

Date: October 6, 2022

Case: In Re: Jeffrey B. Clark



Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc.

Phone: 202-347-3700 Fax: 202-737-3638

Email: info@acefederal.com Internet: www.acefederal.com In Re: Jeffrey B. Clark October 6, 2022

The Board on Professional Responsibility

Pre-Hearing

In re Jeffrey B. Clark, Board DNo. 22-BD-039 / Disciplinary DNo. 2021-D193

ZOOM

Thursday, October 6, 2022 9:30 AM

PARTICIPANTS

Hearing Committee Number Twelve
Merril Hirsh, Esquire
Chair

Hamilton P. Fox, III, Esquire
Disciplinary Counsel
Jason R. Horrell, Esquire
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel

Charles Burnham, Esquire
Harry W. MacDougald, Esquire
Robert A. Destro, Esquire
Respondent's Counsel
Jeffrey B. Clark, Esquire
Respondent

Page 1

Page 2 Page 4 1 PROCEEDINGS hear people more clearly. 2 2 (9:32 a.m.) And now what I will do is swear in the 3 3 CHAIR HIRSH: Good morning. Court Reporter. Mr. Catherine, do you solemnly -- do 4 4 MR. MacDOUGALD: Good morning, sir. you want "swear" or "affirm"? 5 5 COURT REPORTER: Affirm. CHAIR HIRSH: Good morning. Just give me 6 6 one second. There's one piece of paper that I CHAIR HIRSH: Affirm? Okay. Do you 7 7 actually wanted to look for -solemnly affirm that you will faithfully and 8 8 MR. MacDOUGALD: I never have that accurately report the present proceeding to the best 9 9 problem, sir. of your ability as directed by the Presiding Officer 10 CHAIR HIRSH: No one else ever has this 10 herein? 11 11 COURT REPORTER: I do. problem. Just give me one second. 12 12 Thank you very much everybody. Before we CHAIR HIRSH: Thank you very much, Mr. 13 13 swear in the Court Reporter and take appearances, I Catherine. 14 14 Okay, now could counsel please make their just wanted to just introduce the proceeding. 15 15 This is Board Number 22-BD-039, in re appearances on the record. 16 16 Jeffrey B. Clark. This matter is before a Hearing MR. FOX: I am Hamilton Fox and Jason 17 Committee pursuant to Rule 11 of the District of 17 Horrell for the Office of the Disciplinary Counsel. 18 18 Columbia Court of Appeals governing the District of And let me just apologize. For about 30 minutes 19 Columbia. 19 every morning I get this flow of sunlight into the 20 20 I am Merril Hirsh. I am the Chair of window which makes it a little difficult for me to 21 21 Hearing Committee 12. And the purpose of this see the screen, and probably a little difficult for 22 22 prehearing conference is to clarify issues, to you to see me. I think it will go away in a few Page 3 Page 5 1 minutes. determine whether the parties can agree to 2 stipulations, or at least talk about it; set dates 2 CHAIR HIRSH; Okay, well it's the first sun 3 3 we've seen in a week, so -- (Laughing). for the exchange of evidence and witness lists -- we 4 4 need to do that; and determine the length of the Welcome. Good morning. And for the --5 5 MR. MacDOUGALD: I am Harry MacDougald hearing and schedule the hearing. 6 6 for the Respondent Jeffrey Clark. Before we begin, I will note that the 7 7 MR. BURNHAM: Charles Burnham, appearing as COVID-19 pandemic has required the disciplinary 8 8 system to make many adjustments to ensure that cases well for Mr. Clark. Good morning, everyone. 9 MR. DESTRO: Robert Destro, appearing also can continue to move forward without in-person 10 10 for Mr. Clark. Good morning, everyone. 11 11 Specifically, the disciplinary system has And Mr. Clark is here, as well, sir. 12 12 had to modify how it conducts these hearings vis CHAIR HIRSH: Good morning, Mr. Clark. 13 13 video conference which we will live stream for public RESPONDENT CLARK: Good morning, Your 14 14 access through YouTube. Honor. 15 15 CHAIR HIRSH: It's flattering to be called The Board staff has made every effort to 16 16 "Your Honor." I actually don't even play a judge on make this hearing run smoothly, but we know that 17 17 TV. there still may be some inevitable glitches with 18 18 RESPONDENT CLARK: Good morning, Chair technology that may arise. So we may need to 19 19 Hirsh. exercise patience. CHAIR HIRSH: Thank you very much. 20 20 I will also ask the parties to put 21 21 MR. MacDOUGALD: I've been wondering how to yourselves on mute when you are not speaking, which 22 22 will help to minimize the feedback and allow us to address the Chairman, because for 37 years it's been

In Re: Jeffrey B. Clark October 6, 2022

Page 6

"Your Honor" every time, and I may -- I may fall back into that.

CHAIR HIRSH: Yeah, it's a habit that lawyers learn, and it's not a bad habit. If you need to say something, say "Your Honor," and I understand. "Mr. Hirsh," "Chairman," those are both fine, but I appreciate it.

Alright, I discussed what we are going to be discussing today, but I am going to kind of take in reverse order. I would like to start with discussing the hearing, when it is going to be, how long it is going to be. So why don't we start with that.

Either one can really start first. First of all, are there any preliminary matters you want to discuss before we get to that?

MR. MacDOUGALD: Yeah, for us there is, Your Honor. And in the papers that were filed on Monday, we described the question of whether subject matter jurisdiction is a threshold issue that has to be decided first.

We understand of course that the Chair has

Page 8

and without exception. So we think there is a fair
 question of whether the Board's rules and the
 interpretation of those rules controls over two
 Supreme Court decisions and the decision of the D.C.
 Court of Appeals, or whether subject matter
 jurisdiction has to be decided first.

So again, with all respect, and I don't want to argue with the Chairman about something that has already been ruled on, but we do think there is a fair issue here. And we think it has to be addressed before the merits.

So we don't think this Board or the Committees get many subject matter jurisdictions that are structured as ours has been. It appears the rules do not contemplate such challenges, because the rules carry motions to dismiss with the merits hearing, which is not what the Supreme Court said has to be done.

And that Supreme Court Rule applies to federal courts. And at the end of the day, this is a federal court, or at least it's an agency of a federal court.

Page 7

ruled on that; that it doesn't have authority under the Rules of the Board, and the decisions of the Court of Appeals to take that question up. But at the same time, there is higher law that we cited in the filing on Monday to the effect that subject

matter jurisdiction challenges like the one that we have made have to be decided first as a threshold

question before deciding the merits.

But essentially the interpretation of the Board's rules that has been applied is that the Committee and the board are required to hypothetically assume subject matter jurisdiction and then decide the merits of the case.

But the Supreme Court of the United States in the Steel Company versus Citizens for A Better Environment case that we filed and cited in the papers filed on Monday expressly forbids hypothetically assuming subject matter jurisdiction in order to decide the merits.

And it says doing so without subject matter jurisdiction is by definition ultra vires.

And it says that rule has to be applied inflexibly

Page 9

So recognizing the constraints that the Chair is operating under, and the decisions of the Court of Appeals, we wanted to let you know that we are considering our options for seeking judicial review on the subject matter jurisdiction question. And we asked -- before the case is heard on the merits -- we asked Mr. Fox's position on that, and he's opposed to that. So we know where he stands.

But we wanted to put it before the Chairman and ask if the Chair had a position on whether it makes sense to have judicial review of the subject matter jurisdiction question before a hearing on the merits. Not a recommendation on the merits, but a recommendation on whether it ought to be heard. And that could be done, for instance, by the Chair recommending that the issue be given judicial review, for example, in a mandamus petition that we might file.

We are not asking you to take a position on how that ought to be decided, just whether it ought to be taken up and considered before a hearing on the merits, in light of the authorities that we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 10

Page 12

have cited.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Board would be able to take its own position. Mr. Fox and ODC would take their position, arguing against it, but we do think that you would have the authority to make a recommendation about whether it ought to be heard, without taking a position on how it ought to come out.

And so we would respectfully ask if the Chair has a response or a position on that?

CHAIR HIRSH: My response is, if you want to seek judicial review of our jurisdiction, it's up to you. I am not going to take a position and say you ought to seek judicial review.

I also just note that in addition to not deciding, but discussing for purposes of your motion deferral, some of the arguments that you're making on the jurisdictional point, which I understand what I am supposed to do as part of my report and recommendation on that motion. Since that time the D.C. Court of Appeals ruled in a subpoena matter that the court cited as part of that, and as part of what the D.C. Court of Appeals did, is it said that these

that, too. Alright, any other preliminary matters? MR. MacDOUGALD: There is one more, Your Honor, and that is -- and this again comes back to the topic of deferral -- when we originally requested deferral, we made reference to, at some point the January 6th Committee would be finished, and they would release a report, and their full deposition transcripts. And we didn't know, of course, when

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. No, I understand

We now understand from press reports that they are going to release their final report before the election. And based on their prior statements, that would also involve a release of the full deposition transcripts. And undoubtedly, we are going to learn things that are relevant and material to this proceeding, for reasons that we explained when we originally moved for a deferral.

that was going to happen exactly.

And one of the reasons deferral was denied was that we didn't know how long these other related investigations might take. And, well at least for January 6th, we now think that we do. And so we

Page 11

kinds of issues ought to be considered in the first instance by me and by the Board. And so to the extent anyone -- and that

was, as I understood it, after you present a jurisdictional arguments, that the subpoena shouldn't be enforceable because there's no jurisdiction before the D.C. Court of Appeals.

So if you want to take some, you know, step about that, from my standpoint my marching order is to continue with the proceeding, bring it to a hearing, do a report and recommendation, and follow the normal process. And that is what I am planning

MR. MacDOUGALD: Thank you. CHAIR HIRSH: It's up to you to decide whether to seek judicial review.

MR. MacDOUGALD: Thank you for that, Your Honor, and again we want to be clear. We are not trying to argue with you with what you've already said, and we respect the constraints that you operate under, but, you know, we've got to do what we've got to do.

Page 13

wanted to renew the motion for a deferral in light of that to at least get us past the release of those materials, which include depositions of witnesses that Mr. Fox said he intends to call.

So we ask that you consider deferring it to get past the release of the January 6th Committee materials.

CHAIR HIRSH: Well, I don't see that's a reason for deferring this. There are a lot of reasons why I don't agree with that. One of them is, so you're telling me that -- we're going to be talking about dates in January, because both of you have -- and I've asked counsel to come with dates in January -- so you're saying two months or so before the hearing you're going to have material. That isn't a reason to stop doing other things.

Your filing on Monday also suggests that you need time to follow the Justice Department's Touhy regulations on access; that you want to try to potentially subpoena witnesses, which we will talk about later, but there isn't any reason to delay all of those things while all the rest of this happens.

Page 14

And the grounds for deferral are relatively limited. The basic idea of our procedure is that we try to move as fast as we can -- as fast as we can is a little too strong. Our procedure is thorough. It is very careful. It has been criticized as taking too long, you know, and I think everybody associated with the disciplinary process realizes we try very hard to get it right, but it does sometimes take a longer time than people would want, both from the standpoint of the public and its interest and from the standpoint of respondents who want to get a decision one way or the other as it affects their career.

So there is a pretty significant weight against deferring, and the fact that a month from now I may get more evidence that would be useful for a hearing in January I don't see as grounds. So I am going to deny that request.

MR. MacDOUGALD: Alright, Your Honor. Let's move on to the details.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, thank you very much.

Alright, I asked in light of the filing

Page 16

you know, if we're talking about a period of roughly
 a week in time where the events in question occurred,
 and I believe that to be safe three days will be more
 than adequate for us to put on the case.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. Mr. MacDougald?

MR. MacDOUGALD: Thank you. Part of our difficulty is we don't know exactly what evidence Mr. Fox intends to put on, or the exact contours of his case are going to be. And depending on those exact contours, we may need to put on more evidence.

So if he's going to take three days, I would say we might need somewhere between four and seven. And as far as cross-examination is concerned, I don't know how long it will take, but my one commitment is that we will be thorough and swift.

MR. FOX: Mr. Hirsh, may I respond to that? CHAIR HIRSH: Sure.

MR. FOX: More so than I believe in any case that I have tried, the respondent has complete discovery and knows exactly what these witnesses are going to say. The witnesses are Mr. Rosen and Mr.

Donoghue. They have been in written, transcribed

## Page 15

from Monday, you know, one of the takeaways I had from the filings so far as states are concerned where, both because of practical considerations and what people do, and because of the time of year and people's other commitments, we're really talking January here.

So has counsel any dates to suggest? And while we're doing that, I will pull up my own calendar to see what works. Why don't we just start, first of all, how long are people anticipating the hearing is going to take, so that might affect what we need to block off?

MR. FOX: Mr. Hirsh, I believe that my case can be put on in two days, or just say three to be conservative, although I generally am pretty accurate -- good about hitting the mark. The one thing that I don't know is how long cross-examination -- you know, people have different styles of cross-examination, and so I can't really factor that in because I've never had a case with any of these gentlemen before.

But there are two primary witnesses, and,

Page 17

- testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee,
  - which the respondent has had for more than a year.
- 3 They gave testimony before the January 6th
- 4 Committee. While we don't have the transcripts of
  - their depositions, the transcripts of that testimony,
- or the portions that were given, are there. So we
- will have, certainly by what sounds like November,
- 8 the transcripts of the depositions they gave, but
- 9 even without that they have already got the
  - Judiciary.

So they know precisely what the case is going to be. And it is not an accurate representation to say that they don't know what it is going to be. And there is no excuse whatsoever at this point for them not to know how long it's going to take them to put on their case.

MR. MacDOUGALD: Your Honor -- or, Mr. Chairman, you might have observed that in response to our motion to dismiss, Mr. Fox changed his story about what this case is about. And in his argument, he has shifted the ground upon which he intends to prove his case.

Page 18

It started out with the framing of the charges that the alleged attempted falsity was strictly by comparison between the positions proposed in the draft letter on the one hand, and the then-expressed positions of Mr. Clark's superiors at the Department of Justice on the other.

Mr. Fox in his response to our motion to dismiss conceded that there's nothing wrong with proposing a change in position. Now the problem is, and I quote, "but nevertheless he persisted."

So we don't know exactly where he's going. We have a good idea, it's true. And it's true we have the Senate Judiciary Committee transcripts. But one of the distinguishing features of those transcripts is that the Department of Justice limited the topics of inquiry based on law enforcement privilege objections.

We don't know where that's going to go.

Those may be topics that we want to pursue on cross.

And if the position of Mr. Fox is that it was necessarily, knowingly false to suggest that additional investigation of the election was

Page 20

hearing is important, okay? Everyone who comes here is important, and it affects their career.

My reaction, given what limited information I know about the case at this point, and I have to be humble about that. I've read what's been filed, but I don't know all the details of the case at this point, is to think that what you're describing, Mr. MacDougald, sounds on the long side, okay?

What I would like to do is the following. And the other thing is that -- focusing, before I say that -- sometimes focusing the hearing helps, okay? If you give people an infinite amount of time, they will take it.

So what I would like to try to do is start on the assumption that it will be a five-day hearing total, with Disciplinary Counsel more or less expected to have the first two-and-a-half, subject to the vagaries of how long cross-examination is. I'm not inclined to have some kind of chess clock where everybody figures out each minute of what they do, you know that's just kind of silly.

Page 19

appropriate, and that seems to be the direction that he's going from his response to the motion to dismiss, well we don't know exactly where that might go, or exactly what evidence we would put on to rebut that.

So the case may take longer. I mean, if it's so simple and straightforward, why does it take him three days?

CHAIR HIRSH: Here is my reaction. There has never been a case where everyone -- and certainly in this setting, but even in a civil case, where you've had massive discovery, and depositions, and everybody who ever had any information or anything related to anything, that everyone has known exactly what's going to happen at a trial. It just doesn't happen. Okay?

I think that probably in the great pantheon of information you don't have 100 percent, but you probably have more than you have in the average disciplinary proceeding. But regardless, the real question is how much time does this hearing take? And how much time does it require? And every

Page 21

I'm trying to give you a general guideline. And as we approach the end of the time we have blocked out, we will discuss whether there is really need for more time. But I am going to go on a presumption that this is going to be enough, and I expect counsel on both sides to be acting in good faith on this and to be tried, not to stretch things out for the point of stretching it out, which is not in anybody's interest.

So if Mr. Fox can present his case in two days rather than two-and-a-half, I would expect him to do that. And I would expect -- you know, I am not going to arbitrarily cut off things. So I will leave open, when we get to a circumstance whether we need to schedule an additional day, but we have to have some idea of what we are going to block off.

So let's talk about blocking off five days.

MR. MacDOUGALD: And I hear you, Mr. Hirsh, and what I would say is as we get closer these things may come into sharper focus.

CHAIR HIRSH: Sure. That can happen.

