and everyone have a nice week. |
| 14 | Yeah. It doesn't talk about address on here. Maybe | 14 | (Whereupon the prehearing conference |
| 15 | I missed it. I see social security number, | 15 | adjourned at 12:06 p.m.) |
| 16 | birthdate, so the ones in -- with the fourth exhibit | 16 |  |
| 17 | on Georgia and Pennsylvania, I think they just have | 17 |  |
| 18 | the names, and correct me if I'm wrong, they just | 18 |  |
| 19 | have the names and the addresses -- the identical | 19 |  |
| 20 | names and addresses. | 20 |  |
| 21 | So I'm not sure anything has to be | 21 |  |
| 22 | redacted from that one. I just wanted to make sure | 22 |  |
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