

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
NEW YORK COUNTY**

PRESENT: HON. ARTHUR F. ENGORON PART 37

Justice

-----X

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, BY LETITIA JAMES, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

INDEX NO. 452564/2022

Plaintiff,

- v -

SUPPLEMENTAL LIMITED
GAG ORDER

DONALD J. TRUMP, DONALD TRUMP JR, ERIC TRUMP, ALLEN WEISSELBERG, JEFFREY MCCONNEY, THE DONALD J. TRUMP REVOCABLE TRUST, THE TRUMP ORGANIZATION, INC., TRUMP ORGANIZATION LLC, DJT HOLDINGS LLC, DJT HOLDINGS MANAGING MEMBER, TRUMP ENDEAVOR 12 LLC, 401 NORTH WABASH VENTURE LLC, TRUMP OLD POST OFFICE LLC, 40 WALL STREET LLC, SEVEN SPRINGS LLC,

Defendants.

-----X

On October 3, 2023, after Defendant Donald J. Trump posted to his social media account an untrue, disparaging, and personally identifying post about my Principal Law Clerk, I imposed on all parties to this action a very limited gag order, “forbidding all parties from posting, emailing, or speaking publicly about any members of my staff,” emphasizing, quite clearly, that “personal attacks on members of my court staff are unacceptable, inappropriate, and I will not tolerate them under any circumstances.” I further made clear that “failure to abide by this directive will result in serious sanctions.”

On October 20, 2023, upon learning that Donald J. Trump failed to remove the post from one of his campaign websites, donaldjtrump.com, for a total of 17 days, I imposed a fine of \$5,000.00 against Donald J. Trump for violating the gag order. On October 25, 2023, after conducting a brief hearing, I concluded that Donald J. Trump had intentionally violated my gag order by stating to a gaggle of reporters outside the courtroom the following statement in reference to my Principal Law Clerk: “This judge is a very partisan judge with a person who’s very partisan sitting alongside him, perhaps even more partisan than he is,” and fined him an additional \$10,000.00.

I imposed the gag order only upon the parties, operating under the assumption that such a gag order would be unnecessary upon the attorneys, who are officers of the Court.

Over the past week, defendants’ principal attorneys, namely, Christopher Kise (admitted *pro hac vice*) (Continental PLLC), Clifford Robert (Robert & Robert PLLC) and Alina Habba (Habba

OTHER ORDER – NON-MOTION

Madaio & Associates LLP), have made, on the record, repeated, inappropriate remarks about my Principal Law Clerk, falsely accusing her of bias against them and of improperly influencing the ongoing bench trial. Defendants' attorneys have made long speeches alleging that it is improper for a judge to consult with a law clerk during ongoing proceedings, and that the passing of notes from a judge to a law clerk, or vice-versa, constitutes an improper "appearance of impropriety" in this case. These arguments have no basis.

Pursuant to 22 NYCRR § 100.3(B)(6)(6)(c): "**A judge may consult with court personnel whose function is to aid the judge in carrying out the judge's adjudicative responsibilities or with other judges**" (emphasis added). This is precisely the role of a Principal Law Clerk in the New York State Courts.

Moreover, ethics advisory opinions have further emphasized that: "The relationship between a judge and his/her law clerk is one of particular trust and confidence. Although a judge and his/her law clerk are of course not 'partners,' the two engage in the kind of professional interchange that might be found between long-time colleagues in a law firm." Advisory Opinion 07-04, available at <https://www.nycourts.gov/ipjudicialethicsopinions/07-04.htm>.


As I have stated on the record, seemingly to no avail, my law clerks are public servants who are performing their jobs in the manner in which I request. This includes providing legal authority and opinions, as well as responding to questions I pose to them. Plainly, defendants are not entitled to the confidential communications amongst me and my court staff, who are hired specifically to aid me in carrying out my adjudicative responsibilities. Nor are they entitled to continue referencing my staff in the record. Defendants' attorneys have had ample opportunity to make their record, and they have at length. Indeed, I will assist them by repeating here that I will continue to consult with my staff, as is my unfettered right, throughout the remainder of the trial. Accordingly, defendants' record is now fully preserved for the duration of the proceedings. Defendants' attorneys may refer back to this blanket statement in their appeal as they deem appropriate. Defendants may reference my staff as is appropriate to ask about scheduling issues or the management of the trial, which is an integral part of their jobs. What they may *not* do is to make any further statements about internal and confidential communications (be it conversations, note passing, or anything similar) between me and my staff.

Defendants' First Amendment arguments in opposition to the imposition are wholly unpersuasive. This gag order is as narrowly tailored as possible to accomplish its purpose, which is to protect the safety of my staff and promote the orderly progression of this trial. As I have made clear, as the Judge in this case and the trier of fact, the gag order does not apply to me. However, I will not tolerate, under any circumstances, remarks about my court staff. The threat of, and actual, violence resulting from heated political rhetoric is well-documented. Since the commencement of this bench trial, my chambers have been inundated with hundreds of harassing and threatening phone calls, voicemails, emails, letters, and packages. The First Amendment right of defendants and their attorneys to comment on my staff is far and away outweighed by the need to protect them from threats and physical harm.

Thus, for the reasons stated herein, I hereby order that all counsel are prohibited from making any public statements, in or out of court, that refer to *any* confidential communications, in any form, between my staff and me.

Failure to abide by this directive shall result in serious sanctions.

NOV 03 2023 HON. ARTHUR F. ENGORON



ARTHUR F. ENGORON, JSC

DATE: 11/3/2023

Check One:

Case Disposed

Non-Final Disposition

Check if Appropriate:

Other (Specify _____)