Page 22 Page 24 1 would work for me. The week of the 9th would work And you may find out really you need is a three-day 2 2 hearing -for me, or perhaps the -- no, the 16th is a holiday. 3 3 MR. FOX: I can certainly do it the week MR. MacDOUGALD: Or we may need more. 4 4 of the 9th. But we are not going to belabor things in the 5 5 hearing. We want to be crisp and effective in what I consulted with the witnesses, and that 6 6 we present. So -- but at the same time, this is a week of the 9th would work. The following week 7 7 very unusual case. It presents a lot of novel doesn't work for one of the witnesses. The week 8 8 questions, and we owe Mr. Clark our best efforts to after the 16th, but the week of the 9th is 9 9 represent him and tell the story the best way we can. available. 10 10 And again, as we commented in some of our MR. MacDOUGALD: Okay, so I think Mr. Fox 11 11 filings, there is a premise underneath this case that just said starting the 25th would not work for your 12 12 we don't accept. witnesses? 13 13 MR. FOX: That gets us into February, and MR. HIRSH: I understand that. 14 14 frankly I haven't inquired about February. I thought MR. MacDOUGALD: And if we go -- and if 15 15 we are required to rebut that in our presentation, it we were going with January. 16 16 MR. MacDOUGALD: And, Your Honor, we will take more time. 17 17 MR. HIRSH: Okay. Alright, well let's haven't yet identified all of our witnesses, or 18 18 talk about dates. Have you folks had an opportunity talked to them. So we don't know right now about 19 19 their availability or any given date. You know, to speak with each other since I issued the Order 20 20 because we can take depositions to preserve evidence asking for dates in January? 21 21 MR. FOX: We probably had the for use at trial, and because we can present 22 22 opportunity, but we didn't avail ourselves of it. testimony by Zoom, we hope we can work through any Page 23 Page 25 1 1 MR. HIRSH: Okay, you didn't avail availability problems. But, you know, we haven't 2 2 either identified or confirmed availability for our yourselves. 3 3 MR. MacDOUGALD: That's a fair statement witnesses for any of these dates. 4 4 from Mr. Fox. MR. HIRSH: Understood. And, you know, I 5 5 MR. HIRSH: Okay, so what are we looking will make efforts to accommodate -- look, we're all 6 6 at? What dates might be available? remote and I should tell you in January -- the plans 7 7 MR. MacDOUGALD: If I could, for our haven't been set. So the entire hearing may be 8 8 team, we would ask that it not be immediately after remote in January. So obviously I am not going to 9 9 get desperately upset if somebody has to testify by the New Year, because that will create some hardships 10 10 for people that have families. So the week of remote testimony, even if we are live. And I will 11 11 January 16th, that's a Monday. Is that MLK Day? Yes, try to accommodate practical things like that. 12 12 the 16th is MLK Day. Can we focus on the week of the 9th? 13 13 MR. FOX: That was precisely the week I MR. MacDOUGALD: Does anybody -- on our 14 14 was going to suggest, so we are in agreement on that. team, have a conflict that week? I'm not hearing 15 15 MR. MacDOUGALD: But does the panel do one. Nothing has come up at the moment, Your Honor. 16 16 We would rather start on the 25th or the 30th, but -business on MLK day? 17 17 MR. HIRSH: The 16th is a holiday, so I 18 18 think the government is off. MR. HIRSH: Alright, let's go with the 19 19 MR. FOX: The 17th, then. week of the 9th, then. I'll block off the 9th to the 20 20 MR. HIRSH: The difficulty is -- for that 13th with the understanding that we're going to try 21 21 week, is my schedule. That week doesn't really work to avoid needing additional time. And I expect

people to try to fit within the time, but if it comes

for me. The week before, or starting on the 25th

22

22

Page 26 Page 28 1 up and we actually need time and it can't be done on that? 2 2 separately or remotely, we have lots of MR. FOX: I am fine with all the schedule 3 3 possibilities, that a continuation would be on the that Mr. Clark's counsel has proposed. The one 4 4 25th. caveat is that I want to look at what days the 5 MR. MacDOUGALD: In other words, if we 5 holidays are and we may want to adjust a day or two 6 6 don't finish the week of the 9th, we would resume on around the holidays. But with that caveat, I am fine 7 7 the 25th? with all the dates they suggest. 8 8 MR. HIRSH: Yeah. And I assume that The one thing I would say is that I think 9 9 would handle Mr. Fox's problem, because he would the normal rule about declaring 21 days before the 10 already have presented his case during the week 9th. 10 hearing whether testimony is going to be done 11 11 remotely in the context of the way we've been trying MR. FOX: Yes. 12 12 MR. MacDOUGALD: For the sake of these cases now, is a bit silly, and that -- and 13 13 continuity, would it be better to start on the 25th particularly in light of your comment a moment ago 14 14 and continue the following week, if we need to -that we simply ought to agree that there are 15 15 MR. HIRSH: No. I'd rather start on the witnesses -- even if we go live, if there are 16 16 week of the 9th. I don't need to have this stacked witnesses who are outside the District of Columbia 17 to back and frequently things get divided up because 17 and it's easier for them to testify remotely, that we 18 18 of schedules. I'd like to get this done, and the can do it by Zoom or some other remote way, without 19 19 week of the 9th works. I don't want to try to having the necessity of declaring that 21 days in 20 20 explore stuff. So let's start on the 9th. I'm advance. But aside from that, I have no problem 21 21 with any of the schedule that they suggest. hoping that all we'll need is the week of the 9th. 22 22 MR. MacDOUGALD: Well, we're hoping we CHAIR HIRSH: Alright, why don't we do Page 27 Page 29 1 1 won't even need the week of the 9th. this. 2 2 MR. HIRSH: Okay, and you're hoping you MR. MacDOUGALD: We would agree with that 3 3 won't even need -- see we're on the same page. last suggestion. 4 4 (Laughter.) MR. HIRSH: Okay. Alright, I will make 5 5 MR. HIRSH: Okay. Alright -as part of my Order that witnesses may testify 6 6 remotely, the whole hearing might be remote, but MR. BURNHAM: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman? 7 7 How many days in the week of the 25th should we block regardless, witnesses will be able to testify 8 8 out? I didn't catch that. remotely, and we'll set up for doing that. 9 9 MR. HIRSH: I'm assuming we won't need And perhaps when people identify the 10 10 it. What I'm saying is that if we need an additional witness, the 30 days before, they can just indicate 11 11 day, it will be the 25th. Okay? So that people whether they are intending to call them remotely so 12 12 will have an idea of when this will be, if it that opposing counsel is aware of it. Okay? 13 13 happens. Just helping for people's schedules. Okay? And that saves that deadline of 21 days to 14 14 MR. BURNHAM: Thank you. come up with this gut-wrenching decision. 15 15 MR. HIRSH: Thank you. Alright, now MR. MacDOUGALD: That is -- that rule was a 16 there are dates that queue off that timing that we 16 challenge. 17 17 just set up. Now the -- Mr. Clark has proposed 30 MR. HIRSH: Yeah, right. Okay. 18 days before the hearing for submission of the 18 MR. MacDOUGALD: And, Your Honor, the idea 19 19 witness list and exhibits, as I read it. Is that of having stipulations come after the witness list 20 20 correct, Mr. MacDougald? and the exhibit list is, when we see those we may 21 21 MR. MacDOUGALD: Yes, it is. have the ability to stipulate documents. We would be 22 22 MR. HIRSH: Mr. Fox, do you have a position in a better position to stipulate the things at that

Page 30 Page 32 1 1 point. But if we can reach stipulations ahead of time. 2 2 that, you know, we will pursue that. MR. HIRSH: Okay. Now let's talk about 3 3 MR. HIRSH: Okay. Well let me sort of day two. Object to exhibits, to file objections. Do 4 4 work backwards. My rough math if this is done we want to say the 19th? That's one week after the 5 5 quickly, is December 12th would be the day for the 6 6 witness and exhibit lists? MR. MacDOUGALD: I think a week is 7 7 I think the 11th might actually be -- it probably enough for us. Charles, any thoughts on 8 8 may be 29 days rather than 30, but it seems like that? 9 9 there's a weekend before the 12th. The 12th is a MR. BURNHAM: That's fine. 10 Monday. Would that work for the exhibit and 10 MR. HIRSH: Okay, on the stipulations, 11 11 witness lists? you would propose 21 days before the hearing for the 12 12 MR. MacDOUGALD: December the 12th? stipulations. So more or less that would be December 13 13 MR. HIRSH: Yes. 21st. 14 14 MR. FOX: That's fine with me. MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any 15 15 MR. HIRSH: Okay. problem with that. But it has also been my 16 16 MR. MacDOUGALD: Let me interject that, observation that a hearing committee has welcomed 17 depending on the timing of the January 6th Committee 17 stipulations following the deadline. I don't know 18 18 releases, we may be hard up on that date or even past exactly -- and I presume we are going to get to that 19 19 next -- what the defense -- or the respondent's case 20 20 So, you know, we would like -- if there's is going to look like. 21 21 something in there that we need to get in, we'd like I would think, frankly, that in the 22 to be able to come back and amend the list, if context that we-- what I know of our case, this is Page 31 Page 33 1 1 needed. You know, we don't know what we have or not a case that is going to result in very many 2 what they're going to release, but we know that some 2 stipulations -- perhaps through authenticity of 3 3 of it is going to be favorable compared to what's documents -- but I just don't see that there's much 4 4 been publicly released. that I would be seeking a stipulation about. So I 5 5 MR. HIRSH: Look, I will take that up, if just want to flag that. 6 6 it comes. But in any event, I am certainly going to 7 7 MR. MacDOUGALD: Okay. be open if something comes up the day before the 8 8 MR. HIRSH: I hope I can get across. I'm hearing and it makes sense to stipulate, to stipulate 9 9 to it. not trying to stand overly on ceremony, okay? If 10 10 people have good reasons for things, then we will get MR. HIRSH: You can kumbaya at any 11 11 to some things that in fact, you know, I do want you moment. We will include that in the Order, but of 12 12 to follow the rules on some of the discovery stuff, course that is true. The advantage of having a 13 13 but I'm not here to say, okay, well, we just the deadline is -- I'm gonna expect that if we have a 14 14 stock yesterday, too bad, too late. You know, it's deadline for stipulations, that counsel are going to 15 15 talk with each other. And it is not unusual in a lot not--16 MR. MacDOUGALD: Thank you very much. 16 of cases, you know, I mean you both file briefs to 17 17 MR. HIRSH: I will handle things in a -some extent that you have critical things to say 18 18 MR. MacDOUGALD: We understand that you've about how the other side curious things, which is not 19 19 got to set a schedule to move the case, and we will the first time this has ever happened in, you know, 20 20 do our best on all that. But I wanted to flag it so in all disputes. 21 21 that it didn't come up as -- it wouldn't be a I do want you to work together 22 22 surprise or sound like we were making stuff up at the professionally and cooperatively. If there are ways

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 34

Page 36 see raised in the briefs that you've already filed

- $^{1}$  of, you know, avoiding arguments particularly about
- various details and things that, you know, aren't
- really disputed, you know -- I mean obviously there
- are things that are not disputed that may not be
- worth the time. The way Mr. Clark was admitted to
- $^{\,6}\,$   $\,$  the Bar, for example, is a relevant fact, that I
- 7 doubt is in dispute, you know, for example.
  - MR. FOX: The facts have been admitted

to.

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. MacDOUGALD: We have. We admitted that.

CHAIR HIRSH: You admitted that in your answer, so I assume that is -- you know, I'm giving that as an example.

So, okay, the other -- Mr. Clark's brief also raised timing for motions in limine.

MR. MacDOUGALD: Yeah, maybe we ought to change the suggested dates on those, although I don't know exactly when they ought to be. And our thinking on that was we do what we have to do as lawyers, but if we can, not be briefing like mad men between Christmas and New Year's, that would be good.

that I'd like you to think about, okay, and address.
 And I absolutely want people to be prepared at the

4 hearing to address this, okay? I don't want to find

out, well, we haven't thought about it, or it will
end up in our post-hearing briefs, because it will

help us understand the evidence at the hearing.

The question is whether it is worthwhile

The question is whether it is worthwhile to follow up with a prehearing brief to do this or not. And I'm open to people's views. As I said, you might want to hear the sort of things I have been thinking about so far as what parties have said before deciding that. Or you might want to comment on it now, to see that to some extent potentially tied to the motion in limine. Because motions in limine may relate to what the theories of the case are, you know, how it is being argued.

So do you have a general thought on that?

MR. MacDOUGALD: I think our preference would be to have a briefing on that. But it

obviously depends on the issue and the question.

CHAIR HIRSH: Mr. Fox, do you have

Page 35

Page 37

- CHAIR HIRSH: Yeah, I think that makes sense. Let me ask a sort of separate but related question, which is: I was going to ask whether people want to file prehearing briefs. And what I am going to get to -- and you might just want to put a pin in that question, because what I wanted to do a little bit during this is, try to focus a little bit on, not necessarily -- I'm not going to give you a pop quiz, you know, what is your argument here? What do you mean there? And, you know, whatever.
- What I tend to do at hearings is something I wish judges did with me so I try to do it for other people, which is sometimes judges sit there stone-faced listening to arguments, smile politely, say thank you counsel, and hear the other argument and walk away, and you never know what it is that concerned them, interested them, or would be worth spending time and my attention to.
- So I am going to give you sort of -nowhere close to a ruling. This is not a decision. It's not even close to a decision. You shouldn't even infer anything. But some of the things that I

thoughts on it?

MR. FOX: I frankly would rather hear first what the positions are. I mean --

CHAIR HIRSH: You don't want to buy a pig in a poke.

MR. FOX: Exactly so. In addition to that, there has been some rather extensive briefing already --

CHAIR HIRSH: That's certainly true.

MR. FOX: -- on a number of issues.

CHAIR HIRSH: There have been some. But to some extent -- and I'm not criticizing this -- part of your response was this isn't the time to address it.

MR. FOX: That's correct.

CHAIR HIRSH: So, alright, so let me talk a little bit about that, and then we'll work back on some things with the schedule.

As I said, I do this really as a courtesy to counsel, okay? I haven't made decisions in this case. It's early in the case. I have read the briefs that people have filed, and it's unusual.

Page 38

People have spent more time talking about the issues surrounding the case than most of our cases have,

okay? So usually I don't even have this much. So, Mr. Fox, let me just start with you.

And as I said, this isn't a pop quiz. If you want to say, okay, I've got your point, I'll think about it, I'm perfectly fine with that. You don't have to have an answer off the top of your head about everything.

First is just kind of a point of clarification. As I understand the specification of charges, both of the counts that you are reining -- it's not actually separated in accounts, but they are both attempt. They are both a combination of 8.4A, discussing attempts, and either 8.4C discussing dishonesty and other things, and 8.4D, discussing serious interference with the administration of justice.

Your claim is that in both of the instances Mr. Clark attempted, not did -- it's not just a pure 8.4 C or D, if you understand my question. It's a case about attempt.

MR. FOX: That's correct.

Page 40

the 2020 Presidential election that might have affected the results in Georgia."

It goes on beyond that. But what I want to focus on is -- what I want you to focus on in presenting your case, not necessarily now, is a question I have in my mind that I want to apprise you of so that you can think about it, is: What is the line that Mr. Clark crossed? Okay? Where was it?

As I understand it -- your theory. You're not saying that drafting this memo after Attorney General Barr had said that there wasn't evidence -- I'm over-simplifying -- said there wasn't evidence of substantial fraud on December 1st; it was, rather, continuing to pursue the memo at some point.

What I want you to be able to articulate is: At what point does this become attempted dishonesty, as opposed to what you describe as a stupid suggestion?

Okay? Where is the line? And how do we draw that line in deciding how to apply this? Okay? That was one thing that struck me about it.

A second issue -- and if you want to

Page 39

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. And as I understand, there is an exchange in the briefing where you were responding to Mr. Clark's characterization of the events in his motion to dismiss. And in your omnibus response, you said: "Respondent's arguments assume that the conduct at issue was a predecisional recommendation, part of providing advice to the President or an honest expression of opinion on a legal issue, and therefore does not implicate Rule 8.4."

That is the rule that all of your claims fall under.

"The evidence will show that this is not so. Had Respondent merely suggested sending the so-called proof of concept letter to various Georgia officials, this case would not have been brought. It is generally not a disciplinary violation to make a stupid suggestion. Rather, these charges arise from Respondent's conduct after he proposed sending the letter, and was informed by his superiors that there was no factual basis for the claims made in it. Most significantly, that there was no evidence of fraud in

Page 41

comment now, that is fine, but I can understand why you might want to think about it, you know, but either way is fine.

MR. FOX: Well, I mean I'm happy to comment now. I should probably have had the dates more at my fingertips than I do, and I don't, but our position is, that after he was initially told that there was no basis to make these claims, that he came back and used coercive methods, or means to attempt to get the letter to be sent, even though he had no additional information. Indeed, there was a suggestion that he made that he contact the U.S. Attorney in Atlanta, which he didn't do. And even though the people that he was addressing it to were the people who had the responsibility, the overall responsibility of supervising the investigations that were being made into election irregularities, and that when he came back and attempted to coerce them into sending the letter, that that's where he crossed the line.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, I appreciate you providing that insight. This is not -- as I said,

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 42

it's not a pop quiz. So if you think about refining some of this point, or a different way of articulating it, I'm not going to say ah-ha! You told me on October 6th, X but now it's X-prime.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

People think about cases they develop, but my point in flagging it is this is something I was wondering about, I don't know right, wrong, or

Another thing I'm wondering about -- and I should also add, I'm going to be the Chair of the Committee. There are going to be two other people at the hearing, so I am not the sole decision-maker, even to the point of an important recommendation. And of course all it is is an important recommendation to a Board who will decide what it wants to do, and potentially proceeding before the D.C. Court of Appeals who is also responsible for particularly legal issues.

So I am just one part of this process, but I am trying to help people in formulating things that have struck me.

The other one I wanted to raise with you,

Page 44

1 attempting to cause them to do, the litigation --2 unnecessary litigation that would have followed would 3 have been extraordinary. 4

So that's my response with respect to the 8.4D.

CHAIR HIRSH: Thank you. Mr. MacDougald, again I don't know if you want to comment on these particular points right now. This was more me, trying to frame things that people can think about. If you want to comment, that's fine, but if you don't that's fine, too.

