IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: CACE 15-000072

BRADLEY J. EDWARDS and PAUL G. CASSELL,,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ,

Defendant.

VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF

ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ

VOLUME 1 Pages 1 through 179

Thursday, October 15, 2015 9:31 a.m. - 4:13 p.m.

Cole Scott & Kissane 110 Southeast 6th Street Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Stenographically Reported By: Kimberly Fontalvo, RPR, CLR Realtime Systems Administrator

| | 2 | | | 4 |
|----------|--|----------|--|----------------------|
| | 2 | 1 | | 4 |
| 1 2 | APPEARANCES: | 1 2 | I N D E X | |
| | On behalf of Plaintiffs: | | | |
| 3 | SEARCY, DENNEY, SCAROLA | 4 | Examination | Page |
| 4 | BARNHART & SHIPLEY, P.A. 2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard | 5 | | 1 450 |
| 5 | West Palm Beach, Florida 33402-3626 | 6 | VOLUME 1 (Pages | 1 - 179) |
| 6 | BY: JACK SCAROLA, ESQ. jsx@searcylaw.com | 7 | Direct By Mr. Scare | |
| 7 | | 8 | Certificate of Oath | 176 |
| 8 9 | On behalf of Defendant: COLE, SCOTT & KISSANE, P.A. | | Certificate of Reporter | 177 |
| 10 | Dadeland Centre II - Suite 1400 | 9 | Read and Sign Letter to Wit | |
| 10 | 9150 South Dadeland Boulevard Miami, Florida 33156 | 10 | Errata Sheet (forwarded upo | on execution) 179 |
| 11 | BY: THOMAS EMERSON SCOTT, JR., ESQ. | 11 | No exhibits marked to Volu | ma 1 |
| 12 | thomas.scott@csklegal.com BY: STEVEN SAFRA, ESQ. (Via phone) | 12 | No exhibits marked to volu | me 1. |
| 10 | steven.safra@csklegal.com | 13 | | |
| 13 14 | and SWEDER & ROSS, LLP | 14 | | |
| 15 | 131 Oliver Street Boston, MA 02110 | 15 | | |
| | BY: KENNETH A. SWEDER, ESQ. | 16 | | |
| 16 17 | ksweder@sweder-ross.com and | 17 | | |
| 18 | WILEY, REIN | 18 | | |
| 19 | 17769 K Street NW Washington, DC 20006 | 19 20 | | |
| | BY: RICHARD A. SIMPSON, ESQ. | 21 | | |
| 20 | RSimpson@wileyrein.com BY: NICOLE A. RICHARDSON, ESQ. | 22 | | |
| 21 22 | nrichardson@wileyrein.com | 23 | | |
| 22 | | 24 | | |
| 24 25 | | 25 | | |
| | | | | |
| | 3 | | | 5 |
| 1 | APPEARANCES (Continued): | 1 | Thereupon, | |
| 2 | | 2 | the following proceedings began at 9:3 | 1 a.m.: |
| 3 4 | On behalf of Jeffrey Epstein: | 3 | VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the | |
| - | MARTIN G. WEINBERG, PC 20 Park Plaza, Suite 1000 | 4 | October, 2015. The time is approxi | mately 9:31 |
| 5 | Boston, MA 02116 | 5 | a.m. This is the videotaped deposit | ion of Alan |
| | BY: MARTIN G. WEINBERG. ESQ. (Via phone) | 6 | M. Dershowitz in the matter of Brad | iley J. |
| 6 7 | marty@martinweinberglaw.com | 7 | Edwards and Paul Cassell versus Al | an M. |
| 8 | and DARREN K. INDYKE, PLLC | 8 | Dershowitz. This deposition is beir | ig held at |
| | 575 Lexington Ave., 4th Fl. | 9 | 110 Southeast 6th Street, Suite 1850 |), Fort |
| 9 | New York, New York | 10 | Lauderdale, Florida, 33301. | |
| 10 | BY: DARREN K. INDYKE, ESQ. (Via phone) | 11 | My name is Travis Gallagher. In | m the 09:31:40 |
| 11 | On behalf of Virginia Roberts: | 12 | videographer representing Above & | Beyond |
| 12 | BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER, LLP | 13 | Reprographics. | |
| 13 | 401 E. Las Olas Blvd., Ste. 1200 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 | 14 | Will the attorneys please announ | ce their 09:31:46 |
| | BY: SIGRID STONE MCCAWLEY, ESQ. | 15 | appearances for the record. | |
| 14 | smccawley@bsfllp.com | 16 | MR. SCAROLA: My name is Ja | |
| 15 16 | ALCO DECENT. | 17 | I'm counsel on behalf of Bradley Ed | |
| 10 | ALSO PRESENT: Joni Jones, Utah Attorney General Office | 18 | Professor Paul Cassell. Mr. Edward | is and |
| 18 | Travis Gallagher, Videographer | 19 | Mr. Cassell are also present. | 00.01.50 |
| 19 20 | | 20 | Also with us from the Utah Attor | mey 09:31:58 |
| 20 21 | | 21 22 | General's office is Joni Jones. | |
| 22 | | 22 | MS. McCAWLEY: Sigrid McCa | - |
| 23 | | 23 | the law firm of Boies Schiller & Fle | |
| 24 | | | behalf of Virginia Roberts-Gray. | |
| 25 | | 25 | MR SCOTT: Good morning T | om Scott on Du-27-17 |
| 25 | | 25 | MR. SCOTT: Good morning. T | om Scott on 09:32:12 |

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

| 1 behalf of the Defendant Professor Dershowitz. 1 to teach at Harvard for my has sensater, we stayed 2 MR, SMPSON: Rehard Simpore on behalf of 09:3218 0. How tong have yon had the apartment in 09:34:20 4 MR, SWEDEK: Em Sweder on behalf of 09:3222 0. How tong have yon had the apartment in 09:34:20 5 Dershowitz. 0. How tong have yon had the apartment in 09:34:20 6 Dershowitz. 0. And prior to that, was there a period of 09:34:23 7 MR, SMRA: This is Samme halyke on 09:32:47 0. And whore residence in 09:34:40 14 MS, RCHARSON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:47 0. New York? 15 behalf of forfossor Denkowitz. 09:32:47 16 Thercopor: 09:32:47 0. New York 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 18 behalf of forfossor Denkowitz. 09:32:47 19 INK SCAROLA: 09:32:47 19 New York domains approximately 30 years ago; 09:34:40 19 New York domains and property in an approximately 30 years ago; 09:34:42 19 New York domainsoup for approximately 30 years ago; 09:34:56 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:57 11 A. Weany no maintimized a resid | | 6 | 8 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 2 MR. SIMISON: Richard Simpson on behalf of 09:32:18 2 in the Chartes Roted. 3 Professor Denhowitz. 0. How long have you had the apartment in 09:34:20 4 MR. SWEDRE Ken Sweder on behalf of 09:32:22 0. How long have you had the apartment in 09:34:20 5 Deterbowitz. A. This apartment in 09:34:20 7 MR. WEINERG: This is Marin Weinberg 09:32:37 0. And prior to that, was there a period of 09:34:32 10 MR. SAFRA: This is Saven Safn also on 09:32:43 09:34:31 11 behalf of Professor Denhowitz. 09:32:47 12 MR. RDYKE: This is Duren hadye on 09:32:47 09:34:42 13 behalf of Professor Denhowitz. 09:32:47 14 A. Yes. 09:32:47 15 behalf of Professor Denhowitz. 09:32:47 16 Res Yerk 09:33:47 17 MARN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 18 New Yerk 09:32:47 19 Yes 0. Yes underpoore was agon: 09:33:46 20 Yes 09:33:27 21 A. Mark more Denhowitz. 09:32:47 22 Q. Would you plases statey our full name, 09:32:47 09:35: | 1 | behalf of the Defendant Professor Dershowitz. | 1 to teach at Harvard for my last semester, we staved |
| 3 Professor Demokeniz: 3 Q. How long have you had the apartment in @9:34:20 4 MK. SWEDDR: Ken Sweed on behalf of 09:32:22 behalf made Conterchainmant Alan M. 6 7 MK. WHINERER. This is Marin Weinberg 09:32:29 9 appearing by telephone. Thusk you for allowing 6 9 nhar on behalf of Jeffrey Epsain. 9 New York? 11 Delta Marin Weinberg 09:32:37 10 A. Yes. 09:34:43 13 behalf of Jeffrey Epsain. 9 9 09:34:44 14 MKS. RICHARDOW. Nicole Richardson on 09:32:47 16 0. Son hare you maintained an object or 09:34:43 14 MS. RICHARDOW. Nicole Richardson on 09:32:47 16 0. Son hare you maintained a residence in 09:34:49 15 ball of Jeffrey Epsain. 13 09 ears? 16 New York 16 Therespon: 09:32:47 16 0. Son hare you maintained a residence a shall 09:34:46 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:57 16 New York Canthouses the a careful of 09:35:67 12 Q. Would you please state your full nume. 09:32:57 17 New York and was cassionally visited overe he past 37 14< | 2 | | |
| 4 MR. SWEDER: Ken Sweder on behalf of 09:32:22 4 New York? 5 Defendant and Countercharmant Alam M. 6 A. This apartment, it's been a couple of 09:34:23 7 MR. WEINBERG: This is Martin Weinberg 09:32:29 7 O. And prior to that, was there a period of 09:34:26 9 thin on behalf of Jeffrey Epatein. 9 New York? 10 MK. SAFRA: This is Suren fail also on 09:32:47 10 A. Yes. 09:34:41 13 behalf of Poffssor Deshowiz. 09:32:47 12 A. Yes. beginning approximately 30 years ago. 90:34:42 14 MS. RCHARGON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:46 yeas. 10 So years? 15 behalf of Poffssor Deshowiz. 09:32:47 13 So years? 0. So hare you maintained a residence at hat 09:34:46 16 Thereupor: 09:32:47 13 New York continuously for approximately 30 years ago. 90:34:46 17 MAN DOTO DESNIOWITZ 09:32:47 13 New York continuously for approximately 30 years ago. 90:34:46 16 New York Continuously you place state your full name. 09:32:47 14 A. Yes. to unintained a residence at hat 09:34:50 17 Howas you full opiase state your full name. 09:32:47 <th>3</th> <td>-</td> <td></td> | 3 | - | |
| 5 Defindant and Counterchainant Alan M. 5 A. This apartment, if's been a couple of 09:34:23 6 Darkhowitz. 0 7 MR. WINNERG, This is Martin Weinberg 09:32:37 0 10 MR. SAFRA: This is Steven Safra also on 09:32:37 0 11 behalf of Professor Deshowitz. 0 12 MR. NINVER, This is Daren Indyk on 09:32:43 0 13 behalf of Professor Deshowitz. 0 14 MS. SRCHARDSON: Needo Richardson on 09:32:43 0 15 behalf of Professor Deshowitz. 0 16 Thereupon: 09:32:47 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 18 baving been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 19 nscrift als follows: 09:32:47 19 nscrift als follows: 09:32:47 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:47 11 Dy Ms. SCAROLA: 09:32:47 12 Javing been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 14 A. Ana Motron Deshowitz. 09:32:57 15 A. Man Motron Deshowitz. 09:33:00 < | 4 | | |
| 6 Dershowitz. 6 years. 7 MR. WEINBEG: This is Murin Weinberg 09:32:29 7 O. And prior to that, was here a period of 09:34:26 9 appending by deleption. Thank, you for allowing 7 O. And prior to that, was here a period of 09:34:21 10 MR. SAFRA: This is Steven Safra also on 09:32:37 10 A. Yes. 09:34:42 11 Delaff of Professor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 13 O. Beginning approximately 30 years age, 09:34:46 12 MR. NRYKE This is Daren Indyle on 09:32:47 14 A. Yes. beginning approximately 30 years age, 09:34:46 13 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 14 New York continuously for approximately 30 years age, 09:34:46 14 MS. RCHARDSON: Nexel Richardson on 09:32:47 14 New York continuously for approximately 40 years age, 09:32:47 15 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 15 16 New York and the state as that 09:34:50 16 New KNCHARDSON: Nexel Richardson on 09:32:57 2 0. So, have you maintained a residence as that 09:34:50 17 A. Wein SCAROLA: 09:32:57 2 0. So, have you maintained a resid | 5 | | |
| 7 MR. WEINBERG: This is Martin Weinberg 09:32:29 9 appearing by telephone. Thank you for allowing 10 MR. SARRA: This is Souven Safe also on 09:32:37 11 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 12 MR. NUYKE: This is Duren Indyk on 09:32:43 13 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 14 MS. RCHARDSON: Nickole Richardson on 09:32:46 15 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 16 Therespon: 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 18 having been first dufy sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 19 resified as follows: 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION 21 A. Weindy ou please state your full name, 09:32:57 23 a. A lam Morton Dershowitz. 24 A. Weil, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:251 37 Q. You had property where you could stay 38 we spend the winters. We live in the fail and part 4 A. Yes. 09:33:27 5 Q. And where div your Nork and then 09:33:27 5 Q. And where div your Nork and then 09:33:27 5 Q. And where div your Nork and then 09:33:21 < | 6 | | |
| 8 appearing by telephone. Thank you for allowing 9 time when you maintained another residence in 9 that on behalf of effery Epstein. 9 11 MR, SARRA: This is Seven Safn alo on 09:32:47 14 A. Yes. 09:34:31 12 MR, NDYKE: This is Darren Indyke on 09:32:46 14 A. Yes. 09:34:42 13 behalf of Professor Dershowiz. 13 Q. And what period of time was that? 09:34:42 14 MS, NCHARDSON: Neede Richardson on 09:32:46 14 A. Yes. beginning approximately 30 years ago. 09:34:42 15 behalf of Professor Dershowiz. 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have you maintained a residence in 09:34:40 16 Thereupon: 09:32:47 17 New York continuously for approximately 40 years ago. 17 A. Bank onton Dershowiz. 09:32:47 18 30 years. 18 Mswig been first duly sown, was examined an 09:32:57 20 New York tautw occasionally visied over the past 30 years. 23 Q. Would you picase state your full name, 09:32:57 21 A. We have a anomal could apartment where 24 A. Mell, Liwe in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 25 We anore on Marha's Vineyard. <th>7</th> <td>MR. WEINBERG: This is Martin Weinberg 09:32:29</td> <td></td> | 7 | MR. WEINBERG: This is Martin Weinberg 09:32:29 | |
| 9 that on behalf of Leffrey Epstein. 9 New York? 10 MR, SARKA: This is Saven Safra also on 09:32:47 10 0. And what period of time was that? 09:34:37 13 behalf of Defossor Dershowiz. 11 10. A ves. beginning approximately 30 years, ago: 09:34:47 14 MS, RCHARDSON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:46 14 A. Ves. beginning approximately 30 years ago: 09:34:42 15 behalf of Defossor Dershowiz. 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have your maintained a residence in 09:34:43 16 Thereupon: 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have your maintained a residence in 09:34:49 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have your maintained a residence in 09:34:42 18 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:57 16 New York continuously for approximately 30 years, ago: 09:34:42 20 DW Rold you please state your full name, 09:32:57 24 A. Would you please state your full name, 09:32:57 23 Sir? A. Alan Monton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 A. Would you please state you rul the full and part 3 25 O. And where at they? 09:33:27 36 We was a summer place on Matha's Vineyard.< | 8 | | |
| 11 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 11 Q. Ad what period of time was that? 09:34:32 12 MR, NDYKE: This is Duren ladyk on 09:32:43 12 A. Probably 30 years, around 30 years, age: 09:34:42 13 behalf of Erforssor Dershowitz. 13 0. So have your maintained a residence in 09:34:40 14 MS, RICHARDSON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:47 14 A. Yes, beginning approximately 30 years, age: 09:34:42 15 behalf of Defossor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have your maintained a residence in 09:34:49 16 Investified a follows: 09:32:47 19 New York continuously for approximately the last 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 10 New York that we occasionally visited over the 18 INR SCAROLA: 09:32:57 24 New York continuously for the past 30 years? 29 Q. Mod where did you live? 09:33:20 11 New York continuously for the past 30 years? 21 A. Well, Live in three places. We have a 09:33:20 12 A. That's correct. 09:35:21 30 A. Well, Thive in three stree years 09:33:27 34 44 A. That's correct. 09:35:23 31 | 9 | | 9 New York? |
| 12 MR. INDYKE: Thi is Daren Indyke on 09:32:43 13 behalf of Leffrey Epstein. 12 A. Probably 30 years. around 30 years. 80: 09:34:47 14 MS. RCHARDSON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:47 14 A. Yes, beginning approximately 30 years. 80: 09:34:46 15 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 14 A. Yes, beginning approximately 30 years. 80: 09:34:46 16 Thercupon: 09:32:47 16 New York continuously for approximately 40 years. 80: 09:34:46 17 ALAN DERSHOWTIZ 09:32:47 18 30 years? 18 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 18 New York continuously for approximately the last 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:57 21 A. Weal was not maintained a residence in the dul side science 18 21 A. Man Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 22 19 Vork continuously for the past 30 years? 22 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:27 24 0. You had property where you could stay 09:35:20 31 A. Weal, Hi we in the full and part 3 A. That's correct. 09:35:23 32 M. Within the last the syntry. | 10 | MR. SAFRA: This is Steven Safra also on 09:32:37 | 10 A. Yes. 09:34:31 |
| 13 behalf of Jeffrey Epstein. 13 0. Beginning approximately 30 years ago? 09:34:42 14 MS. RICHARDSON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:46 14 A. Yee, beginning approximately 30 years ago? 09:34:42 15 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have you maintained a residence in 09:34:49 16 Maximum approximately 30 years ago? 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have you maintained a residence in 09:34:49 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 16 New York continuously for approximately 40 years ago? 09:34:40 18 having been first duly swom, was examined and 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have you maintained a residence as that 00:34:56 20 Woold you pleas state your full name, 09:32:57 24 A. We have not maintained a residence in 09:35:07 17 24 A. Man Morto Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 Q. You had property where you could stay 09:35:07 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:57 25 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 26 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:21 3 we speed the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring | 11 | behalf of Professor Dershowitz. | 11 Q. And what period of time was that? 09:34:32 |
| 14 MS. RCHARDSON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:46 14 A. Yes, beginning approximately 30 years ago, 09:24:46 15 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 16 A. Yes, beginning approximately 30 years ago, 09:24:46 16 Thereupon: 09:32:47 17 New York continuously for approximately the last 17 ALAN DERSHOWTZ 09:32:47 18 30 years? 18 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 19 A. We have not maintained a residence as that 09:34:56 20 DURECT EXAMINATION 09:32:57 24 A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 O. You had property where you could stay 09:35:07 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:57 24 New York continuously for the past 30 years? 26 Mortin Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where 0. You had aproperty where you could stay 09:35:20 26 Ne wither withers. We live in the fail and part 4 4 A. That's correct. 09:35:23 27 A. Yes. 09:33:27 8 Mk. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're 09:35:23 28 We owned | 12 | MR. INDYKE: This is Darren Indyke on 09:32:43 | 12 A. Probably 30 years, around 30 years. 09:34:37 |
| 15 behalf of Professor Dershowitz. 09:32:47 16 Thereupon: 09:32:47 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 18 having been first days worn, was examined and 09:32:47 19 testified as follows: 19 20 Wonk own, was examined and 09:32:47 21 BY MR SCAROLA: 09:32:57 23 sir? A. Alan Moton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 23 Q. Mould you please state your full name, 09:32:57 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:57 26 A. Mell, Ilive in three places. We have a 09:33:00 27 A. Well, Ilive in three places. We have a 09:33:20 28 We witnes. We live in the fall and part 4 4 of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 5 we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. 5 6 Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 6 7 A. Yes. 09:33:27 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:21 6 A. Wel, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:27 | 13 | behalf of Jeffrey Epstein. | 13 Q. Beginning approximately 30 years ago? 09:34:42 |
| 16 Thereupon: 09:32:47 16 Q. So, have you maintained a residence in 09:34:49 17 ALAN DERSHOWTZ 09:32:47 18 30 years? 18 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 18 30 years? 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:47 18 30 years? 21 DY MR, SCAROLA: 09:32:57 20 term's legally applied. We have had a pied-a-terre 21 DY Wold you please state your full name, 09:32:57 23 overnight, you had property where you could stay 09:35:07 24 A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 New York continuously for the past 30 years? 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:27 25 New York continuously for the past 30 years? 26 A. Well, Hive in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:22 29 A. Well, Hive in three places. We have a 00:33:21 6 A. That's correct. 09:35:23 4 O. Hat accurate? 09:35:23 9 0. All right. Can you tell me, please. 09:35:23 5 we have a nummer place on Matrha's Vineyant. 6 | 14 | MS. RICHARDSON: Nicole Richardson on 09:32:46 | 14 A. Yes, beginning approximately 30 years ago, 09:34:46 |
| 17 ALAN DERSHOWITZ 09:32:47 17 New York and joint in the full at the full and part of the spring in an apartment in while All and part of the spring in an apartment in New York and a pied-alterne in New York that we occasionally visited over the past 30 years; 18 A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:47 19 A. We have not maintained a residence as that 09:34:56 21 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:32:57 25 24 A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 23 sir? 09 A. Main Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 25 24 A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:59 25 0. You had property where you could stay 09:35:07 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 25 New York continuously for approximately the stay 09:35:07 26 A. Mell, Hive in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 36 Me synch the stat on yours, where and a pied-alterne of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. 6 Q. All right. Can you toll mee, please, 09:35:22 37 O. And where are they? 09:33:27 8 M. Scorrit: Can lask mat you're 09:35:33 38 Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:37 | 15 | behalf of Professor Dershowitz. | 15 yes. |
| 18 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 18 30 years? 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:47 19 A. We have not maintained a residence as that 09:34:56 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:47 20 termik legally applied. We have had a pied-a-terre 21 BY MR, SCAROLA: 09:32:55 22 23 Q. Would you please state your full name, 09:32:55 23 24 A. Alam Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 5 Q. And where di you live? 09:32:59 25 7 7 9 1 A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 9 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:21 4 A. That's correct. 09:35:22 4 of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 6 M. Wether you agree or disagree with the following: statement: "According to our philosophical and ethic at an one in Cambridge, 09:33:30 10 M. SCAROLA: Im you he oy:35:43 11 A. Wee wend a home in Cambridge, 09:33:45 10 A. That's correct, 10:09:35:43< | 16 | Thereupon: 09:32:47 | 16 Q. So, have you maintained a residence in 09:34:49 |
| 19 testified as follows: 19 A. We have not maintained a residence as that 09:34:56 20 DRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:47 20 term's legally applied. We have had a pied-a-terre 21 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:32:54 20 23 sir? 23 Q. Would you please state your full name, 09:32:55 23 24 A. Alan Moton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 25 7 7 9 1 A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 2 Q. Ket in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:21 3 we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part 3 A. That's correct. 09:35:23 9 Q. Multin the last ten years, have yon had 09:33:27 9 M. R. SCAPOLA: Im yout ell me, please, 09:35:23 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 9 M. SCAPOLA: Im yut asking a question. 09:35:41 7 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law 10 A. Believe reputation is sacrosanct and 1 09:35:43 11 Massc | 17 | - | 17 New York continuously for approximately the last |
| 20 Instruct and model and a pied-shere 21 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:32:54 22 Q. Would you please state your full name, 09:32:55 23 sir? 23 24 A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 7 7 9 1 A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:21 26 We spend the winters. We live in the fall and part 3 A. That's correct. 09:35:22 4 of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:21 8 A. Yes. 09:33:27 8 MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're 09:35:39 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 8 MR. SCAROLA: I'n just asking a question. 09:35:31 13 M. Second: The ide and part of the fall and part 1 A. Thet's correct. 99:35:39 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 8 MR. SCAROLA: I'n just asking a question. 09:35:31 14 Messachusetts about a mile away from the | 18 | having been first duly sworn, was examined and 09:32:47 | 18 30 years? |
| BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:32:54 22 Q. Would you please state your full name, 09:32:55 23 sir? 24 A. Alan Moton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:57 26 Q. Mould you please state your full name, 09:32:57 26 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:57 26 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 27 A. Mell, Live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 20 D. Is that accentel? 09:35:21 3 A. That's correct, yes. 09:35:22 4 of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 5 we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. 5 5 statement: "According to our philosophical and other residence besides those that you'v described? 6 A. Yes. 09:33:27 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 9 publishing from? M. SCAROLA: I mould move to strike the 09:35:41 11 Masschusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law 5 5 memsponsive portion of the answer | 19 | testified as follows: | 19 A. We have not maintained a residence as that 09:34:56 |
| 22 Q. Would you please state your full name, 09:32:55 22 past 30 years, yes. 23 sir? 23 Q. You had property where you could stay 09:35:07 24 A. Alan Moton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 25 7 7 9 1 A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 2 years a years 9 Q. Is that accurate? 09:35:21 3 we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part 3 A. That's correct, yes. 00:35:22 4 of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 6 Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 6 statement: "According to our philosophical and ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"? 8 A. Yes. 09:33:27 9 MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question. 09:35:41 11 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law 11 A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and 1 09:35:43 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 9 MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question. 09:35:41 11 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harv | 20 | DIRECT EXAMINATION 09:32:47 | 20 term's legally applied. We have had a pied-à-terre |
| a si? a. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 Q. You had property where you could stay 09:35:07 overnight, you had access to that property in New York continuously for the past 30 years? A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Mitch in the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 A. Yes. 09:33:27 A. Yes. 09:33:27 M. Scoroff, Can Lask what you're 09:35:39 publishing from? A. Yes. 09:33:27 M. Scoroff, I can Lask what you're 09:35:31 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And what point in time did you no 09:33:39 Ionger have the Cambridge home? A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:45 ago and then it was ond market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 ago and then it was old within the last three op:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:04 A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:02 <l< td=""><th>21</th><td>BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:32:54</td><td>²¹ in New York that we occasionally visited over the</td></l<> | 21 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:32:54 | ²¹ in New York that we occasionally visited over the |
| 24 A. Alan Motton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 24 overright, you had access to that property in New York continuously for the past 30 years? 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 25 7 7 9 1 A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:21 3 we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part 3 A. That's correct, yes. 09:35:22 4 other pring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 5 we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. 5 whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: "According to our philosophical and ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"? 8 A. Yes. 09:33:27 9 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 9 10 A. We owned a home in Cambridge, 09:33:30 10 MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question. 09:35:41 11 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law 11 A. Ibelieve reputation is sacrosanct and I 09:35:53 13 Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:39 10 MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike t | 22 | Q. Would you please state your full name, 09:32:55 | 22 past 30 years, yes. |
| 25 Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 25 New York continuously for the past 30 years? 7 7 9 1 A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 2 0. Mome in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where 2 Q. Is that accurate? 09:35:21 3 we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part 3 A. That's correct, yes. 09:35:22 4 of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 5 we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. 6 Q. Within the last to regress, have you had 09:33:21 6 Q. Within the last to regress, have you had 09:33:27 8 MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're 09:35:39 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 9 MR. SCAROLA: Im just asking a question. 09:35:41 11 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law 10 A. That's correct. 09:35:23 12 School. 12 MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the 09:35:53 13 Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:37 13 <th>23</th> <td>sir?</td> <td>23 Q. You had property where you could stay 09:35:07</td> | 23 | sir? | 23 Q. You had property where you could stay 09:35:07 |
| 7 9 1 A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 2 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where 2 Q. Is that accurate? 09:35:21 3 we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part 3 A. That's correct, yes. 09:35:22 4 of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 5 we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. 5 whether you garee or disagree with the following 6 Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 6 statement: "According to our philosophical and 7 dether tresidence besides those that you've described? 7 ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct:"? 8 A. Yes. 09:33:27 9 publishing from? 9 Q. And where are they? 09:33:30 10 MR. SCAROLA: In just asking a question. 09:35:41 11 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law 12 believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine 13 Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:357 13 by false and malicious charges, yes. 14 M. WescAROLA: I would move to st | 24 | A. Alan Morton Dershowitz. 09:32:57 | ²⁴ overnight, you had access to that property in |
| 1A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:001A. That's correct.09:35:202home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where2Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part3A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then4Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard.5whether you agree or disagree with the following6Q. Within the last ten years, have you had09:33:2167other residence besides those that you've described?7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct''?8A. Yes.09:33:278MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're9Q. And where are they?09:33:279publishing from?10A. We owned a home in Cambridge,09:33:3010MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.11Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:5312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mineby false and malicious charges, yes.14longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:5719great riches''?16ago and then it was ond he market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5617the | 25 | Q. And where did you live? 09:32:59 | 25 New York continuously for the past 30 years? |
| 4of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard.4Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: "According to our philosophical and ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?6Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described?5whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: "According to our philosophical and ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8A. Yes.09:33:278MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399Q. And where are they?09:33:3010MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question. 09:35:4111Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mineby false and malicious charges, yes.14longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:4515BY MR. SCAROLA: (09:35:5609:35:5616ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA: (09:35:5609:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than great riches"?19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:34:022121A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:022122years, yes.22MR. SCAROLA: I move to stri | | | |
| 5We have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard.5We have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard.56Q. Within the last ten years, have you had09:33:216statement: "According to our philosophical and7other residence besides those that you've described?7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanet"?8A. Yes.09:33:278MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399Q. And where are they?09:33:3010MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:391314longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was onthe market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with that. And there's09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and20A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good na | | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 | 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 |
| 6Q. Within the last ten years, have you had09:33:216statement: "According to our philosophical and ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?7other residence besides those that you've described?78A. Yes.09:33:278MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399Q. And where are they?09:33:2799MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4110A. We owned a home in Cambridge,09:33:3010MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4311Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:3913by false and malicious charges, yes.14longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:6018mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three09:34:0220A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three | 2 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where | 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 2 Q. Is that accurate? 09:35:21 |
| 7other residence besides those that you've described?7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct'?8A. Yes.09:33:278MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399Q. And where are they?09:33:279publishing from?10A. We owned a home in Cambridge,09:33:3010MR. SCAROLA: Im just asking a question.09:35:4111Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. Ibelieve reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:391314Ionger have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and20A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and23Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0624MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924A. Moved out earlie | 2 3 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part | 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 2 Q. Is that accurate? 09:35:21 3 A. That's correct, yes. 09:35:22 |
| 8A. Yes.09:33:278MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399Q. And where are they?09:33:279publishing from?10A. We owned a home in Cambridge,09:33:3010MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.11Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mineby false and malicious charges, yes.13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:3913by false and malicious charges, yes.14longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22years, yes.2223Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then | 1 A. That's correct. 09:35:20 2 Q. Is that accurate? 09:35:21 3 A. That's correct, yes. 09:35:22 4 Q. All right. Can you tell me, please, 09:35:23 |
| 9Q. And where are they?09:33:279publishing from?10A. We owned a home in Cambridge,09:33:3010MR. SCAROLA: Im just asking a question.09:35:4111Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy minebelieve that an effort has been made to destroy mine13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:3913by false and malicious charges, yes.14Ionger have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and20approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's 09:36:02been an effort to destroy my good name by false and21A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the22years, yes.22MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0923Q. And you moved out when?09:34:06 <th>2 3 4 5</th> <td>A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard.</td> <td>1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following</td> | 2 3 4 5 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following |
| 10A. We owned a home in Cambridge, Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:301314Ionger have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and20A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0921A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out09:34:0624MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and |
| 11Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law11A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:3913by false and malicious charges, yes.14longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and20approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22years, yes.22MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0923Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"? |
| 12School.12believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:3913believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine14longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:33:0221A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0922years, yes.23Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer.23Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:39 |
| 13Q. And at what point in time did you no09:33:391314longer have the Cambridge home?14by false and malicious charges, yes.15A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the 09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:5719great riches"?20approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's 09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:022122years, yes.2223Q. And you moved out when?09:34:042324A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:062424A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:0624 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from? |
| 14longer have the Cambridge home?14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the 09:35:5315A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:5719great riches"?20approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's 09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22years, yes.22MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the 09:36:0923Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the 09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:27 A. We owned a home in Cambridge, 09:33:30 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: Tm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:43 |
| 15A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years09:33:4515unresponsive portion of the answer.16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:33:571920approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22years, yes.22MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. Q. And where are they? Q. 99:33:27 A. We owned a home in Cambridge, 09:33:30 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine |
| 16ago and then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was on the market for a while. And16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618mind.18following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:33:5719great riches"?20approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22years, yes.2223MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:30 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes. |
| 17then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind.17Q. Do you agree or disagree with the following: "A good name is more desirable than19Q. Sometime within the last three years approximately?09:33:571920approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's been an effort to destroy my good name by false and mendacious charges.23Q. And you moved out when? A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:0609:34:062424A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:0624MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:30 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:53 |
| 18 mind. 18 following: "A good name is more desirable than 19 Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 19 great riches"? 20 approximately? 20 A. I certainly agree with that. And there's 09:36:02 21 A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:02 21 been an effort to destroy my good name by false and 22 years, yes. 22 23 Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:04 23 MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the 09:36:09 24 A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:06 24 unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:39 longer have the Cambridge home? A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:45 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315unresponsive portion of the answer. |
| 19Q. Sometime within the last three years09:33:5719great riches''?20approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22years, yes.2222mendacious charges.23Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law school. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:39 longer have the Cambridge home? A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:56 |
| 20approximately?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's 09:36:0221A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22years, yes.2222mendacious charges.23Q. And you moved out when?09:34:0423MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the 09:36:0924A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:0624unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:30 Magra have the Cambridge home? A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:56 |
| 21 A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:02 21 been an effort to destroy my good name by false and 22 years, yes. 22 been an effort to destroy my good name by false and 23 Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:04 23 MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the 09:36:09 24 A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:06 24 unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 A. We owned a home in Cambridge, 09:33:30 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618following: "A good name is more desirable than |
| 22 years, yes. 22 mendacious charges. 23 Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:04 23 MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the 09:36:09 24 A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:06 24 unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618following: "A good name is more desirable than19great riches"? |
| 23 Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:04 23 MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the 09:36:09 24 A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:06 24 unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 A. We owned a home in Cambridge, 09:33:30 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law school. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 approximately? | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618following: "A good name is more desirable than19great riches''?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:02 |
| 24 A. Moved out earlier than that. Moved out 09:34:06 24 unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law school. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 approximately? A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:02 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618following: "A good name is more desirable than19great riches"?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are they? 09:33:20 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law school. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:30 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law school. A. Well, we moved out of it a couple of years 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 approximately? A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:02 years, yes. | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5315unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618following: "A good name is more desirable than19great riches'"?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22mendacious charges. |
| when we put it on the market. And when i came back | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. 09:33:27 Q. And where are the? 09:33:20 A. We owned a home in Cambridge, 09:33:30 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law school. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 approximately? A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out ofit a couple of years 09:33:45 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618following: "A good name is more desirable than19great riches''?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:09 |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Well, I live in three places. We have a 09:33:00 home in Miami Beach, a small condo apartment where we spend the winters. We live in the fall and part of the spring in an apartment in New York, and then we have a summer place on Martha's Vineyard. Q. Within the last ten years, have you had 09:33:21 other residence besides those that you've described? A. Yes. O9:33:27 Q. And where are they? O9:33:30 Massachusetts about a mile away from the Harvard Law School. Q. And at what point in time did you no 09:33:45 ago and then it was on the market for a while. And then it was sold. I don't have exact dates in my mind. Q. Sometime within the last three years 09:33:57 approximately? A. Certainly was sold within the last three 09:34:02 years, yes. Q. And you moved out when? 09:34:06 | 1A. That's correct.09:35:202Q. Is that accurate?09:35:213A. That's correct, yes.09:35:224Q. All right. Can you tell me, please,09:35:235whether you agree or disagree with the following6statement: "According to our philosophical and7ethical traditions, reputation is sacrosanct"?8MR. SCOTT: Can I ask what you're09:35:399publishing from?10MR. SCAROLA: I'm just asking a question.09:35:4111A. I believe reputation is sacrosanct and I09:35:4312believe that an effort has been made to destroy mine13by false and malicious charges, yes.14MR. SCAROLA: I would move to strike the09:35:5615unresponsive portion of the answer.16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:35:5617Q. Do you agree or disagree with the09:35:5618following: "A good name is more desirable than19great riches"?20A. I certainly agree with that. And there's09:36:0221been an effort to destroy my good name by false and22mendacious charges.23MR. SCAROLA: I move to strike the09:36:0924unresponsive portion of the answer. |