Let me ask you a couple of things from what I've seen in the papers that Mr. Clark has submitted. Your answer raises 54 I think affirmative defenses, many of which cite various provisions of the Constitution, or various deliberative process, rules of Administrative Law or Practice, and various other things.

And, you know, I understand these provisions existing, but what is not quite as clear to me in some of the briefing is the connection between some of the points you make and our

Page 43

- Mr. Fox, is, your theory is "attempted serious
- 2 interference with the administration of justice under
- 8.4D." In what way do you maintain that Mr. Clark 4
- attempted to interfere with the administration of 5 justice? What's the administration of justice that
- was interfered with, or potentially, or attempted to be interfered with? And how does that fit into that
- 8 box?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FOX: And here my answer is a little more tentative, but I think there are two ways.

There is one case in the District of Columbia, I think it's called "White" in which the interference in a legislative matter was deemed to be an 8.4D violation. So that's the first thing.

And the -- because, you know, clearly what he was seeking to do was to cause all kinds of what we would contend to be unwarranted legislative activity, and in this context the legislative activity is -- it's legislative, but it's also sort of a fact-finding quasi-judicial function.

And secondly, that undoubtedly, had the Department of Justice done what Mr. Clark was Page 45

proceeding. There really are a couple of aspects of it that, you know, it would help me if you would address how the theories of this work.

One of the aspects of it is, you kind of make a general point that the President is the boss of the Attorney General, I'm putting it in very simple terms, but basically it's that ultimately it's the President and the Attorney General. But it is not clear to me exactly what that means in the context.

First of all, part of that is: Is the Attorney General reporting to the Office of the President, or the personal interest of the President as an aspect of how you do this? And is there a distinction between those two? If the person who is there as opposed to the Office of the President.

Another area where I'm unclear about how you're articulating it is: Okay, so what does that mean? Can the President -- is every -- you know, what is the limiting principle? Is every employee of the Justice Department, or every appointed person in the Justice Department obliged to do something no

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 46

matter how obvious it might be contrary to law, simply because the President says so? You know, what does that mean, right? What's the limiting principle on that?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

And the third aspect of it that I'm trying to get a connection between all of these principles is: How does that apply to the enforcement not of a governmental action -- this isn't a lawsuit where you're trying to say, you know, someone is bringing a civil suit saying Mr. Clark shouldn't advise the President. Okay? I understand that, you know, that application of what you're talking about.

But this is, Mr. Clark is a member of the D.C. Bar. And from Mr. Fox's perspective, from the Disciplinary Counsel's perspective, the D.C. Bar has rules. And if you are a member of our Bar, you have a license -- as he describes it under case law, it's a privilege to serve as a lawyer in the District of Columbia, and you have to follow the rules.

How does all that play out to what's actually before us as opposed to principles that might apply differently to, you know, could you have Page 48

1 make a ruling on this today, and I don't want you 2 spending all of your life writing additional briefs. 3 I just wanted to alert it as a courtesy so you could 4 think about it.

> And there's kind of a flip side, Mr. Fox, to this on your side, which is: Okay, I see part of their argument is that there is a deliberative process here, and there are ordinarily some protections to what takes place in a deliberative process. Okay. How does that affect any of this? Does it affect it not at all, that some of this stuff might be under a normal kind of, you know, a pre-decisional discussion about stuff that ordinarily in some sense -- and I'm not trying to overstate or misstate; I'm just trying to lay it out -- some sense is part of this is not fair game, in some sense. Okav?

> And how does that play into this case and how we evaluate the significance of the evidence you're going to present? I mean, does the context matter not at all, I guess is the question, or does it matter, but not enough? Or whatever, it may not

Page 47

access to communications that take place for, you know, the delivery of process privilege argument, or 4A exemption 5, or something.

How does that relate exactly to our proceeding, is at least from my initial reading of what you filed, less obvious than that these principles are out there. Okay?

MR. MacDOUGALD: Those are thoughtful questions, and I would have hoped that we had been sufficiently clear in our briefing, but perhaps we didn't hit the mark. We'd like to huddle and submit briefing on that, additional briefing. Those are very important questions, and there's some subtlety to it. So we would like to express it in writing, if it's all right with the Chair.

CHAIR HIRSH: I don't need the answers right now. I mean, if we're going to have a prehearing brief, I'd rather you do this more in the context of the facts, because the theories may change.

21 MR. MacDOUGALD: Okay. 22

CHAIR HIRSH: Because I'm not going to

Page 49

be clear, but -- .

MR. FOX: I mean if we're going to do a prehearing briefing, we are going to obviously address it there, but frankly I don't understand the question very well. I mean, we are not challenging advice that Mr. Clark gave to the President, or even to the Acting Attorney General.

Our challenge is that he attempted to have the Department of Justice engage in what was very serious conduct with no basis to do so. And, you know, to the extent that there's a pre-decision line, I think -- I'm not sure it is, but I think it is the one that I've already drawn, which is: look, I worked in the Department of Justice. I'm sure that I wrote some memos that had, you know, were dumb ideas and they got shot down. But, you know, if after being told that there is no basis for it, no factual basis for it, I nevertheless went ahead and tried to act as though they were, then that's problematic. And it is particularly problematic if, you know, I attempt to say if you don't sign this letter it's going to cost you your job.

Page 50

And opposition is going to be that -well, I won't say what the position is, but this is
not like a criminal trial where one is prohibited
from commenting on that to the jury.

MR. BURNHAM: And, Your Honor, we would --

And if Mr. MacDougald is able to articulate better what it is his position is, I'm happy to refine that answer.

draw. And, frankly, I don't understand all of the

arguments that have been advanced, that this is

somehow Presidential advice or something like that.

So, you know, that's the line that I would

7 MR. MACDOUGALD: Go ahead, Charles.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay.

MR. BURNHAM: I was just going to say,
 real briefly, we obviously object to the position Mr

MR. MacDOUGALD: Well, you know, they've got the burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that there was a violation of the rules.

And this goes right back to the question that the Chairman posed, which is where is the line? Where is the line?

real briefly, we obviously object to the position Mr.
Fox has intimated, and I'm happy to go into that now if it would be helpful to the Chair at this point.
Or we can include that on our list of things to brief up, because we think the ODC's position is quite incorrect on that. Thank you.

If it's okay to make a suggestion but it's not okay to persist in the suggestion, there's nothing in the rules about that.

CHAIR HIRSH: Let me just make two comments. One is, I can't control the tone of your back-and-forth arguments, okay? Here today you've been, you know, very professional, of course, and reasonably civil, although there's differences you both had made, but in your briefs which is a bit more

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. That's helpful.

And, Mr. MacDougald, you make a point I wanted to emphasize. At this point, it's burden of

of this.
 Look, you know, I can't control it. You

proof by clear and convincing evidence. I'm not assuming any facts are true. I'm just trying to

Page 51

Page 53

Page 52

understand what the theories are.

MR MacDOLIGALD: And you ke

MR. MacDOUGALD: And, you know, speaking for our side, we are very grateful for the questions that have been posed. It's helpful.

CHAIR HIRSH: Thank you.

Alright, well let's continue on getting to the things we need to discuss. Alright, if we are going to have -- Mr. Fox, now that you've heard some of my musings, okay, and please treat them as such, how do you feel about doing prehearing briefs?

MR. FOX: Well, you know, it sounds to me like this is a case that inevitably is going to result in prehearing briefs, because of the nature of the "throw it against the wall and see what sticks" defense that's being put forward. And that may be a way to refine that.

And so I certainly don't oppose doing so. Indeed, I think another issue that needs to be addressed in the prehearing briefs is that Mr. Clark has asserted his right against self-incrimination, and should he persist in doing that, the evidentiary effect of that in these proceedings.

can make whatever arguments you want. I'm just telling you as the audience, you know, that type of stuff doesn't really move me very much. I am more interested in the merits. If an argument doesn't have merit, it is not because you dislike the opposing attorney, it is because the argument doesn't have merit and I'm not going to buy it.

If the argument has merit, it doesn't matter how bad the opposing -- you know, you think the attorney is, if it's a meritorious argument, it is. So you might want to -- I can't stop you. I'm just telling you what effects, how I read it.

As far as the, whatever, it seems to me that you folks should probably talk. I'm not requiring you to do it, but it would make sense to try to. Because I'm not going to have 47 rounds of pretrial briefing where you make replies and counter replies, okay? That's just a waste of people's time.

I think it would help to have everybody file a pretrial brief, and it would probably help for counsel to talk with each other just to understand the broad topics that are going to be addressed so

Page 54 Page 56 1 1 that the issues don't fly past each other. indication in one of the papers -- and perhaps it was 2 2 And here's what I'm going to do. Going in an email -- that the Respondent was considering 3 3 back to our calendar, I'm going to ask that you meet calling an expert in legal ethics, and I would just 4 4 and confer about the topics of the brief by say, refer respondents to the decision that the Court of 5 5 December 12, and file the brief by the 21st, which is Appeals came down with about two weeks ago, I think 6 6 the same schedule on the motions in limine, which it was, in the Clayman case in which they said that 7 7 will get it to correspond. expert testimony on the subject of legal ethics is 8 8 MR. MacDOUGALD: 12/20? Or 12/21? I'm not appropriate in these proceedings. 9 9 sorry, I misheard. Now I don't know what other kinds of 10 10 CHAIR HIRSH: Yeah, not actually maybe we experts there may be. If we are going to have 11 11 should move this up. Why don't you meet and confer experts, I would request that we build into the 12 12 by December 7, and file your prehearing briefs on schedule a requirement that an expert report be filed 13 13 December 14, with motions in limine. That will allow at some time that would give me the opportunity, if 14 14 a response to the motion in limine before we get too it is needed -- I suspect it may not be needed -- to 15 15 close to the holidays. designate a counter-expert. 16 16 MR. MacDOUGALD: Let us have a chance to MR. MacDOUGALD: Okay. 17 17 CHAIR HIRSH: And then have a response to study on the claimant opinion and we'll --18 18 the motion in limine due December 21st? CHAIR HIRSH: Sorry? 19 MR. MacDOUGALD: And, Mr. Chairman, in 19 MR. MacDOUGALD: We'd like to study the 20 20 your Order are you going to enumerate any of the claimant opinion on the point raised by Mr. Fox, as 21 21 topics that you've identified? Or should we just go he suggested we do. And then we'll confer with him 22 22 from our notes? I mean that gives us some about that after that. Page 55 Page 57 1 1 structure on what to address. CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. 2 CHAIR HIRSH: I understand, but I'm going 2 MR. FOX: But I do request, Mr. Hirsh, 3 3 to leave it to you, okay? I'm raising these, you that we have built into the schedule a date by which 4 4 know, as I said, as a heads-up. This is something expert reports need to be submitted. And that would 5 5 I'm thinking about, so it would help if you address be done in sufficient time to allow me to designate a 6 it, not as a "you're required to." I'm only one of 6 counter-expert if I deem that necessary. 7 7 three people on this panel anyway. I'm just giving CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, so what dates would 8 8 you an insight, you know, into what kinds of topics you propose, Mr. Fox? 9 I'd like people to help explain. MR. FOX: I would say 30 days out about 10 10 And, truly, don't take it as a view on the the time of the witness list. 11 11 merits, okay? I haven't decided any of these for CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, so that would be the 12 12 either side, okay? You know, I think it's important December 19th date we're using? 13 13 to give people the opportunity to make their best MR. FOX: I thought it was the 12th --14 14 case before I make that decision. So that's really CHAIR HIRSH: Oh, right, I'm sorry. 15 15 December 12th, I'm sorry. I just can't read my what I'm trying to do. 16 Okay, are there going to be any expert 16 notes, but otherwise it's fine. Any experts will be 17 17 witnesses? designated by December 12th, and what's the deadline 18 MR. MacDOUGALD: Mr. Fox? 18 for the reports? 19 19 MR. FOX: No. MR. FOX: I would think the reports by 20 20 MR. MacDOUGALD: We may have one or two, December 12th. 21 21 Your Honor. CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, designated and report 22 22 MR. FOX: Mr. Hirsh, there was an at the same time?

Page 58 Page 60 1 1 MR. FOX: Yeah, because I can't -- you but it gives you more time before the hearing. 2 2 MR. FOX: That's fine with me. know, the designation that you get for an expert is 3 3 MR. BURNHAM: Your Honor, can I ask a "Mr. Jones is going to testify, give his opinion 4 4 about," whatever. And I can't make a real clarifying question? Just to try to avoid any 5 5 knowledgeable determination as to whether I need to disputes about whether the, quote, report is 6 6 counter that unless I have the meat of the opinion in sufficient, would it be sufficient if we filed 7 7 front of me. something consistent with the expert notice provision 8 8 CHAIR HIRSH: Alright, so you're talking in Federal Rule of Evidence 16? 9 9 about designating an expert with a report on December CHAIR HIRSH: Well, I was thinking --10 12th, and then when would a responding expert, or 10 you're talking about the expert notice of a pretrial, 11 11 opposing expert need to be designated also with a on the pretrial rule as opposed to an expert report 12 12 report? that -- I need to go back and look at it, because the 13 13 MR. FOX: I would say, my suggestion elements of a report -- is there a separate rule on 14 14 would be three weeks later. You know, getting an 15 15 expert report in three weeks is a bit of a push, but MR. FOX: The Superior Court Rule for 16 16 it is doable, and that should give the respondents expert reports, which I would submit is more 17 ample time to prepare to cross 17 relevant, I think it is 26. 18 18 CHAIR HIRSH: Yeah, the difficulty is you CHAIR HIRSH: That's what I was thinking. 19 19 are getting into the holidays, but if that isn't a I thought it was Rule 26. 20 20 MR. FOX: It could be 28, but I think problem -- three weeks after the 12th puts you on the 21 21 it's 26. I'm not -day after New Year's, a week before the hearing. 22 MR. FOX: Well let's make it the 31st. 22 CHAIR HIRSH: I thought it was Rule 26. Page 59 Page 61 1 CHAIR HIRSH: The 31st is a Saturday. Rule 16 is what you need to say in pretrial, for a 2 MR. FOX: The 30th, then. 2 pretrial hearing. 3 3 CHAIR HIRSH: Does that schedule work MR. FOX: I would suggest --4 4 with you, Mr. MacDougald? CHAIR HIRSH: I once had a case I was 5 5 MR. MacDOUGALD: Your Honor, that's -arguing in the D.C. Circuit on Title 8, and Judge 6 6 dealing with the rebuttal expert it's putting us Edwards says, well how would this work under Title 7? 7 7 right on the eve of the hearing, and, you know, Mr. You know, there were two statutes four years apart. 8 8 Fox's predicament, which I sympathize with, of How does Title 7 work? It was one of these pop 9 wanting to know the case he's got to confront, is quizzes, right? 10 10 going to consist of, is a shoe that was on my foot (Laughter.) 11 11 just a few minutes ago. CHAIR HIRSH: So, you know, I believe --12 12 CHAIR HIRSH: Alright, what if we moved look, a normal report that would comply with D.C. 13 13 it up a week? Superior Court rules for the submission of an expert 14 14 MR. MacDOUGALD: It makes sense to maybe report, I'm fine with using that as guidance. I just 15 15 don't think it's actually Rule 16 is the right rule push the hearing out a little bit to allow any expert 16 16 discovery to occur -for it, from my off-hand recollection. 17 17 MR. FOX: I'll do it earlier rather than MR. BURNHAM: I was referring to the 18 18 to push the hearing. Federal Rules, but --19 19 CHAIR HIRSH: I prefer to do it earlier. CHAIR HIRSH: It's hard to track it, but 20 20 Why don't we have the expert designation on the 5th I would look at the D.C. Circuit Court rules. 21 21 instead of the 12th and make it December 23rd instead MR. BURNHAM: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 22 of the 30th. That gives you the same amount of time, MR. FOX: It is Rule 26.

Page 62 Page 64 1 CHAIR HIRSH: That's what I thought. non-Touhy Touhy letter. But for us, if we get an 2 2 MR. FOX: 26 A-2, I think. ex-DOJ employee under subpoena, we are for sure going 3 3 CHAIR HIRSH: You passed the quiz. to trigger the full panoply of Touhy review. And, 4 (Laughter.) you know, so I want to come back to a antecedent of 5 5 CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. Alright, we've questions about that in just a second, but we don't 6 6 talked about experts. Now let's go back to some of know how long that's going to take, or how it's going 7 7 the points that Mr. Clark has raised about discovery to come out. But, you know, just looking at which 8 8 issues. Okay? way the wind blows we are not expecting DOJ to be 9 9 First of all, I don't know if it's Mr. helpful to us in that process. 10 10 MacDougald or Mr. Burnham, but let me start with Mr. CHAIR HIRSH: Let me separate out a few 11 11 different things. Fox for a second. 12 12 Have you made Touhy requests to the First of all, you mentioned the Law 13 13 Enforcement Privilege? Justice Department in connection with calling Mr. 14 14 MR. MacDOUGALD: Yes. Rosen and Mr. MacDougald? 15 15 MR. FOX: Oh, yeah, I have. That's been CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, to the extent this is 16 16 done for more than a year. And I've supplied copies an issue so far as what I would expect to hear, or 17 of the letters to Mr. Clark's counsel. 17 the panel would expect to hear at the hearing, 18 18 MR. MacDOUGALD: And -- the DOJ -- we address it in your pretrial brief. You know, again 19 19 objected to the sufficiency of whether they complied it's not a pop quiz. But if this is something we 20 20 need to handle in some way, and alternatively put with the Touhy regulations, because the letter we got 21 21 back didn't reflect that. And we got a letter back aside whether it's a privilege about asking a 22 22 from DOJ that said, well, actually, we're not question, if the DOJ or somebody else is going to ask Page 63 Page 65 1 1 required to go through the Touhy regulation process that a portion of this hearing take place under seal 2 2 because this request from Mr. Fox did not trigger or confidentially, or if something that comes up --3 3 those regulations, because it was just a request and MR. MacDOUGALD: I don't know that it is. 4 4 not a subpoena, demand or order. CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, I'm just saying 5 5 CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. that's something I would want to know about in 6 6 MR. MACDOUGALD: But there is a letter advance so we can figure it out. 7 7 from DOJ, authorizing these witnesses to give MR. MacDOUGALD: And, you know, that's 8 8 information to the DC Bar. They reserve the right to why we put it in our material file Monday. We wanted 9 9 review what testimony might be given publicly and to raise the flag that the whole point of the Touhy 10 10 potentially assert their position on what testimony regulations is to permit the Executive Branch to put 11 11 they think should be excluded. And as I mentioned forth equities with respect to the evidence being 12 12 earlier, in the Senate Judiciary Committee sought. And those equities run the gamut of Executive 13 13 depositions, there were quite a number of objections Branch privileges from Executive Privilege, to Law 14 14 based on law enforcement privilege concerning DOJ's Enforcement Privilege, Deliberative Process 15 15 investigations of the election. Privilege, Presidential Communications Privilege, and 16 16 So that issue may come up again. on and on. There's a whole panoply of those. 17 17 CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. And that process is intended to establish 18 18 MR. MacDOUGALD: And, you know, if these a rigorous procedure for evaluating those questions. 19 19 witnesses are going to appear not under subpoena, you And we know from the Senate Judiciary Transcripts 20 20 know, presumably the DOJ position would be that the that they are asserting Law Enforcement Privilege 21 21 Touhy regulations were still not triggered. with respect to most of the universe of topics that 22 22 So, you know, we've been calling that a would be embraced by investigation of the election.

In Re: Jeffrey B. Clark October 6, 2022

Page 66 Page 68 1 They were only permitted testimony in a couple of MR. MacDOUGALD: Okay, very good. 2 2 CHAIR HIRSH: As far as -- okay, now as narrow areas. 3 3 far as the remaining, you talk about one or more DOJ And inasmuch as Mr. Fox has indicated that 4 4 a premise of his case is that there's no basis for witnesses. One or more who might be out of town is 5 5 further investigation because Mr. Clark was told that what you say in this. 6 6 by his superiors, well then it becomes relevant to First of all, have you submitted a -- have 7 7 know to get behind that. you identified who it is you're talking about? 8 8 CHAIR HIRSH; Okay, as I said, address MR. MacDOUGALD: We have spent a good bit 9 9 that in the briefs. I don't want to cut you off from of time trying to identify those people. And we hope 10 10 to have that finalized relatively soon. responding --11 11 MR. MacDOUGALD: And I apologize for But I would like to ask an embarrassingly 12 12 going over. dumb question, Mr. Chairman. And that is, whether 13 13 the subpoena from the Board is something that we can CHAIR HIRSH: No, that's no problem. I 14 14 use through the Uniform Foreign Deposition Act to get just don't-- I want to focus on this at a time when I 15 15 have enough information to do something intelligent witnesses under subpoena in foreign jurisdictions? 16 16 about it, as opposed to going -- I appreciate it's an And I apologize. I just don't know the answer to 17 17 issue. I don't know how big an issue it is, or that question. 18 18 whether, if it is an issue we need to figure out how CHAIR HIRSH: Well, okay, Mr. Fox, I 19 to work with it. 19 don't know for sure but I imagine the answer is 20 20 MR. MacDOUGALD: It can have a serious 'yes,' but I'll ask Mr. Fox. 21 21 MR. FOX: It varies from jurisdiction to consequence on whether we are able to put on our 22 22 defense. jurisdiction. But I think the cart is considerably Page 67 Page 69 1 1 CHAIR HIRSH: Now let me -- so far as in front of --2 discovery is concerned, first of all I assume you've 2 CHAIR HIRSH: No, I think you're about 3 3 already gotten the Rule 3.1 discovery and access to four steps before we get there, but -- but let me 4 4 Mr. Fox's files? start with the steps and understand it. 5 5 MR. MacDOUGALD: We have been provided First of all, are you talking about -- I 6 6 some documents from his files. He's asserted work gather from your statement of subpoena you're talking 7 7 product privileges with respect to certain categories about people who would not voluntarily agree to 8 8 of information. Some of that we agree with, and some testify. 9 9 of that we don't. So rather than try to argue that MR. MacDOUGALD: Well, if they are former 10 10 here, would the appropriate vehicle then be to file a DOJ employees, Mr. Chairman, they're not permitted to 11 11 motion with the court, or do a meet-and-confer with testify under subpoena --12 12 Mr. Fox antecedent to a motion? CHAIR HIRSH: There are Touly 13 13 How would you like us to handle that? regulations, just as Mr. Fox is dealing with. 14 14 CHAIR HIRSH: Do a meet-and-confer. I'd MR. MacDOUGALD: Okay, fine. 15 15 like you to do these things as expeditiously as CHAIR HIRSH: But whether the witness 16 16 possible, to use a lawyer word, as fast as possible, insists on getting a subpoena to testify is a

question for the witness. So are we first talking

current or former DOJ employees and we have a

the prior notice and ability to weight in, to put it

in simple terms, you know, into whether there's a

regulatory system that gives the Justice Department

about people who -- is the issue that these are

will consider it.

17

18

19

20

21

22

you know, and not have this be a reason for delay.

you've got a dispute over whether you've gotten

access under 3.1, you can file a motion to me and I

CHAIR HIRSH: And so talk about it. If

MR MacDOUGALD: Okay.

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 70 Page 72 1 1 problem with having this person testify about these the requirements. 2 2 subjects? That is how I understand the Touhy It's different if you're seeking a 3 3 subpoena for participation at the hearing. So which regulations to operate. 4 Are we talking about people who you don't is it you're seeking? 5 5 MR. MacDOUGALD: I can't say exactly think would be going to testify unless they were 6 6 subpoenaed? right now. It depends. We have not talked to these 7 7 MR. MacDOUGALD: The truthful answer, people. And, you know, many of them have lawyers and 8 8 Your Honor, is I don't know. we're in a very fraught environment for people who 9 9 CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. And -talk about these topics, because there are criminal 10 10 MR. FOX: Mr. Hirsh, could I interject. investigations going on. And so people -- we expect 11 11 people to be reluctant to testify. I apologize, but could I ask a clarifying question? 12 12 Are we talking about witnesses to testify at the But, you know, we just haven't had time to 13 13 identify those. Now we will expeditiously find out hearing? Or are we talking about discovery 14 where we stand on that, and we'll just have to make a 14 depositions? 15 15 CHAIR HIRSH: This is the next question I call about whether we try to depose them or now. And 16 16 the way ya'll will know is we file motion for a was going to ask. 17 MR. MacDOUGALD: Well, we would like to 17 discovery subpoena. 18 18 take their depositions so we can figure out whether I apologize for not being able to answer 19 19 we want to use them at the hearing. That may that. I know it's a great question and we have been 20 20 giving that some thought, but we're just not resolved streamline the hearing. 21 21 CHAIR HIRSH: Alright. That's a good on that at the moment. 22 22 question. The reason it's a good question is the CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. Here's what I'd like Page 71 Page 73 1 1 rules operate very differently with respect to you to do. Alright? First of all, I don't want this 2 requesting people to attend the hearing and getting 2 to delay things, okay? If you need to make a Touhy 3 3 discovery. Okay? request, I take at face value you don't know how long 4 4 MR. MacDOUGALD: Right. the Justice Department will take with the request, or 5 5 CHAIR HIRSH: "Discovery" is actually what kind of reaction you'll get, or you may fear a 6 6 kind of the wrong word for this proceeding, okay, of negative reaction. I understand that. But nothing 7 7 third parties. There are proceedings to ask for happens until you submit. 8 8 information from each other, okay? You know, from a So you need to submit the request as soon 9 9 Disciplinary Counsel respondent, there's 3.1. There as possible so that you can start the process, you 10 10 are ways of getting information from the respondent. know. Then you can come back to me later and tell me 11 11 As far as third-party discovery, that's what a problem it is, and then we can try to figure 12 12 under 3.2. And 3.2 has a standard that is far from out what to do about it, and whether it affects 13 13 automatic. anything. 14 14 MR. MacDOUGALD: Right. But, you know, in the abstract, telling me 15 15 CHAIR HIRSH: But basically it's -- you I'm going to do something and I haven't done it yet 16 16 have to demonstrate a compelling need for the and it's going to be a problem, doesn't tell me what 17 17 additional discovery in the preparation of the the problem is. Okay? 18 18 defense, and that such discovery is not an undue So it needs to be concrete. You need to 19 19 burden on the complainant or others. That's the submit the Touhy request for anybody you think might 20 20 standard under 3.2. So it's far from automatic that be covered by the Touhy regulations as quickly as 21 21 you can get discovery in this proceeding, and you possible. And you need to come as quickly as 22 22 need to file a motion to demonstrate that you meet possible to a conclusion as to whether you want to

In Re: Jeffrey B. Clark October 6, 2022

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

22

Page 74

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay.

try to -- you know, whether you think the circumstances meet 3.2, and submit a motion so that I can, you know, give Mr. Fox an opportunity to respond and act on.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Alright, now so far as documents are concerned, Mr. Fox, have you now gotten from Mr. Clark -- let me phrase it this way: Do you anticipate hiring something to try to get additional documents from Mr. Clark?

I will tell you, in fairness, I will try to act quickly. You know, I recognize that if I'm putting counsel under a time limitations. I will try to put myself -- you know, I can't always promise where I'm going to be on Tuesday. Nobody can. But I will try to act quickly on these, because I understand about the timing, but I can't act on something that's not been filed.

MR. FOX: Yes, and that was on my list of things to raise. We are going to take the court's suggestion and serve a subpoena on Mr. Clark under Rule 45, simply for documents. It will pretty much

MR. MacDOUGALD: That's completely fair, and we will do as instructed.

11 track the -- I'm not saying we won't tweak it here or 12 there -- but pretty much track the subpoena we served

MR. FOX: May I make two observations? One is, it is conceptually difficult for me to conceive of a situation where the respondent has a compelling need to take discovery from a witness

13 earlier. Essentially what we're asking for is any 14 documents that he has that support the position that

when they can't -- at this date, haven't even identified the witness.

he took that there was evidence of -- I forget 16 whether he phrased it in terms of fraud or

The second is to just call to everyone's attention Rule 3.5, which says that discovery

irregularities -- in the Georgia election. And I wanted to inquire whether it was going to be

necessary to actually serve Mr. Clark with that

subpoena, or whether counsel, in light of your admonitions earlier, would accept service.

Heretofore, counsel has been unwilling to

22

Page 75

Page 77

Page 76

requests are not an excuse to delay the proceedings. CHAIR HIRSH: I agree. I mean, I understand those point. I want to give Mr. Clark the opportunity to try to get -- you know, to try to do what he wants to do. And if he wants to make an argument you disagree with as to whether a particular thing is needed, I will hear both sides.

And just as you can't respond to anything, knowing it I can't decide in advance of knowing it who's right.

So the other thing I might add ultimately on the subpoena, and Mr. Fox perhaps you can confirm, but my understanding is that a subpoena when it is issued, includes 25 miles from D.C. It's not just limited to D.C. I don't know whether all -- any of these people are in the D.C. area, but that may simplify your process. It follows Superior Court Rule 45.

MR. MacDOUGALD: It helps with some folks. It doesn't help with others. With others we're going to have to get a subpoena issued in their home jurisdiction.

accept service, and indeed requiring us to tender a check when there is no anticipation that Mr. Clark would actually have to appear and testify.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, so you anticipate you're going to serve him with a subpoena and there might be a fight over it?

MR. FOX: Right. The first thing is I would like to inquire through the Chair whether counsel will accept the subpoena on behalf of Mr. Clark. If not, we will serve him promptly and we'll get the subpoena out in a day or so. Then if there's a fight, there's a fight.

MR. MacDOUGALD: We'll accept service. CHAIR HIRSH: You will? MR. MacDOUGALD: Yes. CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. Well that solves

16 17 that part of the problem. And we'll figure out if 18 there's a fight over the scope of the production, 19 I'll say the same thing to you.

> MR. FOX: Mr. Hirsh, could I --CHAIR HIRSH: Raise it quickly so that we can get this thing resolved and so that it doesn't,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 78

you know, foster additional delay.

Okay, the other sort of category I had just to discuss things are some comments just to bring to your attention about how the hearing, how I am anticipating at this point the hearing is going to

I expect the format on the docs, you know, the exhibits and stuff follow the rules. The rules describe how the exhibits are to be formatted and all

be handled, just to give you some sense of it.

I told you I don't know if the hearing will be live or remote. I will, even though we have pretrial briefs, you know, things come up in the briefs or whatever, I am hoping and expecting that people will be conversant and ready to discuss, you know, how the facts apply to the law, to put it that way, at the hearing.

I don't mean we're going to have a four-day legal argument over everything I'm not anticipating that, but sometimes what happens at these hearing is you raise issues and I say, well, that's a really interesting point, we'll address it

Page 80

session to discuss whether to make a preliminary nonbinding determination that Disciplinary Counsel has proven at least one rule violation by clear and convincing evidence. And if that determination is made, the parties are then asked to put on evidence from the Disciplinary Counsel's side, things like prior disciplines, if any, or that might be aggravating from the side of a respondent, mitigating evidence that might be taken into account in determining the sanctions.

And one of the things that I want people prepared to think about, although I don't know we've reached a determination, I don't know if it will ever be reached, but because this happens immediately at the hearing, I want people to think through what sanction might be appropriate so that we can discuss that intelligently if there is such a finding.

One of the things that from time to time happens in these cases that I don't think is ideal is that people say, okay, well now we have the evidence and this is basically what we do, and we'll tell you in the brief what we think the sanctions ought to be

Page 79

in the post-hearing brief. And while I am absolutely

- contemplating, you're going to be filing post-hearing
- briefs, and you don't need to give every point 12 of
- 4 your argument, you know, and all this stuff, I want
  - you to be prepared particularly in this case because
- there are a lot of issues that are out there, you
- know, to have thought through these. And that was
- part of the reason why I was giving you some, you
- know, sense of my very initial kind of sense of
- issues.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

of that stuff.

Now the normal procedure at the hearing is that ODC gives an opening statement. They of course have the burden of proof as Disciplinary Counsel. And then Mr. Clark will be given the opportunity to give a statement, but he isn't required to give an opening statement.

And also the normal procedure in our rules, which has nothing specific to Mr Clark, but under Rule 11.11, is that you hear the testimony, once everybody rests on providing the testimony on whether there has been a violation.

Our Committee recesses to executive

Page 81

or oughtn't to be, and that leads to less ability for

the parties to joint the issue properly and explain

why they're thinking about it. And, you know, we

4 need to do the work to construct the parties'

5 arguments and think it through. And it is more

6 useful if I know at the hearing, if we get to that

point which we may not, what the parties' views are

and what an appropriate sanction would be.

So just as in a civil case, this is a naturally bifurcated proceeding. But in a civil case where you think you're going to win on liability, you still make arguments about damages. I want people to be prepared to do that so that we have all the information. That will make it easier for us to understand your post-hearing briefs.

And, you know, we can set the timing of the post-hearing briefs at the hearing. I don't need to do that in advance. But I wanted to give people a warning so that they could prepare.

Are there any thoughts or concerns about that?

MR. FOX: Mr. Hirsh, normally -- one of

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

Page 82

the reasons that we -- and it doesn't apply to this

case -- but one of the reasons that we sometimes and

sometimes do not make a final determination -recommendation about sanction at the hearing is that

I want them to confer with me before they do so, and I want to confer in light of how the evidence came

7 out at the hearing.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That is not going to be a factor here, since I'll be involved in the hearing and I will know that, and so I will certainly be able to address the issue of sanctions at the appropriate time.

But I do want to understand that it's not that we sort of duck that issue, it's that I, as the person in charge of the office, want to weigh in on it. And that's the reason for the hesitation. It won't be a factor here because I'll be trying the case.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay. We can discuss that in other cases. I understand we all operate under constraints, but it is sometimes -- it is sometimes difficult when you're doing a long opinion in a complex case to have to wait for the briefs to figure

Page 84

1 mentioned it in our filing Monday. We are going to 2 do everything that you told us to do, but I want to 3 be clear that we are still considering our options on 4 that.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, I understand you're considering the options. Just so, you know, from your standpoint understand I'm going to continue to do this on the schedule we're dealing with, unless somebody tells me not to.

MR. MacDOUGALD: That is understood. CHAIR HIRSH: I am planning to do that. MR. MacDOUGALD: We understand, thank you.

MR. BURNHAM: One final thing, Mr. Chairman. To the extent that the Hearing Committee is on the fence as to whether to do this as an in-person or entirely virtual, I think our side would have a preference for in-person, if public health conditions permit.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, I'm not sure it's going to be my decision -- I don't know. Mr. Fox, I don't know what you --

Page 83

out, okay, so you say A, B, and C is the reason to do this, and, you know, it would have been helpful. And effectively we don't get an opportunity to talk it through.

So the type of questioning you might want to do, and sometimes sanctions is particularly that because sanctions is a judgmental comparison of isn't this worse than this, and this, and this, you know, and not as bad as that. We don't have that type of ability to do those interchanges with the schedule. So that's why I raise it. Okay, unless -- I think that's all the things I had. Obviously, I'll issue an Order based on this. Are there other things that people want to discuss?