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

| | 10 | | 12 |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:36:12 | 1 | agree or disagree with the statement. |
| 2 | Q. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:36:13 | 2 | MR. SCOTT: It's our position that you're 09:38:38 |
| 3 | following statement: "While throughout history | 3 | reading from something that especially if |
| 4 | reputation has been recognized as a priceless | 4 | you're reading something that he's published, |
| 5 | treasure, it is fragile"? | 5 | he has the option to see it in order to if |
| 6 | A. I think that the longer one maintains a 09:36:28 | 6 | you're quoting from it, we would like to ask |
| 7 | good reputation, as I have for over 50 years, the | 7 | you to produce it so he can read it. |
| 8 | less fragile it is; but, yes, it is fragile and one | 8 | A. It's – it's a metaphorical statement 09:38:53 |
| 9 | false allegation maliciously made by a serial liar | 9 | whose general thrust I agree with, yes. |
| 10 | with the help of her unethical lawyers could destroy | 10 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:38:58 |
| 11 | a fragile or hurt a fragile reputation. | 11 | Q. Thank you. 09:38:59 |
| 12 | MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:36:59 | 12 | A. Thank you very much for reading from my 09:39:01 |
| 13 | unresponsive portion of the answer. | 13 | from my book. Appreciate it. |
| 14 | MR. SCOTT: Obviously we take a different 09:37:01 | 14 | Q. In light of your agreement with the 09:39:10 |
| 15 | position. But go ahead, Jack. | 15 | principles that I have just read, can we also agree |
| 16 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:04 | 16 | that a serious injury to a reputation requires |
| 17 | Q. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:37:05 | 17 | serious monetary compensation if the injury is |
| 18 | following statement: "Sensational accusations, even | 18 | unjustified? |
| 19 | when baseless, often cause damage that is | 19 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, conclusion, 09:39:28 |
| 20 | irreversible''? | 20 | speculation. |
| 21 | A. That is a perfect description of exactly 09:37:15 | 21 | A. I don't think that there is any possible 09:39:32 |
| 22 | what happened to me, yes, at the hands of your | 22 | monetary compensation for the attempt to damage my |
| 23 | clients. | 23 | reputation which your clients have maliciously and |
| 24 | MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:37:24 | 24 | deliberately set out to do for their own financial |
| 25 | unresponsive portion of the answer. | 25 | reasons. |
| | | | |
| | 11 | | 13 |
| | <u> </u> | | 13 |
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 | 1 | 09:39:47 |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | - |
| | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 | | 09:39:47 |
| 2 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 | 2 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 |
| 2 3 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:26Q. Do you degree or disagree with the09:37:27following statement:"There is no presumption of | 2 3 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 |
| 2 3 4 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? | 2 3 4 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. |
| 2 3 4 5 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:26Q. Do you degree or disagree with the09:37:27following statement:"There is no presumption ofinnocence in the court of public opinion"?09:37:35 | 2 3 4 5 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? 09:37:35 A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who | 2 3 4 5 6 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:26Q. Do you degree or disagree with the09:37:27following statement:"There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"?A. I think there's some truth to that. But09:37:35when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against me. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:26Q. Do you degree or disagree with the09:37:27following statement:"There is no presumption ofinocence in the court of public opinion"?A. I think there's some truth to that. But09:37:35when you have a good reputation, there are some whodo presume innocence, particularly when the chargesmade against you are so clearly filled with the liesand financial motivation as were in the instancewhen your clients directed false accusations againstme.MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the09:38:06 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against me. MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:06 unresponsive portion of the answer. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 09:39:47BY MR. SCAROLA:09:39:47Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47question that I asked. So let me try again.MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that.09:39:50BY MR. SCAROLA:09:39:52Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53o9:39:53statements that you have recognized to be accurateregarding the priceless value of reputation, that anunjustified injury to reputation is a serious injurythat requires serious compensation?MR. SCOTT: Same objection.09:40:17A. I don't think that question can be09:40:18 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:26Q. Do you degree or disagree with the09:37:27following statement:"There is no presumption ofinocence in the court of public opinion":09:37:35A. I think there's some truth to that. But09:37:35when you have a good reputation, there are some who09:37:35ade against you are so clearly filled with the liesand financial motivation as were in the instancewhen your clients directed false accusations againstop:38:06uresponsive portion of the answer.09:38:08 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 op:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against me. MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:06 uresponsive portion of the answer. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:38:08 Q. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:38:09 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against me. MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:06 uresponsive portion of the answer. BY MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:08 Q. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:38:09 following statement: "The usual reaction to ugu | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion": 09:37:35 A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against met. MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:06 unresponsive portion of the answer. 09:38:08 Q. Do you agree or disagree with the disagree with the lies of unresponsive portion of the answer. 09:38:08 Q. Do you agree or disagree with the disagree with the lies directed false accusations against met. 09:38:08 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of innocence in the court of public opinion"? 09:37:35 A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against met. MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:06 unesponsive portion of the answer. 09:38:08 Q. Do you agree or disagree with the degree of disagree with the degree of disagree with the disagree of d | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 Q. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 op:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:26 9. Do you degree or disagree with the99:37:27 following statement:"There is no presumption ofinocence in the court of public opinion"? A. I think there's some truth to that. But09:37:35when you have a good reputation, there are some whodo presume innocence, particularly when the chargesmade against you are so clearly filled with the liesand financial motivation as were in the instancewhen your clients directed false accusations againstmust09:38:06unesponsive portion of the answer.BY MR. SCAROLA:Move to strike theOp:38:08 0. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:38:0909:38:09 following statement:"The usual reaction to ugyaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath the sunce, rather than the smoke lies."MR. SCOTT:You want that read back?You '09:38:25 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 outlet 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:50 DY MR. SCAROLA: MI move to strike that 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 Q. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation: MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made against me, I would have turned down that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:27 1. Op you degree or disagree with the09:37:27following statement:"There is no presumption ofinocence in the court of public opinion":A. I think there's some truth to that. But09:37:35when you have a good reputation, there are some whoop resume innocence, particularly when the chargesmade against you are so clearly filled with the liesand financial motivation as were in the instancewhen your clients directed false accusations againstmust09:38:06must SCAROLA:Move to strike the09:38:06must SCAROLA:09:38:08Of no you agree or disagree with the09:38:02following statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath thestatement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual reaction to uggaccusations assumes that fire lies beneath themust statement:"The usual react | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 outsion that I asked. So let me try again MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 0. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made against me, I would have turned down that \$10 million. I think that there is no compensation |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:26 Q. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 oflowing statement: "There is no presumption of inocence in the court of public opinion": A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against met. MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:06 09:38:08 Q. Do you agree or disagree with the 09:38:08 09:38:08 Q. Do you agree or disagree with the or 09:38:05 09:38:08 MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:08 09:38:08 MG. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:08 09:38:08 Moving statement: "The usual reaction to ugly accusations assumes that fire lies beneath the smoke lies." MR. SCOTT: You want that read back? You 09:38:25 ogi ti all? 09:38:31 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | D9:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 O. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 question that I asked. So let me try again. MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that. 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 O. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 09:39:52 Statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury tat requires serious compensation? MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made against me, I would have turned down that \$10 million. I think that there is no compensation possible other than a complete apology and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:37:27 9. Do you degree or disagree with the 09:37:27 09:37:27 following statement: "There is no presumption of indocence in the court of public opinion": 09:37:37 A. I think there's some truth to that. But 09:37:35 09:37:35 when you have a good reputation, there are some who do presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against . MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:38:06 09:38:06 uresponsive portion of the answer. 09:38:08 A. Do you agree or disagree with the distance when your agree or disagree with the distance to the struct of the specific to the struct struct and the specific to the specific t | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 09:39:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 0. State however, is not a response to the 09:39:50 BY MR. SCAROLA: MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:52 0. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation MR. SCOTT: Same objection 09:40:17 A. 1 don't think that question can be 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made against me, I would have turned down that \$10 million. I think that there is no compensation possible other than a complete apology and withdrawal of the false accusations, especially |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | <text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text> | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Dy MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 9. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 (uestion that I asked. So let me try again. 09:39:50 MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that 09:39:50 09:39:52 9. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made against me, I would have turned down that \$10 million. I think that there is no compensation possible other than a complete apology and witdrawal of the false accusations, especially ince your clients know that the accusations made |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | BY MR. SCAROLA:09:37:27 9. On your degree or disagree with the construction of fundiwing statement: "There is no presumption of funcience in the court of public opinion": A. I think there's some truth to that. But construction of presume innocence, particularly when the charges made against you are so clearly filled with the lies and financial motivation as were in the instance when your clients directed false accusations against to use provide the statement.MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the construction.09:38:06BY MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the construction of the answer.09:38:08BY MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the construction of the answer.09:38:08Construction of the answer.09:38:08MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the construction of the answer.09:38:08BY MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the construction of the answer.09:38:08BY MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the construction of the answer.09:38:08MR. SCORT: You want that reaction to uspress accusations assumes that fire lies beneath the struction to uspress accusations assumes that fire lies beneath the struction of the answer.MR. SCOTT: You want that read back? You construction of the answer.00:38:31MR. SCOTT: You want that read back? You construction of the answer.00:38:31MR. Scong construction of the answer. <td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td> <td>Dy MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 9. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 (uestion that I asked. So let me try again. 09:39:50 MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that 09:39:50 09:39:52 9. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made against me, I would have turned down that \$10 million. I think that there is no compensation possible other than a complete apology and witdrawal of the false accusations, especially ince your clients know that the accusations made</td> | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Dy MR. SCAROLA: 09:39:47 9. That, however, is not a response to the 09:39:47 (uestion that I asked. So let me try again. 09:39:50 MR. SCAROLA: And I move to strike that 09:39:50 09:39:52 9. Can we agree that in light of the 09:39:53 09:39:53 statements that you have recognized to be accurate regarding the priceless value of reputation, that an unjustified injury to reputation is a serious injury that requires serious compensation? 09:40:17 A. I don't think that question can be 09:40:18 09:40:18 answered in a yes or no way. I will just reiterate that I think the damage to my reputation exceeds any possible amount of money. If I had been offered \$10 million in exchange for somebody making the kinds of baseless accusations that your clients made against me, I would have turned down that \$10 million. I think that there is no compensation possible other than a complete apology and witdrawal of the false accusations, especially ince your clients know that the accusations made |

www.phippsreporting.com (888)811-3408

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

| | 14 | | 16 |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:41:02 | 1 | A. Yes. 09:43:19 |
| 2 | Q. Do you agree that if an injury to 09:41:03 | 2 | Q. Have you done that? 09:43:20 |
| 3 | reputation is done purposefully and with malice, it | 3 | A. I have conferred with three leading ethics 09:43:21 |
| 4 | is deserving of punishment? | 4 | experts and I have been advised that to file a |
| 5 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, legal conclusion, 09:41:13 | 5 | report while there is ongoing litigation is not the |
| 6 | form, speculation. | 6 | proper approach. But rather to gather the evidence |
| 7 | A. I believe that the accusations leveled 09:41:18 | 7 | and the information and to make sure that all of the |
| 8 | against me were made with malice and with deliberate | 8 | allegations I make are well founded, unlike what |
| 9 | intention, which is why I am going to be seeking | 9 | your clients did, and then at the appropriate time, |
| 10 | disciplinary action, including disbarment, against | 10 | when the litigation is concluded, seek the |
| 11 | your unethical and mendacious clients. | 11 | disbarment of Bar associations. I am advised by my |
| 12 | MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike as 09:41:36 | 12 | ethics experts do not look kindly on attempts to |
| 13 | unresponsive to my question. | 13 | disbar lawyers that can be perceived as part of an |
| 14 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:41:38 | 14 | ongoing litigation strategy. |
| 15 | Q. The question I'm posing to you, sir, is: 09:41:39 | 15 | I fully intend to seek disbarment, as I 09:44:10 |
| 16 | Do you agree that if an injury to reputation is done | 16 | said, of your clients because I believe they engaged |
| 17 | without factual basis and intentionally, it is | 17 | in unprofessional, unethical and disbarrable |
| 18 | deserving of punishment? | 18 | conduct. And I've continued to do so until as |
| 19 | A. What you have done is to describe with 09:41:58 | 19 | recently as last week. |
| 20 | great precision what your clients did to me. And so | 20 | MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:44:28 |
| 21 | the answer to my question is the answer to your | 21 | unresponsive portion of that answer. |
| 22 | question is yes, I think your I think your | 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:44:32 |
| 23 | clients are deserving of punishment, yes. | 23 | Q. Who are the three leading experts with 09:44:33 |
| 24 | Q. Do you believe that you are a special 09:42:09 | 24 | whom you've conferred? |
| 25 | case; that is, that intentional injury to your | 25 | A. The expert I conferred with initially was 09:44:37 |
| | 15 | | 17 |
| 1 | reputation is deserving of punishment but | 1 | Dean Monroe Freedman of the Hofstra law school who |
| 2 | intentional injury to the reputation of others is | 2 | had been my kind of ethical guru for my entire |
| 3 | not deserving of punishment? | | |
| 4 | | 3 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with |
| | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 09:42:24 | 3 4 | |
| 5 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 09:42:24 argumentative, compound. | 1 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with |
| 5 6 | | 4 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. |
| | argumentative, compound. | 4 5 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 |
| 6 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 | 4 5 6 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading |
| 6 7 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and | 4 5 6 7 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a |
| 6 7 8 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think | 4 5 6 7 8 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? A. That's right. That's correct. 09:43:03 | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a Florida Bar Association. And he advised me to bring |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? A. That's right. That's correct. 09:43:03 Q. You are aware of the ethical obligation 09:43:05 | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a Florida Bar Association. And he advised me to bring ethics charges saying that from what he had seen, |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? A. That's right. That's correct. 09:43:03 Q. You are aware of the ethical obligation 09:43:05 that a lawyer has when that lawyer has direct | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a Florida Bar Association. And he advised me to bring ethics charges saying that from what he had seen, the conduct of the lawyers were unethical and |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? A. That's right. That's correct. 09:43:03 Q. You are aware of the ethical obligation 09:43:05 that a lawyer has when that lawyer has direct knowledge of unethical conduct on the part of | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a Florida Bar Association. And he advised me to bring ethics charges saying that from what he had seen, the conduct of the lawyers were unethical and unprofessional and deserved disbarment. But also |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? A. That's right. That's correct. 09:43:03 Q. You are aware of the ethical obligation 09:43:05 that a lawyer has when that lawyer has direct knowledge of unethical conduct on the part of another member of the Bar | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a Florida Bar Association. And he advised me to bring ethics charges saying that from what he had seen, the conduct of the lawyers were unethical and unprofessional and deserved disbarment. But also advised me not to do it until litigation was |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 O. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? A. That's right. That's correct. 09:43:03 O. You are aware of the ethical obligation 09:43:05 that a lawyer has when that lawyer has direct knowledge of unethical conduct on the part of another member of the Bar A. That's right. 09:43:16 | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a Florida Bar Association. And he advised me to bring ethics charges saying that from what he had seen, the conduct of the lawyers were unethical and unprofessional and deserved disbarment. But also advised me not to do it until litigation was concluded. |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | argumentative, compound. A. I certainly don't think I'm a special 09:42:26 case. I think that I have been defamed and deliberately by your clients and I don't think lawyers who engage in such deliberate conduct should be allowed to practice law, which is why I am going to seek their their disbarment and other other sanctions. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:42:49 Q. In fact, you have been making public 09:42:50 statements of your intention to seek the disbarment of Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell for approximately ten months, correct? A. That's right. That's correct. 09:43:03 Q. You are aware of the ethical obligation 09:43:05 that a lawyer has when that lawyer has direct knowledge of unethical conduct on the part of another member of the Bar | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | career. I spent an extensive amount of time with him conferring about all aspects of this case. I then conferred with Professor Stephen 09:44:59 Gillers, who is wildly regarded as the leading current ethics expert in the United States who is a professor at NYU law school. I also conferred with Professor Ronald 09:45:12 Rotunda, and in the process of also received advice, some unsolicited some solicited from a variety of lawyers and other experts. I'll give you an example. For example, when I was speaking at an 09:45:33 event in Florida, a man came over to me who I I don't recall his name, but he worked for a big firm and was on the on some ethics committee of a Florida Bar Association. And he advised me to bring ethics charges saying that from what he had seen, the conduct of the lawyers were unethical and unprofessional and deserved disbarment. But also advised me not to do it until litigation was |

Т

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

| | 18 | 20 |
|----------|---|--|
| 1 | And I would ask, Mr. Scott, that you 09:46:10 | 1 remember events very well. And when I argue cases |
| 2 | counsel your client to be responsive to the | ² in front of courts, I generally don't need to have |
| 3 | questions in order that we have some reasonable | ³ notes in front of me because I remember the cases |
| 4 | expectation of being able to finish this | 4 very well. And I remember the transcript very well, |
| 5 | deposition within my lifetime. | ⁵ and so I have always relied on my good memory in my |
| 6 | MR. SCOTT: I'm not here to exchange 09:46:26 | 6 professional life. |
| 7 | sarcastic comments, Jack, with you. I believe | 7 Q. So, on January 5, when you were 09:48:29 |
| 8 | my client is trying to answer your questions. | 8 interviewed on CNN Live, your memory at that time |
| 9 | MR. SCAROLA: The question asked for names 09:46:32 | ⁹ was superb but in the ensuing ten months, it has |
| 10 | of three individuals. What I got was a speech. | 10 become less than superb? |
| 11 | What I have gotten repeatedly in response to | 11 A. No 09:48:41 |
| 12 | direct questions are speeches. I would ask | 12 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 09:48:41 |
| 13 | that you counsel your client to please respond | ¹³ BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:48:42 |
| 14 | to the questions. | ¹⁴ Q. Is that correct? 09:48:42 |
| 15 | MR. SCOTT: When we take a break, I'll 09:46:45 | 15 A. No, that's not correct. 09:48:42 |
| 16 | speak to my client in general based upon what I | 16 MR. SCOTT: Let me objection, form, 09:48:44 |
| 17 | think is appropriate. Let's proceed. | 17 conclusion, not what he said. |
| 18 | MR. SCAROLA: Thank you. 09:46:54 | 18 A. Memory is a matter of degree and memories 09:48:48 |
| 19 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:46:54 | 19 don't unless there's an illness or trauma, |
| 20 | Q. In an interview with Hala Gorani on 09:46:55 | 20 don't don't suddenly change. I've had no |
| 21 | January 5 of this year, broadcast on CNN Live, you | 21 nothing in my life to dramatically change. But as I |
| 22 | said, "I have a superb memory." | 22 said, as a 77-year-old, my memory is not what it was |
| 23 | Do you acknowledge having made that 09:47:08 | ²³ when I was a 25-year-old. |
| 24 | statement? | ²⁴ BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:49:11 |
| 25 | A. I have a superb memory, so I must have 09:47:10 | 25 Q. Are you under the influence today of any 09:49:11 |
| 1 2 | made that statement. My mother had an extraordinary memory and when I was in college and I was on the | 1 drugs or alcohol that might have an affect on your 2 memory? |
| | memory and when I was in college and I was on the | |
| 3 | debate team, my mother allowed me to debate on the | 3 A. No. 09:49:18 |
| 4 | Sabbath, which was Jewish rest day, only on the | 4 Q. Are you having any physical problems that 09:49:19 |
| 5 | condition that I not take notes or write. And at | 5 might make it difficult for you to understand or |
| 6 | that point I discovered that I have a very good | 6 properly respond to my questions? |
| 7 | memory and don't have to generally didn't have to | 7 A. No. 09:49:24 |
| 8 | take notes. | 8 Q. Did you get a good night's sleep last 09:49:25 |
| 9 | My memory, obviously, at the age of 77 has 09:47:41 | ⁹ night? |
| 10 | slipped a bit; but do I have a very good memory, | 10 A. Yes. 09:49:28 |
| 11 12 | yes. | 11 Q. What is the general condition of your 09:49:28 12 health? |
| 13 | MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 09:47:48 | |
| 14 | unresponsive portions of the answer. | |
| 14 | Would you like to take a break now, 09:47:51 Mr. Scott, so that | |
| 16 | MR. SCOTT: No, I'd like to proceed. 09:47:55 | my atrial fibrillation and a recurrence of some experiences of high blood pressure. But beyond |
| 17 | MR. SCAROLA: Okay. 09:47:56 | that, my general health is satisfactory. |
| 18 | A. Me too. 09:47:57 | 17 Inat, my general nearth is satisfactory. 18 Q. Has any healthcare provider attributed the 09:49:58 |
| 19 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:47:58 | 19 recurrence of your atrial fibrillation to |
| 20 | Q. So it is your contention that you still 09:47:58 | involvement in the circumstances that gave rise to |
| 21 | have a superb memory? | 21 this litigation? |
| 22 | A. No. My contention is that I have a very 09:48:00 | 22 A. My cardiologist asked me whether or not 09:50:15 |
| 23 | good memory and that at the age of 77, occasionally | A. My cardiologist asked the whether of not 09,50,15 there were any tense or tension-causing episodes |
| 24 | my memory slips. I particularly have difficult time | recently that might explain my recurrence of the |
| 25 | now remembering names of people I've just met, but I | atrial fibrillation. And in response I did describe |
| | | |

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

| | | 1 | |
|----------|--|----|--|
| | 22 | | 24 |
| 1 | the current false accusations against me in an | 1 | relieved any symptoms of atrial fibrillation or |
| 2 | attempt to destroy my reputation by false and | 2 | atrial flutter, until they recurred until it |
| 3 | malicious charges, yes. | 3 | recurred about a month or maybe it's a month and a |
| 4 | Q. What is the name of your cardiologist? 09:50:39 | 4 | half now. I can give you the exact dates. Because, |
| 5 | A. Jeremy Ruskin, R-U-S-K-I-N. He's the 09:50:41 | 5 | as I say, I have it on my on my machine. |
| 6 | chief of electro cardio physiology at Massachusetts | 6 | Q. When did the atrial flutter occur? 09:54:16 |
| 7 | General Hospital. | 7 | A. I told you that I don't have the exact 09:54:20 |
| 8 | Q. Has any healthcare provider attributed 09:50:53 | 8 | date, but it occurred about a month, month and a |
| 9 | your high blood pressure to events that are the | 9 | half ago, I think sometime in August of this year. |
| 10 | subject of this litigation? | 10 | But I can give you the exact date. As I said, I |
| 11 | A. Again, when I complained about high blood 09:51:01 | 11 | have it on my machine. |
| 12 | pressure, one of the first questions that I'm asked | 12 | Q. So, what you have described as a 09:54:33 |
| 13 | is whether or not there's any tension or any tense | 13 | recurrence of atrial fibrillation you are now |
| 14 | experiences occurring in my life and the doctor | 14 | describing as an atrial flutter? |
| 15 | who's treated me for high blood pressure is | 15 | A. You're confused, sir. Please listen to my 09:54:42 |
| 16 | Dr. Harold Solomon, S-O-L-O-M-O-N, in Brookline, | 16 | answers. What I've said was that I had atrial |
| 17 | Massachusetts. | 17 | flutter. Atrial flutter occurred after my initial |
| 18 | Q. Has Dr. Solomon 09:51:24 | 18 | atrial fib. I then had an ablation. The flutter |
| 19 | A. Right. 09:51:27 | 19 | and the fib both disappeared after the ablation. |
| 20 | Q attributed your high blood pressure to 09:51:27 | 20 | And my atrial fib has returned. |
| 21 | events related to this litigation? | 21 | Q. Given your superb memory, would you please 09:55:13 |
| 22 | A. I think all of my doctors have 09:51:34 | 22 | name for us each of the lawyers who has represented |
| 23 | concluded you'll have to ask them that this | 23 | you in this case? |
| 24 | lawsuit has been a contributing factor to some of | 24 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 09:55:22 |
| 25 | the health issues let me withdraw that. That the | 25 | Argumentative. |
| | | | |
| | 23 | | 25 |
| 1 | false accusations against me from your client have | 1 | If you need a document or anything to 09:55:29 |
| 2 | contributed to some of my health problems, yes. | 2 | refresh your memory, please let us know. |
| 3 | Q. When did your atrial fibrillation recur? 09:52:00 | 3 | A. Well, I'll start with the names of my 09:55:34 |
| 4 | A. About a month ago. About a month ago. 09:52:07 | 4 | lawyers. I've been represented by Judge Scott and |
| 5 | I I could get you the exact date because I keep a | 5 | his law firm, including several associates and |
| б | record with a small cardiogram of my afib pretty | 6 | paralegals. I don't know their status, whether |
| 7 | much every day. | 7 | they're partners, associates or paralegals, but I've |
| 8 | Q. When did your blood pressure increase as a 09:52:23 | 8 | had contact with them. |
| 9 | result of events related to this litigation? | 9 | I have been represented by Mr. Simpson's 09:55:54 |
| 10 | A. Well, it's been up and down. I've had 09:52:31 | 10 | law firm, including several partners, associates, |
| 11 | recurring episodes of high blood pressure. And I | 11 | and paralegals. I've been represented by Kenneth |
| 12 | think particularly since the beginning of the false | 12 | Sweder and presumably some of his partners and |
| 13 | charges, not the litigation, but it's the false | 13 | associates. |
| 14 | charges, the outrageous allegations, baseless | 14 | I've been represented by Kendall Coffey 09:56:15 |
| 15 | outrageous allegations against me have certainly | 15 | and several of his associates and partners. I would |
| 16 | contributed in my view to my variation in blood | 16 | say those are my main lawyers. But I've also had |
| 17 | pressure, yes. | 17 | others. |
| 18 | Q. When were you initially diagnosed with 09:53:07 | 18 | I have sought the legal advice of Mark 09:56:34 |
| 19 | atrial fibrillation? | 19 | Fabiani, who was my former research assistant at |
| 20 | A. About two and a half years ago I had 09:53:17 | 20 | Harvard. I've sought the advice of Mitchell Webber, |
| 21 | let's see, December two and a half years ago | 21 | who was my former research assistant at Harvard. |
| 22 | December I was admitted to Mount Sinai Hospital with | 22 | I was offered legal advice by Carlos 09:56:52 |
| 23 | an episode. It then basically went away. And then | 23 | Sires, who was who is a partner in the Boise firm |
| 24 25 | it returned as atrial flutter. | 24 | who who volunteered to represent me along with |
| 25 | And then I had an ablation, which cured or 09:53:48 | 25 | one of his partners, but then withdraw from the |
| | | 1 | |

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

| | 26 | 28 |
|--|--|---|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | representation when he discovered that I had a | |
| 3 | conflict of interest. | |
| 4 | I've had consultations with a variety of 09:57:18 | 3 A. Yes. Yes. 09:59:52 4 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:53 |
| 5 | other lawyers over particular issues in the case, | B F MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:53 Q. And Mark Fabiani is representing you with 09:59:53 |
| 6 | Floyd Abrams, who is probably the leading lawyer in | 2 |
| 7 | the world on First Amendment, has advised me on my First Amendment rights to have said what I said | 6 regard to this litigation; is that correct? 7 A. Yes, yes. 09:59:57 |
| 8 | C | 7 A. Tes, yes. 09.59.57 8 O. Floyd Abrams is representing you now with 09:59:58 |
| 9 | truthfully and expressed my opinion about your clients. | 9 regard to this litigation; is that correct? |
| 10 | | 10 A. Yes. 10:00:01 |
| 11 | I mean, that's the very beginning. But 09:57:51 when the events first occurred, I got calls from | 11 Q. Mitch Webber is representing you now with 10:00:02 |
| 12 | dozens of lawyers outraged by the unethical conduct | 12 regard to this litigation; is that correct? |
| 13 | of your clients and offering to represent me | 13 A. That's correct, yes. 10:00:06 |
| 14 | pro bono, offering to do anything they could to see | 14 Q. Is Steven Safra representing you with 10:00:11 |
| 15 | that these lawyers were appropriately punished and | 15 regard to this litigation? |
| 16 | disciplined. | 16 A. Yes. 10:00:15 |
| 17 | David Markus, for example, of the Miami 09:58:17 | 17 Q. Is Mary Borja representing you now with 10:00:15 |
| 18 | Bar called and keeps calling asking if there's | 18 regard to this litigation? |
| 19 | anything he can do to help me. | 19 A. Yes. 10:00:19 |
| 20 | There's a lawyer in Broward named Diner, 09:58:28 | 20 Q. Is Ashley Eiler representing you now with 10:00:20 |
| 21 | who has offered to represent me. It goes on and on | 21 regard to this litigation? |
| 22 | and on. The offers are still coming in. People are | 22 A. That's not a name that immediately comes 10:00:24 |
| 23 | just absolutely outraged by the unprofessional and | 23 to my head, but I believe it's an associate in one |
| 24 | unethical conduct of your clients and are offering | 24 of the law firms. I don't know the names of all the |
| 25 | to help me right a wrong and undo an injustice. | 25 lawyers who are doing the background work on the |
| | | |
| | | |
| | 27 | 29 |
| 1 | 2.7 MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 | 1 case for the law firms. |
| 1 2 | | |
| | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 | 1 case for the law firms. |
| 2 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 |
| 2 3 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? |
| 2 3 4 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. | 1 case for the law firms. 2 Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 3 with regard to this litigation? 4 A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. | 1 case for the law firms. 2 Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 3 with regard to this litigation? 4 A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 5 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? | 1 case for the law firms. 2 Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 3 with regard to this litigation? 4 A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 5 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 6 regard to this litigation? 7 A. Yes. 10:00:49 8 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 |
| 2 3 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:24 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:24 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:25 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:24 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:25 now; is that correct? | 1 case for the law firms. 2 Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 3 with regard to this litigation? 4 A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 5 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 6 regard to this litigation? 7 A. Yes. 10:00:49 8 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 9 regard to this litigation? 10 A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 11 that. 12 Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 13 regard to this litigation? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:24 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:25 now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? | 1 case for the law firms. 2 Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 3 with regard to this litigation? 4 A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 5 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 6 regard to this litigation? 7 A. Yes. 10:00:49 8 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 9 regard to this litigation? 10 A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 11 that. 12 Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 13 regard to this litigation? 14 A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:09 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a 11111 little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. 09:59:16 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct. 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:29 A. That's correct. 09:59:28 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:09 paralegal for the last some years and I have used |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a 1 little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. 09:59:16 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:25 now; is that correct? 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 Q. Is Kendall Coffey representing you now? 09:59:30 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:09 paralegal for the last some years and I have used her to perform paralegal work for me in this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a 09:59:00 little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. 09:59:16 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:28 now; is that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:27 G. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. Yes. 09:59:33 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:09 paralegal for the last some years and I have used her to perform paralegal work for me in this litigation. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. 09:59:10 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 09:59:22 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is operating you now; is that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is operating you now; is that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:33 Q. Is Kendall Coffey representing you now? 09:59:30 A. Yes. 09:59:33 | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:09 paralegal for the last some years and I have used her to perform paralegal work for me in this litigation. Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:27 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's09:59:00making noise on the phone and it's causing alittle disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone.Thanks.MR. SCAROLA:09:59:16BY MR. SCAROLA:09:59:21 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21you now; is that correct?09:59:24A. That's correct.09:59:27A. That's correct.09:59:27Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is09:59:28that correct?09:59:27A. That's correct, yes.09:59:28A. That's correct, yes.09:59:29A. That's correct, yes.09:59:20A. That's correct, yes.09:59:23A. That's correct, yes.09:59:30A. That's correct, yes.09:59:31Q. Is Kendall Coffey representing you now?09:59:30A. Yes.09:59:33Q. Is Mark Fabiani representing you now?09:59:35A. Yes.09:59:37 | 1case for the law firms.2Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:373with regard to this litigation?4A. Again, yes, yes.5Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:466regard to this litigation?7A. Yes.8Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:519regard to this litigation?10A. Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:5911that.12Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:0613regard to this litigation?14A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:0915paralegal for the last some years and I have used16her to perform paralegal work for me in this17litigation.18Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:2719with regard to this litigation? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:25 now; is that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. Is Kendall Coffey representing you now? 09:59:35 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. Is Mark Fabiani representing you now? 09:59:35 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. And when I ask "are they representing you 09:59:38 | 1case for the law firms.2Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:373with regard to this litigation?4A. Again, yes, yes.5Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:466regard to this litigation?7A. Yes.8Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:519regard to this litigation?10A. Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:5911that.12Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:0613regard to this litigation?14A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:0915paralegal for the last some years and I have used16her to perform paralegal work for me in this17litigation.18Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:2719with regard to this litigation?20A. Nicholas Maisel is my research assistant 10:01:31 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:24 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:25 now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. Yes. 09:59:33 Q. Is Kendall Coffey representing you now? 09:59:35 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. Is Mark Fabiani representing you now? 09:59:38 mow," they're representing you now in this | 1case for the law firms.2Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:373with regard to this litigation?4A. Again, yes, yes.5Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:466regard to this litigation?7A. Yes.8Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:519regard to this litigation?10A. Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:5911that.12Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:0613regard to this litigation?14A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:0915paralegal for the last some years and I have used16her to perform paralegal work for me in this17litigation.18Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:2719with regard to this litigation?20A. Nicholas Maisel is my research assistant 10:01:3121and paralegal on this litigation, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Richard Simpson is still representing you 09:59:28 now; is that correct? 09:59:27 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 that correct? 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:37 Q. Is Kendall Coffey representing you now? 09:59:30 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. Is Mark Fabiani representing you now? 09:59:35 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. And when I ask ''are they representing you 09:59:38 now,'' they're representing you now in this 109:59:37 | 1case for the law firms.2Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:373with regard to this litigation?4A. Again, yes, yes.5Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:466regard to this litigation?7A. Yes.8Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:519regard to this litigation?10A. Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:5911that.12Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:0613regard to this litigation?14A. Sarah Neely nepresenting you now with 10:01:0915paralegal for the last some years and I have used16her to perform paralegal work for me in this17litigation.18Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:2719with regard to this litigation?20A. Nicholas Maisel is my research assistant 10:01:3121and paralegal on this litigation, yes.22Q. Is your wife representing you with regard 10:01:39 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. 09:59:16 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:26 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you 09:59:25 now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. Is Mark Fabiani representing you now? 09:59:35 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. And when I ask 'are they representing you oversenting you oversenting you oversenting you now; is that correct? Q. And when I ask 'are they representing you oversenting you oversenting you now; they're representing you now; they're representing you now; is they're representing y | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:09 paralegal for the last some years and I have used her to perform paralegal work for me in this litigation. Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:27 with regard to this litigation? A. Nicholas Maisel is my research assistant 10:01:31 and paralegal on this litigation, yes. Q. Is your wife representing you with regard 10:01:39 to this litigation? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Initle disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:16 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 09:59:24 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing you 09:59:25 09:59:27 M. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is that correct? 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 09:59:27 Q. Is Kendall Coffey representing you now? 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:33 Q. Is Kandall Coffey representing you now? 09:59:35 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. And when I ask ''are they representing you solow?'' they're representing you now; is that correct? MR. SCOTT: I don't think that 09:59:45 objection, form. I don't think that 09:59:45 | 1case for the law firms.2Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:373with regard to this litigation?4A. Again, yes, yes.5Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:466regard to this litigation?7A. Yes.8Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:519regard to this litigation?10A. Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:5911that.12Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:0613regard to this litigation?14A. Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:0615paralegal for the last some years and I have used16her to perform paralegal work for me in this17litigation.18Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:2719with regard to this litigation?20A. Nicholas Maisel is my research assistant 10:01:3121and paralegal on this litigation, yes.22Q. Is your wife representing you with regard 10:01:3923to this litigation?24A. My wife has been instrumental in helping 10:01:42 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. SCOTT: Just hold it. Somebody's 09:59:00 making noise on the phone and it's causing a little disruption here. So, you know, I'm not sure who it is, one of you-all on the phone. Thanks. 09:59:16 BY MR. SCAROLA: 09:59:26 Q. Mr. Scott is obviously still representing 09:59:21 you now; is that correct? 09:59:24 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you 09:59:25 now; is that correct? A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 A. That's correct. 09:59:27 Q. Ken Sweder is representing you now; is 09:59:28 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. That's correct, yes. 09:59:30 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. Is Mark Fabiani representing you now? 09:59:35 A. Yes. 09:59:37 Q. And when I ask 'are they representing you oversenting you oversenting you oversenting you now; is that correct? Q. And when I ask 'are they representing you oversenting you oversenting you now; they're representing you now; they're representing you now; is they're representing y | case for the law firms. Q. Is Nicole Richardson representing you now 10:00:37 with regard to this litigation? A. Again, yes, yes. 10:00:41 Q. Is Gabe Groisman representing you now with 10:00:46 regard to this litigation? A. Yes. 10:00:49 Q. Is Ben Brodsky representing you now with 10:00:51 regard to this litigation? A. Ben Brodsky? I would have to check on 10:00:59 that. Q. Is Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely representing you now with 10:01:06 regard to this litigation? A. Sarah Neely has been my assistant and 10:01:09 paralegal for the last some years and I have used her to perform paralegal work for me in this litigation. Q. Is Nicholas Maisel representing you now 10:01:27 with regard to this litigation? A. Nicholas Maisel is my research assistant 10:01:31 and paralegal on this litigation, yes. Q. Is your wife representing you with regard 10:01:39 to this litigation? |

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

| | 30 | 32 |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | knows more about records and where my records are | ¹ become part of my legal team and to examine some of |
| 2 | kept and I've asked her to perform paralegal service | ² the witnesses in this case. |
| 3 | in addition to her loving service as my wife. | ³ BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:03:55 |
| 4 | Q. Is Harvey Silverglate representing you now 10:02:04 | 4 Q. Did you ever accept that offer from Nancy 10:03:56 |
| 5 | with regard to this litigation? | ⁵ Gertner |
| 6 | A. Yes. 10:02:08 | 6 A. Yes. 10:03:59 |
| 7 | Q. Is Mark Fabiani representing you now with 10:02:09 | 7 Q so as to establish an attorney-client 10:03:59 |
| 8 | regard to this litigation? | 8 relationship with |
| 9 | A. You've asked me that question and the 10:02:12 | 9 A. Yes. 10:04:04 |
| 10 | answer is | 10Q. So she is one of your lawyers10:04:04 |
| 11 | Q. No, I asked you, sir, if he was your 10:02:14 | 11 A. She is currently I regard her currently 10:04:05 |
| 12 | lawyer; but I haven't asked you whether he's | 12 as one of my lawyers, yes. |
| 13 | representing you now with regard to this litigation. | 13Q. And is Mitch Webber one of your lawyers in 10:04:08 |
| 14 | A. The answer is yes. 10:02:20 | ¹⁴ this case? |
| 15 | Q. Is Floyd Abrams representing you now with 10:02:22 | ¹⁵ A. Yes. 10:04:11 |
| 16 | regard to this litigation? | 16Q. But if I just give you a name without10:04:12 |
| 17 | A. Yes. 10:02:25 | 17 repeating the second part, "is that one of the |
| 18 | Q. Is Jamin Dershowitz representing you now 10:02:26 | 18 lawyers in your case," will you understand |
| 19 20 | with regard to this litigation? | 19 A. I understand. 10:04:21 20 O that I'm asking you with regard to 10:04:22 |
| 20 | A. Yes. 10:02:30O. Is Nancy Gertner representing you now with 10:02:32 | Q. unit i in using you with regard to 10104.22 |
| 22 | c. Is Nancy Germer representing you now with 10:02:52 regard to this litigation? | these each of these individuals whether they are a lawyer representing you in this case? |
| 23 | A. That requires a lengthier answer, if you 10:02:36 | 23 A. Yes. 10:04:30 |
| 24 | will permit me. | 24 Q. Okay. Anthony Julius? 10:04:30 |
| 25 | Q. I haven't stopped you yet. 10:02:41 | 25 A. Anthony Julius is a British barrister and 10:04:35 |
| | | |
| | 31 | 33 |
| 1 | A. You've tried. 10:02:43 | 1 solicitor who I conferred with regarding the |
| | | |
| 2 | Q. Much as I may have liked to. 10:02:44 | 2 possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients |
| 2 3 | Q. Much as I may have liked to. 10:02:44 A. You've tried. 10:02:45 | |
| | | 2 possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients |
| 3 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 | 2 possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients 3 in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on |
| 3 4 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 | 2 possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients 3 in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on 4 matters relating to defamation. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 | A. You've tried.10:02:45MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably10:02:47one of the few times you and I agree on | 2 possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients 3 in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on 4 matters relating to defamation. 5 Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 6 lawyers representing you with regard to matters 7 relating to this lawsuit? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by - 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. | 2 possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients 3 in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on 4 matters relating to defamation. 5 Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 6 lawyers representing you with regard to matters 7 relating to this lawsuit? 8 A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 9 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 10 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him that what I've been accused of could not possibly | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him that what I've been accused of could not possibly have happened and there must have been a mistake or | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the general picture. So, I do regard him as one of my |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him that what I've been accused of could not possibly have happened and there must have been a mistake or something. And clearly she had confused me with | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the general picture. So, I do regard him as one of my lawyers in this litigation, yes. I certainly regard |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him that what I've been accused of could not possibly have happened and there must have been a mistake or something. And clearly she had confused me with someone else. | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the general picture. So, I do regard him as one of my lawyers in this litigation, yes. I certainly regard him as having been given privileged information as |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him that what I've been accused of could not possibly have happened and there must have been a mistake or something. And clearly she had confused me with someone else. And as I understand it, Nancy Gertner made 10:03:29 | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the general picture. So, I do regard him as one of my lawyers in this litigation, yes. I certainly regard him as having been given privileged information as part of a lawyer-client privilege, yes. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him that what I've been accused of could not possibly have happened and there must have been a mistake or something. And clearly she had confused me with someone else. And as I understand it, Nancy Gertner made 10:03:29 that phone call to your client, Professor Cassell, | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the general picture. So, I do regard him as one of my lawyers in this litigation, yes. I certainly regard him as having been given privileged information as part of a lawyer-client privilege, yes. Q. There there may be a time when I need 10:05:47 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. You've tried. 10:02:45 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Scarola, that's probably 10:02:47 one of the few times you and I agree on something. MR. SCAROLA: No, we've agreed on a lot, 10:02:52 Tom. MR. SCOTT: Yeah, we I'm kidding you. 10:02:55 I'm kidding you. MR. SCAROLA: I know you are. 10:02:57 A. Nancy Gertner is one of the attorneys who 10:02:58 called me immediately and expressed outrage at what was happening to me and offered to help me. Initially she wanted to help me by calling your client, Professor Cassell, and explaining to him that what I've been accused of could not possibly have happened and there must have been a mistake or something. And clearly she had confused me with someone else. And as I understand it, Nancy Gertner made 10:03:29 that phone call to your client, Professor Cassell, and Professor Cassell reiterated his false | possibility of filing lawsuits against your clients in Great Britain. I continue to confer with him on matters relating to defamation. Q. So you consider him to be one of your 10:04:54 lawyers representing you with regard to matters relating to this lawsuit? A. I'll stand by 10:05:00 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:05:01 A my answer. I'll stand by my answer. 10:05:02 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:05:04 Q. Charles Ogletree? 10:05:05 A. Charles Ogletree is a close personal 10:05:06 friend and colleague at the Harvard Law School with whom I have conferred about this case. I always have regarded him as a personal attorney and continue to confer with him about this case and the general picture. So, I do regard him as one of my lawyers in this litigation, yes. I certainly regard him as having been given privileged information as part of a lawyer-client privilege, yes. Q. There there may be a time when I need 10:05:47 more than just an answer to the question that I'm |