MR. MacDOUGALD: Yes, Your Honor. We would like to order an expedited transcript from the Court Reporter.

CHAIR HIRSH: Okay.

MR. MacDOUGALD: And returning to the point that I raised initially, if we do seek a judicial review that may impact the schedule. And we want to be up front about that. That is why we

Page 85

MR. FOX: I don't have any intelligence on that. We're operating under an Order from the Board that is still in existence about that we do these things virtually. My preference also is to do them face to face, if it is possible. But so far, the Order is that we conduct them this way. CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, I appreciate it. Mr.

Fox, do you have anything else? MR. FOX: No, I have nothing further.

10 CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, Mr. MacDougald or Mr. 11 Burnham?

MR. BURNHAM: I don't think so. Thank vou. Your Honor.

14 MR. MacDOUGALD: Thank you very much, 15 Your Honor. We very much appreciate your time and 16 attention. 17

MR. FOX: Thank you, Your Honor. CHAIR HIRSH: As far as the transcript, I don't know, Mr. Catherine, whether -- what's your --I can't, you know. I heard that you ordered an expedited transcript, but since I'm not doing the work, it's easier --

In Re: Jeffrey B. Clark October 6, 2022

	Page 86	Page 88
1	(Laughter.)	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
2	COURT REPORTER: Yes, we can provide	
3	that, but I'm not sure if it goes through Meghan or	<sup>3</sup> I, GAYNELL CATHERINE, Court Reporter, do hereby
4	should we give the information to order directly to	4 certify that that the testimony contained herein is a
5	Mr. MacDougald.	5 true record of the testimony given by said witness,
6	MS. BORRAZAS: I guess my question would	6 and I further certify that I am neither attorney nor
7	be how fast do you want it? Typically we do 10	7 counsel for, related to, or employed by any of the
8	business days.	8 parties to the action in which this statment is
9	MR. MacDOUGALD: We might need it a	9 taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or an
10	little quicker than that.	employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
11	MS. BORRAZAS: It depends on pricing	parties hereto, or financially interested in the
12	depends on the day. So just how fast you would like	12 action.
13	it, just let me know.	13
14	MR. MacDOUGALD: We'll send you an email.	14
15	MS. BORRAZAS: Okay, great.	15
16	CHAIR HIRSH: Alright, then. Is there	16 GAYNELL CATHERINE
17	anything else?	17
18	MR. MacDOUGALD: I don't think so.	18
19	MR. FOX: Not from me.	19
20	CHAIR HIRSH: And I assume if any of the	20
21	executive attorney people on this had something I	21
22	needed to do, they would have sent me something in	22
	Page 87	
1	chat with lots of exclamation points or something, so	
2	I assume we are	
3	MR. MacDOUGALD: You get those, too.	
4	(Laughter.)	
5	CHAIR HIRSH: Okay, so in that case we're	
6	adjourned.	
7	(Whereupon, at 11:14 a.m., Thursday,	
8	October 6, 2022, the hearing was adjourned.)	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
<u> </u>		

	I	1	l
<b>A</b>	<b>ago</b> 28:13 56:5 59:11	areas 66:2	В
<b>A-2</b> 62:2	<b>agree</b> 3:1 13:10 28:14	<b>argue</b> 8:8 11:19 67:9	<b>B</b> 1:3,21 2:16 83:1
a.m 2:2 87:7	29:2 67:8 69:7 75:2	argued 36:17	back 6:1 12:4 26:17
ability 4:9 29:21 69:21	agreement 23:14	<b>arguing</b> 10:4 61:5	30:22 37:17 41:9,18
81:1 83:10	<b>ah-ha</b> 42:3	<b>argument</b> 17:20 35:9,15	50:12 54:3 60:12 62:6
able 10:2 29:7 30:22	ahead 30:1 49:18 52:7	47:2 48:7 53:4,6,8,10	62:21,21 64:4 73:10
40:15 50:5 66:21 72:18	alert 48:3	75:6 78:19 79:4	back-and-forth 52:17
82:10	alleged 18:2	<b>arguments</b> 10:16 11:5	backwards 30:4
absolutely 36:3 79:1	<b>allow</b> 3:22 54:13 57:5	34:1 35:14 39:5 50:3	<b>bad</b> 6:4 31:14 53:9 83:9
abstract 73:14	59:15	52:17 53:1 81:5,12	<b>Bar</b> 34:6 46:14,15,16
accept 22:12 76:21 77:1,9	<b>alright</b> 6:8 12:2 14:19,22	<b>articulate</b> 40:15 50:5	63:8
77:13	22:17 25:18 27:5,15	articulating 42:3 45:18	<b>Barr</b> 40:11
access 3:14 13:19 47:1	28:22 29:4 37:16 51:6,7	aside 28:20 64:21	based 12:13 18:16 63:14
67:3,21	58:8 59:12 62:5 70:21	asked 9:6,7 13:13 14:22	83:13
accommodate 25:5,11	73:1 76:2 86:16	80:5	basic 14:2
account 80:9	alternatively 64:20	asking 9:19 22:20 64:21	basically 45:7 71:15
accounts 38:12	amend 30:22	76:13	80:21
accurate 15:16 17:12	amount 20:13 59:22	aspect 45:14 46:5	<b>basis</b> 39:21 41:8 49:10,17
accurately 4:8	ample 58:17	aspects 45:1,4	49:18 66:4
act 49:19 68:14 74:4,6,10	answer 34:13 38:8 43:9	assert 63:10	behalf 77:9
74:11	44:14 50:7 68:16,19	asserted 51:20 67:6	belabor 22:4
acting 21:6 49:7	70:7 72:18	asserting 65:20	<b>believe</b> 15:13 16:3,18
action 46:8 88:8,12	answers 47:16	Assistant 1:15	61:11
activity 43:18,19	antecedent 64:4 67:12	associated 14:7	<b>best</b> 4:8 22:8,9 31:20
add 42:10 75:11	anticipate 76:4 77:4	assume 7:12 26:8 34:13	55:13
<b>addition</b> 10:14 37:6	<b>anticipating</b> 15:10 78:5	39:5 67:2 86:20 87:2	<b>better</b> 7:15 26:13 29:22
additional 18:22 21:15	78:20 <b>anticipation</b> 77:2	assuming 7:18 27:9 50:22	50:5
25:21 27:10 41:11	anybody 25:13 73:19	assumption 20:16 Atlanta 41:13	beyond 40:3
47:12 48:2 71:17 76:5	anybody's 21:9	attempt 38:13,21 41:9	bifurcated 81:10
78:1	anyway 55:7	49:21	big 66:17
address 5:22 36:2,4 37:14	apart 61:7	attempted 18:2 38:19	bit 28:12 35:7,7 37:17
45:3 49:4 55:1,5 64:18	apologize 4:18 66:11	40:16 41:18 43:1,4,6	52:20 58:15 59:15 68:8
66:8 78:22 82:10 addressed 8:10 51:19	68:16 70:11 72:18	49:8	block 15:12 21:16 25:19 27:7
53:22	<b>Appeals</b> 2:18 7:3 8:5 9:3	attempting 44:1	blocked 21:3
addressing 41:14	10:20,22 11:7 42:17	attempts 38:14	blocking 21:17
addressing 41.14 adequate 16:4	56:5	attend 71:2	blows 64:8
adjourned 87:6,8	appear 63:19 77:3	attention 35:18 74:22	board 1:1,3 2:15 3:15 7:2
adjust 28:5	appearances 2:13 3:10	78:4 85:16	7:11 8:12 10:2 11:2
adjustments 3:8	4:15	attorney 40:10 41:13	42:15 68:13 85:3
administration 38:16	appearing 5:7,9	45:6,8,12 49:7 53:6,10	<b>Board's</b> 7:10 8:2
43:2,4,5	appears 8:14	86:21 88:6,10	BORRAZAS 86:6,11,15
Administrative 44:17	application 46:12	audience 53:2	boss 45:5
admitted 34:5,8,10,12	<b>applied</b> 7:10,22	authenticity 33:2	box 43:8
admonitions 76:21	applies 8:19	authorities 9:22	<b>Branch</b> 65:10,13
advance 28:20 65:6 75:9	apply 40:20 46:7,22	authority 7:1 10:5	<b>brief</b> 34:15 36:9 47:18
81:18	78:16 82:1	authorizing 63:7	52:12 53:20 54:4,5
advanced 50:3	appointed 45:21	automatic 71:13,20	64:18 79:1 80:22
advantage 33:12	appreciate 6:7 41:21	avail 22:22 23:1	<b>briefing</b> 34:21 36:20 37:7
advice 39:7 49:6 50:4	66:16 85:7,15	availability 24:19 25:1,2	39:2 44:21 47:10,12,12
advise 46:10	apprise 40:6	available 23:6 24:9	49:3 53:17
<b>affect</b> 15:11 48:10,11	approach 21:2	average 19:20	briefly 52:9
<b>affirm</b> 4:4,5,6,7	appropriate 19:1 56:8	avoid 25:21 60:4	<b>briefs</b> 33:16 35:4 36:1,6
affirmative 44:14	67:10 80:16 81:8 82:11	avoiding 34:1	37:22 48:2 51:10,13,19
agency 8:21	arbitrarily 21:13	aware 29:12	52:20 54:12 66:9 78:13
aggravating 80:8	area 45:17 75:16		78:14 79:3 81:15,17
	1	I	<u> </u>

00.00	1	<b></b>	
82:22	14:21 16:5,17 19:9	77:10 79:14,18	concrete 73:18
<b>bring</b> 11:10 78:4	21:22 28:22 34:12 35:1	Clark's 18:5 28:3 34:15	conditions 84:19
bringing 46:9	36:22 37:4,9,11,16 39:1	39:3 62:17	conduct 39:6,19 49:10
broad 53:22	41:21 42:10 44:6 47:15	Clayman 56:6	85:6
brought 39:16	47:16,22 50:8,18 51:5	clear 11:18 44:20 45:9	conducts 3:12
<b>build</b> 56:11	52:11,15 54:10,17 55:2	47:10 49:1 50:10,21	confer 54:4,11 56:21 82:5
<b>built</b> 57:3	56:18 57:1,7,11,14,21	80:3 84:3	82:6
<b>burden</b> 50:10,20 71:19	58:8,18 59:1,3,12,19	clearly 4:1 43:15	conference 2:22 3:13
79:13	60:9,18,22 61:4,11,19	clock 20:20	confidentially 65:2
<b>Burnham</b> 1:17 5:7,7 27:6	62:1,3,5 63:5,17 64:10	close 35:20,21 54:15	confirm 75:12
27:14 32:9 52:5,8 60:3	64:15 65:4 66:8,13 67:1	closer 21:20	confirmed 25:2
61:17,21 62:10 84:14	67:14,19 68:2,18 69:2	coerce 41:18	conflict 25:14
85:11,12	69:12,15 70:9,15,21	coercive 41:9	confront 59:9
business 23:16 86:8	71:5,15 72:22 75:2 76:1	<b>Columbia</b> 2:18,19 28:16	<b>connection</b> 44:21 46:6
<b>buy</b> 37:4 53:7	77:4,8,14,16,21 82:18	43:12 46:19	62:13
	83:18 84:5,11,20 85:7	combination 38:13	consequence 66:21
<u>C</u>	85:10,18 86:16,20 87:5	come 10:7 13:13 21:21	conservative 15:15
C 2:1 38:20 83:1	<b>Chairman</b> 5:22 6:6 8:8	25:15 29:14,19 30:22	<b>consider</b> 13:5 67:22
calendar 15:9 54:3	9:10 17:18 27:6 32:14	31:21 63:16 64:4,7	considerably 68:22
call 13:4 29:11 72:15	50:13 54:19 68:12	73:10,21 78:13	considerations 15:3
74:21	69:10 84:15	comes 12:4 20:1 25:22	considered 9:21 11:1
<b>called</b> 5:15 43:12	<b>challenge</b> 29:16 49:8	31:6 33:7 65:2	<b>considering</b> 9:4 56:2 84:3
<b>calling</b> 56:3 62:13 63:22	challenges 7:6 8:15	<b>comment</b> 28:13 36:13	84:6
career 14:13 20:2	challenging 49:5	41:1,5 44:7,10	consist 59:10
careful 14:5	chance 56:16	commented 22:10	consistent 60:7
<b>carry</b> 8:16	<b>change</b> 18:9 34:18 47:20	commenting 52:4	Constitution 44:16
cart 68:22	changed 17:19	<b>comments</b> 52:16 78:3	constraints 9:1 11:20
case 7:13,16 9:6 15:14,20	characterization 39:3	commitment 16:15	82:20
16:4,9,19 17:11,16,20	charge 82:14	commitments 15:5	construct 81:4
17:22 19:6,10,11 20:4,7	<b>charges</b> 18:2 38:11 39:18	<b>committee</b> 1:8 2:17,21	consulted 24:5
21:10 22:7,11 26:10	Charles 1:17 5:7 32:7	7:11 12:7 13:6 17:1,4	contact 41:12
31:19 32:19,22 33:1	52:7	18:13 30:17 32:16	contained 88:4
36:16 37:21,21 38:2,21	<b>chat</b> 87:1	42:11 63:12 79:22	contemplate 8:15
39:16 40:5 43:11 46:17	check 77:2	84:15	contemplating 79:2
48:18 51:12 55:14 56:6	chess 20:20	Committees 8:13	contend 43:17
59:9 61:4 66:4 79:5	Christmas 34:22	communications 47:1	context 28:11 32:22
81:9,10 82:2,17,22 87:5	<b>Circuit</b> 61:5,20	65:15	43:18 45:10 47:19
cases 3:8 28:12 33:16	circumstance 21:14	Company 7:15	48:20
38:2 42:5 80:19 82:19	circumstances 74:2	compared 31:3	continuation 26:3
catch 27:8	cite 44:15	comparison 18:3 83:7	<b>continue</b> 3:9 11:10 26:14
categories 67:7	cited 7:4,16 10:1,21	compelling 71:16 74:18	51:6 84:7
category 78:2	Citizens 7:15	complainant 71:19	continuing 40:14
Catherine 4:3,13 85:19	civil 19:11 46:10 52:19	complete 16:19	continuity 26:13
88:3,16	81:9,10	completely 74:13	<b>contours</b> 16:8,10
cause 43:16 44:1	claim 38:18	complex 82:22	contrary 46:1
caveat 28:4,6	claimant 56:17,20	complied 62:19	control 52:16,22
ceremony 31:9	claims 39:11,21 41:8	comply 61:12	controls 8:3
certain 67:7	clarification 38:10	conceded 18:8	conversant 78:15
certainly 17:7 19:10 24:3	clarify 2:22	conceive 74:17	convincing 50:10,21 80:4
33:6 37:9 51:17 82:10	clarifying 60:4 70:11	concept 39:15	cooperatively 33:22
CERTIFICATE 88:1	Clark 1:3,21 2:16 5:6,8	conceptually 74:16	copies 62:16
certify 88:4,6	5:10,11,12,13,18 22:8	concerned 15:2 16:13	correct 27:20 37:15
Chair 1:10 2:3,5,10,20	27:17 34:5 38:19 40:8	35:17 67:2 76:3	38:22
4:6,12 5:2,12,15,18,20	43:3,22 44:13 46:10,13	concerning 63:14	correspond 54:7
6:3,22 9:2,10,15 10:9	49:6 51:19 62:7 66:5	concerns 81:20	cost 49:22
10:10 11:15 12:1 13:8	75:3 76:4,6,9,19 77:2	conclusion 73:22	counsel 1:13,15,20 4:14
Ī	I	1	I

21:11,18 27:7,18 28:4.9 4:17 13:13 15:7 20:17 describes 46:17 **DNo** 1:3.4 28:19 29:10,13 30:8 describing 20:8 **doable** 58:16 21:6 28:3 29:12 33:14 32:11 57:9 86:8 **designate** 56:15 57:5 docs 78:7 35:15 37:20 53:21 62:17 71:9 74:7 76:20 **DC** 63:8 designated 57:17,21 **documents** 29:21 33:3 76:22 77:9 79:13 80:2 deadline 29:13 32:17 58:11 67:6 76:2,5,10,14 88:7.10 33:13,14 57:17 designating 58:9 doing 7:20 13:16 15:8 Counsel's 46:15 80:6 **dealing** 59:6 69:13 84:8 **designation** 58:2 59:20 29:8 51:10,17,21 82:21 **counter** 53:17 58:6 **December** 30:5,12 32:12 desperately 25:9 85:21 40:13 54:5,12,13,18 counter-expert 56:15 **Destro** 1:19 5:9.9 **DOJ** 62:18,22 63:7,20 **details** 14:20 20:6 34:2 64:8,22 68:3 69:10,19 57:6 57:12,15,17,20 58:9 **counts** 38:11 59:21 determination 58:5 80:2 **DOJ's** 63:14 don't-- 66:14 **couple** 44:12 45:1 66:1 decide 7:13,19 11:15 80:4,13 82:3 **course** 6:22 12:9 33:12 42:15 75:9 determine 3:1,4 **Donoghue** 16:22 doubt 34:7 42:14 52:18 79:12 decided 6:21 7:7 8:6 9:20 determining 80:10 court 2:13,18 4:3,5,11 develop 42:5 draft 18:4 55:11 differences 52:19 7:3,14 8:4,5,17,19,21 **deciding** 7:8 10:15 36:13 drafting 40:10 draw 40:20 50:2 8:22 9:3 10:20,21,22 40:20 **different** 15:18 42:2 decision 8:4 14:12 29:14 drawn 49:13 11:7 42:17 56:4 60:15 64:11 72:2 61:13,20 67:11 75:17 35:20,21 55:14 56:4 differently 46:22 71:1 duck 82:13 83:17 86:2 88:1,3 84:21 difficult 4:20,21 74:16 **due** 54:18 decision-maker 42:12 82:21 **dumb** 49:15 68:12 **court's** 76:8 **decisions** 7:2 8:4 9:2 **difficulty** 16:7 23:20 **courtesy** 37:19 48:3 E 37:20 courts 8:20 58:18 declaring 28:9,19 E 2:1.1 covered 73:20 directed 4:9 **COVID-19** 3:7 deem 57:6 direction 19:1 **earlier** 59:17,19 63:12 create 23:9 **deemed** 43:13 directly 86:4 76:13,21 early 37:21 criminal 52:3 72:9 **defense** 32:19 51:15 disagree 75:6 easier 28:17 81:14 85:22 **crisp** 22:5 66:22 71:18 **Disciplinary** 71:9 critical 33:17 **disciplinary** 1:4,13,15 3:7 Edwards 61:6 defenses 44:15 criticized 14:6 deferral 10:16 12:5.6.18 3:11 4:17 14:7 19:20 effect 7:5 51:22 criticizing 37:12 12:19 13:1 14:1 20:17 39:17 46:15 effective 22:5 cross 18:19 58:17 **deferring** 13:5,9 14:15 79:13 80:2,6 effectively 83:3 cross-examination 15:17 effects 53:12 definition 7:21 disciplines 80:7 delav 13:21 67:17 73:2 15:19 16:13 20:19 **discovery** 16:20 19:12 **effort** 3:15 crossed 40:8 41:19 75:1 78:1 31:12 59:16 62:7 67:2,3 efforts 22:8 25:5 either 6:14 25:2 38:14 curious 33:18 **deliberative** 44:16 48:7,9 70:13 71:3,5,11,17,18 current 69:19 65:14 71:21 72:17 74:18,22 41:3 55:12 **election** 12:13 18:22 40:1 cut 21:13 66:9 delivery 47:2 discuss 6:16 21:3 51:7 41:17 63:15 65:22 demand 63:4 78:3,15 80:1,16 82:18 D **demonstrate** 71:16,22 83:14 76:17 **D** 2:1 38:20 **denied** 12:19 discussed 6:8 elements 60:13 **D.C** 8:4 10:20.22 11:7 deny 14:18 **discussing** 6:9,11 10:15 email 56:2 86:14 42:17 46:14,15 61:5,12 **Department** 18:6,15 38:14,14,15 embarrassingly 68:11 61:20 75:14,15,16 43:22 45:21,22 49:9,14 discussion 48:13 embraced 65:22 damages 81:12 62:13 69:20 73:4 dishonesty 38:15 40:17 emphasize 50:20 date 24:19 30:18 57:3,12 Department's 13:18 dislike 53:5 **employed** 88:7,10 74:19 **depending** 16:9 30:17 dismiss 8:16 17:19 18:8 **employee** 45:20 64:2 dates 3:2 13:12,13 15:7 depends 36:21 72:6 86:11 19:3 39:4 88:10 22:18,20 23:6 25:3 86:12 **dispute** 34:7 67:20 **employees** 69:10,19 27:16 28:7 34:18 41:5 **depose** 72:15 **disputed** 34:3,4 enforceable 11:6 57:7 **deposition** 12:8,15 68:14 **disputes** 33:20 60:5 **enforcement** 18:16 46:7 day 8:20 21:15 23:11,12 **depositions** 13:3 17:5,8 distinction 45:15 63:14 64:13 65:14,20 23:16 27:11 28:5 30:5 19:12 24:20 63:13 distinguishing 18:14 engage 49:9 32:3 33:7 58:21 77:11 70:14,18 **District** 2:17,18 28:16 ensure 3:8 entire 25:7 86:12 **describe** 40:17 78:9 43:11 46:18

days 15:14 16:3,11 19:8

**divided** 26:17

described 6:19

entirely 84:17

**files** 67:4.6

79:2 84:1

**filing** 7:5 13:17 14:22

enumerate 54:20 **environment** 7:16 72:8 **equities** 65:11,12 **Esquire** 1:9,12,14,17,18 1:19.21 **essentially** 7:9 76:13 establish 65:17 ethics 56:3.7 evaluate 48:19 evaluating 65:18 eve 59:7 event 33:6 events 16:2 39:4 **everybody** 2:12 14:7 19:13 20:21 53:19 79:20 everyone's 74:21 evidence 3:3 14:16 16:7 16:10 19:4 24:20 36:7 39:13,22 40:11,12 48:19 50:11,21 60:8 65:11 76:15 80:4,5,9,20 82:6 evidentiary 51:21 **ex-DOJ** 64:2 exact 16:8.9 exactly 12:10 16:7,20 18:11 19:3,4,14 32:18 34:19 37:6 45:9 47:4 72:5 **example** 9:17 34:6,7,14 exception 8:1 **exchange** 3:3 39:2 exclamation 87:1 excluded 63:11 excuse 17:14 75:1 **executive** 65:10,12,13 79:22 86:21 exemption 47:3 exercise 3:19 exhibit 29:20 30:6.10 exhibits 27:19 32:3 78:8 78:9 existence 85:3 existing 44:20 **expect** 21:6,11,12 25:21 33:13 64:16,17 72:10 78:7 expected 20:18 **expecting** 64:8 78:14 **expedited** 83:16 85:21 expeditiously 67:15 72:13 **expert** 55:16 56:3,7,12 57:4 58:2,9,10,11,15 59:6,15,20 60:7,10,11

60:16 61:13 experts 56:10,11 57:16 62:6 **explain** 55:9 81:2 explained 12:17 **explore** 26:20 **express** 47:14 expression 39:8 expressly 7:17 extensive 37:7 extent 11:3 33:17 36:14 37:12 49:11 64:15 84:15

extraordinary 44:3

face 73:3 85:5,5 **fact** 14:15 31:11 34:6 fact-finding 43:20 factor 15:19 82:8,16 facts 34:8 47:19 50:22 78:16 factual 39:21 49:17 fair 8:1,10 23:3 48:16 74:13 fairness 74:5 **faith** 21:7 faithfully 4:7 **fall** 6:1 39:12 false 18:21 falsity 18:2 families 23:10 **far** 15:2 16:13 36:12 53:13 64:16 67:1 68:2.3 71:11,12,20 76:2 85:5 85:18 **fast** 14:3,3 67:16 86:7,12 favorable 31:3 fear 73:5 features 18:14 **February** 24:13.14 **federal** 8:20,21,22 60:8 61:18 feedback 3:22 feel 51:10 **fence** 84:16 **fight** 77:6,12,12,18 **figure** 65:6 66:18 70:18 73:11 77:17 82:22 **figures** 20:21 file 9:18 32:3 33:16 35:4 53:20 54:5,12 65:8

67:10,21 71:22 72:16

36:1 37:22 47:6 56:12

**filed** 6:18 7:16,17 20:6

60:6 74:12

**filings** 15:2 22:11 **final** 12:12 82:3 84:14 finalized 68:10 financially 88:11 **find** 22:1 36:4 72:13 **finding** 80:17 **fine** 6:6 28:2,6 30:14 32:9 38:7 41:1,3 44:10,11 57:16 60:2 61:14 69:14 fingertips 41:6 **finish** 26:6 finished 12:7 **first** 5:2 6:14,14,21 7:7 8:6 11:1 15:10 20:18 33:19 37:3 38:9 43:14 45:11 62:9 64:12 67:2 68:6 69:5,17 73:1 77:7 fit 25:22 43:7 **five** 21:17 five-day 20:16 **flag** 31:20 33:5 65:9 flagging 42:6 flattering 5:15 flip 48:5 flow 4:19 **fly** 54:1 focus 21:21 25:12 35:7 40:4,4 66:14 focusing 20:11,12 folks 22:18 53:14 75:20 **follow** 11:11 13:18 31:12 36:9 46:19 78:8 followed 44:2 **following** 20:10 24:6 26:14 32:17 **follows** 75:17 **foot** 59:10 forbids 7:17 foreign 68:14,15 **forget** 76:15 **format** 78:7 formatted 78:9 former 69:9,19 formulating 42:20 forth 65:11 **forward** 3:9 51:15 **foster** 78:1 **four** 16:12 61:7 69:3 four-day 78:19 Fox 1:12 4:16,16 10:3 13:4 15:13 16:8,16,18 17:19 18:7,20 21:10 22:21 23:4,13,19 24:3

24:10.13 26:11 27:22 28:2 30:14 32:14 34:8 36:22 37:2,6,10,15 38:4 38:22 41:4 43:1.9 48:5 49:2 51:8.11 52:10 55:18,19,22 56:20 57:2 57:8,9,13,19 58:1,13,22 59:2,17 60:2,15,20 61:3 61:22 62:2,11,15 63:2 66:3 67:12 68:18,20,21 69:13 70:10 74:3,15 75:12 76:3,7 77:7,20 81:22 84:21 85:1,8,9,17 86:19 **Fox's** 9:7 26:9 46:14 59:8 67:4 **frame** 44:9 framing 18:1 **frankly** 24:14 32:21 37:2 49:4 50:2 **fraud** 39:22 40:13 76:16 fraught 72:8 frequently 26:17 **front** 58:7 69:1 83:22 **full** 12:8.14 64:3 function 43:20 **further** 66:5 85:9 88:6,9

G G2:1game 48:16 gamut 65:12 gather 69:6 **GAYNELL** 88:3.16 general 21:1 36:18 40:11 45:5,6,8,12 49:7 generally 15:15 39:17 gentlemen 15:21 **Georgia** 39:15 40:2 76:17 **getting** 51:6 58:14,19 69:16 71:2.10 **give** 2:5,11 20:13 21:1 35:8,19 55:13 56:13 58:3,16 63:7 74:3 75:3 78:6 79:3,15,15 81:18 86.4 **given** 9:16 17:6 20:3 24:19 63:9 79:14 88:5 gives 54:22 59:22 60:1 69:20 79:12 **giving** 34:13 55:7 72:20 79:8 glitches 3:17 **go** 4:22 18:18 19:4 21:4 22:14 25:18 28:15 52:7 52:10 54:21 60:12 62:6

heads-up 55:4 82:18 83:18 84:5.11.20 informed 39:20 63:1 goes 40:3 50:12 86:3 initial 47:5 79:9 **health** 84:18 85:7,10,18 86:16,20 hear 4:1 21:19 35:15 initially 41:7 83:20 going 6:8,9,11,12 10:12 87:5 12:10.12.16 13:11.15 36:11 37:2 64:16.17 hit 47:11 **inquire** 76:18 77:8 14:18 15:11 16:9,11,21 75:7 79:19 **hitting** 15:16 inquired 24:14 heard 9:6,14 10:6 51:8 holiday 23:17 24:2 **inquiry** 18:16 17:12,14,15 18:11,18 19:2,15 21:4,5,13,16 85:20 holidays 28:5,6 54:15 insight 41:22 55:8 22:4 23:14 24:15 25:8 hearing 1:8 2:16,21 3:5,5 58:19 **insists** 69:16 **instance** 9:15 11:2 25:20 28:10 31:2,3 3:16 6:11 8:17 9:12,21 home 75:22 32:18,20 33:1,6,14 35:3 11:11 13:15 14:17 honest 39:8 instances 38:19 35:4,8,19 42:3,10,11 15:11 19:21 20:1,12,16 **Honor** 5:14,16 6:1,5,18 instructed 74:14 47:17,22 48:20 49:2,3 22:2,5 25:7,14 27:18 11:18 12:4 14:19 17:17 intelligence 85:1 28:10 29:6 32:11,16 24:16 25:15 29:18 52:5 intelligent 66:15 49:22 51:8,12 52:1,8 intelligently 80:17 53:7,16,22 54:2,2,3,20 33:8 36:4,7 42:12 58:21 55:21 59:5 60:3 61:21 55:2,16 56:10 58:3 59:7,15,18 60:1 61:2 70:8 83:15 85:13,15,17 intended 65:17 59:10 63:19 64:2,6,6,22 64:17 65:1 70:13,19,20 hope 24:22 31:8 68:9 intending 29:11 66:12,16 70:5,16 72:10 **intends** 13:4 16:8 17:21 71:2 72:3 78:4,5,11,17 **hoped** 47:9 73:15,16 74:9 75:21 78:21 79:11 80:15 81:6 hoping 26:21,22 27:2 interchanges 83:10 78:14 **interest** 14:11 21:9 45:13 76:8,18 77:5 78:5,18 81:17 82:4,7,9 84:15 79:2 81:11 82:8 84:1,7 Horrell 1:14 4:17 **interested** 35:17 53:4 87:8 84:21 **huddle** 47:11 hearings 3:12 35:11 88:11 interesting 78:22 **gonna** 33:13 **help** 3:22 36:7 42:20 45:2 **humble** 20:5 **good** 2:3,4,5 5:4,8,10,12 53:19,20 55:5,9 75:20 hypothetically 7:12,18 interfere 43:4 5:13,18 15:16 18:12 **helpful** 50:18 51:4 52:11 interfered 43:6,7 21:6 31:10 34:22 68:1,8 64:9 83:2 **interference** 38:16 43:2 70:21.22 **helping** 27:13 idea 14:2 18:12 21:16 43:13 gotten 67:3,20 76:3 helps 20:12 75:19 27:12 29:18 **interject** 30:16 70:10 ideal 80:19 governing 2:18 **hereto** 88:11 interpretation 7:9 8:3 ideas 49:15 intimated 52:10 government 23:18 Heretofore 76:22 hesitation 82:15 **identified** 24:17 25:2 introduce 2:14 governmental 46:8 grateful 51:3 higher 7:4 54:21 68:7 74:20 **investigation** 18:22 65:22 identify 29:9 68:9 72:13 great 19:17 72:19 86:15 **hiring** 76:5 66:5 **ground** 17:21 **Hirsh** 1:9 2:3,5,10,20 4:6 **III** 1:12 investigations 12:21 41:16 63:15 72:10 grounds 14:1,17 4:12 5:2,12,15,19,20 **imagine** 68:19 guess 48:21 86:6 **immediately** 23:8 80:14 involve 12:14 6:3,6 10:10 11:15 12:1 guidance 61:14 13:8 14:21 15:13 16:5 **impact** 83:21 involved 82:9 guideline 21:2 16:16,17 19:9 21:20,22 implicate 39:9 irregularities 41:17 **important** 20:1,2 42:13 gut-wrenching 29:14 22:13,17 23:1,5,17,20 76:17 42:14 47:13 55:12 25:4,18 26:8,15 27:2,5 **issue** 6:20 8:10 9:16 Н 27:9,15,22 28:22 29:4 **in-person** 3:9 84:17.18 36:21 39:6,9 40:22 habit 6:3.4 29:17 30:3,13,15 31:5,8 inasmuch 66:3 51:18 63:16 64:16 **Hamilton** 1:12 4:16 31:17 32:2,10 33:10 inclined 20:20 66:17,17,18 69:18 81:2 **include** 13:3 33:11 52:12 hand 18:4 34:12 35:1 36:22 37:4,9 82:11,13 83:12 handle 26:9 31:17 64:20 37:11,16 39:1 41:21 includes 75:14 issued 22:19 75:14,21 67:13 44:6 47:16,22 50:8,18 incorrect 52:14 issues 2:22 11:1 37:10 handled 78:6 51:5 52:15 54:10,17 indicate 29:10 38:1 42:18 54:1 62:8 happen 12:10 19:15,16 55:2,22 56:18 57:1,2,7 indicated 66:3 78:21 79:6,10 21:22 57:11,14,21 58:8,18 indication 56:1 happened 33:19 59:1,3,12,19 60:9,18,22 inevitable 3:17 happens 13:22 27:13 61:4,11,19 62:1,3,5 inevitably 51:12 **January** 12:7,22 13:6,12 73:7 78:20 80:14,19 63:5,17 64:10,15 65:4 infer 35:22 13:14 14:17 15:6 17:3 happy 41:4 50:6 52:10 66:8,13 67:1,14,19 68:2 **infinite** 20:13 22:20 23:11 24:15 25:6 inflexibly 7:22 hard 14:8 30:18 61:19 68:18 69:2,12,15 70:9 25:8 30:17 hardships 23:9 70:10,15,21 71:5,15 **information** 19:13,18 **Jason** 1:14 4:16