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

| | 34 | | 36 |
|----------|--|----------|--|
| 1 | So if you would, please, I would 10:06:01 | 1 | your clients' false and mendacious allegations |
| 2 | appreciate it if you would tell me only whether | 2 | regarding me and Virginia Roberts. |
| 3 | these individuals are or are not your lawyers in | 3 | O. Jeanne Baker? 10:08:30 |
| 4 | this case. | 4 | A. Jeanne Baker is a long-term associate, 10:08:32 |
| 5 | A. I'm sorry, but I cannot comply with that. 10:06:09 | 5 | legal associate and friend who also called and |
| 6 | I'm | 6 | offered me legal help, legal representation, and I |
| 7 | Q. Well, you can but you refuse to. 10:06:12 | 7 | continue to confer with her on a privileged basis. |
| 8 | MR. SCOTT: Let's not interrupt him. 10:06:14 | 8 | Q. Rick Pildes? 10:08:51 |
| 9 | A. Let me complete my answer, please. 10:06:16 | 9 | A. Rick Pildes is a professor at New York 10:08:53 |
| 10 | MR. SCOTT: It doesn't help the court 10:06:17 | 10 | University law school and I sought his legal advice |
| 11 | reporter or the record. | 11 | on a particular issue in this case. And continue to |
| 12 | A. I've been teaching legal ethics for close 10:06:19 | 12 | seek his legal advice. |
| 13 | to 40 years. I understand the complexity of the | 13 | Q. Susan Rosen? 10:09:03 |
| 14 | lawyer-client relationship. And it's impossible as | 14 | A. Susan Rosen is a prominent lawyer in 10:09:04 |
| 15 | to some of the names you've mentioned to simply give | 15 | Charleston, South Carolina and a cousin of my |
| 16 | a yes or no answer to whether they are representing | 16 | wife's. And she has offered me legal advice about |
| 17 | me in this case. | 17 | this case as recently as two days ago. |
| 18 | What I can do is give you the facts and 10:06:39 | 18 | Q. Alex MacDonald? 10:09:24 |
| 19 | then you and others can draw legal conclusions from | 19 | A. Alex MacDonald is my personal lawyer in 10:09:25 |
| 20 | those facts. But I – I cannot, under my oath to | 20 | several instances in Massachusetts and he has |
| 21 | tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the | 21 | offered me advice and consultation on this case, |
| 22 | truth, respond to questions with yes or no answers | 22 | again volunteering in an effort to undo the horrible |
| 23 | when those questions do not call for simplistic yes | 23 | injustice that was done to me by your clients' |
| 24 | or no answers. | 24 | mendacious willful and unprofessional conduct and |
| 25 | or no unswers. | 25 | leveling of false charges, sexual misconduct against |
| | | | levening of fuse energes, sevial misconduct against |
| | 35 | | 37 |
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:07:01 | 1 | me at a time when they knew it wasn't true and |
| 2 | Q. Is Philip Heymann a lawyer representing 10:07:01 | 2 | seeking to repeat that charge after they knew that |
| 3 | you in this case? | 3 | it was impossible that I could have engaged in any |
| 4 | A. I have conferred with Philip Heymann on 10:07:04 | 4 | of the conduct that they have accused me of. |
| 5 | several occasions about several aspects of this case | 5 | Q. Barbara Gillers? 10:10:05 |
| 6 | and I regard him, for purposes of lawyer-client | 6 | A. Barbara Gillers is at professor at NYU law 10:10:06 |
| 7 | privilege, as one of my lawyers on this case. | 7 | school and also the wife of Steven Gillers and she, |
| 8 | Q. David Oscar Markus, same question? 10:07:18 | 8 | along with Steven Gillers, have advised me and |
| 9 | MR. SCOTT: We covered him, didn't we? 10:07:22 | 9 | conferred with me about the legal ethics aspects of |
| 10 | A. David Oscar Markus is a former student and 10:07:23 | 10 | this case. |
| 11 | research assistant of mine. Lives in Miami and | 11 | Q. So you consider her to be one of your 10:10:19 |
| 12 | practices law. And he has repeatedly called and | 12 | lawyers in this case, is that |
| 13 | offered me legal representation. Has offered to | 13 | A. I can 10:10:22 |
| 14 | help me in the legal context of this case. And I've | 14 | MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. Go ahead. 10:10:23 |
| 15 | conferred with him on lawyer-client confidential | 15 | Let me make an objection. I know you're just |
| 16 | basis about this case on several occasion. | 16 | trying to answer, but go ahead, you can answer, |
| 17 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:07:49 | 17 | sir. |
| 18 | Q. Thomas Wiegand? 10:07:49 | 18 | A. Sorry. I regard my conversations with her 10:10:29 |
| 19 | A. Thomas Wiegand is a litigator in Chicago 10:07:51 | 19 | as having come within the lawyer-client privilege. |
| 20 | with whom I worked along with Carlos Sires and | 20 | We've conferred on a number of occasions about the |
| 21 | Sigrid McCawley on the Guma Aguiar case in Florida. | 21 | ethical misconduct of your clients. |
| 22 | And as soon as this case occurred, Thomas Wiegand | 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:10:43 |
| 23 | was one of those lawyers who called and offered to | 23 | Q. Rana Dershowitz? 10:10:43 |
| | was one of those lawyers who caned and offered to | 1 | • |
| 24 | represent me and do whatever he could to help undo | 24 | A. Rana Dershowitz is my niece and Harvard 10:10:45 |
| 24 25 | | 24 25 | - |

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

| | 50 | |
|--|---|--|
| 1 | U.S. Olympic Committee and a prominent lawyer in | ¹ Q. Charles Johnson? 10:13:31 |
| 2 | Colorado. And I've conferred with her on numerous | 2 A. Charles Johnson is my former research 10:13:32 |
| 3 | occasions about litigation and strategy and aspects | ³ assistant and paralegal. I think we've taken his |
| 4 | of this case. | 4 name off the list of lawyers because he now, I |
| 5 | Q. Ella Dershowitz? 10:11:05 | ⁵ think, performs more of a journalistic job than a |
| 6 | A. Ella Dershowitz is my daughter and she has 10:11:06 | 6 legal one, though he has offered to help me gather |
| 7 | served as a paralegal helping me gather material. I | 7 information on your clients. |
| 8 | don't think I regard her I certainly don't regard | 8 Q. When did you cease considering Charles 10:14:02 |
| 9 | her as a lawyer in the case. But I regard her as | ⁹ Johnson to be your lawyer with regard to matters |
| 10 | somebody who has been a part of our kind of legal | ¹⁰ relating to this case? |
| 11 | team. | 11 A. After a conference with my attorneys in 10:14:10 |
| 12 | Q. Ellen Dershowitz? 10:11:29 | 12 Washington, D.C. about ten days ago or so. We went |
| 13 | A. Ellen 10:11:32 | 13 through the list and that was one that I said was |
| 14 | Q. Elon? 10:11:33 | 14 too close a question and I would regard him more as |
| 15 | A. Elon Dershowitz is my oldest son, child, 10:11:34 | a blogger and a journalist than as a lawyer. But |
| 16 | and he has served repeatedly in a paralegal capacity | 16 it's a close question. |
| 17 | in this case helping me to gather information and | ¹⁷ Q. David Efron? 10:14:32 |
| 18 | evidence and doing some investigative work for me. | 18A. David Efron is a prominent lawyer in10:14:33 |
| 19 | Q. Nathan Dershowitz? 10:11:52 | 19 Miami, Florida and Puerto Rico. He was one who |
| 20 | A. Nathan Dershowitz is my brother. He's a 10:11:52 | 20 called me immediately and offered his assistance, |
| 21 | distinguished attorney in New York, had his own law | 21 the assistance of his law firm. I've conferred with |
| 22 | firm. And he and I did a lot of our legal cases | him repeatedly about this case. |
| 23 | together and as soon as this case emerged, I | Q. In an attorney-client capacity; is that 10:14:54 |
| 24 | conferred with him and have conferred with him on | 24 correct? |
| 25 | numerous occasions about this case. | 25 A. Yes. 10:14:57 |
| | | |
| | 39 | 41 |
| | 55 | |
| 1 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 | 1 Q. Ashe? 10:14:57 |
| 1 2 | | 1 Q. Ashe? 10:14:57 2 A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:57 |
| | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 | |
| 2 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? | 2 A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 |
| 2 3 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers10:12:14in this case?A. Yes.10:12:16 | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was |
| 2 3 4 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers10:12:14in this case?A. Yes.10:12:16Q. Ben Brafman?10:12:17 | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. Because he could help me gather all the information |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers10:12:14in this case?.A. Yes10:12:16.Q. Ben Brafman?.10:12:17A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal.10:12:19lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. Because he could help me gather all the information necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. Because he could help me gather all the information necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. Because he could help me gather all the information necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office who specializes in sex |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. Because he could help me gather all the information necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office who specializes in sex trafficking. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14in this case?A. Yes.D:12:16Q. Ben Brafman?10:12:17A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York?He has volunteered to help me in any way he could inthis case and we have conferred and I have soughtlegal advice from him in this in this matter.Q. Arthur Aidala?10:12:36 | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. Because he could help me gather all the information necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office who specializes in sex trafficking. I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:49 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14in this case?10:12:16A. Yes.10:12:17A. Ben Brafman?10:12:17A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York?He has volunteered to help me in any way he could inthis case and we have conferred and I have soughtlegal advice from him in this in this matter.Q. Arthur Aidala?10:12:36A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 | A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one 10:14:5 of the first people I called on the day I was informed of the lies being spread by your clients. Because he could help me gather all the information necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office who specializes in sex trafficking. I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:49 immediately, that the only time I was ever at |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers10:12:14in this case?.A. Yes0:12:16Q. Ben Brafman?.0:12:17A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal.10:12:19lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York?He has volunteered to help me in any way he could inthis case and we have conferred and I have soughtlegal advice from him in this in this matter.Q. Arthur Aidala?.10:12:36A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of10:12:38the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a8prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a8prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a8prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey I0:16:15 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try to undo the injustice perpetrated on me by your | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey I0:16:1519Epstein had bought a ranch, a very large ranch in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try to undo the injustice perpetrated on me by your clients' mendacious and false and unethical allegations against me, and I continue to confer with him. | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey 10:16:1519Epstein had bought a ranch, a very large ranch in20New Mexico and Ashe was very interested in the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try to undo the injustice perpetrated on me by your clients' mendacious and false and unethical allegations against me, and I continue to confer | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a8prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey 10:16:1519Epstein had bought a ranch, a very large ranch in20New Mexico and Ashe was very interested in the21outdoors and asked me if I would do him a favor and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try to undo the injustice perpetrated on me by your clients' mendacious and false and unethical allegations against me, and I continue to confer with him. | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a8prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew13immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey10:16:1519Epstein had bought a ranch, a very large ranch in20New Mexico and Ashe was very interested in the21outdoors and asked me if I would do him a favor and22call to see if we could just take a look at what the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought lead advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try to undo the injustice perpetrated on me by your clients' mendacious and false and unethical alegations against me, and I continue to confer with him. Q. David Zornow? 10:12:15 | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a8prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew13immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey10New Mexico and Ashe was very interested in the21outdoors and asked me if I would do him a favor and22call to see if we could just take a look at what the23ranch looked like. And I did that. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought lead advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try to undo the injustice perpetrated on me by your clients' mendacious and false and unethical algations against me, and I continue to confer twith the them. Q. David Zornow? 10:13:17 | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a9prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey 10:16:1519Epstein had bought a ranch, a very large ranch in20New Mexico and Ashe was very interested in the21outdoors and asked me if I would do him a favor and22call to see if we could just take a look at what the23ranch looked like. And I did that.24And we spent about an hour looking around 10:16:3 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. You consider him to be one of your lawyers 10:12:14 in this case? A. Yes. 10:12:16 Q. Ben Brafman? 10:12:17 A. Ben Brafman is one of the leading criminal 10:12:19 lawyers and general lawyers in the City of New York? He has volunteered to help me in any way he could in this case and we have conferred and I have sought legal advice from him in this in this matter. Q. Arthur Aidala? 10:12:36 A. Arthur Aidala is a distinguished member of 10:12:38 the who's president of the Brooklyn Bar Association and a former district attorney in Brooklyn. He has volunteered to help me. He was outraged at the unethical behavior of your clients and has sought the opportunity to do everything in his power to try to undo the injustice perpetrated on me by your clients' mendacious and false and unethical allegations against me, and I continue to confer with him. Q. David Zornow? 10:13:17 partner at Skadden Arps in New York. He has offered | 2A. Thomas Ashe is not a lawyer. He was one10:14:53of the first people I called on the day I was4informed of the lies being spread by your clients.5Because he could help me gather all the information6necessary to prove that the only time I was ever in7New Mexico was visiting him and his wife, who is a8prominent film person, and his daughter, who is a9sex offender prosecutor in the Brooklyn District10Attorney's Office who specializes in sex11trafficking.12I needed to call them to prove what I knew 10:15:4913immediately, that the only time I was ever at14Jeffrey Epstein's ranch was when I went to visit the15Ashes in New Mexico. I spoke to their daughter, the16prosecutor's, class. She was then in high school,17and took a day trip to Santa Fe.18Ashe had known had heard that Jeffrey 10:16:1519Epstein had bought a ranch, a very large ranch in20New Mexico and Ashe was very interested in the21outdoors and asked me if I would do him a favor and22call to see if we could just take a look at what the23ranch looked like. And I did that. |

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

| | 42 | 44 |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Ashe to gather all the evidence for me, including | 1 that you were answering? |
| 2 | journal entries in his daughter's journal, | 2 MR. SCOTT: Object to form. 10:20:01 |
| 3 | photographs, other evidence and proof of our visit | 3 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:20:01 |
| 4 | to the ranch, which your client encouraged Virginia | 4 Q. Based upon your superb memory, what is it 10:20:02 |
| 5 | Roberts to include in an affidavit perjurious | 5 that I asked you? |
| 6 | affidavit, that she submitted with details, false | 6 A. I think you asked me to tell me how I 10:20:07 |
| 7 | and mendacious details that could not have occurred | 7 found out who told me that your clients had suborned |
| 8 | about an alleged sexual encounter between her and me | 8 perjury. |
| 9 | at the ranch in New Mexico. | 9 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:20:14 |
| 10 | Q. Which of my clients are you swearing under 10:17:30 | 10 Q. No, sir. What I asked you was to give me 10:20:14 |
| 11 | oath encouraged Virginia Roberts to include | 11 a name. Who? |
| 12 | allegations of an encounter with you at the | 12 MR. SCOTT: Objection. 10:20:17 |
| 13 | New Mexico ranch? | 13 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:20:18 |
| 14 | A. Both of them, both of your clients, both 10:17:49 | 14 Q. Who? What's the name of the person? 10:20:18 |
| 15 | Judge Cassell and Mr. Edwards were both involved in | 15 A. Her name is her first name is Rebecca. 10:20:20 |
| 16 | encouraging your client to file a perjurious | 16 Q. Yes. 10:20:25 |
| 17 | affidavit that they knew or should have known was | 17 A. I don't know her last name. 10:20:26 |
| 18 | perjurious and did know was perjurious recently when | 18 Q. Did you attempt to find out her last name? 10:20:28 |
| 19 | they sought to file another defamatory allegation in | 19 A. I have her last name written down but 10:20:30 |
| 20 | the federal proceeding. | 20 Q. Where? 10:20:32 |
| 21 | Q. Was the encouragement such that what you 10:18:21 | 21 A. It's in my in my notes. And I could 10:20:34 |
| 22 | are charging Bradley Edwards and Professor Paul | 22 get it for you. |
| 23 | Cassell with doing was suborning perjury? | 23 Q. When did you 10:20:40 |
| 24 | A. Absolutely. 10:18:34 | 24 A. I have told 10:20:41 |
| 25 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:18:35 | 25 Q. When did you write Rebecca's name down? 10:20:43 |
| | | |
| | 43 | 45 |
| 1 | Go ahead. 10:18:36 | |
| | 00 allead. 10.18.50 | 1 A. When she when she first called me 10:20:45 |
| 2 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the |
| 3 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. |
| 3 4 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I $10:18:37$ | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 |
| 3 4 5 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. |
| 3 4 5 6 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they |
| 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell |
| 3 4 5 7 8 9 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was 11 willing to give me her name. She asked me to |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell me their names. And after a period of time, after she told me the story in great detail, she was willing to give me her name. She asked me to promise that I would not disclose her identity |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell me their names. And after a period of time, after she told me the story in great detail, she was willing to give me her name. She asked me to promise that I would not disclose her identity without her permission. I have been trying to call |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell me their names. And after a period of time, after she told me the story in great detail, she was willing to give me her name. She asked me to promise that I would not disclose her identity without her permission. I have been trying to call her. Called her as recently as this morning and |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell me their names. And after a period of time, after she told me the story in great detail, she was willing to give me her name. She asked me to promise that I would not disclose her identity without her permission. I have been trying to call her. Called her as recently as this morning and last night. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell me their names. And after a period of time, after she told me the story in great detail, she was willing to give me her name. She asked me to promise that I would not disclose her identity without her permission. I have been trying to call her. Called her as recently as this morning and last night. I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell me their names. And after a period of time, after she told me the story in great detail, she was willing to give me her name. She asked me to promise that I would not disclose her identity without her permission. I have been trying to call her. Called her as recently as this morning and last night. I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 her this morning. I called her twice last night to |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and | let me be very clear since you've asked me the question. At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 the phone. They would not give me their names. They did not want to disclose their names. But they told me the story. We had a series of phone conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell me their names. And after a period of time, after she told me the story in great detail, she was willing to give me her name. She asked me to promise that I would not disclose her identity without her permission. I have been trying to call her. Called her as recently as this morning and last night. I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 her this morning. I called her twice last night to try to get her permission to reveal her complete |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and Virginia Roberts had told her that she never | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was 11 willing to give me her name. She asked me to 12 promise that I would not disclose her identity 13 without her permission. I have been trying to call 14 her. Called her as recently as this morning and 15 last night. 16 I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 17 her this morning. I called her twice last night to 18 try to get her permission to reveal her complete 19 name and identity. But I have the name and I will |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and Virginia Roberts had told her that she never mentioned me previously. That the lawyers pressured | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was 11 willing to give me her name. She asked me to 12 promise that I would not disclose her identity 13 without her permission. I have been trying to call 14 her. Called her as recently as this morning and 15 last night. 16 I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 17 her this morning. I called her twice last night to 18 try to get her permission to reveal her complete 19 name and identity. But I have the name and I will 20 be happy to give it to you. I just don't have it on |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and Virginia Roberts had told her that she never mentioned me previously. That the lawyers pressured her into mentioning me. And mentioning me over her | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was 11 willing to give me her name. She asked me to 12 promise that I would not disclose her identity 13 without her permission. I have been trying to call 14 her. Called her as recently as this morning and 15 last night. 16 I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 17 her this morning. I called her twice last night to 18 try to get her permission to reveal her complete 19 name and identity. But I have the name and I will 20 be happy to give it to you. I just don't have it on 21 off the top of my head. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and Virginia Roberts had told her that she never mentioned me previously. That the lawyers pressured her into mentioning me. And mentioning me over her desire not to mention me, yes. | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was 11 willing to give me her name. She asked me to 12 promise that I would not disclose her identity 13 without her permission. I have been trying to call 14 her. Called her as recently as this morning and 15 last night. 16 I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 17 her this morning. I called her twice last night to 18 try to get her permission to reveal her complete 19 name and identity. But I have the name and I will 20 be happy to give it to you. I just don't have it on 21 off the top of my head. 22 Q. You obviously had her telephone number 10:21:52 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and Virginia Roberts had told her that she never mentioned me previously. That the lawyers pressured her into mentioning me. And mentioning me over her is into mention me, yes. Q. Doyou remember what the question is? 10:19:55 | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was 11 willing to give me her name. She asked me to 12 promise that I would not disclose her identity 13 without her permission. I have been trying to call 14 her. Called her as recently as this morning and 15 last night. 16 I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 17 her this morning. I called her twice last night to 18 try to get her permission to reveal her complete 19 name and identity. But I have the name and I will 20 be happy to give it to you. I just don't have it on 21 off the top of my head. 22 Q. You obviously had her telephone number 10:21:52 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and Virginia Roberts had told her that she never mentioned me previously. That the lawyers pressured her into mention ing me. And mentioning me over her desire not to mention me, yes. Q. Doyou remember what the question is? 10:19:57 | 2let me be very clear since you've asked me the3question.4At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:505the phone. They would not give me their names.6They did not want to disclose their names. But they7told me the story. We had a series of phone8conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell9me their names. And after a period of time, after10she told me the story in great detail, she was11willing to give me her name. She asked me to12promise that I would not disclose her identity13without her permission. I have been trying to call14her. Called her as recently as this morning and15last night.16I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:3517her this morning. I called her twice last night to18try to get her permission to reveal her complete19name and identity. But I have the name and I will20be happy to give it to you. I just don't have it on21off the top of my head.22Q. You obviously had her telephone number 10:21:5223also?24A. No. She called me and she wouldn't give 10:21:54 |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Absolutely. If you ask me the question, I 10:18:37 am directly charging Judge Cassell and Bradley Edwards with suborning perjury. I have been advised that Virginia Roberts did not want to mention me, told her friends that she did not want to mention me. And was, quote, pressured by her lawyers into including me and including these totally false allegations against me. Yes, your clients are guilty of suborning perjury. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:19:06 Q. Who told you that Bradley Edwards 10:19:06 pressured Virginia Roberts into falsely identifying you? A. A friend of Virginia Roberts, who called 10:19:17 me out of the blue, and told me that she was horrified by what was happening to me, and that she recently had meetings with Virginia Roberts and Virginia Roberts had told her that she never mentioned me previously. That the lawyers pressured her into mentioning me. And mentioning me over her is into mention me, yes. Q. Doyou remember what the question is? 10:19:55 | 2 let me be very clear since you've asked me the 3 question. 4 At first her husband and she called me on 10:20:50 5 the phone. They would not give me their names. 6 They did not want to disclose their names. But they 7 told me the story. We had a series of phone 8 conversations in which I asked them, please, to tell 9 me their names. And after a period of time, after 10 she told me the story in great detail, she was 11 willing to give me her name. She asked me to 12 promise that I would not disclose her identity 13 without her permission. I have been trying to call 14 her. Called her as recently as this morning and 15 last night. 16 I want to recall I don't think I called 10:21:35 17 her this morning. I called her twice last night to 18 try to get her permission to reveal her complete 19 name and identity. But I have the name and I will 20 be happy to give it to you. I just don't have it on 21 off the top of my head. 22 Q. You obviously had her telephone number 10:21:52 |

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

| | 46 | | 48 |
|----|---|----|--|
| 1 | husband said she would call me back. They were | 1 | phone conversations other than Rebecca, Michael and |
| 2 | being quite circumspect about this. Ultimately I | 2 | you? |
| 3 | got her phone number. Yes, I have her phone number. | 3 | A. Yes. 10:24:10 |
| 4 | Q. I'm a little bit confused. 10:22:10 | 4 | Q. Who? 10:24:11 |
| 5 | A. There's no reason 10:22:12 | 5 | A. My wife. 10:24:11 |
| 6 | Q. Is the answer 10:22:12 | 6 | Q. When did the first conversation occur? 10:24:14 |
| 7 | A. There's no reason for you to be confused. 10:22:12 | 7 | A. I can probably get you specific 10:24:17 |
| 8 | Q. Well, I am. Is the answer to the question 10:22:14 | 8 | information about that. But it was months ago. |
| 9 | you do have her phone number or | 9 | When the story was in the newspapers, she called and |
| 10 | MR. SCOTT: Counsel, you're arguing with 10:22:19 | 10 | related the entire story to me and related to me |
| 11 | the witness. | 11 | that this was part of a massive extortion plot. |
| 12 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:22:19 | 12 | MR. SCOTT: When you're ready to take a 10:24:39 |
| 13 | Q you do have her phone number or you 10:22:19 | 13 | break, let's take break. You've been going |
| 14 | don't have her phone number? | 14 | about an hour. |
| 15 | A. I don't have the phone number in my head. 10:22:21 | 15 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:24:43 |
| 16 | I have the phone number written down, yes. | 16 | Q. How long after the filing of the Crime 10:24:44 |
| 17 | Q. And the last time you called her was 10:22:27 | 17 | Victims' Rights Act pleading in which you were |
| 18 | A. Last night. 10:22:29 | 18 | referenced did you receive the phone call, the first |
| 19 | Q last night? 10:22:29 | 19 | phone call from Rebecca? |
| 20 | A. That's right. Left a message. 10:22:30 | 20 | A. I would be speculating, but it would 10:24:58 |
| 21 | Q. From where? 10:22:32 | 21 | probably be about a month or two after that. |
| 22 | A. From my apartment in Miami Beach. 10:22:33 | 22 | MR. SCOTT: Don't speculate, sir. If you 10:25:03 |
| 23 | Q. Did you call her from a cell phone or a 10:22:41 | 23 | know the facts. |
| 24 | landline? | 24 | A. I I don't recall. 10:25:06 |
| 25 | A. Cell phone. 10:22:44 | 25 | |
| | 47 | | 49 |
| 1 | Q. Is it the cell phone that you have with 10:22:49 | 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:25:06 |
| 2 | you right now? | 2 | Q. Your best estimate as you sit here today 10:25:06 |
| 3 | A. It is a cell phone that I have with me 10:22:54 | 3 | is? |
| 4 | right now. | 4 | A. Two two months, probably. So let's say 10:25:08 |
| 5 | Q. Would you take out your cell phone and 10:22:56 | 5 | January, February probably end of February, |
| 6 | tell us what that number is, please. | 6 | beginning of March, but I can get you those specific |
| 7 | MR. SCOTT: We'll do I'm not going to 10:23:00 | 7 | dates. There's no secret about that. |

| Q. Is it the cell phone that you have with 10:22:49 | 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:25:06 |
|---|----|---|
| you right now? | 2 | Q. Your best estimate as you sit here today 10:25:06 |
| A. It is a cell phone that I have with me 10:22:54 | 3 | is? |
| right now. | 4 | A. Two two months, probably. So let's say 10:25:08 |
| Q. Would you take out your cell phone and 10:22:56 | 5 | January, February probably end of February, |
| tell us what that number is, please. | 6 | beginning of March, but I can get you those specific |
| MR. SCOTT: We'll do I'm not going to 10:23:00 | 7 | dates. There's no secret about that. |
| have him do that. At a break I'll speak to him | 8 | MR. SCOTT: Want to take a break? 10:25:22 |
| and we'll provide you the number, as he's | 9 | MR. SCAROLA: In just a moment. 10:25:24 |
| indicated. | 10 | MR. SCOTT: Certainly. 10:25:26 |
| BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:23:07 | 11 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:25:26 |
| Q. How many phone conversations did you have 10:23:12 | 12 | Q. Did you take contemporaneous notes of 10:25:30 |
| with this person Rebecca? | 13 | those phone conversations? |
| A. More than six. Probably between six and 10:23:21 | 14 | A. No. I took notes of names, but not really 10:25:36 |
| ten, maybe closer to ten. The first few she called | 15 | notes of the substance, no. |
| me and after I got their number I called her a | 16 | Q. Have you ever made notes with regard to 10:25:48 |
| number of times. | 17 | the substance of any communication that you |
| Q. What is her husband's name? 10:23:43 | 18 | allegedly had with Rebecca and/or Michael? |
| A. Michael. Different last name from hers, 10:23:44 | 19 | A. I didn't allegedly have these 10:25:58 |
| but again | 20 | conversations. I had these conversations. And I |
| Q. Where do they live? 10:23:50 | 21 | don't recall taking any notes of these |
| A. Palm Beach. Or West Palm Beach, in the 10:23:51 | 22 | conversations. |
| Palm Beach area. They have been friends of Virginia | 23 | MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break. 10:26:09 |
| Roberts since she was a young child. | 24 | MR. SCAROLA: Yes. 10:26:10 |
| Q. Were there any witnesses to any of these 10:24:03 | 25 | VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 10:26:12 |
| | | |

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

| 50 | 52 |
|--|--|
| ¹ time is approximately 10:26 a.m. | ¹ said to me. She said to me that she had been told |
| ² (Recess was held from 10:26 a.m. until 10:44 a.m.) 10:26:16 | ² directly by her friend, Virginia Roberts, who stayed |
| ³ VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 10:44:08 | ³ with her overnight for a period of time, that she |
| 4 The time is approximately 10:44 a.m. | 4 never wanted to mention me in any of the pleadings. |
| ⁵ BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:44:11 | ⁵ And that her two lawyers in the pleadings, or her |
| ⁶ Q. How many phone calls did you have with 10:44:13 | 6 lawyers who filed the pleadings, pressured her in to |
| 7 this person Rebecca before she informed you as to | 7 including my name and the details. |
| ⁸ the reason why she was calling you? | ⁸ BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:46:52 |
| ⁹ A. She informed me the first time. 10:44:29 | 9 Q. Did Rebecca ever suggest to you that the 10:46:53 |
| 10 Q. The very first conversation? 10:44:31 | 10 details sworn to by Virginia Roberts with regard to |
| 11 A. Yes. 10:44:32 | 11 you were false? |
| 12 Q. How many phone calls was it before she 10:44:34 | 12 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. Go ahead. 10:47:08 |
| 13 asked you for money? | 13 A. She certainly suggested that, yes. She 10:47:09 |
| 14 A. Never asked me for money. 10:44:38 | ¹⁴ mentioned to me that Virginia Roberts had never, |
| ¹⁵ Q. How many phone calls was it before her 10:44:40 | 15 ever mentioned to her me, among any of the people |
| 16 husband asked you for money? | 16 that she had had any contact with until she until |
| 17 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:44:43 | ¹⁷ she was pressured into doing so by her lawyers, yes. |
| 18 A. I was never asked for money, ever. 10:44:43 | ¹⁸ BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:47:28 |
| ¹⁹ BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:44:45 | 19 Q. So, from the very first conversation, the 10:47:29 |
| 20 Q. Do you know how it is that these people 10:44:47 | 20 impression you had was that this was a witness who |
| 21 knew how to contact you? | 21 could provide information that Bradley Edwards and |
| A. They told me they went on my website and 10:44:54 | 22 Paul Cassell had acted unethically and dishonestly, |
| 23 got my number and left a message for me to call. | ²³ correct? |
| 24 Yeah, that's what happened. Oh, no, they sent me | A. I wasn't sure she could provide the 10:47:48 |
| they went on my website and sent me an e-mail and | ²⁵ information because she was very reluctant to come |
| | |
| 51 | 53 |
| 1 asked me and the e-mail had a blank name but a | 1 forward. She didn't want to be involved. She |
| 2 way to respond. And so I responded to the e-mail | 2 didn't want her name involved. But I knew she had |
| ³ with my phone number and then they called, is my | ³ provided me with information, yes, but I didn't |
| 4 recollection. That's my best recollection. | 4 know, and still don't know, whether she is prepared |
| 5 Q. Is that an e-mail that you produced in 10:45:26 | 5 to be a witness. I don't know the answer to that 6 question |
| 6 discovery? 7 A Lhave no idea 10:45:28 | quotion |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 10 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:45:33 11 O. Have you ever seen that e-mail since it 10:45:34 | 10 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:48:16 11 Argumentative. |
| 12 was received? | 12A. I don't understand.10:48:18 |
| 13 A. I have no recollection. 10:45:39 | 13 BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:48:18 |
| | 13 BTMR. SCAROLA. 10.40.10 14 Q. You don't understand that? 10:48:19 |
| ± 4 (). Certainly you recognized the significance 10.45.40 | |
| Q. Certainly you recognized the significance 10:45:40 of preserving that e-mail? | |
| ¹⁵ of preserving that e-mail? | 15 A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:19 |
| 15of preserving that e-mail?16A. I'm sure I have it.10:45:46 | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:1916would do. |
| 15 of preserving that e-mail? 16 A. I'm sure I have it. 10:45:46 17 Q. You sure you have it? 10:45:47 | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:1916would do.17Q. She was telling you that she had the 10:48:22 |
| 15 of preserving that e-mail? 16 A. I'm sure I have it. 10:45:46 17 Q. You sure you have it? 10:45:47 18 A. I'm positive, of course. 10:45:48 | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:1916would do.17Q. She was telling you that she had the 10:48:2218ability to impeach Virginia Roberts' assertions |
| 15of preserving that e-mail?16A. I'm sure I have it.10:45:4617Q. You sure you have it?10:45:4718A. I'm positive, of course.10:45:4819Q. So from the very first conversation that10:45:55 | 15 A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:19 16 would do. 17 Q. She was telling you that she had the 10:48:22 18 ability to impeach Virginia Roberts' assertions 19 against you? |
| 15of preserving that e-mail?16A. I'm sure I have it.10:45:4617Q. You sure you have it?10:45:4718A. I'm positive, of course.10:45:4819Q. So from the very first conversation that10:45:5520you had with this person, you had information | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:1916would do.17Q. She was telling you that she had the 10:48:2218ability to impeach Virginia Roberts' assertions19against you?20MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 10:48:31 |
| 15of preserving that e-mail?16A. I'm sure I have it.10:45:4617Q. You sure you have it?10:45:4718A. I'm positive, of course.10:45:4819Q. So from the very first conversation that10:45:5520you had with this person, you had information21indicating that this person was informing you that | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or10:48:1916would do.17Q. She was telling you that she had the10:48:2218ability to impeach Virginia Roberts' assertions19against you?20MR. SCOTT: Same objection.10:48:3121A. What she told me was the truth, is that10:48:32 |
| 15of preserving that e-mail?16A. I'm sure I have it.10:45:4617Q. You sure you have it?10:45:4718A. I'm positive, of course.10:45:4819Q. So from the very first conversation that10:45:5520you had with this person, you had information21indicating that this person was informing you that | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:1916would do.17Q. She was telling you that she had the 10:48:2218ability to impeach Virginia Roberts' assertions19against you?20MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 10:48:3121A. What she told me was the truth, is that 10:48:3222Virginia Roberts never wanted to mention me, but |
| 15of preserving that e-mail?16A. I'm sure I have it.10:45:4617Q. You sure you have it?10:45:4718A. I'm positive, of course.10:45:4819Q. So from the very first conversation that10:45:5520you had with this person, you had information21indicating that this person was informing you that22Bradley Edwards had engaged in unethical conduct, | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:1916would do.17Q. She was telling you that she had the 10:48:2218ability to impeach Virginia Roberts' assertions19against you?20MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 10:48:3121A. What she told me was the truth, is that 10:48:3222Virginia Roberts never wanted to mention me, but |
| 15of preserving that e-mail?16A. I'm sure I have it.10:45:4617Q. You sure you have it?10:45:4718A. I'm positive, of course.10:45:4819Q. So from the very first conversation that10:45:5520you had with this person, you had information2121indicating that this person was informing you that22Bradley Edwards had engaged in unethical conduct,23correct? | 15A. I don't understand that. She could do or 10:48:1916would do.17Q. She was telling you that she had the 10:48:2218ability to impeach Virginia Roberts' assertions19against you?20MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 10:48:3121A. What she told me was the truth, is that 10:48:3222Virginia Roberts never wanted to mention me, but23that she was pressured by her lawyer into mentioning |