head 38:8

Harry 1:18 5:5

20:4 41:11 63:8 66:15

67:8 71:8,10 81:14 86:4

72:22 75:2 76:1 77:4,14

77:16,20,21 81:22

**Jeffrey** 1:3,21 2:16 5:6

**job** 49:22

joint 81:2 knows 16:20 32:20 49:13 52:22 men 34:21 **Jones** 58:3 **kumbaya** 33:10 mentioned 63:11 64:12 60:12 61:12,20 judge 5:16 61:5 **looking** 23:5 64:7 84:1 L judges 35:12,13 **lot** 13:9 22:7 33:15 79:6 merely 39:14 late 31:14 merit 53:5.7.8 judgmental 83:7 lots 26:2 87:1 judicial 9:4,11,16 10:11 Laughing 5:3 meritorious 53:10 M 10:13 11:16 83:21 Laughter 27:4 61:10 62:4 merits 7:8,13,19 8:11,16 **Judiciary** 17:1,10 18:13 86:1 87:4 **MacDougald** 1:18 2:4,8 9:7,13,13,22 53:4 55:11 63:12 65:19 law 7:4 18:16 44:17 46:1 5:5,5,21 6:17 11:14,17 Merril 1:9 2:20 12:3 14:19 16:5,6 17:17 jurisdiction 6:20 7:6,12 46:17 63:14 64:12 methods 41:9 7:18,21 8:6 9:5,12 65:13,20 78:16 20:8 21:19 22:3,14 23:3 miles 75:14 10:11 11:6 68:21,22 lawsuit 46:8 23:7,15 24:10,16 25:13 mind 40:6 lawyer 46:18 67:16 26:5,12,22 27:20,21 minimize 3:22 75:22 jurisdictional 10:17 11:5 lawyers 6:4 34:20 72:7 29:2,15,18 30:12,16 **minute** 20:21 jurisdictions 8:13 68:15 lay 48:15 31:7,16,18 32:6 34:10 minutes 4:18 5:1 59:11 leads 81:1 jury 52:4 34:17 36:19 44:6 47:8 misheard 54:9 learn 6:4 12:16 47:21 50:5,9,19 51:2 justice 13:18 18:6,15 **misstate** 48:15 **leave** 21:13 55:3 52:7 54:8,16,19 55:18 38:17 43:2,5,5,22 45:21 mitigating 80:8 45:22 49:9,14 62:13 legal 39:9 42:18 56:3,7 55:20 56:16,19 59:4,5 MLK 23:11,12,16 69:20 73:4 78:19 59:14 62:10,14,18 63:6 **modify** 3:12 moment 25:15 28:13 **legislative** 43:13,17,18,19 63:18 64:14 65:3,7 K length 3:4 66:11,20 67:5,18 68:1,8 33:11 72:21 **let's** 14:20 21:17 22:17 **kind** 6:9 20:20,22 38:9 69:9,14 70:7,17 71:4,14 **Monday** 6:19 7:5,17 45:4 48:5,12 71:6 73:5 25:18 26:20 32:2 51:6 72:5 74:13 75:19 77:13 13:17 15:1 23:11 30:10 79:9 58:22 62:6 77:15 83:15,19 84:10 65:8 84:1 kinds 11:1 43:16 55:8 **letter** 18:4 39:15,20 84:12 85:10,14 86:5,9 month 14:15 56:9 41:10,19 49:21 62:20 86:14,18 87:3 months 13:14 know 3:16 9:3,8 11:8,21 mad 34:21 62:21 63:6 64:1 morning 2:3,4,5 4:19 5:4 12:9,20 14:6 15:1,17,18 **letters** 62:17 maintain 43:3 5:8,10,12,13,18 16:1,7,14 17:11,13,15 liability 81:11 making 10:16 31:22 motion 10:15,19 13:1 18:11,18 19:3 20:4,6,22 license 46:17 mandamus 9:17 17:19 18:7 19:2 36:15 life 48:2 21:12 24:18,19 25:1,4 marching 11:9 39:4 54:14,18 67:11,12 30:2,20 31:1,1,2,11,14 **light** 9:22 13:1 14:22 mark 15:16 47:11 67:21 71:22 72:16 74:2 32:17,22 33:16,19 34:1 28:13 76:20 82:6 massive 19:12 motions 8:16 34:16 36:15 34:2,3,7,13,19 35:9,10 limine 34:16 36:15,16 material 12:16 13:15 54:6.13 54:6,13,14,18 35:16 36:17 41:2 42:7 65:8 **move** 3:9 14:3,20 31:19 43:15 44:7,19 45:2,19 limitations 74:7 materials 13:3,7 53:3 54:11 limited 14:2 18:15 20:3 math 30:4 46:2,9,11,22 47:2 48:12 moved 12:18 59:12 49:11,15,16,20 50:1,9 75:15 matter 2:16 6:20 7:6,12 musings 51:9 51:2,11 52:18,22 53:2,9 **limiting** 45:20 46:3 7:18,21 8:5,13 9:5,12 **mute** 3:21 55:4.8.12 56:9 58:2.14 line 40:8.19.20 41:20 10:20 43:13 46:1 48:21 N 59:7,9 61:7,11 62:9 49:12 50:1.13.14 48:22 53:9 list 27:19 29:19,20 30:22 N 2:1 63:18,20,22 64:4,6,7,18 matters 6:15 12:2 65:3,5,7,19 66:7,17 52:12 57:10 76:7 mean 19:6 33:16 34:3 **narrow** 66:2 67:17 68:16,19 69:22 listening 35:14 35:10 37:3 41:4 45:19 naturally 81:10 70:8 71:8 72:7,12,16,19 lists 3:3 30:6,11 46:3 47:17 48:20 49:2,5 **nature** 51:13 73:3,10,14 74:1,3,6,8 litigation 44:1,2 54:22 75:2 78:18 **necessarily** 18:21 35:8 75:4,15 78:1,7,11,13,16 little 4:20,21 14:4 35:6,7 means 41:9 45:9 40:5 79:4,7,9 80:12,13 81:3 37:17 43:9 59:15 86:10 meat 58:6 necessary 57:6 76:19 81:6,16 82:9 83:2,8 live 3:13 25:10 28:15 meet 54:3,11 71:22 74:2 necessity 28:19 84:6,21,22 85:19,20 78:12 meet-and-confer 67:11 need 3:4,18 6:4 13:18 86:13 long 6:12 12:20 14:6 67:14 15:12 16:10,12 21:4,14 **knowing** 75:9,9 15:10,17 16:14 17:15 Meghan 86:3 22:1,3 26:1,14,16,21

knowingly 18:21

known 19:14

knowledgeable 58:5

member 46:13,16

memo 40:10,14

memos 49:15

20:8,19 64:6 73:3 82:21

longer 14:9 19:6

look 2:7 25:5 28:4 31:5

27:1,3,9,10 30:21 47:16

51:7 57:4 58:5,11 60:12

61:1 64:20 66:18 71:16

50:19,20 52:11 56:20 panoply 64:3 65:16 71:22 73:2.8.18.21 36:2.4 37:20 38:3.6 74:18 79:3 81:4,17 86:9 pantheon 19:18 65:9 75:3 78:5,22 79:3 39:1 40:8,19,20 41:21 **needed** 31:1 56:14.14 paper 2:6 45:18 46:11 47:7.21 81:7 83:20 75:7 86:22 48:6.10.17 50:8.15.16 **papers** 6:18 7:17 44:13 points 44:8.22 62:7 87:1 needing 25:21 50:18 51:9 52:17 53:18 56:1 **poke** 37:5 needs 51:18 73:18 54:16 55:3,11,12,16 part 10:18,21,21 16:6 politely 35:14 negative 73:6 57:1,7,11,21 62:5,8 29:5 37:13 39:7 42:19 **pop** 35:8 38:5 42:1 61:8 neither 88:6 63:5.17 64:15 65:4 66:8 45:11 48:6.16 77:17 64:19 portion 65:1 67:18 68:1,2,18 69:14 never 2:8 15:20 19:10 79:8 **PARTICIPANTS** 1:7 portions 17:6 35:16 70:9 71:3,6,8 72:22 nevertheless 18:10 49:18 73:2,17 76:1 77:4,16 participation 72:3 posed 50:13 51:4 New 23:9 34:22 58:21 78:2 80:20 82:18 83:1 **particular** 44:8 75:6 **position** 9:7,10,19 10:3,3 non-Touhy 64:1 83:11,18 84:5,20 85:7 **particularly** 28:13 34:1 10:7,9,12 18:9,20 27:22 nonbinding 80:2 42:18 49:20 79:5 83:6 85:10 86:15 87:5 29:22 41:7 50:6 52:2,9 normal 11:12 28:9 48:12 omnibus 39:4 parties 3:1,20 36:12 71:7 52:13 63:10,20 76:14 61:12 79:11,17 once 61:4 79:20 80:5 81:2 88:8,11 **positions** 18:3,5 37:3 normally 81:22 open 21:14 33:7 36:10 parties' 81:4,7 possibilities 26:3 **not--** 31:15 **opening** 79:12,16 **passed** 62:3 **possible** 67:16,16 73:9,21 note 3:6 10:14 **operate** 11:20 70:3 71:1 patience 3:19 73:22 85:5 notes 54:22 57:16 82:19 **people** 4:1 14:9 15:4,10 **post-hearing** 36:6 79:1,2 **notice** 60:7,10 69:21 **operating** 9:2 85:2 15:18 20:13 23:10 81:15,17 **opinion** 39:8 56:17,20 potentially 13:20 36:14 novel 22:7 25:22 27:11 29:9 31:10 58:3,6 82:21 42:16 43:6 63:10 November 17:7 35:3,13 36:3 37:22 38:1 number 1:8 2:15 37:10 **opportunity** 22:18,22 41:14,15 42:5,11,20 **practical** 15:3 25:11 63:13 55:13 56:13 74:3 75:4 44:9 55:7,9,13 68:9 Practice 44:17 pre-decision 49:11 79:14 83:3 69:7.18 70:4 71:2 72:7 0 **oppose** 51:17 72:8,10,11 75:16 78:15 pre-decisional 48:13 O 2:1 **opposed** 9:8 40:17 45:16 80:11,15,20 81:12,18 **Pre-Hearing** 1:2 object 32:3 52:9 **precisely** 17:11 23:13 46:21 60:11 66:16 83:14 86:21 objected 62:19 opposing 29:12 53:6,9 people's 15:5 27:13 36:10 predecisional 39:6 **objections** 18:17 32:3 58:11 predicament 59:8 53:18 63:13 opposition 52:1 percent 19:18 **prefer** 59:19 obliged 45:22 **preference** 36:19 84:18 options 9:4 84:3,6 perfectly 38:7 observation 32:16 order 6:10 7:19 11:9 period 16:1 85:4 observations 74:15 22:19 29:5 33:11 54:20 permit 65:10 84:19 **prehearing** 2:22 35:4 63:4 83:13,16 85:2,6 36:9 47:18 49:3 51:10 observed 17:18 **permitted** 66:1 69:10 **obvious** 46:1 47:6 86:4 persist 50:16 51:21 51:13,19 54:12 **preliminary** 6:15 12:2 **obviously** 25:8 34:3 ordered 85:20 persisted 18:10 36:21 49:3 52:9 83:12 **ordinarily** 48:8,13 **person** 45:15,21 70:1 80:1 occur 59:16 originally 12:5,18 82:14 **premise** 22:11 66:4 occurred 16:2 ought 9:14,20,21 10:6,7 personal 45:13 preparation 71:17 **October** 1:6 42:4 87:8 10:13 11:1 28:14 34:17 **perspective** 46:14,15 **prepare** 58:17 81:19 **ODC** 10:3 79:12 34:19 80:22 petition 9:17 **prepared** 36:3 79:5 80:12 **ODC's** 52:13 oughtn't 81:1 phrase 76:4 81:13 off-hand 61:16 outside 28:16 **phrased** 76:16 **present** 4:8 11:4 21:10 office 4:17 45:12,16 over-simplifying 40:12 piece 2:6 22:6 24:21 48:20 82:14 overall 41:15 **pig** 37:4 presentation 22:15 Officer 4:9 overly 31:9 pin 35:5 presented 26:10 officials 39:16 overstate 48:14 **place** 47:1 48:9 65:1 presenting 40:5 Oh 57:14 62:15 owe 22:8 **planning** 11:12 84:11 presents 22:7 okay 4:6,14 5:2 12:1 **plans** 25:6 preserve 24:20 P 14:21 16:5 19:16 20:1,9 play 5:16 46:20 48:18 **President** 39:8 45:5,8,13 **please** 4:14 51:9 20:12 22:17 23:1,5 P 1:12 2:1 45:13,16,19 46:2,11 24:10 27:2,5,11,13 29:4 page 27:3 point 10:17 12:6 17:15 49:6 29:12,17 30:3,15 31:7,9 pandemic 3:7 20:4,7 21:8 30:1 38:6,9 Presidential 40:1 50:4 31:13 32:2,10 34:15 panel 23:15 55:7 64:17 40:14,16 42:2,6,13 45:5 65:15

Presiding 4:9 **proven** 80:3 reaction 19:9 20:3 73:5.6 renew 13:1 press 12:11 read 20:5 27:19 37:21 provide 86:2 **replies** 53:17,18 presumably 63:20 provided 67:5 53:12 57:15 report 4:8 10:18 11:11 **presume** 32:18 **providing** 39:7 41:22 reading 47:5 12:8.12 56:12 57:21 ready 78:15 presumption 21:5 79:20 58:9,12,15 60:5,11,13 real 19:21 52:9 58:4 **pretrial** 53:17,20 60:10 provision 60:7 61:12.14 60:11 61:1,2 64:18 **provisions** 44:15,20 realizes 14:8 **Reporter** 2:13 4:3,5,11 78:13 **public** 3:13 14:10 84:18 really 6:14 15:5,19 21:4 83:17 86:2 88:1.3 pretty 14:14 15:15 76:10 **publicly** 31:4 63:9 22:1 23:21 34:3 37:19 reporting 45:12 76:12 reports 12:11 57:4,18,19 **pull** 15:8 45:1 53:3 55:14 78:22 pricing 86:11 pure 38:20 reason 13:9,16,21 67:17 60:16 **primary** 15:22 purpose 2:21 70:22 79:8 82:15 83:1 represent 22:9 **principle** 45:20 46:3 purposes 10:15 reasonably 52:19 representation 17:13 **principles** 46:6,21 47:7 pursuant 2:17 reasons 12:17,19 13:10 **request** 14:18 56:11 57:2 **prior** 12:13 69:21 80:7 **pursue** 18:19 30:2 40:14 31:10 82:1,2 63:2,3 73:3,4,8,19 **privilege** 18:17 46:18 push 58:15 59:15,18 rebut 19:4 22:15 requested 12:5 47:2 63:14 64:13,21 **put** 3:20 9:9 15:14 16:4,8 rebuttal 59:6 requesting 71:2 requests 62:12 75:1 65:13,14,15,15,20 16:10 17:16 19:4 35:5 recesses 79:22 **privileges** 65:13 67:7 recognize 74:6 require 19:22 51:15 64:20 65:8,10 **probably** 4:21 19:17,19 66:21 69:21 74:8 78:16 recognizing 9:1 **required** 3:7 7:11 22:15 80:5 recollection 61:16 55:6 63:1 79:15 22:21 32:7 41:5 53:14 recommendation 9:13,14 53:20 puts 58:20 requirement 56:12 **problem** 2:9,11 18:9 26:9 putting 45:6 59:6 74:7 10:5,19 11:11 39:7 requirements 72:1 28:20 32:15 58:20 42:13,15 82:4 **requiring** 53:15 77:1 0 66:13 70:1 73:11,16,17 recommending 9:16 reserve 63:8 quasi-judicial 43:20 77:17 record 4:15 88:5 resolved 72:20 77:22 **question** 6:19 7:3,8 8:2 **problematic** 49:19,20 refer 56:4 **respect** 8:7 11:20 44:4 9:5,12 16:2 19:21 35:3 problems 25:1 reference 12:6 65:11,21 67:7 71:1 **procedure** 14:2,4 65:18 35:6 36:8,21 38:21 40:6 referring 61:17 respectfully 10:8 79:11.17 48:21 49:5 50:12 60:4 **refine** 50:6 51:16 respond 16:16 74:3 75:8 **proceeding** 2:14 4:8 64:22 68:12,17 69:17 refining 42:1 respondent 1:22 5:6,13 70:11,15,22,22 72:19 reflect 62:21 5:18 16:19 17:2 39:14 11:10 12:17 19:20 regardless 19:20 29:7 56:2 71:9,10 74:17 80:8 42:16 45:1 47:5 71:6,21 86:6 questioning 83:5 regulation 63:1 respondent's 1:20 32:19 81:10 **proceedings** 51:22 56:8 questions 22:8 47:9,13 regulations 13:19 62:20 39:5.19 51:3 64:5 65:18 63:3,21 65:10 69:13 71:7 75:1 **respondents** 14:11 56:4 **process** 11:12 14:7 42:19 **queue** 27:16 70:3 73:20 58:16 quicker 86:10 44:16 47:2 48:8,10 63:1 regulatory 69:20 **responding** 39:3 58:10 quickly 30:5 73:20,21 64:9 65:14,17 73:9 reining 38:11 66:10 75:17 74:6,10 77:21 **relate** 36:16 47:4 response 10:9,10 17:18 product 67:7 quite 44:20 52:13 63:13 related 12:20 19:14 35:2 18:7 19:2 37:13 39:5 quiz 35:8 38:5 42:1 62:3 production 77:18 88:7 44:4 54:14,17 professional 1:1 52:18 64:19 relative 88:9 responsibility 1:1 41:15 professionally 33:22 quizzes 61:9 **relatively** 14:2 68:10 41:16 prohibited 52:3 quote 18:10 60:5 release 12:8,12,14 13:2,6 responsible 42:17 promise 74:8 31:2 rest 13:22 R promptly 77:10 released 31:4 rests 79:20 **proof** 39:15 50:10,21 R 1:14 2:1 releases 30:18 result 33:1 51:13 79:13 raise 42:22 65:9 76:8 relevant 12:16 34:6 60:17 results 40:2 properly 81:2 77:21 78:21 83:11 66.6 resume 26:6 raised 34:16 36:1 56:20 **propose** 32:11 57:8 reluctant 72:11 returning 83:19 **proposed** 18:3 27:17 28:3 62:7 83:20 remaining 68:3 reverse 6:10 39:19 raises 44:14 remote 25:6,8,10 28:18 review 9:5,11,16 10:11 raising 55:3 proposing 18:9 29:6 78:12 10:13 11:16 63:9 64:3 protections 48:9 reach 30:1 remotely 26:2 28:11,17 83:21 **prove** 17:22 reached 80:13,14 29:6,8,11 **right** 14:8 24:18 29:17