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

| | 54 | | 56 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:48:46 | 1 | or chronology. |
| 2 | Q. Well, you also have told us that not only 10:48:47 | 2 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:51:17 |
| 3 | did she suggest to you that Virginia Roberts didn't | 3 | Q. Well, let me hand you for purposes of 10:51:18 |
| 4 | want to mention you, but that Virginia Roberts had | 4 | refreshing your recollection the answers to |
| 5 | not had the sexual encounters with you that she has | 5 | interrogatories that were filed as of February 23, |
| 6 | sworn under oath she did have, correct? | 6 | 2015. |
| 7 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Go ahead. 10:49:07 | 7 | A. What was the date again? I missed that. 10:51:55 |
| 8 | A. What she told me was that she didn't 10:49:09 | 8 | MR. SCOTT: He's going to show you the 10:51:58 |
| 9 | believe that is, this woman didn't believe that | 9 | exhibit. |
| 10 | there had been any contact between me and Virginia | 10 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:00 |
| 11 | Roberts because Virginia Roberts had never mentioned | 11 | Q. The answers to interrogatories bear a 10:52:01 |
| 12 | me previously until her lawyers pressured her | 12 | certificate of service dated February 23, 2015 and a |
| 13 | into into allowing my name to be included in the | 13 | verification |
| 14 | pleading, that's what she told me. | 14 | MR. SCOTT: Are you going to mark that as 10:52:15 |
| 15 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:49:31 | 15 | an exhibit, please? |
| 16 | Q. Did you have the impression that there was 10:49:32 | 16 | MR. SCAROLA: I will in just a moment. 10:52:17 |
| 17 | improper pressure that had been exerted on Virginia | 17 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:18 |
| 18 | Roberts based upon what you were being told by this | 18 | Q. And a verification that appears to be your 10:52:19 |
| 19 | woman? | 19 | signature. |
| 20 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:49:47 | 20 | A. It is. 10:52:22 |
| 21 | A. Absolutely. Of course. 10:49:48 | 21 | Q. Is that, in fact, your signature? 10:52:23 |
| 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: | 22 | A. It is, in fact, my signature. 10:52:24 |
| 23 | Q. So this was based upon what this woman was 10:49:50 | 23 | Q. Were you verifying those answers intending 10:52:25 |
| 24 | telling you, evidence of unethical, unprofessional | 24 | them to be your sworn responses to those |
| 25 | dishonest conduct on the part of Bradley Edwards and | 25 | interrogatories? |
| | | | |
| | | 1 | F 7 |
| 1 | Boul Cossell wight? | 1 | 57 |
| 1 | Paul Cassell, right? | 1 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 |
| 2 | Paul Cassell, right?A. That was certainly the impression I got10:50:04 | 2 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. |
| 2 3 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I | 2 3 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes.Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 |
| 2 3 4 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one | 2 3 4 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? |
| 2 3 4 5 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, | 2 3 4 5 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 |
| 2 3 4 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. | 2 3 4 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. | 2 3 4 5 6 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Paul Cassell, right?A. That was certainly the impression I got10:50:04and certainly an impression that confirmed what Ialready believed. I mean, I've known from day onethat they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional,in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct.This simply confirmed that.Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that10:50:20shortly, but I want to stay focused right now onthese communications that you claim to have hadA. Not claimed to have had.10:50:28 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Paul Cassell, right?A. That was certainly the impression I got10:50:04and certainly an impression that confirmed what Ialready believed. I mean, I've known from day onethat they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional,in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct.This simply confirmed that.Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that10:50:20shortly, but I want to stay focused right now onthese communications that you claim to have hadA. Not claimed to have had.10:50:28Q with Rebecca.10:50:29 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them - 10:52:48 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Paul Cassell, right?A. That was certainly the impression I got10:50:04and certainly an impression that confirmed what Ialready believed. I mean, I've known from day onethat they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional,in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct.This simply confirmed that.Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that10:50:20shortly, but I want to stay focused right now onthese communications that you claim to have hadA. Not claimed to have had.10:50:28Q with Rebecca.10:50:29A. Communications that I had. Let's be10:50:30 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers '- 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:49 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:49 correct? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:49 correct? A. Let me just read what it says. 10:52:51 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 a little better when the first of these | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers responses? A. My lawyers 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:51 Yes, they were true to the best of my 10:52:51 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 a little better when the first of these conversations occurred. Do you recall having been | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers '- 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:49 correct? A. Let me just read what it says. 10:52:51 Yes, they were true to the best of my 10:52:57 knowledge and belief, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 a little better when the first of these conversations occurred. Do you recall having been propounded interrogatories in this case that asked | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers' responses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:49 correct? A. Let me just read what it says. 10:52:51 Yes, they were true to the best of my 10:52:57 knowledge and belief, yes. Q. Since there is no reference in those 10:53:05 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 a little better when the first of these conversations occurred. Do you recall having been propounded interrogatories in this case that asked you to identify all persons with knowledge of any | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers are sponses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:51 Yes, they were true to the best of my 10:52:57 knowledge and belief, yes. Q. Since there is no reference in those 10:53:05 answers to interrogatories to Rebecca or Wichael, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 a little better when the first of these conversations occurred. Do you recall having been propounded interrogatories in this case that asked you to identify all persons with knowledge of any circumstance in which it is alleged that Bradley | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:51 Yes, they were true to the best of my 10:52:57 knowledge and belief, yes. Q. Since there is no reference in those 10:53:05 answers to interrogatories to Rebecca or Michael, can we assume that the first of your phone calls |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 a little better when the first of these conversations occurred. Do you recall having been propounded interrogatories in this case that asked you to identify all persons with knowledge of any circumstance in which it is alleged that Bradley Edwards engaged in unethical conduct, unprofessional | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them - 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:49 correct? A. Let me just read what it says. 10:52:51 Yes, they were true to the best of my 10:52:57 knowledge and belief, yes. Q. Since there is no reference in those 10:53:05 answers to interrogatories to Rebecca or Michael, can we assume that the first of your phone calls must have occurred some time after February 23 when |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Paul Cassell, right? A. That was certainly the impression I got 10:50:04 and certainly an impression that confirmed what I already believed. I mean, I've known from day one that they were engaged in unethical, unprofessional, in my view and my opinion, disbarrable conduct. This simply confirmed that. Q. Yes, sir. We're going to get to that 10:50:20 shortly, but I want to stay focused right now on these communications that you claim to have had A. Not claimed to have had. 10:50:28 Q with Rebecca. 10:50:29 A. Communications that I had. Let's be 10:50:30 clear. Communications that I had. No claim. I had them. Q. Let's first try, if we could, to pinpoint 10:50:39 a little better when the first of these conversations occurred. Do you recall having been propounded interrogatories in this case that asked you to identify all persons with knowledge of any circumstance in which it is alleged that Bradley Edwards engaged in unethical conduct, unprofessional conduct or dishonest conduct? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. I was verifying my lawyer's responses, 10:52:30 yes. Q. Well, were they your responses or were 10:52:35 they your lawyer's responses? A. My lawyers - 10:52:38 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:52:40 You can answer it. 10:52:42 A. My lawyers drafted the responses. I was 10:52:42 asked to look over them. I looked over them and I signed, yes. BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:52:47 Q. You signed them - 10:52:48 A. Yes. 10:52:48 Q and swore to their truthfulness, 10:52:51 Yes, they were true to the best of my 10:52:57 knowledge and belief, yes. Q. Since there is no reference in those 10:53:05 answers to interrogatories to Rebecca or Michael, can we assume that the first of your phone calls must have occurred some time after February 23 when you verified the answers to those interrogatories? |

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

| | | | <u> </u> |
|----|---|----|--|
| | 58 | | 60 |
| 1 | A. I don't have a specific recollection as to 10:53:28 | 1 | little while ago you still haven't received, |
| 2 | the exact date of when the call came. | 2 | correct? |
| 3 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:53:32 | 3 | A. I have not received the permission to 10:56:01 |
| 4 | Q. Well, you certainly would not have sworn 10:53:32 | 4 | identify them by name, that's right. |
| 5 | to the accuracy of those answers which ask you to | 5 | By the way, in the recess oh, no, 10:56:10 |
| 6 | identify every person with knowledge of any | 6 | that's enough. Okay. |
| 7 | unethical, unprofessional, or dishonest conduct on | 7 | Q. What happened in the recess? 10:56:15 |
| 8 | the part of Bradley Edwards, and omitted the name of | 8 | MR. SCOTT: Objection 10:56:17 |
| 9 | Rebecca and Michael | 9 | A. I spoke to my lawyers. 10:56:18 |
| 10 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 10:53:57 | 10 | MR. SCOTT: don't answer that. It's 10:56:19 |
| 11 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:53:58 | 11 | conversations with counsel. |
| 12 | Q if they already called you? 10:53:58 | 12 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:56:20 |
| 13 | MR. SCOTT: Argumentative and compound. 10:54:01 | 13 | Q. You spoke to whom? 10:56:20 |
| 14 | A. I don't recall when Rebecca and Michael 10:54:03 | 14 | A. I spoke to my lawyers. 10:56:21 |
| 15 | called me, but I do recall that they made me promise | 15 | Q. Was your promise to these people that you 10:56:29 |
| 16 | that I would not disclose the information that they | 16 | wouldn't disclose their last name? |
| 17 | had revealed until they gave me permission to do so. | 17 | A. My promise to the people was that I would 10:56:36 |
| 18 | They also did not give me their names, initially, | 18 | not identify them so that they would not be hassled |
| 19 | and I only learned both the names over time and the | 19 | and harassed and any pressure put on them. That was |
| 20 | information. | 20 | their concern, that they didn't want to be receiving |
| 21 | The information came out gradually. But 10:54:23 | 21 | phone calls and they didn't want to be part of what |
| 22 | there was a time when I did have the information | 22 | they regarded as a media circus. |
| 23 | that the two clients pressured that was her word, | 23 | Q. Well, you know you have broken that 10:56:57 |
| 24 | "pressured" Virginia Roberts into naming me, | 24 | promise at this point, haven't |
| 25 | right. | 25 | A. No, I haven't 10:57:01 |
| | 59 | | 61 |
| 1 | | 1 | |
| 2 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:54:43 | 2 | MR. SCOTT: Objection 10:57:01 A broken that promise. 10:57:01 |
| 3 | Q. You certainly considered the communication 10:54:53 that you were having with these individuals to be a | 3 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:57:02 |
| 4 | matter of significance from the timing of the first | 4 | Q. You have not? 10:57:02 |
| 5 | phone call, correct, since it was in the first phone | 5 | A. No. 10:57:02 |
| 6 | call that they disclosed to you the essence of what | 6 | Q. You don't think that they will be able to 10:57:02 |
| 7 | you are saying they said? | 7 | be identified by the first names that you have |
| 8 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, compound. 10:55:10 | 8 | given? The fact that they live in Palm Beach, and |
| 9 | A. I wasn't sure whether it would be 10:55:11 | 9 | the fact that Virginia Roberts lived together with |
| 10 | significant or not because I didn't know at the time | 10 | them for some period of time, that's not identifying |
| 11 | whether I would be free to reveal it or to use it. | 11 | information? |
| 12 | I'm still I just wasn't sure whether I 10:55:24 | 12 | A. Not 10:57:18 |
| 13 | would be free to reveal it. It would not be | 13 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. 10:57:19 |
| 14 | particularly significant except to my own | 14 | A. Not for the media, which is what they're 10:57:19 |
| 15 | confirmation of what I knew to be true; namely, that | 15 | concerned about. They're concerned about getting |
| 16 | your clients had engaged in unethical and | 16 | calls from the media and being harassed. |
| 17 | unprofessional conduct. I knew that to be true. | 17 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:57:25 |
| 18 | But this provided me with some confirmation of that. | 18 | Q. Well, you are aware of the fact that 10:57:25 |
| 19 | But I didn't know whether I was going to 10:55:42 | 19 | there's a press representative sitting in this room, |
| 20 | be able to use that confirmation because I had made | 20 | aren't you? |
| 21 | a promise that was elicited from me by them that I | 21 | A. Yes. I don't think there's enough 10:57:29 |
| 22 | would not disclose this information without their | 22 | information for them to identify these folks unless |
| 23 | permission. | 23 | you provide them with that information. |
| 24 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:55:55 | 24 | Q. How long have you been a member of the 10:57:37 |
| 25 | Q. All right. Permission that you swore to a 10:55:56 | 25 | Bar? |
| | | 1 | |

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

| | 62 | | 64 |
|----|--|----|--|
| 1 | A. Over 50 years. 10:57:47 | 1 | the disclosure of those names? |
| 2 | Q. And during that period of time, you've 10:57:48 | 2 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 10:59:58 |
| 3 | been involved in many, many litigated matters, | 3 | several times. |
| 4 | correct? | 4 | A. Obviously I confer with my lawyers about 11:00:00 |
| 5 | A. I'm mostly an appellate lawyer, but I have 10:57:56 | 5 | matters of that kind. |
| 6 | been involved in many appeals, yes. | 6 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:00:05 |
| 7 | Q. You do understand that you cannot make a 10:58:01 | 7 | Q. That's not my question to you. Was it 11:00:05 |
| 8 | binding promise to a potential witness that would | 8 | your understanding in February of 2015, on |
| 9 | authorize you to withhold information that you are | 9 | February 23, 2015, when you signed these answers to |
| 10 | required to give in the course of discovery | 10 | interrogatories under oath, that you had the |
| 11 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 10:58:22 | 11 | authority to withhold the names of these individuals |
| 12 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:58:22 | 12 | who you claim to be witnesses? |
| 13 | Q correct? 10:58:22 | 13 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, legal conclusion. 11:00:27 |
| 14 | A. I told them in the course of my 10:58:23 | 14 | A. I don't believe I had their names on 11:00:28 |
| 15 | conversations with them that I would not violate any | 15 | February 23. I would have to check. But my belief |
| 16 | court orders, that I would not break the law, that I | 16 | is that I didn't have their names. It took quite |
| 17 | would do my best to maintain what they wanted | 17 | quite a bit of effort for me to obtain their names |
| 18 | because it was very important for me to get as much | 18 | under promises of confidentiality. |
| 19 | information from them as I could. I did not want to | 19 | I think these are very, very hard legal 11:00:41 |
| 20 | cut off my sources of information. I think I have a | 20 | and ethical questions. There's obviously a right to |
| 21 | right to obtain that information. | 21 | investigate and to try to get information, |
| 22 | And so there was a back and forth. And 10:58:49 | 22 | particularly information that would proffer that |
| 23 | ultimately I think we all realized ultimately | 23 | your clients had engaged in criminal actions, |
| 24 | probably their names will be revealed, yes. | 24 | subornation of perjury and pressuring witnesses. |
| 25 | F, | 25 | And I know that many of you are former 11:01:00 |
| | | | |
| | 63 | | 65 |
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:59:02 | 1 | prosecutors. I know that prosecutors also try very |
| 2 | Q. What is their phone number? 10:59:02 | 2 | hard to obtain such information and make promises |
| 3 | A. I don't have it. 10:59:04 | 3 | and the Courts have varying approaches to how these |
| 4 | MR. SCOTT: You can make a request when 10:59:06 | 4 | promises will be dealt with. |
| 5 | you want to and we'll take it under | 5 | So it was a complicated question. And I 11:01:18 |
| 6 | consideration for the information that you've | 6 | sought my legal advice based on it being a |
| 7 | asked my client about. He's not the lawyer. I | 7 | complicated question. |
| 8 | am. There's confidentiality orders. I have to | 8 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:01:24 |
| 9 | review all of that. You can take whatever | 9 | Q. When did you first seek legal advice with 11:01:25 |
| 10 | appropriate discovery you want on that. | 10 | regards to these matters? |
| 11 | MR. SCAROLA: What what confidentiality 10:59:17 | 11 | A. When I first found out about it, I told my 11:01:29 |
| 12 | orders? | 12 | lawyers that the information had come that it |
| 13 | MR. SCOTT: There's a confidentiality 10:59:19 | 13 | hadn't been I hadn't gotten permission. That I |
| 14 | order by the Court. | 14 | was getting it in dribs and drabs. And that I was |
| 15 | MR. SCAROLA: That covers the phone number 10:59:21 | 15 | anxious to pursue it. I told my lawyers not to call |
| 16 | of a witness? | 16 | her at all, not to call them. Because I thought |
| 17 | MR. SCOTT: That covers various issues and 10:59:24 | 17 | that would shut down the flow of information. |
| 18 | I have to review it. And so you can I'm | 18 | Q. Which lawyers did you take these 11:01:53 |
| 19 | just telling you that you can make any formal | 19 | disclosures to? |
| 20 | request you want and we will take it up. | 20 | MR. SCOTT: Let him ask that question. 11:02:02 |
| 21 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 10:59:33 | 21 | MR. SIMPSON: Just the names. 11:02:04 |
| 22 | Q. Was it your understanding in February of 10:59:37 | 22 | A. My recollection is Ken Sweder, and I would 11:02:05 |
| 23 | this year that you had the authority to withhold in | 23 | have to check my records but probably probably |
| 24 | answers to interrogatories the names of these | 24 | Mr. Simpson, probably. Probably Mr. Scott. But I'm |
| 25 | individuals if questions were asked that called for | 25 | not positive about Mr. Scott at this point, about |
| - | | 1 | |

www.phippsreporting.com (888)811-3408

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

| | 66 | 68 |
|----------|--|--|
| 1 | Judge Scott. I'm not positive about that. | ¹ BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:04:16 |
| 2 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:02:32 | 2 Q. You knew that you might be able to and so 11:04:17 |
| 3 | Q. And what is it that you disclosed to 11:02:33 | ³ it was significant to you |
| 4 | Mr. Sweder? | 4 MR. SCOTT: Object. 11:04:21 |
| 5 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Don't answer that. 11:02:38 | ⁵ BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:04:21 |
| 6 | Attorney-client privilege and work product. | ⁶ Q is that correct? 11:04:22 |
| 7 | MR. SCAROLA: Our position is that it's 11:02:41 | 7 MR. SCOTT: Form. 11:04:23 |
| 8 | already been waived voluntarily by virtue of | A. It was significant to me psychologically 11:04:24 |
| 9 | the testimony that was just given. | ⁹ because it confirmed my firm belief that your |
| 10 | MR. SCOTT: I understand your position. 11:02:45 | 10 clients had engaged in unethical behavior, yes. |
| 11 | We don't agree. | ¹¹ BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:04:34 |
| 12 | MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. I know you 11:02:47 | 12Q. As an experienced criminal defense lawyer, 11:04:34 |
| 13 | don't. | ¹³ you certainly recognize the importance of a |
| 14 | MR. SCOTT: Okay. 11:02:49 | 14 contemporaneous record of significant |
| 15 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:02:49 | 15 communications, don't you? |
| 16 | Q. What information did you give to 11:02:50 | 16 A. Sometimes. But it's more important to me 11:04:45 |
| 17 | Mr. Simpson with regard to this | 17 to have the conversation and to try to be in the |
| 18 | MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 11:02:54 | 18 moment and elicit the information. And that was |
| 19 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:02:54 | 19 what my focus was at the time. |
| 20 21 | Q communication? 11:02:55 | 20 Q. Was there something that prevented you 11:04:56 21 from taking contemporaneous notes with regard to |
| 21 | MR. SCOTT: Don't answer that. 11:02:57 | it on taking contemportateous notes whill regard to |
| 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:02:59 | |
| 24 | Q. And since you don't remember whether you 11:03:00 did on did not toll Mr. Spott Loggunge you don't | |
| 25 | did or did not tell Mr. Scott, I assume you don't remember what information you may have given to | 24 contemporaneous notes. 25 Q. That's not my question, sir. 11:05:07 |
| | remember what information you may have given to | Q. That's not my question, sn. 11.05.07 |
| | 67 | 69 |
| 1 | Mr. Scott if you did speak to him; is that correct? | 1 MR. SCOTT: Don't cut him off, please. 11:05:07 |
| 2 | MR. SCOTT: The same objection. Don't 11:03:08 | A. I generally don't take notes. I find that 11:05:08 |
| 3 | answer that. | ³ it's much more important to concentrate. In fact, I |
| 4 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:03:14 | 4 tell my students in my classes not to take notes but |
| 5 | Q. Since you were well, did you make these 11:03:15 | ⁵ rather to listen, listen carefully to what's being |
| 6 | disclosures to your lawyers as soon as you got the | 6 said. I'm not a particular advocate of note taking. |
| 7 | first phone call? | 7 BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:05:23 |
| 8 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Don't answer that. 11:03:29 | 8 Q. And since you have a superb memory, the 11:05:23 |
| 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:03:33 | ⁹ notes don't have much value to you? |
| 10 | Q. You obviously considered this to be a 11:03:37 | 10 A. In fact 11:05:28 |
| 11 | significant communication, correct? | 11 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 11:05:29 12 14 5 14:05:20 |
| 12 13 | A. Potentially 11:03:41 MR. SCOTT: Objection, repetitious. 11:03:42 | 12 A. In fact, my memory is one of the reasons 11:05:30 13 that I don't focus on notes as much as some other |
| 14 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, repetitious. 11:03:42 You've asked that several times. | |
| 15 | | 14 people may. 15 BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:05:37 |
| 16 | A. Potentially significant, but I did not 11:03:44 know well, it was significant to me because it | 16 Q. So let's go through these conversations 11:05:37 |
| 17 | confirmed my own knowledge that your clients had | 17 one at a time then. |
| 18 | engaged in behavior which was unprofessional and | 18 A. Okay. 11:05:40 |
| 19 | possibly criminal. And it confirmed it in my own | 19 Q. And I want you to tell us, based upon your 11:05:41 |
| 20 | mind. So it was very gratifying to me. | 20 superb memory, as best you are able to relate, |
| 21 | But I had didn't know at that point 11:04:07 | word-for-word exactly how the first conversation |
| 22 | whether I could in any way use that information to | 22 went. |
| 23 | produce the truth in the litigation. I wasn't sure | 23 A. Okay. 11:05:55 |
| 24 | of that. | 24 Q. Who placed the call to whom? 11:05:56 |
| 25 | | A. The first conversation came as a result of 11:05:59 |
| | | A. The first conversation came as a result of 11.05.57 |

Т

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

| | 70 | | 72 |
|----|---|----|--|
| 1 | me getting a phone number from them by an e-mail or | 1 | think they did. |
| 2 | text correspondence. I then placed – this is my | 2 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:08:31 |
| 3 | best memory. I then placed the conversation and I | 3 | Q. They or he? 11:08:31 |
| 4 | spoke to Michael. | 4 | A. He. He's the only one who spoke to me. I 11:08:32 |
| 5 | Q. You then placed the phone call? 11:06:19 | 5 | also had their phone number, which I think I recall |
| 6 | A. I then placed the phone call. And I spoke 11:06:20 | 6 | is in that area generally. I didn't know |
| 7 | to Michael. Michael told me that his wife, Rebecca, | 7 | specifically where they lived. I did not have their |
| 8 | felt terrible about what was going on in relation to | 8 | address. |
| 9 | me, but that she was not willing to talk to me about | 9 | Q. Were arrangements made during the first 11:08:52 |
| 10 | it. But he then said to me that if she did talk to | 10 | conversation for a subsequent communication? |
| 11 | me, she would tell me that I was not mentioned by | 11 | A. No. 11:08:56 |
| 12 | Virginia ever previously until this case occurred, | 12 | Q. Was any request made by you for a meeting? 11:08:59 |
| 13 | and that she was pressured into mentioning me. | 13 | A. Yes. 11:09:02 |
| 14 | I said that would be important to me, I 11:07:04 | 14 | Q. Let me back up then, if I could, please. 11:09:05 |
| 15 | would really like to talk to Rebecca. | 15 | Because what I want you to do, based upon your |
| 16 | Well, he said, she's very emotional about 11:07:07 | 16 | superb memory, is to tell us in as much detail as |
| 17 | this, she's a very close friend of Virginia, she | 17 | you possibly can recall everything that was said. |
| 18 | likes Virginia, and she just doesn't want to get | 18 | And when I asked you to do that, you didn't say |
| 19 | involved. | 19 | anything about a request for a meeting. |
| 20 | And I said, well, let's have please 11:07:21 | 20 | A. I'm not sure 11:09:28 |
| 21 | have her think about it. And let's see if we can | 21 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:09:29 |
| 22 | talk again. | 22 | A. I'm not sure the request for the meeting 11:09:30 |
| 23 | I then made a second phone call. 11:07:29 | 23 | came in the first call or the second call. But |
| 24 | Q. I'm sorry, I was still on the first one. 11:07:31 | 24 | there was ultimately a request for a meeting. It |
| 25 | A. Okay. That was the first phone call. 11:07:33 | 25 | wouldn't surprise me if it came in the first call. |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | 71 | | 73 |
| 1 | That's about the first phone call. | 1 | The first call was basically, I'd really 11:09:41 |
| 2 | Q. Thank you. All right. Now, during the 11:07:3 | | like to talk to your wife about this. I'm happy to |
| 3 | course of that phone call, did you ever ask Michael, | 3 | fly down. I'm happy to talk to you on the phone. |
| 4 | why did you ask me to contact you if your wife | 4 | And we left it that they would think that she |
| 5 | doesn't want to talk to me? | 5 | would that he would ask her to think about it. |
| 6 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 11:07:46 | 6 | And that I could call back in a in a few days and |
| 7 | argumentative. | 7 | find out what her what her current feelings were. |
| 8 | A. I did not. 11:07:48 | 8 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:10:09 |
| 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:07:48 | 9 | Q. Where were you when you received this 11:10:09 |
| 10 | Q. Why not? 11:07:49 | 10 | phone call or when you made this phone call? |
| 11 | MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 11:07:51 | 11 | Sorry. |
| 12 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:07:51 | 12 | A. I think I was in New York. 11:10:14 |
| 13 | Q. Did that seem strange to you? 11:07:51 | 13 | Q. Do you know whether that phone call was 11:10:23 |
| 14 | A. No, never occurred to me. He was 11:07:53 | 14 | made on a cell phone or a landline? |
| 15 | obviously reaching out to me. There was obviously | 15 | A. I don't remember. 11:10:26 |
| 16 | some ambivalence. They wanted to talk to me. They | 16 | Q. Have you attempted to gather your 11:10:37 |
| 17 | didn't want to get involved. They wanted to tak to he. They | 17 | telephone records for purposes of responding to |
| 18 | waters. They wanted to see if I was a reliable | 18 | discovery requests in this case? |
| 19 | person. I think they wanted to get a sense of me, | 19 | A. I left that to my lawyers. I know that we 11:10:47 |
| 20 | just as I was trying to get a sense of them. | 20 | did produce telephone records during the relevant |
| 21 | Q. Did they tell you at that point in time 11:08:16 | 20 | periods of time when Virginia Roberts knew Jeffrey |
| 22 | that they lived in the Palm Beach area in the first | 22 | Epstein and those telephone records established that |
| 23 | conversation? | 23 | I could not have been at the locations and at the |
| 24 | MR. SCOTT: Same objection. 11:08:25 | 24 | times that Virginia Roberts claimed to have had |
| 25 | A. I don't recall, but I think they did. I 11:08:26 | 25 | falsely claimed to have sexual contact with me. |
| | A. Foortread, our funkturey du. 1 11.00.20 | | mosty statistica to have sexual contact with me. |
| | | | 19 (Pages 70 to 73) |

www.phippsreporting.com (888)811-3408

| | 74 | | 76 |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Q. I promise you we're going to get to those. 11:11:15 | 1 | and had dinner, just the two of them. And that she |
| 2 | A. Good. 11:11:18 | 2 | confided in her, Virginia Roberts confided in |
| 3 | Q. Promise you. Along with all the flight 11:11:18 | 3 | Rebecca that she had never wanted to mention me in |
| 4 | logs that you claim exonerate you. | 4 | any of the pleadings, but she was pressured by her |
| 5 | A. Is that a question? 11:11:25 | 5 | lawyer into doing so. |
| 6 | Q. It wasn't. It was a comment. 11:11:26 | 6 | Rebecca then said that I was not the 11:14:09 |
| 7 | MR. SCOTT: I object. 11:11:28 | 7 | object of this effort. The object of the effort was |
| 8 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:11:29 | 8 | a billionaire who lives in Columbus, Ohio and who |
| 9 | Q. In response to your comment. 11:11:29 | 9 | owns Victoria's Secret and the Limited, Too. |
| 10 | MR. SCOTT: Let me just say this to you, I 11:11:31 | 10 | Rebecca told me she did not know the name of that |
| 11 | think it's inappropriate to have comments by | 11 | billionaire, but that Virginia and her lawyers hoped |
| 12 | counsel. | 12 | to get 1 billion, B-I-L-L-I-O-N, \$1 billion or half |
| 13 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:11:36 | 13 | of his net worth from him by alleging that he had |
| 14 | Q. Let's go to the very second contact that 11:11:37 | 14 | improperly engaged in sexual misconduct with |
| 15 | you had with either Michael or Rebecca. Who | 15 | Virginia Roberts. |
| 16 | initiated the second contact? | 16 | That that money would be divided three 11:15:12 |
| 17 | A. I think I did. I called and got Michael 11:11:48 | 17 | ways: A third of it to Virginia Roberts, a third of |
| 18 | on the phone. | 18 | it to a charity that she and her lawyers were |
| 19 | Q. Where did you call from? 11:11:53 | 19 | setting up for battered women, and a third of it to |
| 20 | A. I think New York. 11:11:54 | 20 | the lawyers. |
| 21 | Q. Tell me in as much detail as your superb 11:12:02 | 21 22 | She then told me that they were trying to 11:15:35 |
| 22 23 | memory allows you to recall everything that was said | 22 | get ABC News to interview Virginia Roberts so as to |
| 23 | during the course of that phone conversation. | 23 | give her credibility in order to pressure the |
| 25 | MR. SCOTT: Let's object to the form and 11:12:14 the continued use of the word "superb." He's | 25 | billionaire from Columbus, Ohio into paying a large sum of money. And that I was named as an effort to |
| 23 | the continued use of the word supero. Thes | | sum of money. And that I was named as an error to |
| | | | |
| | 75 | | 77 |
| 1 | described his memory. That's your | 1 | 77 try to show the billionaire what could happen to |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| | described his memory. That's your | | try to show the billionaire what could happen to |
| 2 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. | 2 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. |
| 2 3 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 | 2 3 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or |
| 2 3 4 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have | 2 3 4 5 6 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. 11:17:15 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | <pre>try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. I 11:17:15 Q. How? I 11:17:20</pre> |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | <pre>try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. I 11:17:15 Q. How? I 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21</pre> |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. 11:17:15 Q. How? 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. A. That's right. 11:17:15 Q. How? 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any time she wanted. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. 11:17:15 Q. How? 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. Obviously I knew that the only billionaire in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any time she wanted. And there came a time during that 11:13:07 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. 11:17:15 Q. How? 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. Obviously I knew that the only billionaire in Columbus, Ohio who owned Limited, Too and who owned |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any time she wanted. And there came a time during that 11:13:07 conversation when she did get on the phone, and | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. 11:17:15 Q. How? 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. Obviously I knew that the only billionaire in Columbus, Ohio who owned Limited, Too and who owned Victoria's Secret was Leslie Wexner. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any time she wanted. And there came a time during that 11:13:07 conversation when she did get on the phone, and here's what she told me. She said she had grown up | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. O. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. I1:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very - I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. Obviously I knew that the only billionaire in Columbus, Ohio who owned Limited, Too and who owned victoria's Secret was Leslie Wexner. I had met Leslie Wexner on two occasions, 11:17:47 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any time she wanted. And there came a time during that 11:13:07 conversation when she did get on the phone, and here's what she told me. She said she had grown up with Virginia Roberts. That they were very, very | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't - 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. 11:17:15 Q. How? 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. Obviously I knew that the only billionaire in Columbus, Ohio who owned Limited, Too and who owned Victoria's Secret was Leslie Wexner. I had met Leslie Wexner on two occasions, 11:17:47 I think, and his wife. I called Abigail on the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any time she wanted. And there came a time during that 11:13:07 conversation when she did get on the phone, and here's what she told me. She said she had grown up | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. O. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. I1:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very - I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. Obviously I knew that the only billionaire in Columbus, Ohio who owned Limited, Too and who owned victoria's Secret was Leslie Wexner. I had met Leslie Wexner on two occasions, 11:17:47 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | described his memory. That's your characterization. Go ahead. MR. SCAROLA: No, I think that that was 11:12:24 Mr. Dershowitz's characterization, which I have adopted. MR. SCOTT: Okay. Go ahead. 11:12:29 A. I called, spoke to Michael. I asked 11:12:31 Michael if he had spoken to his wife. She said yes and she was still reluctant to talk to me. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:12:41 Q. I'm sorry, she said yes when you asked 11:12:41 Michael if he had spoken to his wife? A. He said yes. And that she was still 11:12:46 reluctant to talk to me. I suggested to him that perhaps she could talk to me briefly just so that she hears what I have to say. And he could listen and remain on the phone and she could stop at any time she wanted. And there came a time during that 11:13:07 conversation when she did get on the phone, and here's what she told me. She said she had grown up with Virginia Roberts. That they were very, very close friends as young people. That Virginia | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | try to show the billionaire what could happen to somebody if they were accused of sexual misconduct. And that would encourage him to settle a lawsuit or pay money in exchange for his name not being mentioned or revealed. I had no idea about this. And I didn't - 11:16:44 I didn't ask about this. She just stated this. And I then corroborated the fact that she was absolutely correct in everything she had said to me. Q. You corroborated the fact that she was 11:17:09 absolutely correct in everything that she had said to you? A. That's right. 11:17:15 Q. How? 11:17:20 A. Okay. Let me answer that question. I was 11:17:21 very I wasn't sure, so I called Leslie Wexner. I got his wife on the phone, Abigail Wexner. Obviously I knew that the only billionaire in Columbus, Ohio who owned Limited, Too and who owned Victoria's Secret was Leslie Wexner. I had met Leslie Wexner on two occasions, 11:17:47 I think, and his wife. I called Abigail on the phone and I said, I think you ought to know that |

Т

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

| | 78 | | 80 |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 1 | Florida. | 1 | interview with ABC had to be postponed because her |
| 2 | And she said, oh, we're aware of that, 11:18:09 | 2 | husband, Virginia Roberts' husband, had beaten her |
| 3 | they've already been in contact with us, which | 3 | up so badly that she was hospitalized and that she |
| 4 | surprised me. But was confirmation of that. | 4 | could not appear on television with the bruises |
| 5 | I then also I can't give you the 11:18:24 | 5 | because she didn't want to have to explain that her |
| 6 | chronology of that. I then was in touch with ABC and | 6 | husband had beaten her up. |
| 7 | found out she was absolutely correct about her | 7 | And I ultimately corroborated that 11:21:56 |
| 8 | efforts to try to get interviewed on ABC television. | 8 | information as well by investigating the fact that |
| 9 | In fact, I learned that your client, Brad 11:18:41 | 9 | she, in fact, filed a complaint against her husband |
| 10 | Edwards, had sent a communication to people in | 10 | and had been hospitalized. |
| 11 | the in the area urging them to watch her | 11 | So everything that Rebecca told me has 11:22:08 |
| 12 | interview that was scheduled to be on three | 12 | proved to be absolutely true and absolutely |
| 13 | television programs. If I'm not mistaken, it was | 13 | corroborated. And, therefore, I believe it and |
| 14 | Good Day Show, the evening news, and the show | 14 | believe that your clients were engaged in what I |
| 15 | Nightline and Nightline. | 15 | believe is an extortion plot against Leslie Wexner, |
| 16 | I then was in communication with ABC and 11:19:10 | 16 | conspiracy to commit extortion in which I was a |
| 17 | helped to persuade them that they would be putting | 17 | victim, as well as Leslie Wexner, of being a victim. |
| 18 | false information on the air if they allowed | 18 | Q. Did you speak directly to Leslie Wexner or 11:22:36 |
| 19 | Virginia Roberts to tell her false story. | 19 | only to his wife? |
| 20 | So, I was able to corroborate that. I 11:19:28 | 20 | A. Only to his wife and to his lawyers. 11:22:41 |
| 21 | then also corroborated the fact that she had never | 21 | Q. And you spoke by telephone? 11:22:42 |
| 22 | mentioned me when her boyfriend appeared on | 22 | A. Yes. 11:22:43 |
| 23 | television and publically stated that she had never | 23 | Q. Where were you and where was she? 11:22:44 |
| 24 | mentioned me in any of her description of people who | 24 | A. I called from, I think, New York and I 11:22:48 |
| 25 | she had sexual contact with. | 25 | spoke to her about it. I told her what I said I |
| | 79 | | 81 |
| 1 | | 1 | - |
| 2 | So, I was then completely satisfied that 11:19:53 | 2 | said. She said what I said she said. And then she said that her lawyers would 11:23:00 |
| 3 | Rebecca was telling me the complete truth. And that in my view, there was an extortion plot directed | 3 | And then she said that her lawyers would 11:23:00 be in touch with me. And her lawyer then called me |
| 4 | against Leslie Wexner, a criminal extortion plot | 4 | and corroborated again that there had been contact |
| 5 | directed against Leslie Wexner, and that your | 5 | and eventually there was greater contact. |
| 6 | clients were involved in that extortion plot. | 6 | Q. Contact by whom with whom? 11:23:15 |
| 7 | Q. If we were to try to fix the time of this 11:20:16 | 7 | A. Contact by by Virginia Roberts' lawyer, 11:23:17 |
| 8 | second phone call, one way in which we would fix the | 8 | lawyers. I wasn't it wasn't clear at that point. |
| 9 | time of this second phone call, in addition to | 9 | Q. Which lawyer or lawyers? 11:23:26 |
| 10 | getting your telephone records, would be to find out | 10 | A. I wasn't clear at that point. They didn't 11:23:27 |
| 11 | when this ABC interview took place, correct? Since | 11 | indicate to me which lawyer or lawyers |
| 12 | the phone call you're telling us came after the ABC | 12 | Q. Didn't you ask? 11:23:31 |
| 13 | interview, that you convinced ABC not to air? | 13 | A contact. 11:23:32 |
| 14 | A. No, I didn't state that. Let me be very 11:20:51 | 14 | Q. Didn't you want to know, is this Bradley 11:23:32 |
| 15 | clear. | 15 | Edwards or Professor Paul Cassell who is |
| 16 | I found out from her that there was going 11:20:53 | 16 | A. I asked 11:23:35 |
| 17 | to be an ABC television interview. I don't think I | 17 | Q making this 11:23:36 |
| 18 | was aware of the fact that there was going to be a | 18 | A. I asked 11:23:36 |
| 19 | television interview at that point. | 19 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. Go ahead. 11:23:37 |
| 20 | I remember then getting a either a 11:21:05 | 20 | A. I asked whether there was a letter and 11:23:39 |
| 21 | | 21 | they wouldn't show me a letter. I asked if there |
| | phone call or e-mail from ABC informing me of that. | | - |
| 22 | And that corroborated to my mind the fact that she | 22 | were phone calls. They were a they wanted to be |
| 22 23 | | 22 23 | were phone calls. They were a they wanted to be discreet about how the contact had occurred. But |
| | And that corroborated to my mind the fact that she | | |
| 23 | And that corroborated to my mind the fact that she was telling me the truth about the ABC interview. | 23 | discreet about how the contact had occurred. But |
| 23 24 | And that corroborated to my mind the fact that she was telling me the truth about the ABC interview. She also told me and this was 11:21:27 | 23 24 | discreet about how the contact had occurred. But |

www.phippsreporting.com (888)811-3408

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

| | 82 | | 84 |
|----------|--|----------|--|
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:23:52 | 1 | MS. McCAWLEY: No, we're 11:25:35 |
| 2 | Q. But they wouldn't tell you who? 11:23:53 | 2 | MR. SIMPSON: No, no, no. 11:25:37 |
| 3 | A. They wouldn't show me any letter. 11:23:55 | 3 | MS. McCAWLEY: going to discontinue. 11:25:38 |
| 4 | Q. That's not my question. Did they tell 11:23:58 | 4 | We will contact the judge. |
| 5 | you did you ask who contacted Leslie Wexner? | 5 | MR. SCAROLA: We'll move on to another 11:25:41 |
| 6 | A. The first answer was Virginia Roberts' 11:24:07 | 6 | area and address that issue with the judge as |
| 7 | lawyer. | 7 | to whether or not a protective order is |
| 8 | I then subsequently learned that among 11:24:11 | 8 | appropriate. |
| 9 | those who contacted Leslie Wexner's lawyers was | 9 | A. Would you like to establish the foundation 11:25:46 |
| 10 | David Boies and Sigrid McCawley. | 10 | for why it's not protected? |
| 11 | Q. Not Bradley Edwards, correct? 11:24:24 | 11 | MR. SWEDER: Alan 11:25:50 |
| 12 | MR. SCOTT: Objection as to the form. 11:24:27 | 12 | MR. SCOTT: Alan, just let it alone. Let 11:25:51 |
| 13 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:24:28 | 13 | it alone. |
| 14 | Q. Correct? 11:24:29 | 14 | THE WITNESS: Okay. 11:25:53 |
| 15 | A. I was not given the name Bradley Edwards 11:24:30 | 15 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:25:55 |
| 16 | at that time. But was subsequently told by David | 16 | Q. This second conversation you've told us 11:26:00 |
| 17 | Boies that Bradley Edwards and Paul Cassell | 17 | was conducted while you were in New York, correct? |
| 18 | MS. McCAWLEY: I'm going to object to the 11:24:43 | 18 | A. That's my best recollection. 11:26:06 |
| 19 | extent this reveals any conversations that | 19 | Q. The first conversation also conducted 11:26:09 |
| 20 | happened in the context of settlement | 20 | while you were in New York? |
| 21 | discussions. | 21 | A. That's my best recollection. 11:26:12 |
| 22 | MR. SCOTT: Okay. Note your objection. 11:24:48 | 22 | Q. Are you aware that New York is a one-party 11:26:17 |
| 23 | Go ahead. | 23 | consent state for purposes of permitting the |
| 24 | A. That I was ultimately told by David Boies 11:24:52 | 24 | recording of communications, correct? |
| 25 | that he had done an extensive investigation of the | 25 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Do you know? 11:26:31 |
| 1 2 | allegations against Leslie Wexner and had concluded that they were | 1 2 | A. I'm I think that's right, yeah.11:26:34BY MR. SCAROLA:11:26:40 |
| 3 | MS. McCAWLEY: Again, I'm going to object 11:25:05 | 3 | Q. Okay. So you knew that these significant 11:26:41 |
| 4 | to this has happened in the context of | 4 | conversations could have been recorded by you had |
| 5 | settlement | 5 | you chosen to record them, correct? |
| 6 | A false. 11:25:07 | 6 | A. I don't think I thought about that at the 11:26:52 |
| 7 | MS. McCAWLEY: negotiations. I'm going 11:25:07 | 7 | time. I certainly I didn't think about that at |
| 8 | to move for sanctions if information is | 8 | the time, no. |
| 9 | revealed that happened in the context of | 9 | Q. How many conversations in total did you 11:27:00 |
| 10 | settlement discussions. | 10 | have with Rebecca and/or Michael when you were in |
| 11 | MR. SCOTT: I don't know whether I 11:25:12 | 11 | New York and had the legal right, had you chosen to, |
| 12 | don't believe there were settlement | 12 | not only to make contemporaneous notes but to |
| 13 | discussions. But even if they weren't, they | 13 | actually record the conversations? |
| 14 15 | would still be admissible. | 14 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:27:20 |
| 15 16 | A. Let me continue 11:25:21 | 15 | A. I think I was in New York for two of the 11:27:21 |
| 10 | MR. SCOTT: For discovery purposes. 11:25:22 | 16 17 | conversations. I think I was in Massachusetts for |
| 18 | A that David Boies had done 11:25:23 MS_McCAWLEX: L disagree_ L think ware 11:25:24 | 18 | several of the conversations. I don't think I was |
| 10 | MS. McCAWLEY: I disagree. I think we're 11:25:24 | 19 | in Florida. I think it was New York and Massachusetts. |
| 20 | going to have to take this to the judge, then; if we're going to reveal settlement | 20 | Massachusetts. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:27:33 |
| 20 | conversations in this conversation, then we | 21 | Q. Massachusetts is also a one-party consent 11:27:33 |
| 22 | need to go to the judge on it. | 22 | g. Massachusetts is also a one-party consent 11:27:55 state, is it not? |
| 23 | | 23 | A. You don't know the law, sir, no. 11:27:36 |
| | VIR SCULT: Whatever you need to do 11.75.31 | | |
| 24 | MR. SCOTT: Whatever you need to do. 11:25:31 A. Let me continue the what he told me. 11:25:33 | 1 | |
| | A. Let me continue the what he told me. 11:25:33 That David Boies had | 24 25 | Q. It is not? 11:27:38 A. No. 11:27:38 |

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

| 86 | 88 |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1 Q. Okay. 11:27:39 1 A. Not in those | words. 11:30:04 |
| 2 A. It is clearly not. 11:27:39 2 BY MR. SCAROL | A: 11:30:06 |
| 3 Q. Okay. So, you you recognize the 11:27:40 3 Q. Did she say a | any words that conveyed that 11:30:06 |
| 4 significant distinction between making the phone 4 message? | |
| 5 call from New York and making the phone call from 5 A. Yes. | 11:30:09 |
| 6 Massachusetts because in New York you would be 6 Q. What words | s did she say? 11:30:10 |
| 7 permitted to excuse me, to record the phone call; 7 A. That she had | never mentioned me 11:30:12 |
| 8 whereas, in Massachusetts you could not record it 8 previously. And that | t she was pressured into |
| 9 without the consent of all parties involved? 9 mentioning me by here | er lawyers and that certainly gave |
| 10A. It never11:27:5810rise to an inference of | on my part that the story an |
| 11 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 11:27:58 11 inference that simply | y confirmed what I knew to be |
| 12 A. It never occurred to me. 11:28:00 12 the fact, that her alle | egations against me were |
| 13 BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:28:02 13 completely, totally at | nd entirely made up out of |
| 14 Q. Never occurred to you? 11:28:02 14 whole cloth. | |
| 15 A. No. 11:28:03 15 Q. Let's see if w | ve can make sure that we're 11:30:37 |
| 16 Q. Have we covered the entire content of the 11:28:09 16 understanding one | another, sir. |
| 17 second conversation? 17 Do you recognized | nize that there's a 11:30:44 |
| 18 A. I think so, yes. I continued to ask her 11:28:25 18 distinction between | Virginia Roberts having met you, |
| 19 if if I could use her if she was willing to 19 having been sexual | ly abused by you on multiple |
| 20 give me allow me to use her name. But that's 20 occasions, but not w | wanting to name you, as opposed |
| | s never having met you and never |
| 22 me I think I've covered fairly thoroughly, yes. 22 having been sexual | ly abused by you? |
| 23Q. Did Michael ever tell you that Virginia11:28:4623MR. SCOTT: | Objection 11:31:12 |
| 24 had said she never met you? 24 BY MR. SCAROL | A: 11:31:12 |
| 25 MR. SCOTT: Read that back, will you, for 11:28:53 25 Q. Are those tw | vo things different in your 11:31:13 |
| 87 | 89 |
| 1 me. Sorry. 1 mind? | |
| 2 (Requested portion read back.) 11:28:54 2 MR. SCOTT: | Objection, argumentative and 11:31:15 |
| 3 MR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you. 11:29:00 3 compound. | |
| 4 A. Michael and I did not discuss the 11:29:04 4 A. Not in the co | ntext of this case. Because 11:31:17 |
| 5 substance of Virginia's conversations with Rebecca 5 Virginia Roberts said | d that she was going to seek |
| 6 because the conversations were between Virginia and 6 justice from everybo | bdy that had abused her. And if |
| 7 Rebecca. So there was no conversation about that. 7 she didn't want to na | ame me, I think the inference is |
| 8 BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:29:18 8 inescapable that I wa | as not among those people that |
| 9 Q. Did Rebecca ever tell you that Virginia 11:29:19 9 she had had any sexu | ual contact with. So that was |
| 10 ever said that she had never met you? 10 certainly the inference | ce I drew and I think it's an |
| 11 A. The implication was quite clear that she 11:29:25 11 inescapable inference | ce. |
| 12had never mentioned me, that she didn't want to12BY MR. SCAROL | A: 11:31:45 |
| 13mention me, and that the lawyers pressured her into13Q. When did V | irginia Roberts say she was 11:31:45 |
| | e from everyone who had abused |
| 15 occurred. 15 her? | |
| | er depositions, in her 11:31:50 |
| - | media, certainly that's been a |
| | t it was time that that Jeffrey |
| | o had abused her were brought to |
| | seen as above the law. Just go |
| | 'll see there are repeated |
| 22 What I am asking you is whether Rebecca 11:29:53 22 references to that in | |
| 23 ever told you that Virginia said she had never met 23 Q. Which depose | |
| | o check those. You know 11:32:18 |
| 25 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:30:03 25 those as well as I do. | |

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

| | 90 | 92 |
|--|---|---|
| 1 | Q. Well, I'm I'm sorry. My memory is not 11:32:22 | ¹ drew, not something that either Rebecca or Michael |
| 2 | superb. | ² ever told you, correct? |
| 3 | A. Okay. So let me go over them. 11:32:26 | ³ A. I certainly believe that they believe 11:34:57 |
| 4 | Q. And and I would like you to tell us 11:32:29 | 4 that. But Rebecca was very careful about the words |
| 5 | based | 5 that she communicated to me and she told me |
| 6 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Please just ask 11:32:29 | 6 precisely what it was that Virginia Roberts had told |
| 7 | questions, Counsel. | ⁷ her and didn't go beyond that and didn't draw any |
| 8 | MR. SCAROLA: I am doing that. 11:32:32 | and didn't go coyona that and didn't didw dify and didn't tell me any words that weren't, in fact, |
| 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:32:32 | ⁹ recited by Virginia Roberts. |
| 10 | Q. I would like you to tell us which 11:32:33 | 10 So the words were she never mentioned you 11:35:24 |
| 11 | depositions Virginia Roberts said in which | 11 before all this stuff in the media, and she told me |
| 12 | depositions Virginia Roberts said, I am going to | 12 expressly that she did not want to include you in |
| 13 | seek justice from everyone who abused me. | ¹³ any of the allegations of sexual misconduct but her |
| 14 | A. My recollection is she said it on multiple 11:32:44 | 14 lawyers pressured her into doing it. |
| 15 | occasions. She may have said it in her | ¹⁵ MR. SCOTT: I'd like to take a break in 11:35:47 |
| 16 | conversations in her telephone interview with | 16 another five minutes or so. We've been going |
| 17 | Bradley Edwards and you. She may have said it in | ¹⁷ another hour. So where ever you think is good, |
| 18 | her interviews with various British media for which | 18 Jack. |
| 19 | she was apparently paid. She may have said it in | 19 MR. SCAROLA: We're not quite there yet. 11:35:55 |
| 20 | her two false affidavits that she filed in the | 20 BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:35:58 |
| 21 | federal court. | Q. Who are the people that Rebecca says 11:35:58 |
| 22 | I'm not sure where she said it, but I'm 11:33:18 | 22 Virginia had previously told her that Virginia was |
| 23 | completely confident that she said it. | ²³ abused by? |
| 24 | Q. What is a deposition? 11:33:25 | A. I never asked her that question. 11:36:10 |
| 25 | A. What we're having here now. 11:33:27 | 25 Q. Did you ask her was Les Wexner one of the 11:36:14 |
| | | |
| | 91 | 93 |
| 1 | | |
| | Q. Your testimony was that Virginia Roberts 11:33:35 | 1 people that abused Virginia? |
| 2 | Q. Your testimony was that Virginia Roberts 11:33:35 made these statements in depositions, plural. You | people that abused Virginia? A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 |
| | | |
| 2 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your |
| 2 3 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:17 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:17 that never before 2014, end of December, was it |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:17 that never before 2014, end of December, was it ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:17 that never before 2014, end of December, was it ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:17 that never before 2014, end of December, was it ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts, that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:17 that never before 2014, end of December, was it ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts, that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I had ever been with her. I was completely aware of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under | A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:21 Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:48 of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:16 A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:17 that never before 2014, end of December, was it ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts, that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I had ever been with her. I was completely aware of that. There had never been any allegation. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:48 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation and will be deposed as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I was entitled to draw the conclusion, the reasonable | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation and will be deposed as19a witness to this allegation. I believe it is an |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I was entitled to draw the conclusion, the reasonable inference, that when she did not want to name me, it | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation. I believe it is an20entirely false allegation that she told you in 2011 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I was entitled to draw the conclusion, the reasonable inference, that when she did not want to name me, it was because that I I never had any sexual or any | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation and will be deposed as19a witness to this allegation. I believe it is an20entirely false allegation that she told you in 201121that she had had any sexual contact with me. I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I was entitled to draw the conclusion, the reasonable inference, that when she did not want to name me, it was because that I I never had any sexual or any other contact with her, which I know to be the | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation and will be deposed as19a witness to this allegation. I believe it is an20entirely false allegation that she told you in 201121that she had had any sexual contact with me. I22think she's lying through her teeth when she says |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I was entitled to draw the conclusion, the reasonable inference, that when she did not want to name me, it was because that I I never had any sexual or any other contact with her, which I know to be the truth. So that's an inference that I draw. | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation and will be deposed as19a witness to this allegation. I believe it is an20entirely false allegation that she told you in 201121that she had had any sexual contact with me. I22think she's lying through her teeth when she says23that. And I doubt that your notes will reveal any |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I was entitled to draw the conclusion, the reasonable inference, that when she did not want to name me, it was because that I I never had any sexual or any other contact with her, which I know to be the truth. So that's an inference that I draw. BY MR. SCAROLA: 1:2:4:2 | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation and will be deposed as19a witness to this allegation. I believe it is an20entirely false allegation that she told you in 201121that she had had any sexual contact with me. I22think she's lying through her teeth when she says23that. And I doubt that your notes will reveal any24such information. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | made these statements in depositions, plural. You then went on to talk about a telephone interview and interviews with the British media. Let's go back to my question, if we could. When you made the statement under oath 11:33:50 that Virginia Roberts said she was going to seek justice from everyone who abused her in depositions, which depositions were you talking about? A. I was using 11:34:05 MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered. 11:34:06 He's already provided A. I was using the term loosely, I apologize. 11:34:08 I meant in statements, including statements under oath. So I withdraw the statement about depositions. But I insist that she made statements along those lines in her interviews of both formal and informal, both legal and to the media, so that I was entitled to draw the conclusion, the reasonable inference, that when she did not want to name me, it was because that I I never had any sexual or any other contact with her, which I know to be the truth. So that's an inference that I draw. | 2A. I told you I never asked her the question. 11:36:213Q. Are you aware that years before December 11:36:484of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your5name had come up repeatedly in connection with6Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?7MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 11:37:168A. Let me answer that question. I am aware 11:37:179that never before 2014, end of December, was it10ever, ever alleged that I had acted in any way11inappropriately with regard to Virginia Roberts,12that I ever touched her, that I ever met her, that I13had ever been with her. I was completely aware of14that. There had never been any allegation.15She claims under oath that she told you 11:37:4816that secretly in 2011, but you have produced no17notes of any such conversation. You, of course, are18a witness to this allegation and will be deposed as19a witness to this allegation. I believe it is an20entirely false allegation that she told you in 201121that she had had any sexual contact with me. I22think she's lying through her teeth when she says23that. And I doubt that your notes will reveal any |

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

| | 94 | | 96 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | absolutely, categorically lying. So I am completely | 1 | MR. SCAROLA: No, how about just reading 11:40:22 |
| 2 | aware that never, until the lies were put in a legal | 2 | back the last question and maybe we can get an |
| 3 | pleading at the end of December 2014, it was never | 3 | answer to the question. |
| 4 | alleged that I had any sexual contact with Virginia | 4 | MR. SCOTT: Again, I move to strike your 11:40:27 |
| 5 | Roberts. | 5 | comments, Counsel, because it's inappropriate |
| 6 | I know that it was alleged that I was a 11:38:46 | 6 | and you're too good a lawyer to know that |
| 7 | witness to Jeffrey Epstein's alleged abuse and that | 7 | that's not true |
| 8 | was false. I was never a witness to any of Jeffrey | 8 | MR. SCAROLA: Nothing inappropriate about 11:40:33 |
| 9 | Epstein's sexual abuse. And I wrote that to you, | 9 | my insisting upon an answer to the question |
| 10 | something that you have falsely denied. And I stand | 10 | that I asked instead of a speech. |
| 11 | on the record. The record is clear that I have | 11 | MR. SCOTT: Well, you know, he's trying to 11:40:37 |
| 12 | categorically denied I was ever a witness to any | 12 | answer your question to the best of his |
| 13 | abuse, that I ever saw Jeffrey Epstein abusing | 13 | ability. Counsel objected to it. I wanted to |
| 14 | anybody. | 14 | take a break to make sure that we explained to |
| 15 | And and the very idea that I would 11:39:18 | 15 | him the position so that we didn't have a |
| 16 | stand and talk to Jeffrey Epstein while he was | 16 | problem, and I was trying to protect everybody |
| 17 | receiving oral sex from Virginia Roberts, which she | 17 | in this room. But if you want to proceed, we |
| 18 | swore to under oath, is so outrageous, so | 18 | can do it. |
| 19 | preposterous, that even David Boies said he couldn't | 19 | MR. SCAROLA: Well, if we simply answer 11:40:52 |
| 20 | believe it was true. | 20 | the questions that are asked, there won't be a |
| 21 | MS. McCAWLEY: I object. I object. I'm 11:39:40 | 21 | problem. |
| 22 | not going to allow you to reveal any | 22 | MR. SCOTT: Well, I guess everybody you 11:40:59 |
| 23 | conversations that happened in the context of a | 23 | can characterize it one way, I can characterize |
| 24 | settlement discussion. | 24 | it another, that he's doing the best he can to |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: Does she have standing? 11:39:46 | 25 | answer your questions. |
| | | <u> </u> | |
| | 95 | 1 | |
| | 55 | | 97 |
| 1 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 | 1 | 97 MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 | 1 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 |
| 2 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to | 2 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. |
| 2 3 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 | 2 3 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 |
| 2 3 4 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? | 2 3 4 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 |
| 2 3 4 5 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 | 2 3 4 5 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? | 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is MR. SIMPSON: Wait a minute. Wait a 11:40:04 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 would like, I will answer it again. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is MR. SIMPSON: Wait a minute. Wait a 11:40:04 minute. Wait a minute. Please don't disclose | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 would like, I will answer it again. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:41:50 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is MR. SIMPSON: Wait a minute. Wait a 11:40:04 minute. Wait a minute. Please don't disclose something that she has a right to raise that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 would like, I will answer it again. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:41:50 Q. I would like an answer to that question. 11:41:50 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is MR. SIMPSON: Wait a minute. Wait a 11:40:04 minute. Wait a minute. Please don't disclose something that she has a right to raise that objection if she wants to. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 would like, I will answer it again. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:41:50 A. I am aware - 11:41:51 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCOTT: No. If he 11:39:58 MR. SCAROLA: I'd like him to finish the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is MR. SIMPSON: Wait a minute. Wait a 11:40:04 minute. Wait a minute. Please don't disclose something that she has a right to raise that objection if she wants to. MR. SCOTT: Exactly. 11:40:13 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 would like, I will answer it again. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:41:50 Q. I would like an answer to that question. 11:41:50 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is MR. SIMPSON: Wait a minute. Wait a 11:40:04 minute. Wait a minute. Please don't disclose something that she has a right to raise that objection if she wants to. MR. SCOTT: Exactly. 11:40:13 THE WITNESS: Okay. 11:40:14 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 would like, I will answer it again. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:41:50 Q. I would like an answer to that question 11:41:51 Q. Seems to me it calls for yes or no 11:41:52 response. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MS. McCAWLEY: I have a standing objection 11:39:47 and, I'm objecting again. I'm not going to THE WITNESS: No, no, no. Does she have 11:39:49 standing in this deposition? MR. SCOTT: Let's take a break for a 11:39:51 minute, okay? THE WITNESS: I'm not sure she has 11:39:54 standing. MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:57 speech? MR. SCAROLA: Are we finished with the 11:39:59 speech so that we can get to my question and then we can take a break. A. So the question the answer to your 11:40:02 question is MR. SIMPSON: Wait a minute. Wait a 11:40:04 minute. Wait a minute. Please don't disclose something that she has a right to raise that objection if she wants to. MR. SCOTT: Exactly. 11:40:13 THE WITNESS: Okay. 11:40:14 MR. SCOTT: Ask your question. 11:40:17 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. SCAROLA: And ultimately Judge Lynch 11:41:05 will make that determination. MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Sobeit. 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 MR. SCAROLA: So read back the last 11:41:08 question, if you would, please. We'll get a hopefully get an answer to that and then we can take a break. MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to the 11:41:14 comments, Counsel. (Requested portion read back as follows:) 11:41:16 THE COURT REPORTER: "Are you aware that 11:41:39 years before December of 2014, when the CVRA pleading was filed, that your name had come up repeatedly in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's abuse of minors, correct?" MR. SCOTT: Objection, asked and answered 11:41:41 several times. Go ahead. A. I have answered that question. If you 11:41:45 would like, I will answer it again. BY MR. SCAROLA: 11:41:50 A. I am aware 11:41:51 Q. Seems to me it calls for yes or no 11:41:52 |

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

| | 98 | | 100 |
|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | Q. Yes, I am aware that my name is 11:41:55 | 1 | by you? |
| 2 | MR. SCOTT: Again, I object to I'm not 11:41:57 | 2 | A. By me to the best of my recollection. 12:03:22 |
| 3 | trying to get into a fight with you, Jack, but | 3 | I called him and he would always be the 12:03:23 |
| 4 | I object to the comments, you know. Really | 4 | kind of gatekeeper and often she was putting the |
| 5 | just let him answer the question. | 5 | babies to sleep, and sometimes she couldn't come to |
| 6 | MR. SCAROLA: You and I don't need to 11:42:02 | 6 | the phone. The third conversation, substantive |
| 7 | fight. | 7 | conversation there may have been conversations |
| 8 | MR. SCOTT: I agree. 11:42:04 | 8 | where I called and Michael wasn't there or I left a |
| 9 | A. The word "in connection" is what requires 11:42:05 | 9 | message, or where Michael was there but she was |
| 10 | a longer answer. Yes, I am aware that it was | 10 | putting the babies to sleep and either she said they |
| 11 | falsely alleged by you that multiple witnesses had | 11 | would either he said they would call me back or I |
| 12 | placed me at places and scenes where multiple | 12 | called them back. |
| 13 | victims had been abused by Jeffrey Epstein. That | 13 | But the third substantive conversation, to 12:03:48 |
| 14 | statement by you, Mr. Scarola, was a false | 14 | the best |
| 15 | statement. It is not true that multiple witnesses | 15 | Q. Where were you? 12:03:51 |
| 16 | have said that. And you misstated that. | 16 | A. Huh? 12:03:52 |
| 17 | I am aware that there were false 11:42:35 | 17 | Q. Where were you when you 12:03:53 |
| 18 | allegations that I was a witness but never a | 18 | A. Probably 12:03:54 |
| 19 | participant in any improper conduct. And I | 19 | Q initiated this call? 12:03:55 |
| 20 | categorically responded in letters to you, and to | 20 | A. Probably in Massachusetts at this point. 12:03:55 |
| 21 | Mr. Edwards, I think, that there was no truth to | 21 | And then we discussed the charity. And 12:04:04 |
| 22 | that. That if any witness had so testified, they | 22 | I think it was called VR, which is her initials, |
| 23 | would be committing perjury. | 23 | Virginia Roberts, and also it stood for something, I |
| 24 | MR. SCAROLA: You have requested a break. 11:43:04 | 24 | don't know, Victims Rights or something like that. |
| 25 | MR. SCOTT: Let's do it. Good point. 11:43:06 | 25 | And she said that the lawyers had contributed |
| | 99 | | 101 |
| 1 | | 1 | \$80,000 of their own money to start the charity. |
| 2 | VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 11:43:07 time is approximately 11:43 a.m. | 2 | She didn't indicate which lawyers. But the lawyers |
| 3 | (Recess was held from 11:43 a.m. until 12:02 p.m.) 11:43:11 | 3 | had contributed \$80,000 of their own money to start |
| 4 | VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 12:02:12 | 4 | the charity and that they were going to fund the |
| 5 | The time is approximately 12:02 p.m. | 5 | charity by contribution from Leslie from the man |
| 6 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:02:16 | 6 | from Columbus who owned Victoria's Secret and they |
| 7 | Q. Have we completely covered the content of 12:02:17 | 7 | expected a very substantial contribution. |
| 8 | phone call number 2? | 8 | They also said that 12:05:02 |
| 9 | A. To my best of my recollection, yes. 12:02:22 | 9 | Q. I'm sorry, but "they" is not helpful to 12:05:04 |
| 10 | Q. Okay. Let's go to the very next 12:02:25 | 10 | |
| | | | me. |
| 11 | communication between you and either Rebecca or | 11 | |
| 11 12 | | 1 | |
| | communication between you and either Rebecca or | 11 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 |
| 12 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. | 11 12 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. |
| 12 13 | communication between you and either Rebecca orMichael.A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 | 11 12 13 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance |
| 12 13 14 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael.A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any | 11 12 13 14 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. |
| 12 13 14 15 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been | 11 12 13 14 15 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the | 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the third conversation we also talked about the charity. | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie Wexner and that they thought that by getting on |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the third conversation we also talked about the charity. And she agreed. | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie Wexner and that they thought that by getting on television, they would increase the chances of |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the third conversation we also talked about the charity. And she agreed. Q. I'm sorry, I need to stop you for a just a 12:03:01 | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie Wexner and that they thought that by getting on television, they would increase the chances of raising this money from Leslie Wexner. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the third conversation we also talked about the charity. And she agreed. Q. I'm sorry, I need to stop you for a just a 12:03:01 moment. Who contacted whom and when? | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie Wexner and that they thought that by getting on television, they would increase the chances of raising this money from Leslie Wexner. And that she thought they had already made 12:05:37 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the third conversation we also talked about the charity. And she agreed. Q. I'm sorry, I need to stop you for a just a 12:03:01 moment. Who contacted whom and when? A. I think I contacted them. Normally the 12:03:08 | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie Wexner and that they thought that by getting on television, they would increase the chances of raising this money from Leslie Wexner. And that she thought they had already made 12:05:37 contact with Wexner and that they had already |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the third conversation we also talked about the charity. And she agreed. Q. I'm sorry, I need to stop you for a just a 12:03:01 moment. Who contacted whom and when? A. I think I contacted them. Normally the 12:03:08 procedure was I speak to Michael, he would pick up | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie Wexner and that they thought that by getting on television, they would increase the chances of raising this money from Leslie Wexner. And that she thought they had already made 12:05:37 contact with Wexner and that they had already made with the man from Columbus, and they had |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | communication between you and either Rebecca or Michael. A. My recollection is that I asked them if 12:02:37 they had anything else that they were aware of, any other information, I asked her whether she had been in touch with Virginia Roberts. I think in the third conversation we also talked about the charity. And she agreed. Q. I'm sorry, I need to stop you for a just a 12:03:01 moment. Who contacted whom and when? A. I think I contacted them. Normally the 12:03:08 procedure was I speak to Michael, he would pick up the phone, I only had his number. I only had his | 111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. She when I say "they" when I talk 12:05:07 about the substance, I'm always talking about her. I never had any conversations about the substance with him. She said that they were hoping to fund the 12:05:17 charity by substantial contribution from Leslie Wexner and that they thought that by getting on television, they would increase the chances of raising this money from Leslie Wexner. And that she thought they had already made 12:05:37 contact with Wexner and that they had already made with the man from Columbus, and they had already made contact with ABC. But I don't think |

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

| | 102 | | 104 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | went to New York at some point for the interviews. | 1 | her credibility, and that that would help her in her |
| 2 | Q. "She" who? 12:06:04 | 2 | efforts to obtain money from her I think at some |
| 3 | A. She, Rebecca, told me that Virginia had 12:06:05 | 3 | point she also mentioned that she would go after |
| 4 | gone to New York and so she assumed that she was | 4 | other people that she hadn't yet named in an effort |
| 5 | into New York for the interviews. | 5 | to obtain money from them as well. |
| б | Q. So this was a conversation that you 12:06:17 | 6 | Q. Did you ever directly ask Rebecca if 12:08:58 |
| 7 | assumed took place after Virginia Roberts was | 7 | Virginia Roberts had admitted that she had never met |
| 8 | interviewed in New York? | 8 | you? |
| 9 | A. I don't know. I don't know. 12:06:25 | 9 | A. No. 12:09:08 |
| 10 | Q. That's what you were told? 12:06:26 | 10 | Q. Did you ever well, why not? Why didn't 12:09:09 |
| 11 | A. No. I was told that she was in New York. 12:06:27 | 11 | you ask that question? |
| 12 | I'm just giving you the facts, sir. | 12 | A. I just 12:09:13 |
| 13 | Q. Okay. Any other information exchanged 12:06:31 | 13 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Go ahead. 12:09:15 |
| 14 | between you and Rebecca and/or Michael during the | 14 | A. I just wanted to get her to tell me what 12:09:15 |
| 15 | third conversation? | 15 | she was going to tell me. I was very satisfied with |
| 16 | A. I can't recall during the third 12:06:44 | 16 | her answers. There were a lot of questions I could |
| 17 | conversation any further information that was | 17 | have asked. I had to treat her very gently. I |
| 18 | exchanged, no. | 18 | wanted to keep her on the phone for as short a |
| 19 | Q. Did you place that phone call on a 12:06:50 | 19 | period of time as possible. I didn't want to be |
| 20 | landline or cell phone? | 20 | perceived as in any way harassing her. And so I |
| 21 | A. I don't remember. 12:06:54 | 21 | didn't ask that question directly. |
| 22 | Q. Do you have a landline in New York? 12:06:58 | 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:09:41 |
| 23 | A. I do. 12:07:00 | 23 | Q. Well, certainly one of the most 12:09:41 |
| 24 | Q. Do you have a landline in Massachusetts? 12:07:01 | 24 | significant questions that you could have asked her |
| 25 | A. Yes. 12:07:05 | 25 | was: Did Virginia ever admit she never met me? |
| | | | |
| | 103 | | 105 |
| 1 | 103 Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 | 1 | 105 That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 | 1 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 |
| 2 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? | 2 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? |
| 2 3 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur?A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 | 2 3 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52it?MR. SCOTT: Objection, form,12:09:55 |
| 2 3 4 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly | 2 3 4 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of | 2 3 4 5 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly | 2 3 4 5 6 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. 12:09:57 A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52it?MR. SCOTT: Objection, form,12:09:55argumentative.A. What I asked her was to please recall12:09:57everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her.BY MR. SCAROLA:12:10:00 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52it?MR. SCOTT: Objection, form,12:09:55argumentative.12:09:57A. What I asked her was to please recall12:09:57everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her.12:10:00Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to12:10:00 |
| 2 4 5 7 8 9 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52it?MR. SCOTT: Objection, form,12:09:55argumentative.12:09:57A. What I asked her was to please recall12:09:57everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her.12:10:00BY MR. SCAROLA:12:10:00Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to12:10:00you.12:10:00 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52it?MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55argumentative.12:09:57A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her.BY MR. SCAROLA:12:10:00Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00you.A. I didn't12:10:02 |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52it?MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55argumentative.12:09:57A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her.BY MR. SCAROLA:12:10:00Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00you.A. I didn't12:10:02Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan 12:10:03 |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. 12:09:57 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan Dershowitz, right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:10 |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan 12:10:03 Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:10 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan 12:10:03 Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:10 ahead. A. It wouldn't have been significant to me 12:10:11 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But basically what I've told you was the substance of | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:10 ahead. A. It wouldn't have been significant to me 12:10:11 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But basically what I've told you was the substance of the information: A, that she didn't ever mention | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan 12:10:03 Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:11 ahead. A. It wouldn't have been significant to me 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz. It would have been significant to me if |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But basically what I've told you was the substance of the information: A, that she didn't ever mention me; B, that she was pressured into mentioning me by | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz, It would have been significant to me 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz. It would have been significant to me if bershowitz. It would have been significant to me if bershowitz. It would have been significant to me if bershowitz. It would have been significant to me if bershowitz. It would have been significant to me if she could have so testified. But I didn't want to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But basically what I've told you was the substance of the information: A, that she didn't ever mention me; B, that she was pressured into mentioning me by her lawyers; C, that she was going to raise a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't - Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:10 ahead. A. I twould have been significant to me 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz. It would have been significant to me if she could have so testified. But I didn't want to in any way turn off her as a source of information. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But basically what I've told you was the substance of the information: A, that she didn't ever mention me; B, that she was pressured into mentioning me by her lawyers; C, that she was going to raise a billion dollars or half of the net worth of the guy | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz. It would have been significant to me if she could have so testified. But I didn't want to in any way turn off her as a source of information. And so I didn't ask her very many questions at all. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 we had further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But basically what I've told you was the substance of the information: A, that she didn't ever mention me; B, that she was pressured into mentioning me by her lawyers; C, that she was going to raise a billion dollars or half of the net worth of the guy from Columbus, Ohio. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. A. I didn't 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan 12:10:10 Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz, right? 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz. It would have been significant to me if she could have so testified. But I didn't want to in any way turn off her as a source of information. And so I didn't ask her very many questions at all. I wanted her to tell me her best recollection Hord and and and and and and and and and an |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. What's the next communication that you had 12:07:07 with Rebecca and/or Michael? When did it occur? A. I don't recall. I don't recall. I know 12:07:16 whad further communications. They were mostly repetitions and I have no specific recollection of when when they occurred. And I was constantly saying to her, can I you know, are you feeling comfortable about being public with this? And she kept saying no. Q. Were there any more substantive 12:07:47 communications that occurred between you and Rebecca and/or Michael? A. I would say that none that gave me new 12:07:54 information. I would constantly ask them, you know, to reiterate has anything changed, have you changed your mind, have you remembered anything new. But basically what I've told you was the substance of the information: A, that she didn't ever mention me; B, that she was pressured into mentioning me by her lawyers; C, that she was going to raise a billion dollars or half of the net worth of the guy from Columbus, Ohio. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | That would be pretty significant, wouldn't 12:09:52 it? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, 12:09:55 argumentative. 12:09:57 A. What I asked her was to please recall 12:09:57 everything that Virginia Roberts had said to her. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 Q. Yes, sir. But that's not my question to 12:10:00 you. 1 12:10:02 Q. It would have been very significant had 12:10:03 Virginia Roberts ever said, I never met Alan Dershowitz, right? MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. Go 12:10:11 because I know that Virginia Roberts never met Alan Dershowitz, li would have been significant to me if she could have so testified. But I didn't want to in any way turn off her as a source of information. And so I didn't ask her very many questions at all. I wanted her to tell me her best recollection unprompted and unquestioned. Virgina and unquestioned. |

25 that she had, A, credibility, that ABC would give

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

| | 106 | 108 |
|--|--|---|
| 1 | me for example, the whole thing about the guy | ¹ BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:51 |
| 2 | from Columbus, I didn't know anything about that. | 2 Q. Whether you filed a criminal complaint or 12:12:51 |
| 3 | She just said that in the course of conversing with | ³ not. |
| 4 | me and led me to conclude that there was an | 4 A. Yes, it does. 12:12:52 |
| 5 | extortion plot. | 5 MR. SCOTT: Please, Jack, he can't say 12:12:53 |
| 6 | I had actually believed there was an 12:10:52 | б that. |
| 7 | extortion plot from the very beginning and said | 7 A. It does involve conversation I had with 12:12:54 |
| 8 | that. But I had no real knowledge about who the | 8 David Boies. |
| 9 | ultimate object of the extortion plot was until I | ⁹ BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:57 |
| 10 | was able to confirm with Leslie Wexner's people | 10 Q. Well, in that case, in light of the fact 12:12:57 |
| 11 | that, in fact, overtures been made to him at about | 11 that that is a matter that will be addressed by the |
| 12 | the same time as my name was publicly and falsely | 12 Court, we'll save that question for another time. |
| 13 | revealed. So it all fit together. | 13A. I'm anxious to answer it.12:13:05 |
| 14 | And my own view is that a prosecutor would 12:11:21 | 14 Q. And I'm anxious to get an answer. 12:13:09 |
| 15 | look very, very harshly at the sequence of events | 15 A. Well, I hope we can agree I should be able 12:13:10 |
| 16 | that occurred in this case and might welcome the | 16 to answer it. |
| 17 | conclusion that there was a criminal extortion plot. | 17 Q. Have we exhausted your recollection of the 12:13:20 |
| 18 | Which is my belief. | 18 details of conversations that you had with Rebecca |
| 19 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:11:37 | ¹⁹ and Michael? |
| 20 | Q. Well, we know you never made a Bar 12:11:37 | A. About the substance of what she told me. 12:13:27 |
| 21 | complaint. | 21 There were many conversations involving would she do |
| 22 | A. Huh-huh. 12:11:39 | this, would she do that. But the conversations, the |
| 23 | Q. Did you ever file a criminal complaint 12:11:39 | 23 substance we've exhausted. |
| 24 | against any of these extortionists or perjury | ²⁴ Q. Okay. Well 12:13:40 |
| 25 | suborners? | 25 A. That is A, B, C, D, E, as I said, those 12:13:40 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | 107 | 109 |
| 1 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 | 1 those are what I've told you is the substance, the |
| 2 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the "we"? 12:11:50 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing |
| 2 3 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the "we"? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the |
| 2 3 4 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the "we"? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. |
| 2 3 4 5 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the "we"? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:11:208 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the "we"? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have filed no criminal complaints against anyone, | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was Q. Okay. Did you do any other background 12:14:46 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have filed no criminal complaints against anyone, correct? | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was Q. Okay. Did you do any other background 12:14:46 information? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. Thad conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have filed no criminal complaints against anyone, correct? A. To answer that question requires me to 12:12:40 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was Q. Okay. Did you do any other background 12:14:46 information? A. Well, I was no, I was obviously 12:14:49 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have filed no criminal complaints against anyone, correct? A. To answer that question requires me to 12:12:40 disclose conversations I had with David Boies. I | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was Q. Okay. Did you do any other background 12:14:46 information? A. Well, I was no, I was obviously 12:14:49 concerned that maybe I was being set up by your |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have filed no criminal complaints against anyone, correct? A. To answer that question requires me to 12:12:40 disclose conversations I had with David Boies. I would love to answer that question. | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was Q. Okay. Did you do any other background 12:14:46 information? A. Well, I was no, I was obviously 12:14:49 concerned that maybe I was being set up by your clients. And so I wanted to be sure that this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. Ihad conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have filed no criminal complaints against anyone, correct? A. To answer that question requires me to 12:12:40 disclose conversations I had with David Boies. I would love to answer that question. Q. No, sir, it does not. 12:12:48 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was Q. Okay. Did you do any other background 12:14:46 information? A. Well, I was no, I was obviously 12:14:49 concerned that maybe I was being set up by your clients. And so I wanted to be sure that this wasn't a setup, that this was an honorable person, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. We actually talked about that. And 12:11:47 Q. Who's the ''we''? 12:11:50 MR. SIMPSON: Don't disclose any 12:11:53 THE WITNESS: Okay 12:11:53 MR. SIMPSON: lawyer-client 12:11:54 A. I had conversations about that with 12:11:55 appropriate persons, yes. And I discussed it with Wexner's lawyers. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:12:07 Q. Are you answering yes to my question that 12:12:08 you have filed a criminal complaint? A. Not yet. 12:12:12 Q. Okay. So it has been ten months since you 12:12:14 allegedly became aware of that suborning of perjury and some eight months since your allegedly having become aware of the extortion plot, but you have filed no criminal complaints against anyone, correct? A. To answer that question requires me to 12:12:40 disclose conversations I had with David Boies. I would love to answer that question. Q. No, sir, it does not 12:12:49 | those are what I've told you is the substance, the details of what she said. And she said nothing different or new, to my recollection, in any of the brief subsequent conversations that we may have had. Q. Which phone call was it when she finally 12:14:01 disclosed her full name? A. Not the first. It was either the second 12:14:19 or the third conversation. Probably the second conversation. First I got his name and I checked him out, checked on Google to make sure that he was who he says he was and lived where he lived. And then she gave me her name. Q. So, when you say you checked Michael out, 12:14:39 what you did is you Googled him; is that right? A. I just Googled him to see that he lived in 12:14:43 the place where he lived and was Q. Okay. Did you do any other background 12:14:46 information? A. Well, I was no, I was obviously 12:14:49 concerned that maybe I was being set up by your clients. And so I wanted to be sure that this wasn't a setup, that this was an honorable person, which is why I asked my wife also to listen to |

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

| | 110 | | 112 |
|----------|--|----------|--|
| 1 | trustworthy and and anxious just to say exactly | 1 | Q. How did you do that? 12:17:12 |
| 2 | and precisely what happened. And so I became | 2 | A. I corroborated what Virginia Roberts said, 12:17:13 |
| 3 | convinced that she was authentic and not not a | 3 | that she was was going to sue Leslie she was |
| 4 | setup. | 4 | going to go after Leslie Wexner to try to get a lot |
| 5 | Q. Okay. So, in order to investigate 12:15:26 | 5 | of money |
| 6 | Michael, you Googled him but did nothing else? | 6 | Q. Let me make sure you understand my 12:17:26 |
| 7 | A. That's all. To my recollection, that's 12:15:32 | 7 | question. |
| 8 | all I did is Google him. | 8 | A. Yeah. Yeah. 12:17:27 |
| 9 | Q. But you also relied upon both your and 12:15:35 | 9 | Q. Okay? You have corroborated surrounding 12:17:28 |
| 10 | your wife's personal assessment of the credibility | 10 | circumstances |
| 11 | of these people; is that right? | 11 | A. Right. 12:17:36 |
| 12 | A. Absolutely. That's right, yes. 12:15:44 | 12 | Q related to you by Rebecca? 12:17:36 |
| 13 | Q. A skill that you've developed over the 12:15:46 | 13 | A. Right. Right. 12:17:40 |
| 14 | course of your years of practice, right? | 14 | Q. You did not corroborate anything that 12:17:41 |
| 15 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Go ahead. 12:15:52 | 15 | Rebecca told you about what Virginia Roberts said |
| 16 | A. I just relied on it. I mean, I'm not I 12:15:52 | 16 | regarding you personally, correct? |
| 17 | don't know how good I am at it. But some people are | 17 | A. Of course I did. No, of course I did. I 12:17:53 |
| 18 | very good liars. But I believed her. That was my | 18 | corroborated it by my absolute firm and complete and |
| 19 | judgment. | 19 | unequivocal knowledge that your clients' allegations |
| 20 | My wife, who is a, you know, Ph.D. 12:16:06 | 20 | against me and Virginia Roberts' allegations against |
| 21 | neuropsychologist with a lot of experience, we all | 21 | me were totally and completely false and completely |
| 22 | thought she sounded we both thought she sounded | 22 | made up. So I knew that. That knowledge |
| 23 | incredibly truthful. | 23 | corroborated her statements. |
| 24 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:16:16 | 24 | Q. Well, the statement that you have related 12:18:14 |
| 25 | Q. But was it all or was it both? 12:16:17 | 25 | is that Rebecca said Virginia Roberts was pressured |
| | 111 | | 113 |
| 1 | A. Just both, just the two of us. 12:16:19 | 1 | into naming you |
| 2 | Q. You and your wife? 12:16:20 | 2 | A. There were 12:18:24 |
| 3 | A. Just me and my wife, yeah. 12:16:21 | 3 | Q correct? 12:18:25 |
| 4 | Q. So 12:16:24 | 4 | A. No, there were two statements. One that 12:18:26 |
| 5 | A. My wife is southern, so I'm used to the 12:16:24 | 5 | Virginia Roberts never mentioned me in connection |
| б | phrase "all." | 6 | with anybody that she had any sexual contact with. |
| 7 | Q. You relied upon your personal assessment 12:16:27 | 7 | I knew that was true. Your clients know that that |
| 8 | of | 8 | is false. And me knowing it's true served to |
| 9 | A. That's right. 12:16:30 | 9 | corroborate that statement by her. |
| 10 | Q Rebecca's credibility? 12:16:30 | 10 | Q. How could you possibly know whether 12:18:45 |
| 11 | A. That's right. 12:16:32 | 11 | Virginia Roberts ever mentioned your name before |
| 12 | Q. And you relied upon your wife's assessment 12:16:33 | 12 | December of 2014? |
| 13 | of Rebecca's credibility? | 13 | A. Because it was false and because she would 12:18:54 |
| 14 | A. That's right. 12:16:37 | 14 | not have mentioned my name until her lawyers |
| 15 | Q. And did you do any further investigation 12:16:38 | 15 | pressured her into doing it because I had no contact |
| 16 | of her? | 16 | with her. |
| 17 | A. No. Well, yes, of course, I corroborated 12:16:44 | 17 | Q. Do you have a copy of the statement that 12:19:11 |
| 18 | everything she said by talking to Leslie Wexner's | 18 | Virginia Roberts made to the FBI? |
| 19 | wife, talking to Leslie Wexner's lawyers, talking to | 19 | A. I don't have it here, no. 12:19:16 |
| 20 | ABC, and finding out that everything she said to me | 20 | Q. Have you seen it? 12:19:17 |
| 21 | was absolutely true, yes. | 21 | A. Her statement to the FBI? 12:19:20 |
| 22 23 | Q. Well, the one thing that you didn't 12:17:01 | 22 23 | Q. Yes. 12:19:22 |
| 23 | corroborate was anything that Virginia Roberts | 23 | A. No, but I do know that she never told the 12:19:23 FBI anything about me whatsoever. Because I was |

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

FBI anything about me whatsoever. Because I was

told that by Jeffrey Sloman, who was the assistant

www.phippsreporting.com (888)811-3408

12:17:10

24

25

allegedly said to her about you?