**styles** 15:18 42:7 44:8 46:3 47:15.17 **Senate** 17:1 18:13 63:12 **sound** 31:22 50:12 51:20 57:14 59:7 65:19 sounds 17:7 20:8 51:11 **subject** 6:19 7:5,12,18,20 send 86:14 speak 22:19 8:5,13 9:5,12 20:18 61:9.15 63:8 71:4.14 72:6 75:10 77:7 **sending** 39:14.19 41:19 **speaking** 3:21 51:2 56:7 sense 9:11 33:8 35:2 specific 79:18 rigorous 65:18 subjects 70:2 Specifically 3:11 Robert 1:19 5:9 48:14,15,16 53:15 **submission** 27:18 61:13 Rosen 16:21 62:14 specification 38:10 59:14 78:6 79:9.9 **submit** 47:11 60:16 73:7 rough 30:4 sent 41:10 86:22 **spending** 35:18 48:2 73:8.19 74:2 roughly 16:1 **separate** 35:2 60:13 spent 38:1 68:8 **submitted** 44:14 57:4 rounds 53:16 64:10 stacked 26:16 68:6 rule 2:17 7:22 8:19 28:9 separated 38:12 **staff** 3:15 **subpoena** 10:20 11:5 29:15 39:9,11 60:8,11 separately 26:2 stand 31:9 72:14 13:20 63:4,19 64:2 standard 71:12,20 60:13,15,19,22 61:1,15 **serious** 38:16 43:1 49:10 68:13,15 69:6,11,16 61:15,22 67:3 74:22 **standpoint** 11:9 14:10,11 72:3,17 75:12,13,21 66:20 75:18 76:10 79:19 80:3 serve 46:18 76:9,19 77:5 84:7 76:9,12,20 77:5,9,11 stands 9:8 ruled 7:1 8:9 10:20 77:10 subpoenaed 70:6 **served** 76:12 start 6:10,12,14 15:9 substantial 40:13 **rules** 7:2,10 8:2,3,15,16 **service** 76:21 77:1,13 subtletv 47:13 31:12 44:17 46:16,19 20:15 25:16 26:13,15 50:11,17 61:13,18,20 session 80:1 26:20 38:4 62:10 69:4 sufficiency 62:19 71:1 78:8,8 79:18 set 3:2 25:7 27:17 29:8 73:9 **sufficient** 57:5 60:6,6 ruling 35:20 48:1 31:19 81:16 sufficiently 47:10 started 18:1 **starting** 23:22 24:11 **suggest** 15:7 18:21 23:14 run 3:16 65:12 setting 19:11 seven 16:13 **statement** 23:3 69:6 28:7,21 61:3 S sharper 21:21 **suggested** 34:18 39:14 79:12.15.16 S 2:1 shifted 17:21 statements 12:13 56:21 **safe** 16:3 **shoe** 59:10 states 7:14 15:2 **suggestion** 29:3 39:18 sake 26:12 **shot** 49:16 statment 88:8 40:18 41:12 50:15,16 sanction 80:16 81:8 82:4 **show** 39:13 58:13 76:9 statutes 61:7 sanctions 80:10,22 82:11 side 20:8 33:18 48:5,6 suggests 13:17 **Steel** 7:15 51:3 55:12 80:6,8 84:17 83:6,7 **step** 11:9 **suit** 46:10 Saturday 59:1 sides 21:6 75:7 steps 69:3,4 sun 5:2 saves 29:13 sign 49:21 sticks 51:14 sunlight 4:19 saying 13:14 27:10 40:10 significance 48:19 **Superior** 60:15 61:13 **stipulate** 29:21,22 33:8,8 46:10 65:4 76:11 significant 14:14 stipulation 33:4 75:17 says 7:20,22 46:2 61:6 significantly 39:22 stipulations 3:2 29:19 **superiors** 18:5 39:20 66:6 74:22 silly 20:22 28:12 30:1 32:10,12,17 33:2 supervising 41:16 schedule 3:5 21:15 23:21 **simple** 19:7 45:7 69:22 33:14 **supplied** 62:16 28:2.21 31:19 37:18 simplify 75:17 stock 31:14 **support** 76:14 54:6 56:12 57:3 59:3 **simply** 28:14 46:2 76:10 stone-faced 35:14 **supposed** 10:18 83:10.21 84:8 sir 2:4,9 5:11 **stop** 13:16 53:11 **Supreme** 7:14 8:4,17,19 **schedules** 26:18 27:13 sit 35:13 story 17:19 22:9 sure 16:17 21:22 49:12 **scope** 77:18 situation 74:17 straightforward 19:7 49:14 64:2 68:19 84:20 screen 4:21 **smile** 35:14 **stream** 3:13 86:3 seal 65:1 smoothly 3:16 streamline 70:20 surprise 31:22 **second** 2:6.11 40:22 so-called 39:15 stretch 21:7 surrounding 38:2 62:11 64:5 74:21 sole 42:12 stretching 21:8 **suspect** 56:14 secondly 43:21 solemnly 4:3,7 strictly 18:3 swear 2:13 4:2,4 see 4:21,22 13:8 14:17 **solves** 77:16 strong 14:4 swift 16:15 15:9 27:3 29:20 33:3 somebody 25:9 64:22 struck 40:21 42:21 sympathize 59:8 36:1,14 48:6 51:14 84:9 structure 55:1 system 3:8,11 69:20 seek 10:11,13 11:16 soon 68:10 73:8 structured 8:14 T 83:20 **sorry** 27:6 54:9 56:18 **study** 56:17,19 seeking 9:4 33:4 43:16 57:14,15 stuff 26:20 31:12,22 take 2:13 6:9 7:3 9:19 72:2,4 sort 30:3 35:2,19 36:11 48:11,13 53:3 78:8,10 10:2,3,12 11:8 12:21 seen 5:3 44:13 43:19 78:2 82:13 79:4 14:9 15:11 16:11,14 self-incrimination 51:20 **sought** 65:12 stupid 39:18 40:18 17:16 19:6,7,22 20:14

22:16 24:20 31:5 47:1
55:10 64:6 65:1 70:18
73:3,4 74:18 76:8
takeaways 15:1
taken 9:21 80:9 88:9
takes 48:9
talk 3:2 13:20 21:17
22:18 32:2 33:15 37:16
53:14,21 67:19 68:3
72:9 83:3
talked 24:18 62:6 72:6
talking 13:12 15:5 16:1
38:1 46:12 58:8 60:10
68:7 69:5,6,17 70:4,12
70:13
team 23:8 25:14
technology 3:18
tell 22:9 25:6 73:10,16
74:5 80:21
telling 13:11 53:2,12
73:14
tells 84:9
tend 35:11
tender 77:1
tentative 43:10
terms 45:7 69:22 76:16
testify 25:9 28:17 29:5,7
58:3 69:8,11,16 70:1,5
70:12 72:11 77:3
/0:12 /2:11 //:3
<b>testimony</b> 17:1,3,5 24:22
25:10 28:10 56:7 63:9
63:10 66:1 79:19,20
88:4,5
thank 2:12 4:12 5:20
11:14,17 14:21 16:6
27:14,15 31:16 35:15
44:6 51:5 52:14 61:21
84:12 85:12,14,17
then-expressed 18:5
theories 36:16 45:3 47:19
51:1
theory 40:9 43:1
•
thing 15:17 20:11 28:8
40:21 42:9 43:14 75:7
75:11 77:7,19,22 84:14
things 12:16 13:16,22
21:7,13,21 22:4 25:11
26:17 29:22 31:10,11
31:17 33:17,18 34:2,4
35:22 36:11 37:18
38:15 42:20 44:9,12,18
51:7 52:12 64:11 67:15
73:2 76:8 78:3,13 80:6
80:11,18 83:12,13 85:4
think 4:22 8:1,9,10,12
10:4 12:22 14:6 19:17
10.4 12.22 14:0 19:17

```
20:7 23:18 24:10 28:8
  30:7 32:6,21 35:1 36:2
  36:19 38:6 40:7 41:2
  42:1,5 43:10,12 44:9,14
  48:4 49:12,12 51:18
  52:13 53:9,19 55:12
  56:5 57:19 60:17,20
  61:15 62:2 63:11 68:22
  69:2 70:5 73:19 74:1
  80:12,15,19,22 81:5,11
  83:11 84:17 85:12
  86:18
thinking 34:19 36:12
  55:5 60:9,18 81:3
third 46:5 71:7
third-party 71:11
thorough 14:5 16:15
thought 24:14 36:5,18
  57:13 60:19,22 62:1
  72:20 79:7
thoughtful 47:8
thoughts 32:7 37:1 81:20
three 15:14 16:3,11 19:8
  55:7 58:14,15,20
three-day 22:1
threshold 6:20 7:7
throw 51:14
Thursday 1:6 87:7
tied 36:15
time 6:1 7:4 10:19 13:18
  14:9 15:4 16:2 19:21,22
  20:13 21:2,4 22:6,16
  25:21,22 26:1 32:1
  33:19 34:5 35:18 37:13
  38:1 53:18 56:13 57:5
  57:10,22 58:17 59:22
  60:1 66:14 68:9 72:12
  74:7 80:18,18 82:11
  85:15
timing 27:16 30:17 34:16
  74:11 81:16
Title 61:5,6,8
today 6:9 48:1 52:17
told 41:7 42:4 49:17 66:5
  78:11 84:2
tone 52:16
top 38:8
topic 12:5
topics 18:16,19 53:22
  54:4,21 55:8 65:21 72:9
total 20:17
Touhy 13:19 62:12,20
```

63:1,21 64:1,3 65:9

track 61:19 76:11,12

town 68:4

69:12 70:2 73:2,19,20

transcribed 16:22 transcript 83:16 85:18,21 transcripts 12:9,15 17:4 17:5.8 18:13.15 65:19 treat 51:9 trial 19:15 24:21 52:3 **tried** 16:19 21:7 49:18 **trigger** 63:2 64:3 triggered 63:21 true 18:12,12 33:12 37:9 50:22 88:5 truly 55:10 truthful 70:7 **try** 13:19 14:3,8 20:15 25:11,20,22 26:19 35:7 35:12 53:16 60:4 67:9 72:15 73:11 74:1,5,7,10 75:4,4 76:5 trying 11:19 21:1 28:11 31:9 42:20 44:9 46:5,9 48:14,15 50:22 55:15 68:9 82:16 Tuesday 74:9 **TV** 5:17 tweak 76:11 Twelve 1:8 **two** 8:3 13:14 15:14,22 21:10 28:5 32:3 42:11 43:10 45:15 52:15 55:20 56:5 61:7 74:15 two-and-a-half 20:18 21:11 type 53:2 83:5,9 Typically 86:7 U U.S 41:12 ultimately 45:7 75:11

**ultra** 7:21 unclear 45:17 underneath 22:11 understand 6:5.22 10:17 12:1,11 22:13 31:18 36:7 38:10,20 39:1 40:9 41:1 44:19 46:11 49:4 50:2 51:1 53:21 55:2 69:4 70:2 73:6 74:11 75:3 81:15 82:12,19 84:5,7,12  $understanding\ 25{:}20$ 75:13 **understood** 11:4 25:4 84:10 undoubtedly 12:15 43:21 **undue** 71:18 **Uniform** 68:14

United 7:14 universe 65:21 unnecessary 44:2 unusual 22:7 33:15 37:22 unwarranted 43:17 unwilling 76:22 upset 25:9 use 24:21 67:16 68:14 70:19 useful 14:16 81:6 usually 38:3

## vagaries 20:19 value 73:3 varies 68:21 various 34:2 39:15 44:15 44:16,17 vehicle 67:10 versus 7:15 video 3:13 view 55:10 views 36:10 81:7 violation 39:17 43:14 50:11 79:21 80:3 vires 7:21

virtual 84:17 virtually 85:4 vis 3:12 voluntarily 69:7

W W 1:18 wait 82:22 walk 35:16 wall 51:14 want 4:4 6:15 8:8 10:10 11:8,18 13:19 14:10,12 18:19 22:5 26:19 28:4,5 31:11 32:4 33:5.21 35:4 35:5 36:3.4.11.13 37:4 38:5 40:3.4.6.15.22 41:2 44:7,10 48:1 53:1 53:11 64:4 65:5 66:9,14 70:19 73:1,22 75:3 79:4 80:11,15 81:12 82:5,6 82:12,14 83:5,14,22 84:2 86:7 wanted 2:7,14 9:3,9 13:1 31:20 35:6 42:22 48:3

50:20 65:8 76:18 81:18 wanting 59:9 wants 42:16 75:5,5 warning 81:19 wasn't 40:11,12 waste 53:18

			rage 99
	1	I	1
way 14:12 22:9 28:11,18	writing 47:14 48:2	<b>25th</b> 23:22 24:11 25:16	
34:5 41:3 42:2 43:3	written 16:22	26:4,7,13 27:7,11	
51:16 64:8,20 72:16	wrong 18:8 42:7 71:6	<b>26</b> 60:17,19,21,22 61:22	
76:4 78:17 85:6	wrote 49:15	62:2	
ways 33:22 43:10 71:10		<b>28</b> 60:20	
<b>we'll</b> 26:21 29:8 37:17	X	<b>29</b> 30:8	
56:17,21 72:14 77:10	X 42:4		
77:13,17 78:22 80:21	<b>X-prime</b> 42:4	3	
86:14		<b>3.1</b> 67:3,21 71:9	
we're 13:11 15:5,8 16:1	Y	<b>3.2</b> 71:12,12,20 74:2	
25:5,20 26:22 27:3	ya'll 72:16	<b>3.5</b> 74:22	
47:17 49:2 57:12 62:22	<b>yeah</b> 6:3,17 26:8 29:17	<b>30</b> 4:18 27:17 29:10 30:8	
72:8,20 75:21 76:13	34:17 35:1 54:10 58:1	57:9	
78:18 84:8 85:2 87:5	58:18 62:15	<b>30th</b> 25:16 59:2,22	
we've 5:3 11:21,21 28:11	year 15:4 17:2 23:9 62:16	<b>31st</b> 58:22 59:1	
62:5 63:22 80:12	Year's 34:22 58:21	<b>37</b> 5:22	
we 32:22	years 5:22 61:7		
week 5:3 16:2 23:10,13	yes,' 68:20	4	
23:21,21,22 24:1,3,6,6	yesterday 31:14	<b>45</b> 75:18 76:10	
24:7,8 25:12,14,19 26:6	YouTube 3:14	<b>47</b> 53:16	
26:10,14,16,19,21 27:1	1001000011	<b>4A</b> 47:3	
27:7 32:4,6 58:21 59:13	$\overline{z}$	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	
weekend 30:9	<b>Zoom</b> 1:5 24:22 28:18	5	
weeks 56:5 58:14,15,20	200m 1.3 2 1.22 20.10	<b>5</b> 47:3	
weigh 82:14	0	<b>54</b> 44:14	
weight 14:14 69:21		5th 59:20	
Welcome 5:4	1	<b>2th</b> 33.20	
welcomed 32:16	<b>10</b> 86:7	6	
went 49:18	<b>100</b> 19:18	<b>6</b> 1:6 87:8	
whatsoever 17:14	<b>11</b> 2:17	<b>6th</b> 12:7,22 13:6 17:3	
White 43:12	<b>11.11</b> 79:19	30:17 42:4	
win 81:11	11:14 87:7	30.17 12.1	
wind 64:8	11th 30:7	7	
window 4:20	<b>12</b> 2:21 54:5 79:3	<b>7</b> 54:12 61:6,8	
wish 35:12	<b>12/20</b> 54:8	1 22 01.0,0	
witness 3:3 27:19 29:10	12/21 54:8	8	
29:19 30:6,11 57:10	<b>12th</b> 30:5,9,9,12 32:5	8 61:5	
69:15,17 74:18,20 88:5	57:13,15,17,20 58:10	<b>8.4</b> 38:20 39:10	
witnesses 13:3,20 15:22	58:20 59:21	<b>8.4A</b> 38:13	
16:20,21 24:5,7,12,17	13th 25:20	<b>8.4C</b> 38:14	
25:3 28:15,16 29:5,7	<b>14</b> 54:13	<b>8.4D</b> 38:15 43:3,14 44:5	
55:17 63:7,19 68:4,15	<b>16</b> 60:8 61:1,15	0.12 30.13 13.3,11 11.3	
70:12	<b>16th</b> 23:11,12,17 24:2,8	9	
wondering 5:21 42:7,9	17th 23:19	<b>9:30</b> 1:6	
word 67:16 71:6	19th 32:4 57:12	<b>9:32</b> 2:2	
words 26:5	1st 40:13	9th 24:1,4,6,8 25:12,19	
work 23:21 24:1,1,6,7,11	130 40.13	25:19 26:6,10,16,19,20	
24:22 30:4,10 33:21		26:21 27:1	
37:17 45:3 59:3 61:6,8	<b>2020</b> 40:1	20.21 27.1	
66:19 67:6 81:4 85:22	2021-D193 1:4		
worked 49:14	<b>2021-D1</b> 33 1.4 <b>2022</b> 1:6 87:8		
	<b>2022</b> 1.0 87.8 <b>21</b> 28:9,19 29:13 32:11		
works 15:9 26:19	<b>21</b> st 32:13 54:5,18		
worse 83:8	<b>22-BD-039</b> 1:3 2:15		
worth 34:5 35:17	23rd 59:21		
worthwhile 36:8	<b>25</b> 75:14		
<b>wouldn't</b> 31:21	<u>20</u> / 3.17		
1	I	1	1