A. Of course I did. Of course I did.

24

25

| | 114 | | 116 |
|----|---|----|---|
| 1 | United States attorney in charge of this case. | 1 | discussed my case with her. |
| 2 | Jeffrey Sloman said he was prepared to file a sworn | 2 | Q. Has Alexi Ashe ever been your lawyer? 12:22:09 |
| 3 | affidavit that my name never came up, period, during | 3 | A. I would say not, no. 12:22:11 |
| 4 | any investigation whatsoever, and that if my name | 4 | Q. Beginning approximately January 3 or 4 of 12:22:23 |
| 5 | had in any way come up, I would not have been | 5 | 2015, you began a mass media campaign battle against |
| б | allowed to participate in the negotiations because I | 6 | Bradley Edwards and Professor Paul Cassell alleging |
| 7 | would have had a conflict of interest. | 7 | that they were sleazy, unethical lawyers who |
| 8 | Jeffrey Sloman said that to me and to 12:19:55 | 8 | fabricated false charges against you, correct? |
| 9 | other people and tried very hard to get the Justice | 9 | A. That's a false 12:22:46 |
| 10 | Department to allow him to file an affidavit | 10 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative, mass 12:22:46 |
| 11 | asserting that. So I know it's true. And I know | 11 | media, et cetera. |
| 12 | it's false what you're alleging; namely, that she | 12 | A. That's a false statement. 12:22:46 |
| 13 | said she had sex with me or implying that to the | 13 | I did not begin. It was your clients who 12:22:49 |
| 14 | FBI. | 14 | began it. Your clients began it by filing false |
| 15 | If she did, she's committed yet an 12:20:14 | 15 | statements in a federal court which the judge struck |
| 16 | additional crime, 1001, by lying to an FBI agent, | 16 | and sanctioned them for as being irrelevant and |
| 17 | which if she did I'd like to know about that because | 17 | pertinent and he used other language. |
| 18 | I'd like to then file a formal complaint with the | 18 | They began it. It is my belief that they 12:23:10 |
| 19 | FBI about that, or with the Justice Department. | 19 | began it in order to get massive press attention to |
| 20 | I recommend that you speak to Jeffrey 12:20:33 | 20 | it. And my my responses were when the press |
| 21 | Sloman. | 21 | called me, the press called me immediately and asked |
| 22 | Q. You know that Virginia Roberts is not the 12:20:35 | 22 | me for my reaction. I was totally shocked that any |
| 23 | only person who has sworn under oath that you were | 23 | lawyer would make these kinds of outrageous |
| 24 | present at Jeffrey Epstein's Palm Beach home with | 24 | career-destroying allegations without even calling |
| 25 | young girls, right? | 25 | me and asking me if I would deny it or have any |
| | 115 | | 117 |
| 1 | A. No. 12:20:54 | 1 | evidence to provide for them. |
| 2 | Q. You don't know that? 12:20:55 | 2 | And when I was called by the media, I did 12:23:47 |

| 1 | A. No. 12:20:54 |
|----|--|
| 2 | Q. You don't know that? 12:20:55 |
| 3 | A. No. I know that 12:20:57 |
| 4 | Q. Well, that's fine. You've answered my 12:20:59 |
| 5 | question. That's not something you know? |
| 6 | A. A, I was not present in Jeffrey Epstein's 12:21:02 |
| 7 | home with any underage young women, period. Never, |
| 8 | ever under any circumstances. |
| 9 | B, I am not aware that anyone has sworn 12:21:12 |
| 10 | under oath that I was there during the relevant |
| 11 | periods of time, which is a three-year period |
| 12 | between the summer of 1999 and the summer of 2002. |
| 13 | Because I was never as far as I know, I was never |
| 14 | in Jeffrey Epstein's home during that period of |
| 15 | time, period. |
| 16 | Q. I want to go back to the Ashes, if I 12:21:36 |
| 17 | could. Joanne Ashe is not a lawyer, is she? |
| 18 | A. Joanne Ashe is not a lawyer, no. 12:21:42 |
| 19 | Q. And is Alexi Ashe a lawyer? 12:21:44 |
| 20 | A. Yes. 12:21:46 |
| 21 | Q. Has Alexi Ashe ever been your lawyer? 12:21:49 |
| 22 | A. I have discussed the case with Alexi Ashe. 12:21:53 |
| 23 | She is a full-time sex trafficking prosecutor whose |
| 24 | whole career has been going after sex traffickers in |
| 25 | the Brooklyn District Attorney's office and I have |
| | |

And when I was called by the media, I did 3 what you would do, Mr. Scarola, or what your clients 4 would do, I defended myself. What any American 5 would do under the First Amendment, I categorically 6 denied career-destroying false statements and I told 7 the truth, which is what the United States 8 Constitution is all about and why we fought for 9 liberty. Yes, I told the truth to the media. 10 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:24:10 11 Q. You engaged in a mass media campaign to 12:24:11 12 convince the world that Bradley Edwards and 13 Professor Paul Cassell were unethical lawyers who 14 had fabricated false charges against you, correct? 15 MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative. 12:24:30 A. No, that's not correct. I responded to 12:24:31 16 17 press inquiries by telling the truth. My goal was 18 to let the world know that Virginia Roberts' 19 allegations against me were totally false. These 20 stories appeared, as far as I can tell, in every 21 single newspaper in the world and on every media, 22 which was part of their plot and the plan of your 23 clients, which is why they absurdly mentioned 24 Prince Andrew, claiming in the most absurd way --25 that they mentioned him because he was trying to

30 (Pages 114 to 117)

| | 118 | | 120 |
|----------------------|---|----------|---|
| 1 | lobby prosecutors to get a reduced sentence for | 1 | It would have been improper for me to have 12:27:18 |
| 2 | Jeffrey Epstein, they obviously put Prince Andrew in | 2 | allowed his use of his credibility as a former |
| 3 | there in order to get massive publicity around the | 3 | federal judge, as a professor who uses, misuses his |
| 4 | world. And every media in the world practically | 4 | university imprimatur, it was very important for me |
| 5 | called me from the BBC, to CBS, to ABC, to CNN and I | 5 | to attack the credibility of the messengers of the |
| 6 | responded to lies with the truth. | 6 | false information. |
| 7 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:25:26 | 7 | And it was important for me to also remind 12:27:43 |
| 8 | Q. And the truth that you attempted to convey 12:25:27 | 8 | the public that Bradley Edwards was a partner of |
| 9 | was that Bradley Edwards and Professor Paul Cassell | 9 | Rothstein, a man who is spending 50 years in jail |
| 10 | were unethical lawyers who fabricated false charges | 10 | for fraudulently creating a Ponzi scheme to sell |
| 11 | against you, right? | 11 | Jeffrey Epstein cases that didn't exist. Yes, it |
| 12 | A. The truth 12:25:42 | 12 | was very important for me to indicate the back |
| 13 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 12:25:43 | 13 | the real backgrounds of these lawyers and to make |
| 14 | A. The truth that I intended to convey was 12:25:44 | 14 | sure that the public didn't believe that because |
| 15 | that the charges against me were false and | 15 | they were credible, their story must be credible. |
| 16 | fabricated, that I never had any sexual contact | 16 | In fact, one of the first questions that I 12:28:22 |
| 17 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:25:52 | 17 | was asked repeatedly by the media is: Why would a |
| 18 | Q. Fabricated by whom, sir? 12:25:52 | 18 | former federal judge level a false charge against |
| 19 | A. Please don't interrupt me. 12:25:54 | 19 | you? Why would a distinguished personal injury |
| 20 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, interrupting. 12:25:55 | 20 | lawyer level a false charge against you? |
| 21 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:25:55 | 21 | And it was important for me to indicate 12:28:36 |
| 22 | Q. Please answer the question. 12:25:55 | 22 | why they would, that they were trying to do it for |
| 23 | A. Please don't interrupt 12:25:56 | 23 | crass financial reasons, they were trying to do it |
| 24 | MR. SCOTT: He's answering them. You may 12:25:57 | 24 | to open up a non-prosecution agreement, they were |
| 25 | not like the answer, but he's answering them. | 25 | trying to do it for reasons that were improper. |
| | | ļ | |
| | 119 | | 121 |
| 1 | A. Now you've you've made me lose my train 12:26:02 | 1 | So, yes, I did you know, Mr. Edwards, 12:28:55 |
| 2 | of thought, so | 2 | your client, is shaking his head, but when he's |
| 3 | MR. SCOTT: Can you read the question back 12:26:05 | 3 | deposed under oath, he's not going to be able to |
| 4 | and the read the question back and his | 4 | simply shake his head. He's going to have to answer |
| 5 | answers, please. | 5 | specific and direct questions. |
| 6 | (Requested portion read back.) 12:26:08 | 6 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:29:11 |
| 7 | THE COURT REPORTER: The question was: 12:26:08 | 7 | Q. Let me try my question. 12:29:12 |
| 8 | "And the truth that you attempted to convey was | 8 | Did you charge Bradley Edwards and 12:29:16 |
| 9 | that Bradley Edwards and Professor Paul Cassell | 9 | Professor Paul Cassell in your mass media |
| 10 | were unethical lawyers who fabricated false | 10 | appearances with fabricating false charges against |
| 11 | charges against you, right?" | 11 | you? |
| 12 | And the answer was: "The truth that I 12:26:08 | 12 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, form. 12:29:29 |
| 13 | intended to convey was that the charges against | 13 | A. My media appearances were largely in 12:29:33 |
| 14 | me were false and fabricated, that I never had | 14 | response to media requests of me. I did not conduct |
| 15 | any sexual contact" and then the question | 15 | a media campaign. The object of my speaking to the |
| 16 | was the answer was interrupted. | 16 | media was to respond to their questions. Their |
| 17 | A. Okay. Let me continue. That I never had 12:26:42 | 17 | questions were, number 1, did you ever have any |
| 18 | any sexual contact with Virginia Roberts because | 18 | sexual contact with Virginia Roberts? And I |
| 10 | Professor Cassell insisted on conveying to the | 19 | unequivocally stated no. |
| 19 | public that he was a former judge and that he was a | 20 | I stated that I knew there were no videos 12:30:01 |
| 20 | | 21 | or photographs because the event didn't occur. I |
| | professor and that he was using, improperly in my | | |
| 20 | professor and that he was using, improperly in my view, the stationery and name of his university to | 22 | stated that I would submit a sworn affidavit, which |
| 20 21 | | 22 23 | stated that I would submit a sworn affidavit, which in effect waived the statute of limitations. I |
| 20 21 22 | view, the stationery and name of his university to | | |
| 20 21 22 23 | view, the stationery and name of his university to add credibility to his claims, I felt that it was | 23 | in effect waived the statute of limitations. I |

| | 122 | | 124 |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| 1 | I was then asked by the media, well, why 12:30:29 | 1 | Q. Are you aware that there's also a 12:32:40 |
| 2 | would somebody who is a former federal judge and | 2 | counterclaim that has been filed on your behalf? |
| 3 | professor at a law school make these false charges? | 3 | A. Yes, I authorized the counterclaim to be 12:32:43 |
| 4 | I responded to those questions. Why would somebody | 4 | filed because I believe that your clients defamed me |
| 5 | like a distinguished personal injury lawyer make | 5 | and that Mr. Cassell wrote a letter to ABC, which |
| 6 | those false charges? And I responded to those | 6 | not even plausibly is within the claim of privilege, |
| 7 | questions. And everything I said was the truth as I | 7 | which asserts that I had asserts falsely and in a |
| 8 | believed it to be at the time. | 8 | defamatory way that I had had sexual contact with |
| 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:30:55 | 9 | Virginia Roberts, yes. |
| 10 | Q. Do you remember the question that was 12:30:57 | 10 | Q. Did you read the answer to the complaint 12:33:06 |
| 11 | asked of you? | 11 | and counterclaim |
| 12 | A. Yes, I've answered it. 12:30:58 | 12 | A. I'm sure I did. 12:33:10 |
| 13 | Q. What was the question? 12:31:00 | 13 | Q before it was filed? 12:33:11 |
| 14 | A. As part of massive media campaign, did I 12:31:03 | 14 | A. I'm sure I did. 12:33:11 |
| 15 | charge your clients with deliberately falsifying a | 15 | Q. And I assume that you approved of it, 12:33:13 |
| 16 | charge against me, and my answer satisfies that | 16 | correct? |
| 17 | question. | 17 | A. I assume I did, yes. 12:33:17 |
| 18 | Q. No, I don't think it does. Can you tell 12:31:18 | 18 | Q. Okay. 12:33:18 |
| 19 | us whether that's what you did, did you charge | 19 | MR. SCOTT: I object to anything as far as 12:33:20 |
| 20 | A. I just did. 12:31:22 | 20 | using pleadings like this, but go ahead and do |
| 21 | Q them with having intentionally 12:31:23 | 21 | it. |
| 22 | fabricated false charges against you? | 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:33:23 |
| 23 | A. I believe that they intentionally 12:31:28 | 23 | Q. As a law professor, would it be fair for 12:33:24 |
| 24 | fabricated false evidence against me. I believe | 24 | us to assume that you know the difference between |
| 25 | that they pressured their client into fabricating | 25 | simple negligence and recklessness? |
| 1 | 123 false evidence against me. I believe that they | 1 | A. That's something that you could spend an 12:33:32 |
| 2 | helped to draft a perjurious affidavit that was | 2 | entire semester teaching the difference between |
| 3 | filed in court, after they knew that I said I could | 3 | simple negligence and recklessness. That's very |
| 4 | prove that I couldn't have been there four of the | 4 | much a matter of degree and the courts are are |
| 5 | five places that the alleged acts could have | 5 | split very much on what the meaning of |
| б | occurred. | 6 | "recklessness" is, particularly in the context of |
| 7 | I believe that when they recently sought 12:31:59 | 7 | defamation. It's a very complicated subject. |
| 8 | to submit an additional claim repeating these | 8 | Q. Do you personally recognize that there is 12:33:51 |
| 9 | charges into the federal court, that they did it | 9 | a difference between simple negligence and |
| 10 | knowing full well that these charges were false. | 10 | recklessness? |
| 11 | That's my belief, yes. | 11 | A. At the extremes, yes, simple negligence is 12:33:58 |
| 12 | Q. Are you aware that your lawyers filed a 12:32:14 | 12 | failure to perform a duty and recklessness is |
| 13 | pleading on your behalf in this case with the title | 13 14 | failure to perform a duty knowing that there |
| 14 15 | Defendant Alan M. Dershowitz's Answer to the | 14 | knowing or should know that there is a likelihood of |
| 15 | Complaint and Counterclaim? | 16 | some harm being committed. That's just what I |
| 17 | A. I'm not aware of that. 12:32:23 O. Pardon me? 12:32:24 | 17 | remember from first year torts. |
| 18 | · | 18 | Q. And you do also recognize that there is a 12:34:17 distinction between simple negligence and |
| 19 | A. I'm not aware of the title of any legal 12:32:25 pleadings. | 19 | distinction between simple negligence and recklessness on one hand and intentional wrongdoing |
| 20 | Q. Do you know that an answer has been filed 12:32:28 | 20 | on the other, correct? |
| 21 | to the defamation action that has been brought | 21 | A. Again, I've argued cases about this issue. 12:34:27 |
| 22 | against you? | 22 | And it's a continuum. Sometimes courts say "that |
| 23 | A. Of course. I mean, I'm sure there's been 12:32:34 | 23 | should have known" is the equivalent of "knowing." |
| 24 | a legal answer prepared. Of course, that's what | 24 | So it's a continuum. There's not an absolute |
| ~ - | | | |
| 25 | lawyers do. | 25 | straight line between those two, yeah. |

32 (Pages 122 to 125)

| | 126 | | 128 |
|----|--|----|--|
| 1 | Q. Well, what are you charging Professor Paul 12:34:48 | 1 | named me. They could have pressed her very hard on |
| 2 | Cassell and Bradley Edwards with having done? Were | 2 | dates and times and specifics of where these alleged |
| 3 | they negligent, reckless; or did they knowingly and | 3 | acts could have occurred. And they didn't do that. |
| 4 | willfully fabricate false charges against you? | 4 | So I think that it comes much closer to 12:37:18 |
| 5 | MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the form. 12:35:11 | 5 | the intentional side of the continuum than the |
| 6 | It's compound. | 6 | negligence side of the continuum. |
| 7 | And, Professor, if you would like to 12:35:13 | 7 | Q. Well, you've described it earlier as 12:37:35 |
| 8 | review the complaint and the counterclaim | 8 | suborning perjury. That's absolutely intentional, |
| 9 | before you respond to that, you have the | 9 | isn't it? |
| 10 | absolute right to do that. | 10 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative, 12:37:40 |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: I'd like to do that, yes. 12:35:21 | 11 | repetitious. Go ahead, you can answer it. |
| 12 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:35:23 | 12 | A. I believe that when the time came to file 12:37:44 |
| 13 | Q. Okay. Let me withdraw that question and 12:35:23 | 13 | the affidavit in which she described six at least |
| 14 | let me ask this question. | 14 | six alleged incidents of sexual misconduct with me, |
| 15 | MR. SCOTT: My position, just so we 12:35:26 | 15 | including having me standing next to Jeffrey Epstein |
| 16 | understand, is and this is a legal | 16 | while he was receiving oral sex, that they knew that |
| 17 | objection is that while I don't think you | 17 | that was false. And that I believe that they |
| 18 | can use pleadings to cross-examine a witness, | 18 | probably drafted the affidavit. And to my mind, |
| 19 | if you're going to do it, he has the right to | 19 | that is subornation of perjury, yes. A criminal |
| 20 | see it, have it in front of him and respond to | 20 | act. |
| 21 | it | 21 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:38:20 |
| 22 | MR. SCAROLA: That's why I was 12:35:37 | 22 | Q. They encouraged Virginia Roberts to make 12:38:21 |
| 23 | MR. SCOTT: as opposed to asking 12:35:38 | 23 | up lies about you and provided the details of those |
| 24 | questions in the vagueness. | 24 | lies to her? |
| 25 | MR. SCAROLA: That's why I'm withdrawing 12:35:40 | 25 | A. No, no 12:38:30 |
| | | ļ | |
| | 127 | | 129 |
| 1 | the question. | 1 | MR. SCOTT: Objection, argumentative, 12:38:32 |
| 2 | MR. SCOTT: Thank you. 12:35:43 | 2 | repetitious. |
| 3 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:35:43 | 3 | A. I believe they encouraged Virginia Roberts 12:38:33 |
| 4 | Q. What do you contend, independent of 12:35:43 | 4 | to make up lies about me and and pressed her and |
| 5 | anything that may be in any pleadings, Bradley | 5 | asked her to put in details. She would never on her |
| 6 | Edwards and Paul Cassell are responsible for, | 6 | own have come up with some of the details. They're |
| 7 | negligence, recklessness, or intentional and willful | 7 | absurd details. |
| 8 | fabrication of lies? | 8 | I mean, it's very, very bad lawyering on 12:38:49 |
| 9 | A. Let me answer that question in full. It 12:36:02 | 9 | their part, by the way. Very bad lawyering for |
| 10 | is my belief as I sit here today that Virginia | 10 | having her put in details that were so clearly and |
| 11 | Roberts never accused me of having any sexual | 11 | demonstrably false, such as, for example, meeting |
| 12 | contact with her because I never did have any sexual | 12 | Bill Clinton on the island. And they should have |
| 13 | contact with her. And that your clients, Edwards | 13 | known, by the way, when they put in an allegation |
| 14 | and Cassell, sat with her and said to her, look, if | 14 | against me that she had also said that she twice met |
| 15 | we want to get the NPA knocked out, we have to find | 15 | Al Gore with his wife, once on an air once on |
| 16 | a lawyer who worked on the NPA, but who you also had | 16 | Jeffrey Epstein's airplane and once on the island. |
| 17 | sexual contact with. The only lawyer who fits that | 17 | And it is completely clear, and David 12:39:21 |
| 18 | description is Alan Dershowitz. Think back, think | 18 | Boies was the lawyer for for Al Gore, as was |
| 19 | hard, did you ever have any sexual contact with Alan | 19 | as was I, we worked together on that case, that a |
| 20 | Dershowitz? | 20 | simple phone call from from David Boies to |
| 21 | And they pressured her into falsely 12:36:48 | 21 | Al Gore would have established that they don't know |
| 22 | stating something that they knew or should have | 22 | each other, that he's never been on the island, |
| 23 | known was an absolute and deliberate lie. They | 23 | never been on his airplane. |
| 24 | could have easily found that out. They could have | 24 | I made a simple phone call on day one and 12:39:46 |
| 25 | pressed her very hard on why she hadn't previously | 25 | established that. So your clients could have easily |
| L | | | |

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

| | 130 | | 132 |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | determined that she just lied, lied, lied, lied. | 1 | questions answered. |
| 2 | She lied about Al Gore. She lied about Ehud Barak, | 2 | A. You walk into the house, and there's a 12:42:33 |
| 3 | she lied about Bill Clinton. She lied about many, | 3 | foyer that extends probably about 6-foot wide and |
| 4 | many other people. | 4 | maybe 20 feet long. Yeah. Yeah. |
| 5 | This is something that your clients could 12:40:06 | 5 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:42:58 |
| 6 | easily have found out about, but they closed their | 6 | Q. Is there a kitchen at the entry level? 12:42:59 |
| 7 | eyes. They willfully blinded themself to a long | 7 | A. There is only an entry level and so 12:43:03 |
| 8 | history of lying by your client and willingly put in | 8 | Q. One-story home? 12:43:05 |
| 9 | an affidavit that they knew would destroy my career, | 9 | A. It's a one-story home. 12:43:06 |
| 10 | my 50-year career which I worked so hard to build, | 10 | Q. And so the kitchen is on that first floor? 12:43:07 |
| 11 | coming from a poor background, with no college | 11 | A. Kitchen is on the first floor to the left, 12:43:11 |
| 12 | education, being the first member of my family to go | 12 | yes. |
| 13 | to college, working so hard to build a career, | 13 | Q. And is there a living room or a lounge 12:43:13 |
| 14 | having an unblemished personal life, and then they | 14 | room adjacent to the kitchen? |
| 15 | willingly put in these false allegations without | 15 | A. Adjacent to the kitchen there is a large 12:43:22 |
| 16 | checking. Shame on them. | 16 | room which serves part of it as a dining area and |
| 17 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:40:49 | 17 | part of it as a living room, yes. |
| 18 | Q. During the period of time between 1998 and 12:40:50 | 18 | Q. And during this period of time that we're 12:43:29 |
| 19 | 2002, you owned a home in the Cambridge area, | 19 | focusing on between 1998 and |
| 20 | correct? | 20 | A. 1998? 12:43:38 |
| 21 | A. Yes. 12:41:04 | 21 | Q. Yes, sir. 12:43:39 |
| 22 | Q. Single-family home in a residential area? 12:41:04 | 22 | A. Okay, okay. 12:43:40 |
| 23 | A. Yes. 12:41:07 | 23 | Q. Between 1998 and 2002, how was the how 12:43:42 |
| 24 | Q. Would you please describe the exterior of 12:41:07 | 24 | was that room furnished? |
| 25 | that home to us? | 25 | A. Well, it would be easy to tell because 12:43:47 |
| 1 2 | A. Yes. It was wooden home, built by an 12:41:12 architect named Coolidge. Had a little basketball | 1 2 | it's been the subject of many photographic essays that appeared in magazines and newspapers. Our home |
| 3 | hoop where I played basketball with my children on | 3 | was often photographed. So anybody would know what |
| 4 | one side. It had a swimming pool an indoor | 4 | the interior of it looked like. Just a simple |
| 5 | swimming pool on the other side. The exterior was | 5 | Google search would show you what the interior of |
| 6 | gray/blue wood. | 6 | the house looked like. |
| 7 | Q. If someone were to enter through the front 12:41:41 | 7 | Q. Tell us what it looked like, please. 12:44:07 |
| 8 | door of your home, would they see some sort of stone | 8 | A. Well, what specifically? 12:44:08 |
| 9 | configuration outside the house? | 9 | Q. Well 12:44:11 |
| 10 | A. After a period of time, we had a 12:41:56 | 10 | A. It had a couch when you walk in. 12:44:12 |
| 11 | sculpture a sculptor from Martha's Vineyard make | 11 | Q. Okay. What other furniture? 12:44:14 |
| 12 | a stone sculpture and a light that stood outside of | 12 | A. It had chairs. It had a dining room 12:44:15 |
| 13 | our house. You can probably see that on Google. | 13 | table, all of which have been pictured in various |
| 14 | | 14 | magazines and newspapers. |
| | Q. When when was that stone sculpture 12:42:10 | | |
| 15 | installed? | 15 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 |
| 15 16 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 | 15 16 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 |
| 15 16 17 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. | 15 16 17 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 Q. Bookshelves? 12:44:33 |
| 15 16 17 18 | installed?A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps.MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 | 15 16 17 18 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 Q. Bookshelves? 12:44:33 A. In the living room? 12:44:34 |
| 15 16 17 18 19 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 of all this. | 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 Q. Bookshelves? 12:44:33 A. In the living room? 12:44:34 Q. In the rooms adjacent to the kitchen. 12:44:37 |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 of all this. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:42:23 | 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 Q. Bookshelves? 12:44:33 A. In the living room? 12:44:34 Q. In the rooms adjacent to the kitchen. 12:44:37 A. No, not to my recollection. 12:44:41 |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 of all this. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:42:23 Q. Describe the floor plan at the entry level 12:42:24 | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 Q. Bookshelves? 12:44:33 A. In the living room? 12:44:34 Q. In the rooms adjacent to the kitchen. 12:44:37 A. No, not to my recollection. 12:44:41 Why, does Virginia Roberts claim to have 12:44:47 |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 of all this. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:42:23 Q. Describe the floor plan at the entry level 12:42:24 of the house, please. | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 Q. Bookshelves? 12:44:33 A. In the living room? 12:44:34 Q. In the rooms adjacent to the kitchen. 12:44:37 A. No, not to my recollection. 12:44:41 Why, does Virginia Roberts claim to have 12:44:47 been in my home? 12:44:47 |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 of all this. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:42:23 Q. Describe the floor plan at the entry level 12:42:24 of the house, please. MR. SCOTT: Can you make a proffer as to 12:42:26 | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. Was there a desk in that room?12:44:27A. No.12:44:31Q. Bookshelves?12:44:33A. In the living room?12:44:34Q. In the rooms adjacent to the kitchen.12:44:37A. No, not to my recollection.12:44:41Why, does Virginia Roberts claim to have12:44:47been in my home?2Q. What kind of floor coverings are there on12:44:50 |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 of all this. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:42:23 Q. Describe the floor plan at the entry level 12:42:24 of the house, please. MR. SCOTT: Can you make a proffer as to 12:42:26 what the relevancy to this is? | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. Was there a desk in that room? 12:44:27 A. No. 12:44:31 Q. Bookshelves? 12:44:33 A. In the living room? 12:44:34 Q. In the rooms adjacent to the kitchen. 12:44:37 A. No, not to my recollection. 12:44:41 Why, does Virginia Roberts claim to have 12:44:47 been in my home? Q. What kind of floor coverings are there on 12:44:50 the entry level? |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | installed? A. I would have to check. I don't know. But 12:42:16 anybody can see that on Google Maps. MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the relevancy 12:42:20 of all this. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:42:23 Q. Describe the floor plan at the entry level 12:42:24 of the house, please. MR. SCOTT: Can you make a proffer as to 12:42:26 | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. Was there a desk in that room?12:44:27A. No.12:44:31Q. Bookshelves?12:44:33A. In the living room?12:44:34Q. In the rooms adjacent to the kitchen.12:44:37A. No, not to my recollection.12:44:41Why, does Virginia Roberts claim to have12:44:47been in my home?2Q. What kind of floor coverings are there on12:44:50 |

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

| | 134 | 13 |
|--|--|--|
| 1 | Q. Yes. 12:44:59 | 1 any time. |
| 2 | A. In the entry level right as you walk in, 12:45:02 | 2 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:47:02 |
| 3 | there are no floor coverings. There are | 3 Q. Any time that Jeffrey Epstein visited your 12:47:03 |
| 4 | Q. Tile, wood? 12:45:09 | 4 home, who was with him? |
| 5 | A. Not a rug. Just a floor. 12:45:13 | 5 A. Normally Ghislaine Maxwell and Sarah 12:47:07 |
| б | Q. What kind of floor? 12:45:16 | 6 Kellen. And he may have had another assistant or |
| 7 | A. I don't remember. 12:45:18 | 7 secretary or somebody. He usually traveled. |
| 8 | Q. What was its composition? 12:45:18 | 8 Usually he would fly in to Bedford 12:47:20 |
| 9 | A. I don't remember. 12:45:20 | 9 Airport, have a car take him usually go to his |
| 10 | Q. How about the living room, what was the 12:45:20 | 10 office. He had an office in Harvard Square, and if |
| 11 | composition of the floor in the living room? | 11 he came by my house, he came by my house with |
| 12 | A. Cork, I think. Cork, yeah. 12:45:26 | 12 whoever was his entourage at any given point in |
| 13 | Q. How many times has Jeffrey Epstein been a 12:45:34 | 13 time. |
| 14 | guest in that Cambridge, Massachusetts house? | 14 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:47:41 |
| 15 | A. Maybe 12:45:44 | 15 Q. And that usually was? 12:47:42 |
| 16 | MR. SWEDER: When you say "guest," you 12:45:46 | 16A. Sarah Kellen, Maxwell and sometimes12:47:43 |
| 17 | don't mean sleeping over? | 17 another one or two people. |
| 18 | A. He's never slept over. 12:45:51 | 18 Q. How old was Sarah Kellen when she was part 12:47:49 |
| 19 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:45:52 | 19 of Jeffrey Epstein's entourage? |
| 20 | Q. I didn't say anything about sleeping over. 12:45:52 | 20 A. If I had to estimate, I would say younger 12:47:56 |
| 21 | MR. SWEDER: I just want to make sure the 12:45:54 | 21 than 30 and older than 25. Somewhere between 25 and |
| 22 | record is clear. | 22 30, probably closer to 30. |
| 23 | A. He has never slept over. Maybe three 12:45:55 | 23 Q. You would describe her as a young woman? 12:48:06 |
| 24 | times. Maybe. Maybe three times. That would be a | A. I would describe her as a woman between 12:48:08 |
| 25 | rough estimate. Not very many. | the ages of 25 and 30. |
| | 135 | 13' |
| | 200 | 15 |
| 1 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 |
| 1 2 | | |
| | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 |
| 2 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? |
| 2 3 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 |
| 2 3 4 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 | 1Q. Does that in your mind fit the description12:48:152of a young woman?3A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her12:48:194age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a5teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a6woman between the ages of 25 and 30. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. | 1Q. Does that in your mind fit the description12:48:152of a young woman?3A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her12:48:194age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a5teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a6woman between the ages of 25 and 30.7Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey12:48:32 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:29 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 12:46:32 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:29 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:29 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But But | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:29 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:29 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:29 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:29 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't - 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:46 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote 18 multiple intelligences, whose name is slipping my |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't - 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:46 Q. How many times excuse me. When he did 12:46:47 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote 18 multiple intelligences, whose name is slipping my 19 mind now, but from the Ed School. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't - 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:46 Q. How many times excuse me. When he did 12:46:47 visit, with whon who accompanied him? | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote 18 multiple intelligences, whose name is slipping my 19 mind now, but from the Ed School. 20 She would arrange some of those lunch 12:49:23 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't - 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:46 Q. How many times excuse me. When he did 12:46:47 visit, with whom who accompanied him? MR. SCOTT: Let me ask you a question. 12:46:55 | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote 18 multiple intelligences, whose name is slipping my 19 mind now, but from the Ed School. 20 She would arrange some of those lunch 12:49:23 21 meetings where we would discuss serious issues, some |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't - 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:46 Q. How many times excuse me. When he did 12:46:47 visit, with whom who accompanied him? MR. SCOTT: Let me ask you a question. 12:46:55 Are we is this relevant timeframe or any | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote 18 multiple intelligences, whose name is slipping my 19 mind now, but from the Ed School. 20 She would arrange some of those lunch 12:49:23 21 meetings where we would discuss serious issues, some |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I don't 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:46 Q. How many times excuse me. When he did 12:46:47 visit, with whon who accompanied him? MR. SCOTT: Let me ask you a question. 12:46:55 Are we is this relevant timeframe or any time? Im just trying | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote 18 multiple intelligences, whose name is slipping my 19 mind now, but from the Ed School. 20 She would arrange some of those lunch 12:49:23 21 meetings where we would discuss serious issues, some |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. SCOTT: During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:12 A. During the relevant timeframe. 12:46:15 MR. SCOTT: 1999 to 2002. 12:46:16 A. 1999 to 2002. Oh, either maybe once. 12:46:17 Maybe once. Certainly not many times. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:24 Q. At least once? 12:46:27 A. I don't - 12:46:29 Q. Maybe two, maybe three? 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. No, no, I have no recollection 12:46:31 MR. SCOTT: Okay. 12:46:32 A. I have no recollection of him being there 12:46:33 at all during that relevant time period. But remembering that he had been in my house on a couple of occasions, it's certainly possible during that relevant time period he had been there once or twice. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:46:46 Q. How many times excuse me. When he did 12:46:47 visit, with whom who accompanied him? MR. SCOTT: Let me ask you a question. 12:46:55 Are we is this relevant timeframe or any | 1 Q. Does that in your mind fit the description 12:48:15 2 of a young woman? 3 A. I don't want to categorize a woman by her 12:48:19 4 age. It's a woman between 25 and 30. It's not a 5 teenager. It's not a middle-aged woman. It's a 6 woman between the ages of 25 and 30. 7 Q. What was Sarah Kellen's role in Jeffrey 12:48:32 8 Epstein's entourage? 9 A. She would, to my knowledge, arrange 12:48:37 10 transportation, she would arrange meetings when 11 meetings were occurring. She worked, I think, at 12 the Harvard office where he would have meetings with 13 George Church, the man who developed the genome, 14 Larry Summers, the president of Harvard, Henry 15 Rosovsky, the provost, the former provost of 16 Harvard; Stephen Kosslyn, the chairman of the 17 psychology department at Harvard, a man who wrote 18 multiple intelligences, whose name is slipping my 19 mind now, but from the Ed School. 20 She would arrange some of those lunch 12:49:23 21 meetings where we would discuss serious issues, some |

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

www.phippsreporting.com (888)811 - 3408

136

| | 138 | 140 |
|--|---|---|
| 1 | O. How old was Ghislaine Maxwell? 12:49:40 | ¹ Q. And you have described a variety of 12:51:59 |
| 2 | A. Ghislaine, Ghislaine Maxwell. I would 12:49:45 | 2 different regular girlfriends who were with him, |
| 3 | estimate | ³ correct? |
| 4 | MR. SCOTT: Your French isn't real high. 12:49:48 | 4 A. Yes. 12:52:06 |
| 5 | A. I would estimate that she was at the time 12:49:50 | 5 Q. Usually in the age range, you would 12:52:00 |
| 6 | between 35 and 40. | 6 estimate, between 20 and 25; is that correct? |
| 7 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:49:55 | 7 A. I would say 12:52:13 |
| 8 | Q. And what was her role in Jeffrey Epstein's 12:49:55 | 8 MR. SCOTT: Objection. That's not it. 12:52:14 |
| 9 | entourage? | 9 A. I would say between 22 and 25 would be a 12:52:15 |
| 10 | A. She was basically his major domo. She 12:49:58 | 10 closer closer estimate. But 23, in that range. |
| 11 | arranged travel as well. And she would tell you | 11 There were none that I ever believed were 12:52:25 |
| 12 | when you could meet with him, when to come over. | 12 in any way teenagers. And they all performed tasks. |
| 13 | She would call me at my office and say, Jeffrey | 13 They were taking notes or they were arranging, |
| 14 | would like to meet with you at 4:10, and then she | 14 serving coffee or doing various things. And that's |
| 15 | would call back and say, could you make it at 4:30? | 15 the way Jeffrey would travel when he went to |
| 16 | I would say that Ghislaine was the senior 12:50:19 | 16 academic meetings. |
| 17 | person organizing his kind of academic contacts and | 17 And these people were seen not only by me. 12:52:45 |
| 18 | Sarah Kellen was the junior person. They worked in | 18 They were seen by Larry Summers, they were seen by |
| 19 | overlapping roles. | 19 Church, they were seen by Marvin Minsky, they were |
| 20 | Q. Were there any other entourage members 12:50:34 | 20 seen by some of the most eminent academics and |
| 21 | that traveled with Jeffrey Epstein when he came to | 21 scholars in the world. There was no hint or |
| 22 | vour home? | 22 suggestion of anything sexual or improper in the |
| 23 | A. I have no recollection of any of them ever 12:50:41 | 23 presence of these people. |
| 24 | coming to my home. I don't remember. But if that's | 24 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:53:09 |
| 25 | who he traveled with. Sometimes he would travel | 25 Q. Describe the motor vehicle that Jeffrey 12:53:09 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | 139 | 141 |
| 1 | 139 he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home |
| 1 2 | | Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home on those occasions when you observed |
| | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I | ¹ Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home |
| 2 3 4 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. |
| 2 3 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two | Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home on those occasions when you observed A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 cars. Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. 5 Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 6 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. 5 Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 6 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 7 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. 5 Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 6 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 7 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 8 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, | Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home on those occasions when you observed A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 cars. Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:35 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a | Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home on those occasions when you observed A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 cars. Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:35 A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:37 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But | Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home on those occasions when you observed A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 cars. Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:35 A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:37 no. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. 5 Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 6 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 7 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 8 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? 9 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:35 10 A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:37 11 no. 12 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:53:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. 5 Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 6 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 7 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 8 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? 9 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:35 10 A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:37 11 no. 12 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:53:41 13 Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:43 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:13Q. So, you can state with certainty, based14upon your superb memory, that at no time between |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 were there and Jeffrey Epstein was there? | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad.12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no,12BY MR. SCAROLA:12BY MR. SCAROLA:13Q. So, you can state with certainty, based14upon your superb memory, that at no time between151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 were there and Jeffrey Epstein was there? A. Well, they were 12:51:42 | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. 5 Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 6 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 7 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 8 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? 9 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:35 10 A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:37 11 no. 12 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:53:41 13 Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:43 14 upon your superb memory, that at no time between 15 15 1999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in 16 16 a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein? 14 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 were there and Jeffrey Epstein was there? A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:13Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:4314upon your superb memory, that at no time between151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in16a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein?17A. I can't imagine any reason why I would 12:54:03 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 were there and Jeffrey Epstein was there? A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 I mean, there in the house, there in | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad.12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:13Q. So, you can state with certainty, based14upon your superb memory, that at no time between151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in16a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein?17A. I can't imagine any reason why I would12:54:0318have. I did not fly in his plane during that period |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 were there and Jeffrey Epstein was there? A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 I mean, there in the house, there in Massachusetts? | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:1212:53:4113Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:4314upon your superb memory, that at no time between151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in16a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein?17A. I can't imagine any reason why I would 12:54:0318have. I did not fly in his plane during that period19of time, my records establish. And I would see no |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 were there and Jeffrey Epstein was there? A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 I mean, there in the house, there in Massachusetts? MR. SCAROLA: There wherever. 12:51:47 | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.7Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad.12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:1212:53:4113Q. So, you can state with certainty, based151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in16a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein?17A. I can't imagine any reason why I would12:54:0318have. I did not fly in his plane during that period19of time, my records establish. And I would see no20reason why I would have. I don't have any |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 I mean, there in the house, there in Massachusetts? MR. SCAROLA: There wherever. 12:51:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: There wherever. 12:51:47 | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.7Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home12:53:248with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:1212:53:4113Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:4314upon your superb memory, that at no time between151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in16a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein?17A. I can't imagine any reason why I would 12:54:0318have. I did not fly in his plane during that period19of time, my records establish. And I would see no20reason why I would have. I don't have any21recollection whether I specifically drove with him |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 I mean, there in the house, there in Massachusetts? MR. SCAROLA: There wherever. 12:51:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:51:47 Q. When you were in Jeffrey Epstein's 12:51:48 | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:13Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:4314upon your superb memory, that at no time between151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in16a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein?17A. I can't imagine any reason why I would 12:54:0318have. I did not fly in his plane during that period19of time, my records establish. And I would see no20reason why I would have. I don't have any21recollection whether I specifically drove with him22during that period of time. But I think I did not. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. Q. They were there at the same time that you 12:51:38 were there and Jeffrey Epstein was there? A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 I mean, there in the house, there in Massachusetts? MR. SCAROLA: There wherever. 12:51:47 Q. When you were in Jeffrey Epstein's 12:51:48 presence, Jeffrey Epstein usually had what you have | 1 Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home 2 on those occasions when you observed 3 A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:20 4 cars. 5 Q. Limousines? 12:53:24 6 A. Limousines, yeah, yeah. 12:53:24 7 Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:26 8 with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine? 9 MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:35 10 A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:37 11 no. 12 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:53:41 13 Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:43 14 upon your superb memory, that at no time between 15 15 1999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in 1 16 a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein? 1 17 A. I can't imagine any reason why I would 12:54:03 18 have. I did not fly in his plane during that period 19 19 of time, my records establish. And I would see no 10 19 of time, my records establish. And I would see no |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | he almost always had a regular girlfriend. And I remember a few of them. One of them was a student at the business school who's I may be merging two of them. One of them was a student at the business 12:51:03 school. Another, maybe the same one, was a wealthy woman whose father owned banks in Great Britain. Another was a woman from either the Czech Republic or Slovakia who was probably between 20 and 25, probably closer to 25. And he would travel with a posse, basically, an entourage of of people. But I never met some of the people who are in the entourage. They were just there. A. Well, they were 12:51:42 MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. That's vague. 12:51:43 I mean, there in the house, there in Massachusetts? MR. SCAROLA: There wherever. 12:51:47 BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:51:47 Q. When you were in Jeffrey Epstein's 12:51:48 | 1Epstein used to travel from the airport to your home2on those occasions when you observed3A. I have no recollection. They were rented 12:53:204cars.5Q. Limousines?12:53:246A. Limousines, yeah, yeah.12:53:247Q. And did you ever travel from your home 12:53:268with Jeffrey Epstein in a limousine?9MR. SCOTT: Objection, form, overly broad. 12:53:3510A. Not during the relevant time period, no, 12:53:3711no.12BY MR. SCAROLA:13Q. So, you can state with certainty, based 12:53:4314upon your superb memory, that at no time between151999 and 2002 did you ever travel from your home in16a limousine with Jeffrey Epstein?17A. I can't imagine any reason why I would 12:54:0318have. I did not fly in his plane during that period19of time, my records establish. And I would see no20reason why I would have. I don't have any21recollection whether I specifically drove with him22during that period of time. But I think I did not. |

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

| | 142 | | 144 |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | the only reason that I would have ever to go in a | 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:56:34 |
| 2 | limousine that I know of. | 2 | Q. Which people told you they saw airplane 12:56:34 |
| 3 | Q. What records establish that you were not 12:54:37 | 3 | manifests for the period between 1999 and 2002? |
| 4 | on Jeffrey Epstein's plane during what you have | 4 | MR. SCOTT: If that involves lawyer 12:56:44 |
| 5 | described as the relevant time period? | 5 | conversations and |
| 6 | A. No, you've described it as the relevant 12:54:46 | 6 | A. It does involve lawyer conversations, yes. 12:56:46 |
| 7 | time period. You said 2009 to 2000 | 7 | MR. SCAROLA: He just waived it. 12:56:48 |
| 8 | Q. No, sir. In the answer you just 12:54:51 | 8 | MR. SCOTT: I'm not taking that position. 12:56:50 |
| 9 | A 1999 12:54:52 | 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:56:52 |
| 10 | Q gave, you used the phrase "relevant 12:54:53 | 10 | Q. Okay. So your position is that you are 12:56:53 |
| 11 | time frame," time period. | 11 | not disclosing |
| 12 | A. Yeah, I was picking up on your terms 12:54:54 | 12 | A. I'm happy to disclose 12:56:54 |
| 13 | between 1999 and 2002. So can we agree that's the | 13 | Q who told you 12:56:56 |
| 14 | relevant time period? | 14 | A. I'm happy to disclose 12:56:57 |
| 15 | Q. You can tell me what what your response 12:55:03 | 15 | MR. SCOTT: No, no, I'm the lawyer here. 12:57:00 |
| 16 | is based on that you never traveled on Jeffrey | 16 | I'm telling him not to answer that question. |
| 17 | Epstein's airplane during the relevant time period, | 17 | I'll discuss it at the lunch break and I'll get |
| 18 | whatever you consider that to be. | 18 | back to you. And I would also like to know |
| 19 | A. Okay. Number 1, my own calendars, which 12:55:15 | 19 | what the relevancy of all those questions were |
| 20 | have been provided to you. Number 2, my cell phone | 20 | about the house. |
| 21 | records. Number 3, my wife's calendars. Number 4, | 21 | THE WITNESS: I can figure it out. 12:57:10 |
| 22 | my teaching and other schedule. | 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:57:15 |
| 23 | Number 5, my own recollection. And number 12:55:33 | 23 | Q. Who did you personally see airplane 12:57:15 |
| 24 | 6, as far as we know, the airplane manifests do not | 24 | manifests during that period between 1999 and 2002? |
| 25 | have me on any airplanes during that time period. | 25 | A. My recollection is that I have looked at 12:57:23 |
| 1 | 143 | | 145 |
| _ | Q. What do you mean as far as 12:55:49 | 1 | plane manifests. I think they were prepared to be |
| 2 | Q. What do you mean as far as12:55:49MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some12:55:50 | 1 2 | plane manifests. I think they were prepared to be shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm |
| | | | |
| 2 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 | 2 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm |
| 2 3 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. | 2 3 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. |
| 2 3 4 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 | 2 3 4 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 | 2 3 4 5 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests | 2 3 4 5 6 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 ''There's an old saying if you have the law on your |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 ''There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the law. If you have the facts on |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers MR. SIMPSON: Don't 12:56:20 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 ''There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the law. If you have the facts on your side, bang on the facts. If you have neither, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers MR. SIMPSON: Don't - 12:56:20 A. Okay. I have been advised by people who 12:56:21 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 ''There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the law. If you have the facts on your side, bang on the facts. If you have neither, bang on the table. I have never believed that, but |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. Twe only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers MR. SIMPSON: Don't 12:56:20 A. Okay. I have been advised by people who 12:56:21 have seen the records that there is that I was | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 "There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the facts. If you have neither, bang on the table. I have never believed that, but I do believe in a variation of that theme. If you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers MR. SIMPSON: Don't - 12:56:20 A. Okay. I have been advised by people who 12:56:21 have seen the records that there is that I was not on any of Jeffrey Epstein's planes during that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 "There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the facts. If you have neither, bang on the table. I have never believed that, but I do believe in a variation of that theme. If you don't have the law or legal facts on your side, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. Twe only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers MR. SIMPSON: Don't 12:56:20 A. Okay. I have been advised by people who 12:56:21 have seen the records that there is that I was not on any of Jeffrey Epstein's planes during that period of time. And that comports with my with | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 "There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the law. If you have the facts on your side, bang on the facts. If you have neither, bang on the table. I have never believed that, but I do believe in a variation of that theme. If you don't have the law or legal facts on your side, argue your case in the Court of public opinion"? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. I've only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers MR. SIMPSON: Don't - 12:56:20 A. Okay. I have been advised by people who 12:56:21 have seen the records that there is that I was not on any of Jeffrey Epstein's planes during that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 ''There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the law. If you have the facts on your side, bang on the facts. If you have neither, bang on the table. I have never believed that, but I do believe in a variation of that theme. If you don't have the law or legal facts on your side, argue your case in the Court of public opinion''? Did you say that those things? 15:44:17 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. SCOTT: We can take a break at some 12:55:50 point. It's about 1:00. BY MR. SCAROLA: 12:55:53 Q. What do you mean as far as you know, the 12:55:54 airplane manifests A. Twe only seen some manifests and none of 12:55:57 them have me on any airplane during the relevant time period. I have no idea whether there are any other manifests. I wouldn't know. Q. Well, have you seen manifests from the 12:56:07 period between 1999 and 2002? A. I think I have, yes. I think I have, 12:56:12 yeah. Q. Okay. The entire period, covers the whole 12:56:14 period? A. Yeah. I think I've been told by my 12:56:17 lawyers MR. SIMPSON: Don't 12:56:20 A. Okay. I have been advised by people who 12:56:21 have seen the records that there is that I was not on any of Jeffrey Epstein's planes during that period of time. And that comports with my with | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | shown to various people who I'm not allowed I'm told not to talk about. MR. SCAROLA: Okay. You've requested a 12:57:41 break. MR. SCOTT: Take a lunch. 12:57:44 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 12:57:44 time is approximately 12:57 p.m. (Recess was from 12:57 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.) 13:10:50 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on the record. 13:35:41 The time is approximately 3:43 p.m. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:43:41 Q. Mr. Dershowitz, did you author a book 15:43:43 called My Life in Court? A. No. 15:43:47 Q. Do you recall having said the following: 15:43:49 "There's an old saying if you have the law on your side, bang on the law. If you have the facts on your side, bang on the facts. If you have neither, bang on the table. I have never believed that, but I do believe in a variation of that theme. If you don't have the law or legal facts on your side, argue your case in the Court of public opinion"? |

Т

37 (Pages 142 to 145)

| | 146 | | 148 | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | that because the statement does not give a | 1 | whether I had the law on my side at that time when | |
| 2 | time, date, place or anything of his | 2 | I, of course, learned that Professor Cassell made a | |
| 3 | recollections. | 3 | statement to ABC News that was not privileged and | |
| 4 | A. No, I remember saying that in following 15:44:25 | ⁴ when I also learned about statements made by both | | |
| 5 | context, I was accused of an unspeakable heinous | 5 | Cassell and Edwards, I realized at that point I had | |
| 6 | crime by lawyers who deliberately put it in a court | 6 | the law on my side, the facts on my side, and | |
| 7 | pleading that they believe would give them immunity. | 7 | morality. And that's the most important thing to | |
| 8 | They put it in a pleading which I was not a party. | 8 | me, morality on my side. | |
| 9 | I had no realistic legal opportunity to respond to | 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:47:22 | |
| 10 | the lies and in that context, my only alternative | 10 | Q. You are quoted in an April 2007 edition of 15:47:24 | |
| 11 | was to respond to the media when the media called | 11 | the Daily Mail as having said "The financier," | |
| 12 | me, because obviously the media had been alerted to | 12 | referring to Jeffrey Epstein, "had paid for massages | |
| 13 | these lies that were inserted in a judicial | 13 | but had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with | |
| 14 | proceeding, and I had no alternative but to respond | 14 | any minors." | |
| 15 | in the court of public opinion. | 15 | Did you make that statement? 15:47:53 | |
| 16 | I prefer to respond in courts of law. In 15:45:16 | 16 | A. Can you show me? 15:47:54 | |
| 17 | fact, I've had cases in my career, including a | 17 | MR. SCOTT: Would you like to see the 15:47:56 | |
| 18 | double capital case, where I made a deal with the | 18 | article? | |
| 19 | prosecutor initially that I would never speak to the | 19 | THE WITNESS: Yes, of course I would. 15:47:58 | |
| 20 | press if he would never speak to the press and we | 20 | MR. SCOTT: Can he see it, please? 15:48:04 | |
| 21 | honored that deal even when I won the case and my | 21 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:48:05 | |
| 22 | clients were taken off death row. | 22 | Q. Does that help to refresh your superb 15:48:06 | |
| 23 | So my strong preference would be to 15:45:34 | 23 | memory? | |
| 24 | respond in the court of law where I think I have | 24 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. No he asked to 15:48:09 | |
| 25 | abilities and talents to respond. But when I have | 25 | see it. There's no question pending. He's | |
| | 147 | | 149 | |
| 1 | no alternative because of the way in which the | 1 | reviewing the document. | |
| 2 | lawyers put the false allegations in a judicial | 2 | A. I have no recollection of having made that 15:48:16 | |
| 3 | pleading hoping to get judicial immunity, yes, at | 3 | statement, nor do I know whether it's an accurate | |
| 4 | that point the appropriate response is in the court | 4 | rendition. I note that it's not in quotation marks. | |
| 5 | of public opinion. | 5 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:48:24 | |
| 6 | That's what Justice Blackmun said in a 15:46:00 | 6 | Q. So you can't remember one way or another 15:48:25 | |
| 7 | concurring opinion in the Supreme Court, that the | 7 | whether you said that; is that correct? | |
| 8 | duty of a lawyer does not stop at the courtroom door | 8 | A. I can't remember my exact words. I was 15:48:28 | |
| 9 | but it continues on to the courtroom steps. And my | 9 | I was defending Jeffrey Epstein both in the court of | |
| 10 | attitude is you fight the battle wherever the other | 10 | law and in the court of public opinion. | |
| 11 | side starts it. | 11 | Q. So, as far as Jeffrey Epstein was 15:48:37 | |
| 12 | So, if the battles are started in the 15:46:16 | 12 | concerned, you decided to resort to the court of | |
| 13 | court of public opinion, I have an obligation to | 13 | public opinion | |
| 14 | continue it in the court of public opinion. | 14 | A. Because 15:48:45 | |
| 15 | MR. SCAROLA: Move to strike the 15:46:25 | 15 | Q correct? 15:48:45 | |
| 16 | unresponsive answer. Let me try again and I'll | 16 | A. Because the press had called me because 15:48:46 | |
| 17 | make it a little simpler for you. | 17 | Epstein's opponents had gone to the press and tried | |
| 18 | BY MR. SCAROLA: | 18 | to make the case against him in the press. As I | |
| 19 | Q. Did you say if you don't have the law or 15:46:31 | 19 | said previously, and I've stated this over and over | |
| 20 | legal facts on your side, argue your case in the | 20 | again, I will fight for my client in any forum in | |
| 21 | court of public opinion? | 21 | which the fight is commenced by the other side. If | |
| 22 | A. I said that in the context of an 15:46:39 | 22 | the fight is limited to the court, I much prefer to | |
| 23 | ability an inability to respond in the court of | 23 | fight in the court. | |
| 24 25 | law. In this case, I think I have I know I have | 24 | No defendant benefits from having his case 15:49:09 | |
| 40 | the facts on my side. In this case, it was unclear | 25 | in the newspapers. Every defendant I know and every | |

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

| | 150 | | 152 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | defense lawyer I know, and I certainly teach this to | 1 | attorney-client communications, representation |
| 2 | my students, try to keep the case out of the press, | 2 | of Epstein, work product, I object. |
| 3 | try to keep the press as far away from the case as | 3 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:51:31 |
| 4 | possible. But if the press is covering the opposing | 4 | Q. Do you understand the question? 15:51:32 |
| 5 | point of view, you have an obligation to respond in | 5 | A. I understand the question and I understand 15:51:33 |
| 6 | whatever forum the the prosecution of your | 6 | the objection. |
| 7 | clients or the persecution of your clients is taking | 7 | Q. Yes, sir. And are you going to answer the 15:51:36 |
| 8 | place. That's been a principle that I've applied | 8 | question? |
| 9 | throughout my professional career. | 9 | THE WITNESS: Marty, you're the lawyer for 15:51:38 |
| 10 | Q. And you have an obligation to respond 15:49:42 | 10 | my client. Do you do you order me to answer |
| 11 | truthfully when you make public statements? | 11 | the question or not? |
| 12 | A. Absolutely, right. 15:49:47 | 12 | MR. WEINBERG: The client does not waive 15:51:46 |
| 13 | Q. The Code of Professional Responsibility of 15:49:48 | 13 | any of the privileges; and, again, to the |
| 14 | the Bar of the State of Massachusetts requires you | 14 | extent you're required to rely on what you |
| 15 | to be truthful in making statements to third | 15 | learned as a result of your professional legal |
| 16 | parties, correct? | 16 | relationship with Epstein, your representation |
| 17 | A. I'm fully aware of the Code of 15:49:58 | 17 | of him in any of any of his legal cases, I |
| 18 | Professional Responsibility. I've always complied | 18 | object and would instruct you to the extent you |
| 19 | with it. I've never violated it, and I wish I could | 19 | will accept an instruction from your client's |
| 20 | say the same for your clients, but I can't. | 20 | lawyer not to answer. |
| 21 | Q. As you sit here today, knowing that more 15:50:07 | 21 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:11 |
| 22 | than 30 underage women have come forward to report | 22 | Q. Mr. Dershowitz, you know I assume 15:52:12 |
| 23 | that your friend, Jeffrey Epstein, paid them for sex | 23 | you're going to follow the instruction, correct? |
| 24 | and that he pled guilty to procuring underage girls | 24 | MR. SCOTT: Yes, you're going to follow 15:52:15 |
| 25 | for prostitution, and that he paid very large sums | 25 | the instruction. |
| | | | |
| | 1 - 1 | | 1 - 0 |
| | 151 | | 153 |
| 1 | $\bot 5 \bot$ of money to settle their civil claims against him, | 1 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 |
| 2 | | 2 | |
| 2 3 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, | 2 3 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 |
| 2 3 4 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 | 2 3 4 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 |
| 2 3 4 5 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 | 2 3 4 5 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection | 2 3 4 5 6 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:41 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:41 independent Q. Okay. Thank you. 15:52:43 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I15:52:16have no choice. He's my client.BY MR. SCAROLA:15:52:19Q. I assume you know from sources entirely15:52:20independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein toldyou, from sources entirely independent of attorneywork product privileged information, that JeffreyEpstein is guilty of being a serial child molester,right?A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not.15:52:37Q. You don't know independent of those15:52:39sources?A. Not only no, I don't know that15:52:41independentQ. Okay. Thank you.15:52:43A of those sources. Of course not.15:52:43 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:41 independent Q. Okay. Thank you. 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 Q. You know that he pled guilty to sexual 15:52:45 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:41 independent Q. Okay. Thank you. 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 indexes of minors, correct? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you - 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation there, so | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:41 independent Q. Okay. Thank you. 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 a of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:45 abuse of minors, correct? A. Could you tell me exactly what he pleaded 15:52:54 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you - 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation there, so MR. SCAROLA: Yeah, is there some 15:51:12 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:43 independent Q. Okay. Thank you. 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:45 induse of minors, correct? A. Could you tell me exactly what he pleaded 15:52:54 guilty to so I can answer that question? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you - 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: - to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation there, so MR. SCAROLA: Yeah, is there some 15:51:12 volume | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 Q. You know that he pled guilty to sexual 15:52:45 abuse of minors, correct? A. Could you tell me exactly what he pleaded 15:52:54 guilty to so I can answer that question? Q. Well, do you know? You represented him 25:52:55 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation there, so MR. SCAROLA: Yeah, is there some 15:51:12 volume THE WITNESS: Go ahead, Marty. 15:51:13 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 Q. You know that he pled guilty to sexual 15:52:54 abuse of minors, correct? A. Could you tell me exactly what he pleaded 15:52:54 guilty to so I can answer that question? Q. Well, do you know? You represented him 15:52:58 during the period of time that he was under that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation there, so MR. SCAROLA: Yeah, is there some 15:51:12 volume THE WITNESS: Go ahead, Marty. 15:51:13 MR. WEINBERG: The the objection is to 15:51:16 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 Q. You know that he pled guilty to sexual 15:52:45 abuse of minors, correct? A. Could you tell me exactly what he pleaded 15:52:54 guilty to so I can answer that question? Q. Well, do you know? You represented him 15:52:58 during the period of time that he was under that he was under criminal charges, didn't |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you - 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation there, so MR. SCAROLA: Yeah, is there some 15:51:12 volume THE WITNESS: Go ahead, Marty. 15:51:13 MR. WEINBERG: The the objection is to 15:51:16 the extent the question requires you to rely on | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 G. You know that he pled guilty to sexual 15:52:45 sources of minors, correct? A. Could you tell me exactly what he pleaded 15:52:55 sources of minors, correct? Q. Well, do you know? You represented him 15:52:55 sources in that he was under that he was under criminal charges, didn't you? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | of money to settle their civil claims against him, do you still insist that he had not engaged in sex or erotic massages with any minors? A. As I told you 15:50:45 MR. WEINBERG: I would like to register an 15:50:46 objection MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 15:50:46 MR. WEINBERG: to the extent that your 15:50:46 opinion THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't 15:50:46 hear the gentleman. MR. SCAROLA: We're going to we're 15:50:52 going to object to more than one lawyer MR. SCOTT: He's representing Epstein, 15:50:57 just like she represents Boies. MR. SCAROLA: That's fine. 15:51:01 MR. SCOTT: This is this is Epstein's 15:51:02 lawyer. And they have attorney-client relation there, so MR. SCAROLA: Yeah, is there some 15:51:12 volume THE WITNESS: Go ahead, Marty. 15:51:13 MR. WEINBERG: The the objection is to 15:51:16 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. I am going to follow the instruction. I 15:52:16 have no choice. He's my client. BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:52:19 Q. I assume you know from sources entirely 15:52:20 independent of anything that Jeffrey Epstein told you, from sources entirely independent of attorney work product privileged information, that Jeffrey Epstein is guilty of being a serial child molester, right? A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. 15:52:37 Q. You don't know independent of those 15:52:39 sources? A. Not only no, I don't know that 15:52:43 A of those sources. Of course not. 15:52:43 Q. You know that he pled guilty to sexual 15:52:45 abuse of minors, correct? A. Could you tell me exactly what he pleaded 15:52:54 guilty to so I can answer that question? Q. Well, do you know? You represented him 15:52:58 during the period of time that he was under that he was under criminal charges, didn't |

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

www.phippsreporting.com (888)811-3408

| | 154 | 150 |
|--|---|---|
| 1 | prior question; you're now asking this | 1 MR. SCAROLA: And it is my suggestion that 15:54:43 |
| 2 | question? Okay. | 2 the statement that the answers would be |
| 3 | MR. SCAROLA: That's correct, I'm 15:53:09 | ³ exculpatory is a waiver of any privilege that |
| 4 | asking | ⁴ might attach, particularly with regard to work |
| 5 | A. So I represented him 15:53:10 | 5 product, which is not Jeffrey Epstein's |
| 6 | MR. SCAROLA: this question. 15:53:10 | 6 privilege, but if it exists at all, is Alan |
| 7 | A. I represented him first in Palm Beach 15:53:11 | 7 Dershowitz's privilege. |
| 8 | County, and at that point, he had been prepared to | 8 MR. SCOTT: We obviously don't agree with 15:55:01 |
| 9 | plead guilty to, I think, one count | 9 that. |
| 10 | MR. WEINBERG: Alan, I'm sorry. This is 15:53:24 | 10 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:55:03 |
| 11 | again, going right into the work that you did | 11 Q. Do you agree, Mr. Dershowitz, that 15:55:04 |
| 12 | for him as his lawyer and I instruct you not to | 12 deciding the issues in this case will depend on |
| 13 | answer. | ¹³ evaluating not only Virginia Roberts' credibility |
| 14 | MR. SCOTT: That's it then, follow his 15:53:32 | ¹⁴ but your credibility as well? |
| 15 | as your attorney, I'm telling you to follow the | 15 MR. SCOTT: Objection, legal conclusion, 15:55:14 |
| 16 | lawyer's advice. | 16 not relevant here. |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. 15:53:36 | 17 A. I think that I can prove my complete 15:55:17 |
| 18 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:53:37 | ¹⁸ innocence and the fact that that Virginia Roberts |
| 19 | Q. You are aware that on October 20, 2005, 15:53:37 | 19 made up the story out of whole cloth without my |
| 20 | the Palm Beach police department executed a search | 20 credibility being at issue, but I'm perfectly happy |
| 21 | warrant on Jeffrey Epstein's Palm Beach mansion, | 21 to put my credibility at issue because I am telling |
| 22 | correct? | the blue absolute truth about everything regarding |
| 23 | A. I'm not aware of that, no. 15:53:45 | 23 Virginia Roberts. |
| 24 | Q. You didn't know that? 15:53:46 | ²⁴ BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:55:39 |
| 25 | A. I don't know that as I stand here today 15:53:48 | 25 Q. One way to evaluate credibility is to 15:55:40 |
| | | |
| | 155 | 15 |
| 1 | 155 | 15' |
| 1 | what date or when | 1 compare an individual's statements with available |
| 2 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? |
| | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:48 |
| 2 3 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary |
| 2 3 4 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:44 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral |
| 2 3 4 5 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:48 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:44 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:48 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:48 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 If you had a videotape that in some way supported |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:44 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 If you had a videotape that in some way supported Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 If you had a videotape that in some way supported Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I said, that would be fine. That's why from day one |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 lengthy Palm Beach police department investigative | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 If you had a videotape that in some way supported Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I said, that would be fine. That's why from day one I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 lengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 If you had a videotape that in some way supported Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I said, that would be fine. That's why from day one I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown or any photographs because I know what happened. I |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 Iengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 | 1compare an individual's statements with available2documentary evidence, correct?3A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:484what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary5could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral6statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think7that's a particularly good way. It depends on the8nature of the document.9For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:010If you had a videotape that in some way supported11Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I12said, that would be fine. That's why from day one13I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown14or any photographs because I know what happened. I15know that I never had any contact, any sexual |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 lengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 MR. WEINBERG: And I object. If you read 15:54:20 | 1compare an individual's statements with available2documentary evidence, correct?3A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:444what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary5could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral6statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think7that's a particularly good way. It depends on the8nature of the document.9For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:010If you had a videotape that in some way supported11Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I12said, that would be fine. That's why from day one13I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown14or any photographs because I know what happened. I15know that I never had any contact, any sexual16contact, any improper contact with Virginia Roberts. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 Iengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 MR. WEINBERG: And I object. If you read 15:54:20 it in the context of providing legal | 1compare an individual's statements with available2documentary evidence, correct?3A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:434what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary5could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral6statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think7that's a particularly good way. It depends on the8nature of the document.9For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:010If you had a videotape that in some way supported11Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I12said, that would be fine. That's why from day one13I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown14or any photographs because I know what happened. I15know that I never had any contact, any sexual16contact, any improper contact with Virginia Roberts.17And I know, therefore, that there cannot15:56:2718be any evidence that contradicts that because you19can't simply make up facts. So I am telling you the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 Iengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 MR. WEINBERG: And I object. If you read 15:54:20 it in the context of providing legal representation to Jeffrey Epstein, it's | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 If you had a videotape that in some way supported Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I said, that would be fine. That's why from day one I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown or any photographs because I know what happened. I know that I never had any contact, any sexual contact, any improper contact with Virginia Roberts. And I know, therefore, that there cannot 15:56:27 be any evidence that contradicts that because you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 lengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 MR. WEINBERG: And I object. If you read 15:54:20 it in the context of providing legal representation to Jeffrey Epstein, it's attorney-client, it's work product, and it's | compare an individual's statements with available documentary evidence, correct? A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:43 what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think that's a particularly good way. It depends on the nature of the document. For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:0 If you had a videotape that in some way supported Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I said, that would be fine. That's why from day one I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown or any photographs because I know what happened. I know that I never had any contact, any sexual contact, any improper contact with Virginia Roberts. And I know, therefore, that there cannot 15:56:27 be any evidence that contradicts that because you can't simply make up facts. So I am telling you the absolute truth. Q. You also know that all of the videotapes 15:56:37 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 Iengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 MR. WEINBERG: And I object. If you read 15:54:20 it in the context of providing legal representation to Jeffrey Epstein, it's attorney-client, it's work product, and it's the same objection. | 1compare an individual's statements with available2documentary evidence, correct?3A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:434what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary5could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral6statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think7that's a particularly good way. It depends on the8nature of the document.9For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:010If you had a videotape that in some way supported11Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I12said, that would be fine. That's why from day one13I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown14or any photographs because I know what happened. I15know that I never had any contact, any sexual16contact, any improper contact with Virginia Roberts.17And I know, therefore, that there cannot 15:56:2718be any evidence that contradicts that because you20can't simply make up facts. So I am telling you the21Q. You also know that all of the videotapes 15:56:322that were taken through surveillance cameras |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 Iengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 MR. WEINBERG: And I object. If you read 15:54:20 it in the context of providing legal representation to Jeffrey Epstein, it's attorney-client, it's work product, and it's the same objection. THE WITNESS: Let me put on the record, 15:54:31 too, that I'm happy to answer any of these questions if I were permitted to do so because | 1compare an individual's statements with available2documentary evidence, correct?3A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:484what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary5could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral6statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think7that's a particularly good way. It depends on the8nature of the document.9For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:010If you had a videotape that in some way supported11Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I12said, that would be fine. That's why from day one13I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown14or any photographs because I know what happened. I15know that I never had any contact, any sexual16contact, any improper contact with Virginia Roberts.17And I know, therefore, that there cannot 15:56:2718be any evidence that contradicts that because you19can't simply make up facts. So I am telling you the20absolute truth.21Q. You also know that all of the videotapes 15:56:322that were taken through surveillance cameras23throughout Jeffrey Epstein's home were destroyed, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | what date or when Q. Do you know that a search warrant was 15:53:52 executed? A. I recall 15:53:54 MR. WEINBERG: Again, the objection is if 15:53:55 you only know it as a result of your legal representation of Mr. Epstein, I object to your answering on that basis. If you know it from independent sources, then I have no objection. A. I do not know it from independent sources. 15:54:08 BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:54:10 Q. You know it from having read a very 15:54:11 Iengthy Palm Beach police department investigative report, don't you? MR. SCOTT: Objection. 15:54:19 MR. WEINBERG: And I object. If you read 15:54:20 it in the context of providing legal representation to Jeffrey Epstein, it's attorney-client, it's work product, and it's the same objection. THE WITNESS: Let me put on the record. 15:54:31 too, that I'm happy to answer any of these | 1compare an individual's statements with available2documentary evidence, correct?3A. That's too broad a question. Depending on 15:55:434what the documentary evidence could be. Documentary5could be lies. Documents contain lies and oral6statements contain truth. So, no, I don't think7that's a particularly good way. It depends on the8nature of the document.9For example, videotape would be very good. 15:56:010If you had a videotape that in some way supported11Virginia Roberts' statements and it undercut what I12said, that would be fine. That's why from day one13I've asked to have if there are any videotape shown14or any photographs because I know what happened. I15know that I never had any contact, any sexual16contact, any improper contact with Virginia Roberts.17And I know, therefore, that there cannot 15:56:2718be any evidence that contradicts that because you19can't simply make up facts. So I am telling you the20absolute truth.21Q. You also know that all of the videotapes 15:56:322that were taken through surveillance cameras |

^{40 (}Pages 154 to 157)

| | 158 | | 160 |
|----------|---|----|--|
| 1 | O. You don't know? 15:56:48 | 1 | Gulfstream IV. That it had a cabin that seated |
| 2 | A. Of course not. 15:56:49 | 2 | approximately one, two, three, four maybe ten |
| 3 | Q. So you didn't read the police reports 15:56:50 | 3 | ten people. It had mostly seats I used to sit in |
| 4 | then? | 4 | the seat facing backward, that's the way I prefer to |
| 5 | MR. SCOTT: Objection. Mr. Epstein, do 15:56:52 | 5 | fly. |
| 6 | you want him to answer that question? | 6 | And in the back of the plane there was a 15:58:52 |
| 7 | MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Weinberg. 15:56:59 | 7 | toilet, a place to serve food. And a couch that |
| 8 | MR. SCOTT: Mr. Weinberg? 15:57:00 | 8 | served as a seat with seat belts for maybe two or |
| 9 | MR. WEINBERG: It's the same objection. 15:57:00 | 9 | three additional people. But I never saw the |
| 10 | If you learned it as a result of the or in | 10 | plane the only time I ever saw the plane filled |
| 11 | the context of legal representation and while | 11 | to capacity was when I went down to watch a launch |
| 12 | providing legal counsel to Jeffrey Epstein, I | 12 | of a satellite |
| 13 | object. | 13 | Q. Does that have 15:59:19 |
| 14 | MR. SCOTT: Based on this lawyer's 15:57:12 | 14 | A to outer space. 15:59:20 |
| 15 | position, your client's lawyer's position, if | 15 | Q anything to do with the configuration 15:59:20 |
| 16 | any of your answers involve that what he's | 16 | of the interior of the plane? |
| 17 | saying, I don't want you to answer them, okay? | 17 | A. Yes. Yes, I'm telling you that I've 15:59:25 |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: The only thing I can say 15:57:21 | 18 | mostly seen it only with four or five people. The |
| 19 | that doesn't | 19 | only time I've seen the couch |
| 20 | MR. SIMPSON: Alan 15:57:23 | 20 | Q. Did I ask you how many people 15:59:29 |
| 21 | MR. SCOTT: There's no question. 15:57:23 | 21 | MR. SCOTT: Well, you're interrupting 15:59:30 |
| 22 | A. That doesn't involve. 15:57:24 | 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:59:31 |
| 23 | MR. SCOTT: There's no question. 15:57:25 | 23 | Q were in the plane at the time I asked 15:59:32 |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: Oh, there's no question. 15:57:26 | 24 | you what the configuration of the cabin was, |
| 25 | Sorry. | 25 | Mr. Dershowitz? |
| | 159 | | 161 |
| 1 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:57:28 | 1 | A. I'm explaining 15:59:35 |
| 2 | Q. You have stated publicly repeatedly that 15:57:29 | 2 | Q. Is that part of the question that I 15:59:35 |
| 3 | the airplane manifests will exonerate you, correct? | 3 | asked |
| 4 | A. I have stated publicly that the airplane 15:57:35 | 4 | A. I'm explaining the couch. 15:59:37 |
| 5 | manifest, the one that I have seen, do not show me | 5 | Q or is that your effort to make speeches 15:59:38 |
| 6 | on any of Jeffrey Epstein's airplanes in the | 6 | in an effort to consume the limited amount of time |
| 7 | relevant period of time, which I define as the | 7 | that we have? |
| 8 | summer of 1999 through the summer of 2002, number 1. | 8 | MR. SCOTT: I would object to that 15:59:44 |
| 9 | Number 2, that none of the airplane 15:57:52 | 9 | characterization. |
| 10 | manifests will show me on the same plane with | 10 | A. I wanted to start at I wanted to start 15:59:44 |
| 11 | Virginia Roberts. | 11 | at 12:00 at 1:30 today. |
| 12 | And 3, that none of the manifests will 15:58:01 | 12 | MR. SCOTT: And the speech. 15:59:48 |
| 13 | show me on an airplane with Jeffrey Epstein and any | 13 | MR. SIMPSON: Alan, Alan. 15:59:48 |
| 14 | underage girls that were at least visible in the | 14 | A. All the delays have been caused by you, 15:59:49 |
| 15 | passenger part of the airplane. | 15 | not me. And I'm ready to go to 5:30, but you're |
| 16 | Q. Well, that raises an interesting point, 15:58:13 | 16 | quitting at 5 or 4:30. |
| 17 | Mr. Dershowitz. Tell us about the interior | 17 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:59:55 |
| 18 | A. Why is it interesting? 15:58:16 | 18 | Q. Yes, sir, I have 15:59:55 |
| 19 | Q of that plane. 15:58:18 | 19 | A. So don't blame any delays on me, sir. 15:59:56 |
| 20 | THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I didn't 15:58:18 | 20 | Q a commitment I have a commitment to 15:59:58 |
| 21 | hear your question. | 21 | chair an |
| 22 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 15:58:18 | 22 | A. Don't we all. 15:59:59 |
| 23 | Q. That raises an interesting point. Tell us 15:58:20 | 23 | Q Easter Seals fundraiser. 15:59:59 |
| 24 25 | about that the interior of that plane. | 24 | A. We all have commitments. 16:00:00 |
| 25 | A. My recollection is the plane was a 15:58:24 | 25 | Q. You've known 16:00:02 |
| | | | |

41 (Pages 158 to 161)

| | 162 | | 164 |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | MR. SCOTT: Timeout. Timeout. Let's 16:00:02 | 1 | for Carolyn to be somewhere else, such as taking |
| 2 | everybody | 2 | care of her 96-year-old mother. But it is true, I |
| 3 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:00:03 | 3 | travel with my wife. |
| 4 | Q that for three days. 16:00:03 | 4 | Q. In fact, the airplane manifests that have 16:02:07 |
| 5 | MR. SCOTT: Everybody cool down. 16:00:05 | 5 | been produced reflect your having traveled on |
| 6 | Everybody cool down. It's late in the day. | 6 | Jeffrey Epstein's airplane on ten separate occasions |
| 7 | That includes Mr. Scarola, my client. Let's do | 7 | and on none of those occasions |
| 8 | question and answer. | 8 | A. Is that testimony, sir? 16:02:22 |
| 9 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:00:14 | 9 | Q. On none of those occasions 16:02:23 |
| 10 | Q. New question 16:00:15 | 10 | MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute. 16:02:25 |
| 11 | MR. SCOTT: Here we go, new question. 16:00:15 | 11 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:02:25 |
| 12 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:00:15 | 12 | Q is your wife reflected as having been a 16:02:26 |
| 13 | Q did you see a bed in the plane? 16:00:15 | 13 | passenger at the same time that you are were on |
| 14 | A. I never saw a bed in the plane. As far as 16:00:16 | 14 | Jeffrey Epstein's airplane, right? |
| 15 | I know, there was no bed in the plane. And that's | 15 | MR. SCOTT: Object to the form. There's 16:02:32 |
| 16 | what I was trying to explain. That the only time | 16 | no timeframe or anything of that nature. If |
| 17 | I've seen that couch used is when two or three | 17 | you can answer |
| 18 | people were sitting in it when we went down to watch | 18 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:02:35 |
| 19 | the launch of the satellite because that was the | 19 | Q. All of the manifests that have been 16:02:35 |
| 20 | only time I saw the plane filled. | 20 | produced in this litigation, the ones that you say |
| 21 | Other than that, it was a plain, ordinary 16:00:36 | 21 | corroborate your testimony and exonerate you, |
| 22 | couch that was never used by anybody during the | 22 | demonstrate that you never flew on Jeffrey Epstein's |
| 23 | flights. We were all sitting in our seats. I do | 23 | plane in the company of your wife, correct? |
| 24 | not know for a fact that that couch becomes a bed. | 24 | A. No. That's not true. I flew in the 16:02:50 |
| 25 | I never saw it as a bed. And the answer is | 25 | company of my wife and my daughter from Charleston, |
| | | | |
| 1 | 163 | 1 | 165 |
| 1 | categorically no. | 1 | South Carolina to Guadalupe |
| 2 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 | 2 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 |
| 2 3 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a | 2 3 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir |
| 2 3 4 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you | 2 3 4 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 |
| 2 3 4 5 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? | 2 3 4 5 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 | 2 3 4 5 6 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:18 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all – as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:29 A. Yes. My wife goes with me everywhere 16:01:30 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:18 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:18 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay. 16:03:19 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown up and went to high school and college, she travels | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:18 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay. 16:03:19 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown up and went to high school and college, she travels with me everywhere. It's a rare, rare occasion when | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing pending. Go 16:03:20 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown up and went to high school and college, she travels with me everywhere. It's a rare, rare occasion when my wife doesn't travel with me. In fact, I have a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing pending. Go 16:03:20 ahead. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:03:21 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown up and went to high school and college, she travels with me everywhere. It's a rare, rare occasion when my wife doesn't travel with me. In fact, I have a condition of my speakings engagements that the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:18 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay. 16:03:20 ahead. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:03:21 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that your 16:03:21 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is you don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown up and went to high school and college, she travels with me everywhere. It's a rare, rare occasion when my wife doesn't travel with me. In fact, I have a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing pending. Go 16:03:20 ahead. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:03:21 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | categorically no. Q. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a don't know; is that right? A. The answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. Q. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 A. Yes. My wife goes with me everywhere 16:01:30 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown up and went to high school and college, she travels with me everywhere. It's a rare, rare occasion when my wife doesn't travel with me. In fact, I have a condition of my speakings engagements that the speaking engagements have to pay for my wife to come | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:18 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay. 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing pending. Go 16:03:20 ahead. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:03:21 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that your 16:03:21 wife ever accompanied you on a flight on Jeffrey |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | categorically no. 9. Well, the question was: Is there a bed on 16:00:57 the plane? The answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is not a gategorical no; the answer to that question is not a categorical no; the answer to that question is there is a 16:01:05 couch on the plane like it is on all – as far as I know, all Gulfstream IVs. I have no idea whether or not that couch becomes a bed. 9. You told the American lawyer on 16:01:15 January 15, 2015 a statement that you have repeated on multiple occasions: "I've been married to the same woman for 28 years. She goes with me everywhere." Do you acknowledge making that statement? 16:01:20 A. Yes. My wife goes with me everywhere 16:01:30 today. These days, now that our daughter is grown up and went to high school and college, she travels with me everywhere. It's a rare, rare occasion when my wife doesn't travel with me. In fact, I have a condition of my speakings engagements that the speaking engagements have to pay for my wife to come with me. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | South Carolina to Guadalupe Q. I'm asking about what the manifests show, 16:03:00 sir A. I'm telling you what 16:03:02 Q the ones that you say exonerate you. 16:03:03 A. Well, I said that 16:03:05 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that you 16:03:06 and your wife were on Jeffrey Epstein's plane at the same time together? MR. SCOTT: Let me object to the 16:03:11 A. I don't know that. 16:03:13 MR. SCOTT: argumentative nature and 16:03:13 compound nature. He's trying to answer your questions. A. Let me go through each of the times 16:03:18 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing 16:03:19 THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay. 16:03:19 MR. SCOTT: There's nothing pending. Go 16:03:20 ahead. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:03:21 Q. Is there a manifest that shows that your 16:03:21 wife ever accompanied you on a flight on Jeffrey Epstein's private airplane? |

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

| 1 interforme - 1 correct? 2 NR, SCAROLA: Any time ever. 1603:34 any wepkew - 1 correct? 3 A. My we accompanies are not on caccasion. 1603:35 mainfests. Is would be happy to lock at the mainfest. Is would be happy to lock at the second be that the lobbs?? 13 mesore companies and no more caccasion. 160343 A. We will - Weeken the would be the presence of your will as excellent to every single rigit to do. Single rigit happy to lock. The would be the presence of your will. Second the lock 1605?? 14 A. My we will have the do that the lobbs?? A. We will - Weeken the happy to lock. The lobbs?? | | 166 | | 168 |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 3A. My wife accompanies in non two censions1603:534my nephew1603:535BY JRS CAROL:1603:596Q. Is there a manifest -1603:507ME SCOTT: You're cutting him off,1603:407A. Let us finih.1603:4110ME SCOTT: You're cutting him off,1603:4111question.1605:4112ME SCOTT: You're cutting him off,1603:4113question.1605:4114A. My aphew accompanies on on one cension.1603:4115question.1605:4116mone occasion.1603:4117witch, accompanies one on one occasion.1603:4118My research assistan, Mich Weber, accompanies the1605:2719A. My aphew accompanies the1605:2710one occasion.1603:4111question.1603:4112ME SCOTT: Yos, he is answering your1603:4313question.1604:4114A. My aphew accompanies the1605:5715mone occasion.1604:2416matter end of the mone dualing that preved of the1604:2416mone occasion.1604:2416mone occasion.1604:2517return priod of time. And during that preved of thim. And during that preved of thim. And the occalip me, do not show me16thy mix with any oung overn.1606:2717previne previd of time. And the occalip me, do not show me16thy m | 1 | timeframe | 1 | correct? |
| 4my nephew - munifests4munifests 1403 5BY MR SCAROLA:16003/9G. Unfortunately -16052/46Q. Ender a manifest -16052/9A. exc of the times -16052/47MK.SCAROLA: His not answering my1603/4116052/79A. Let me finish.1603/4116052/710MK.SCAROLA: His not answering my1603/41 <th>2</th> <th>MR. SCAROLA: Any time ever. 16:03:34</th> <th>2</th> <th>A. I am not aware that there are ten 16:05:18</th> | 2 | MR. SCAROLA: Any time ever. 16:03:34 | 2 | A. I am not aware that there are ten 16:05:18 |
| 5BY MR.SCAROLA:1603:395Q. Unfortunately1605:246Q. Is there a manifest1605:39A each of the times1605:247MR.SCOTT: Youre cutting him off,1603:419A each of the times1605:279A. Let me finish.1603:419A Ive been1605:2710MR.SCAROLA: He's not answering your1603:439A Ive been1605:2711questionNew will - Iwe doome that time, because 116:05:2912A. Scaroback: He's not answering your16:03:43New will - Iwe doome that time, because 116:05:2913cocausion conceasion.16:03:43New will - Iwe doome that time, because 116:05:2914A. My sendber accompanied on one occasion.16:03:43New will - Iwe doome that impace, that16in conceasion. My son or grandson.In or size of the take during that previod of time.New will - Iwe doome that implane, that16in conceasion shaft Hew on of Line May basines:0What I have time to do 16:05:5717relevant weben during that previod of time.16:05:5718My ME, SCAROLA:16:04:2419O. Is Mere -16:04:2410Che He amainfest He when my during the field of11relevant weber, and thi in concervable that16:06:5611that the manifest of the ten All field 16:04:3512O. Is Mere -16:04:2413 | 3 | A. My wife accompanied me on two occasions, 16:03:35 | 3 | manifests. I would be happy to look at the |
| 60.b for a manifest - 1603.396A each of the times - 1603.247MR.SCOTT: You're cutting in oil, 1603.400 we wort have times to foth this 1605.257MR.SCOTT: So in existing my 1603.419A we wort have time to do that this 1605.279A. Let me finish. 1603.419A we will have time to do that 1605.2710MR.SCAROLA: lie's not answering my 1603.4110Coursel.12MR.SCAROLA: lie's not answering my 1603.4312A. We will - 1 welcome that time, because 1 1605.2913A. My nephew accompanied me on one occasion.1603.451414no no eccasion. My one pathon, Than taw15that there was any accustion on which had any17which, accompanied me on one occasion.1603.451418no do eccasion. He was of all appendix1604.041819the cocasion that lievo a faffey 1604.0418Q. What I am trying to do, sir, is to test 1605.5720relevant period of time. And during that period of16.04.241421relevant period of time, and during that period of16.04.2422relevant period of time. And during that period of16.04.2416.04.2623that the manifest in the von that is lice.16.06.0524that the manifest in the von that is lice.16.06.0525that the manifest in the von that is lice.16.06.0626that the manifest of the that that is lice.16.06.0527that the manifest of the that that is lice.16.06.05 </th <th>4</th> <th>my nephew</th> <th>4</th> <th>manifests. I have explained</th> | 4 | my nephew | 4 | manifests. I have explained |
| 911 <th< th=""><th>5</th><th>BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:03:39</th><th>5</th><th>Q. Unfortunately 16:05:24</th></th<> | 5 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:03:39 | 5 | Q. Unfortunately 16:05:24 |
| 8 Counsel. 8 afternoon - 9 A. Let ne finith. 160341 9 A Pue been - 160527 11 question. 10 0 but we will have time to do that 160529 13 question. 12 A. ResCOTT: Yes, he is answering your 160343 13 cecation with the damy 14 A. My replew accompanied me on one occasion. 16 14 took. And if youre trying to covery time. 16 17 which, accompanied me on one occasion. 16 16 took. And if youre trying to do, sir, is to test 16:05:57 18 And the occasion shall flew on Jeffrey 16:04:04 0. 0. What 1 am trying to do, sir, is to test 16:05:57 19 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 16 0. 16:05:57 21 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 16:04:24 24 A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 22 theore and the mainfests the do excell prace of part wife. 16:04:24 25 A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 24 BY MK. SCAROLA: 16:04:24 24 Sr. find we that statesth. 16:06:05 | 6 | Q. Is there a manifest 16:03:39 | 6 | A each of the times 16:05:24 |
| A. Lat ma finish. 1643:41 A. Lat ma finish. 1643:41 MR. SCAROLA: He's not answering my 1603:41 question. MR. SCAROLA: He's not answering your 16:03:43 question. A. My enphew accompanied me on one occasion. 1603:45 My espace macompanied me on one occasion. 1603:45 more occasions durys howines Epstein's plane were almost always business cocasions during a time when my daugher, Ella, was occasions during a time when my daugher, Ella, was in elementary school, if we're talking about the relevant period of time. And during that period of time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me flying with any young were. They know that on every trip 1100k, three 1604:23 Was a business reason for it, there were other A. Suit let me emphasize 1604:25 that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me flying with any young were other was a business reason for it, there were other So bit's your ortention that no mainfests 16:04:26 Was ScAROLA: 104 and the time to the one mainfest 16:04:27 that grain a poing work of the mean files 16:04:26 that the manifest shot do exculp me, do not show me flying with any young work of the mean mainfest 16:04:25 that there mainfest the the times that do acculp me, do not show me flying with any young work of the mean mainfest 16:04:25 that there may of your wife; that there may of your wife; that there may of | 7 | MR. SCOTT: You're cutting him off, 16:03:40 | 7 | Q we won't have time to do that this 16:05:25 |
| 10MR. SCAROLA: He's not answering your1000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 8 | Counsel. | 8 | afternoon |
| 11 question. 11 eventually. 12 MR. SCOTT: Yes, he is answering your 16:03:43 13 question. 13 question. 14 A. We will - I veloceme that ite, because 1 16:05:29 14 A. My pephew accompanied me on one occasion. 16:03:45 15 My nescarch assistant, Mich Webber, accompanied me on one occasion. 16:03:45 16 one occasion. Wy son or grandon, Tw not sure 16 17 is a categorical lie. 16:05:45 18 and the occasions that 16 wo no 16ftey 16:04:04 16 19 the the membra is a lie, sir, a categorical lie. 16:05:57 21 relevan period of ime. And during that period of ime. And on thy with me. 16:04:24 16 Q. Is there - 16:04:24 16 16 MR. SCAROLA: 16:04:24 16 16 that the maintest at do excup me, do not show me 16 16:06:17 17 popole on the plane, and it is inconcivable that 16:06:18 MR. SCOTT: How your prompetup. 16 that the mainfests that do excup me, do not impet the lies:04:11 16:06:23 0 | 9 | A. Let me finish. 16:03:41 | 9 | A I've been 16:05:27 |
| 12 MR. SCOTT: Yes, he is answering your 16:03:43 13 question. 12 14 A. We will I velcome that time, because I 16:05:29 15 My resphew accompanied me on one occasion. 16:03:45 16 on one occasion. My or phew accompanied me on one occasion. 16:03:45 17 witch, accompanied me on one occasion. 16:03:45 16:05:45 18 And the occasions that I flew on leffrey 16:04:04 16:05:57 19 Epstein's plane vere almost always business 16:05:57 16:05:57 20 relevant period of time. And during that period of 21 A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 21 in elementary school, if we're talking aboat the 16:04:24 25 Q. That is what I'n trying to do. 16:05:57 23 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:04:24 25 challenge you to find any statement where I said I having stated publicly on multiple occasions that 31 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this - 16:06:08 32 A. Stuf Mar again, no manifest i 16:04:25 1 was a business reason for it, there were one 6 A. No. | 10 | MR. SCAROLA: He's not answering my 16:03:41 | 10 | Q but we will have time to do that 16:05:27 |
| 13 question. 13 can give complete context to every single trip I 14 A. My nephew accompanied me on one occasion. 1603-545 15 My research assistant, Minch Webber, accompanied me on one occasion. 1603-545 16 on one occasion. 1603-545 17 which, accompanied me on one occasion. 1603 18 And the occasions during a time when ny dunghter, Ella, was 16 19 the veraction of your public assertions that you have 16 20 receasions during a time when ny dunghter, Ella, was 19 16 21 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 21 A. That is a lite. 1605:57 22 relevan period of time. And during that period of 22 Q. That is a lite. 1605:57 23 time, on occasion my wife dd not fly with me. 23 A. That is a lite. 1605:57 24 Py MR, SCAROLA: 16:04:24 25 D. Sthere - 16:04:25 16 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this - 16:06:06 17 people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that 7 Q do you - do you remember hax | 11 | question. | 11 | eventually. |
| 14 A. My nephew accompanied me on one occasion. 160345 14 Interpretation of the presence of your with impression that there was any occasion on which I had any 15 My research assistant, Mich Webber, accompanied me 15 Into K. And if you're trying to convey the impression that there was any occasion on which I had any 16 on one occasions. My son or grandson, I'm not sure 16 17 is categorical life. Q. What I am trying to do, sir, is to test 16:05:57 18 And the occasions that Ifew on Jeffrey 16:04:04 18 19 Epstein's plane were almost always business 16:05:57 20 occasions during a time when ny daughter, Ella, was 16:05:57 21 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 21 A. That is a life. 11:00:5:7 23 no cocasion wy wife did not fly with me. 16:06:25 24 BY MR, SCAROLA: 16:07 16:07 25 N Is ta ta life. 1:00:05:71 16:06:08 A. Sir, find me that statement. 16:06:08 26 that the manifests that do excutp me, do not show me 16:06:10 16:06:10 17 thay with Ying in Roberts they do not show me 16:06:10 16:06:10 18 during any of those periods of time, the lies | 12 | MR. SCOTT: Yes, he is answering your 16:03:43 | 12 | A. We will I welcome that time, because I 16:05:29 |
| 15 My research assistant, Mich Webber, accompanied me 16 or one occasion. My son or grandson, I'm not sure 17 which, accompanied me on one occasion. 18 And the occasions that I flew on Jeffrey 1604/04 19 Epstein's plane were almost always business 20 occasions during a time when my daughter, Ella, was 21 a. That is a lie. 22 relevant period of time. And during that period of 23 time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 24 BY MR, SCAROLA: 25 Q. Is there - 1604:24 25 26 that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, bed on ot show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 19/ing wi | 13 | question. | 13 | can give complete context to every single trip I |
| 16) restance many many products while I was on the airplane, that 17) which, accompanied me on one occasion. 18 19 And the occasions that I flew on Jeffrey 16:04:04 18 And the occasions that I flew on Jeffrey 16:04:04 18 And the occasions that I flew on Jeffrey 16:04:04 19 Epstein's plane were almost always business 20 occasions during a time when my doughter, Ella, was 21 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 22 cell and the occasions that I flew on Jeffrey 16:04:04 23 A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 23 time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 23 24 BY MR, SCAROLA: 16:04:24 25 Q. Is there - 16:04:24 26 The tais a lie. 16:06:57 21 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 26 that the manifests that do exculy me, do not show me 3 0. So if sy our comparemother having - 36 was abasiness reason fori it, there were other 4 A. No. 16:06:17 37 reperejen on the plane, and it is inconcerivable that | 14 | A. My nephew accompanied me on one occasion. 16:03:45 | 14 | took. And if you're trying to convey the impression |
| 1 which, accompanied me on one occasion. 17 is a categorical lie. 18 And the occasions that I flew on Jeffrey 1604:04 18 19 Epstein's plane were almost always business 19 10 occasions during a time when my duptice, Ella, was 19 11 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 21 12 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 21 13 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 21 14 BY MR, SCAROLA: 16:04:24 15 Q. Is there - 16:04:24 16 16:04:24 25 16 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 16 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 17 tiss a tace, sin; categorical lie. 16:06:09 17 people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that 16:06:01 18 during any of those periods of time, the lies that 9 0 or on Jeffrey Epstein? 16:06:02 18 that the rorcer? 1 0. Canyou answer the question - 16:06:28 19 Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 <th>15</th> <th>My research assistant, Mitch Webber, accompanied me</th> <th>15</th> <th>that there was any occasion on which I had any</th> | 15 | My research assistant, Mitch Webber, accompanied me | 15 | that there was any occasion on which I had any |
| 111 <th< th=""><th>16</th><th>on one occasion. My son or grandson, I'm not sure</th><th>16</th><th>improper conduct while I was on that airplane, that</th></th<> | 16 | on one occasion. My son or grandson, I'm not sure | 16 | improper conduct while I was on that airplane, that |
| 19 Epstein's plane were almost always business 19 the veracity of your public assertions that you have 20 occasions during a time when my daughter, Ella, was 10 the veracity of your public assertions that you have 21 in elementary school, if we're taiking about the 20 A. That is a lie, sir, a categorical lie, I 16:05:57 23 time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 23 A. That is a lie, sir, a categorical lie, I 16:05:57 24 BY MR, SCAROLA: 16:04:24 24 challenge you to find any statement where I said I have never traveled outside the presence of my wife. 25 Q. Is there - 16:04:24 25 1 Q. Well, how about this - 16:06:09 2 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this - 16:06:09 3 G ado you - do you - do you remember having - 16:06:10 1 4 flying with any young women. 3 Q for you - do you - do you remember having - 16:06:10 5 They know that on every trip 1 look, there 16:04:35 3 MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:20 9 Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. 9 characterize them by date and time, you just < | 17 | which, accompanied me on one occasion. | 17 | is a categorical lie. |
| 20 occasion during a time when my daughter, Ella, was 20 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 21 A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 21 in elementary school, if we're talking about the 21 A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 22 PY MR, SCAROLA: 16:04:24 25 A. That is a lie, sir, a categorical lie. I 16:05:57 23 time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 23 A. That is a lie, sir, a categorical lie. I 16:05:57 24 challenge gou to find any statement where I said I have never traveled outside the presence of my wife. 25 Q. Is there - 16:04:24 25 26 that the memphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this - 16:06:09 2 that the mainfests that do exculp me, do not show me 3 Q do you - do you - member having - 16:06:10 4 flying with virginia Roberts, they do not show me 16:06:17 Popele on the place, and it is inconceivable that 5 5 They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:35 6 A. No. 16:06:17 9 popple on the place, and it is inconceivable that 8 MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:20 6 | 18 | And the occasions that I flew on Jeffrey 16:04:04 | 18 | Q. What I am trying to do, sir, is to test 16:05:45 |
| 21 in elementry school, if we're talking about the 21 in. It that is a lie. 16:05:57 22 relevant period of time. And during that period of 22 Q. That is a lie. 16:05:57 23 time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 22 A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 24 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:04:24 24 Challenge you to find any statement where I said I 25 Q. Is there - 16:04:25 1 A. That is a lie. 16:06:608 2 A. But let me emphasize let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this 16:06:08 4 flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 2 A. Sir, find me that statement. 16:06:09 4 flying with any young women. 3 Q do you - do you remember having 16:06:10 5 They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:35 5 you never received a massage A. No. 16:06:17 6 A. Suit find me and it is inconceivable that 7 Q from Jeffrey Epstein? 16:06:18 7 p. elso un tait is inconceivable that 7 Q from Jeffrey Epstein? 16:06:28 7 Q. So it's | 19 | Epstein's plane were almost always business | 19 | the veracity of your public assertions that you have |
| 22 In terminal period of time. And during that period of time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 22 Q. That is what I'n trying to do. 16:05:57 23 time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 23 A. That is a lie, sir, a categorical lie. I 16:05:57 24 BY MR, SCAROLA: 16:04:24 24 challenge you to find any statement where I said I 25 Q. Is there 16:04:24 25 challenge you to find any statement where I said I 26 Q. Is there 16:04:24 25 challenge you to find any statement where I said I 26 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this 16:06:10 3 flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 3 Q do you - do you remember having 16:06:10 4 flying with any young women. 5 you never received a massage 6 A. No. 16:06:17 7 people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that 7 Q form Jeffrey Epstein? 16:06:18 8 during any of those periods of time, the lies that 8 MK. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:20 9 Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. 9 characterize | 20 | occasions during a time when my daughter, Ella, was | 20 | never traveled outside the presence of your wife. |
| 23 the on occasion my wife did not fly with me. 23 A. That is a lie, sin, a categorical lie. I 16:05:07 24 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:04:24 24 25 Q. Is there - 16:04:24 24 26 N. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 have never traveled outside the presence of my wife. 1 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 A. Sir, find me that statement. 16:06:09 1 M. By our wey or on on or on on or on on or on | 21 | in elementary school, if we're talking about the | 1 | A. That is a lie. 16:05:57 |
| 24 BY MR, SCAROLA: 1604:24 24 challenge you to find any statement where I said I have never traveled outside the presence of my wife. 25 Q. Is there - 16:04:24 25 challenge you to find any statement where I said I have never traveled outside the presence of my wife. 1 A. But let me emphasize let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this 16:06:08 3 flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 3 Q do you do you remember having 16:06:10 4 having stated publicly on multiple occasions that 9 Q do you do you remember having 16:06:10 5 They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:35 5 you never received a massage A. No. 16:06:17 6 was a business reason for it, there were other 6 A. No. 16:06:17 Qfor Juffrey Epstein? 16:06:20 9 Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. 9 characterize them by date and time, you just 10 Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 10 can't say here it's improper impeachment 11 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; 11 that you eved one this ten times. It's just <tr< th=""><th>22</th><th>relevant period of time. And during that period of</th><th>1</th><th>Q. That is what I'm trying to do. 16:05:57</th></tr<> | 22 | relevant period of time. And during that period of | 1 | Q. That is what I'm trying to do. 16:05:57 |
| 25 Q. is there - 16:04:24 25 have never traveled outside the presence of my wife. 1 A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this - 16:06:09 2 that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me 1 A. Sir, find me that statement. 16:06:09 3 ftying with virginia Roberts, they do not show me 1 A. Sir, find me that statement. 16:06:09 4 ftying with any young women. 3 Q do you do you remember having 16:06:17 5 max a business reason for it, there were other 6 A. No. 16:06:17 7 people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that 8 MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:20 9 Virginia Roberts toid about me could have been true. 9 characterize them by date and time, you just 10 Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 10 can's say here - it's improper impeachment 11 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; 11 that you've done this ten times. It's just 12 improper completely. 13 A. Said that again, no manifest - 16:04:59 14 Q. No manifest shows you | | time, on occasion my wife did not fly with me. | | A. That is a lie, sir, a categorical lie. I 16:05:57 |
| 1 A. But let me emphasize let me emphasize 16:04:25 1 Q. Well, how about this 16:06:08 2 that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me 3 Q do you do you remember having 16:06:09 3 flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me 3 Q do you do you remember having 16:06:10 4 flying with any young women. 3 Q do you do you remember having 16:06:17 5 They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:35 5 you never received a massage A. No. 16:06:18 6 was a business reason for it, there were other 6 A. No. 16:06:17 Qfrom Jeffrey Epstein' 16:06:18 8 during any of those periods of time, the lies that 8 MR, SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:20 can't say here it's improper impeachment 11 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; 11 that to correct? 12 improper completely. 13 A. Said that again, no manifest - 16:04:58 13 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:06:30 14 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 14 Q. Can you answer the question 16:06:28 </th <th>24</th> <th>BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:04:24</th> <th></th> <th>challenge you to find any statement where I said I</th> | 24 | BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:04:24 | | challenge you to find any statement where I said I |
| 1A. But let me emphasize - let me emphasize 16:04:251Q. Well, how about this16:06:082that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me3Q do you do you remember having16:06:093flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me3Q do you do you remember having16:06:104flying with any young women.4having stated publicly on multiple occasions thatyou never received a massage5They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:355you never received a massage6was a business reason for it, there were other6A. No.16:06:177people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that7Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:188during any of those periods of time, the lies that8MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:209Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:4910can't say here it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest -16:04:581314Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:21negative.17Q do you have any recollection of sayi | 25 | Q. Is there 16:04:24 | 25 | have never traveled outside the presence of my wife. |
| 2that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me3A. Sir, find me that statement.16:06:093flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me3Q do you do you remember having 16:06:104flying with any young women.4having stated publicly on multiple occasions that5They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:355you never received a massage6was a business reason for it, there were other6A. No.16:06:177people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that8MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:209Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifest 16:04:4910can't say here it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that to go you and your wife;1113A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2914Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:3016A. Im confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:0718MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad. 16:06:3217question?19A. Idid receive a massage?16:06:3218MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it. 16:05:0719A. Idid receive a massage?16:06:3519question?19A. Idid receive a massage?16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:07 <th></th> <th>167</th> <th></th> <th>169</th> | | 167 | | 169 |
| 3flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me flying with any young women.3Q do you - do you remember having to you do you remember having5They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:355you never received a massage6was a business reason for it, there were other6A. No.16:06:177people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that7Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:188during any of those periods of time, the lies that8MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:209Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifest 16:04:4910can't say here it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that gain, no manifest16:06:2814Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3016A. Im confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:0718that you never received a massage?16:06:3219question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WTINESS: I don't, no.16:05:0719A. I dia' receive a massage.16:06:3221MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0721A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0722Q. Do you have any recol | 1 | A. But let me emphasize let me emphasize 16:04:25 | 1 | Q. Well, how about this 16:06:08 |
| 4flying with any young women.4having stated publicly on multiple occasions that you never received a massage5They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:355you never received a massage6was a business reason for it, there were other6A. No.16:06:177people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that7Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:188during any of those periods of time, the lies that8MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:209Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:4910can't say here it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:581314Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question15the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad. 16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:071617negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying 16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:071619question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3520THE WTINESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you h | 2 | that the manifests that do exculp me, do not show me | 2 | A. Sir, find me that statement. 16:06:09 |
| 5They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:35under price pric | 3 | flying with Virginia Roberts, they do not show me | 3 | Q do you do you remember having 16:06:10 |
| 6was a business reason for it, there were other people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that6A. No.16:06:177people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that during any of those periods of time, the lies that7Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:188during any of those periods of time, the lies that8MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:209Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifests16:04:4911show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2814Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:3016A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:36 | 4 | flying with any young women. | 4 | having stated publicly on multiple occasions that |
| 7people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that7Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:188during any of those periods of time, the lies that8MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:209Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:4910can't say here it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2914Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:3016A. Im confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying 16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?20Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:1023 <t< th=""><th>5</th><th>They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:35</th><th>5</th><th>you never received a massage</th></t<> | 5 | They know that on every trip I took, there 16:04:35 | 5 | you never received a massage |
| 8during any of hose periods of time, the lies that8MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:209Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:4910can't say here - it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2914Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying 16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3523Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24 <td< th=""><th>6</th><th>was a business reason for it, there were other</th><th>6</th><th></th></td<> | 6 | was a business reason for it, there were other | 6 | |
| 9Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true.9characterize them by date and time, you just10Q. So it's your contention that no manifests16:04:4910can't say here it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2814Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3218MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3622BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:51023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 7 | people on the plane, and it is inconceivable that | | A. No. 16:06:17 |
| 10Q. So it's your contention that no manifests16:04:4910can't say here it's improper impeachment11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2814Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:3016A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | | people on the plane, and it is inconcervable that | 7 | |
| 11show you traveling outside the company of your wife;11that you've done this ten times. It's just12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2814Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:1023you never received a massage?2424that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 8 | | | Q from Jeffrey Epstein? 16:06:18 |
| 12is that correct?12improper completely.13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2814Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | | during any of those periods of time, the lies that | 8 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20 |
| 13A. Said that again, no manifest16:04:5813BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:2814Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. | 8 9 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you just |
| 14Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside16:04:5914Q. Can you answer the question16:06:2915the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 | 8 9 10 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachment |
| 15the company of your wife?15MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:2916A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 | during any of those periods of time, the lies thatVirginia Roberts told about me could have been true.Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49show you traveling outside the company of your wife; | 8 9 10 11 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein? 16:06:18 MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:20 characterize them by date and time, you just can't say here it's improper impeachment that you've done this ten times. It's just |
| 16A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple16:05:0216BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:3017negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? | 8 9 10 11 12 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein? 16:06:18 MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and 16:06:20 characterize them by date and time, you just can't say here it's improper impeachment that you've done this ten times. It's just improper completely. |
| 17negative.17Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:3018MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and characterize them by date and time, you just can't say here it's improper impeachment that you've done this ten times. It's just improper completely.16:06:28BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28 |
| 18MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the16:05:0718that you never received a massage?19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and characterize them by date and time, you just can't say here it's improper impeachment that you've done this ten times. It's just improper completely.16:06:28BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29 |
| 19question?19A. I did receive a massage.16:06:3220THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and characterize them by date and time, you just can't say here it's improper impeachment that you've done this ten times. It's just improper completely.16:06:28BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30 |
| 20THE WITNESS: I don't, no.16:05:0720Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:3421MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it.16:05:0921A. I have no recollection16:06:3522BY MR. SCAROLA:16:05:0922Q of making that public statement that16:06:3623Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten16:05:1023you never received a massage?24that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's24A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30 |
| 21 MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it. 16:05:09 21 A. I have no recollection 16:06:35 22 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:05:09 22 Q of making that public statement that 16:06:36 23 Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:10 23 you never received a massage? 24 that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's 24 A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the 16:05:07 | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30that you never received a massage? |
| 22 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:05:09 22 Q of making that public statement that 16:06:36 23 Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:10 23 you never received a massage? 24 that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's 24 A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the 16:05:07 question? | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30that you never received a massage?16:06:32 |
| 23 Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:10 23 you never received a massage? 24 that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's 24 A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. Tm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the 16:05:07 question? THE WITNESS: I don't, no. 16:05:07 | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30that you never received a massage?16:06:32Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:34 |
| 24 that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's 24 A. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said 16:06:39 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. Tm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the 16:05:07 question? THE WITNESS: I don't, no. 16:05:07 MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it. 16:05:09 | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30that you never received a massage?16:06:32Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:34A. I did receive a massage.16:06:35 |
| | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | during any of those periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the 16:05:07 question? THE WITNESS: I don't, no. 16:05:07 MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it. 16:05:09 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:05:09 | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30that you never received a massage?16:06:32Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:34A. I did receive a massage.16:06:35Q of making that public statement that16:06:36 |
| ²⁵ plane that snows your wife there at the same time, ²⁵ it, I was mistaken. I had one massage, to my | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | during any of hose periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the 16:05:07 question? THE WITNESS: I don't, no. 16:05:07 MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it. 16:05:09 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:05:09 Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:10 | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30that you never received a massage?16:06:32A. I did receive a massage.16:06:32Q. Do you have any recollection16:06:34A. I have no recollection16:06:35Q of making that public statement that16:06:36you never received a massage?16:06:35 |
| | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | during any of hose periods of time, the lies that Virginia Roberts told about me could have been true. Q. So it's your contention that no manifests 16:04:49 show you traveling outside the company of your wife; is that correct? A. Said that again, no manifest 16:04:58 Q. No manifest shows you traveling outside 16:04:59 the company of your wife? A. I'm confused. That's a double, triple 16:05:02 negative. MR. SCOTT: Do you understand the 16:05:07 question? THE WITNESS: I don't, no. 16:05:07 MR. SCOTT: Rephrase it. 16:05:09 BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:05:09 Q. There is not a single manifest of the ten 16:05:10 that shows you as a passenger on Jeffrey Epstein's | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q from Jeffrey Epstein?16:06:18MR. SCOTT: Unless you can show them and16:06:20characterize them by date and time, you justcan't say here it's improper impeachmentthat you've done this ten times. It's justimproper completely.BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:28Q. Can you answer the question16:06:29MR. SCOTT: And it's overly broad.16:06:29BY MR. SCAROLA:16:06:30Q do you have any recollection of saying16:06:30that you never received a massage?16:06:32A. I did receive a massage.16:06:35Q of making that public statement that16:06:36you never received a massage?A. I have no recollectionA. I can't imagine me saying that. If I said16:06:39 |

43 (Pages 166 to 169)

| house, which I have never been in, ever, and which nobody was allowed basically into, which was Jeffrey Epstein's part of the house, which contained his bedroom and whatever other rooms. I've read about them, but I've never seen them. So it was in the guest area of the house over the kitchen. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:09:45 Q. Who told you no one was allowed in that 16:09:47 area of the house? A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
|--|
| Epstein's part of the house, which contained his bedroom and whatever other rooms. I've read about them, but I've never seen them. So it was in the guest area of the house over the kitchen. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:09:45 Q. Who told you no one was allowed in that 16:09:47 area of the house? A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| bedroom and whatever other rooms. I've read about them, but I've never seen them. So it was in the guest area of the house over the kitchen. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:09:45 Q. Who told you no one was allowed in that 16:09:47 area of the house? A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| them, but I've never seen them. So it was in the guest area of the house over the kitchen. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:09:45 Q. Who told you no one was allowed in that 16:09:47 area of the house? A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| guest area of the house over the kitchen. BY MR. SCAROLA: 16:09:45 Q. Who told you no one was allowed in that 16:09:47 area of the house? A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| BY MR. SCAROLA:16:09:45Q. Who told you no one was allowed in that16:09:47area of the house?A. I was told by the people that that was16:09:50off - off limits, that that was Jeffrey'sQ. Which people?16:09:54A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that16:09:56was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guestswere limited to the public areas of the house andthe and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms.Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11you're not allowed in this area of the house?A. People people guests are not 16:10:1516:10:19 |
| Q. Who told you no one was allowed in that 16:09:47 area of the house? A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| area of the house? A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| A. I was told by the people that that was 16:09:50 off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:111 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| off off limits, that that was Jeffrey's Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| Q. Which people? 16:09:54 A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| A. Ghislaine, Kellen, Sarah Kellen, that that 16:09:56 was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| was Jeffrey's area of the house and that the guests were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| were limited to the public areas of the house and the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| the and I think that's common in many houses when you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| you go and stay at somebody's house, you don't go into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| into their bathrooms and their bedrooms. Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| Q. And it's common for people to tell you, 16:10:11 you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| you're not allowed in this area of the house? A. People people guests are not 16:10:15 supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| A. People people guests are not16:10:15supposed to go to that area of the house.16:10:19Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it16:10:19 |
| supposed to go to that area of the house. Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| Q. No, sir. That's my question. Is it 16:10:19 |
| |
| |
| common for you to be told |
| A. Yes. 16:10:22 |
| 173 |
| |
| Q when you enter somebody's house, you're 16:10:22 |
| not allowed to go into this portion of the house? |
| A. Oh, yes. I just recently went to a a 16:10:26 |
| breakfast at somebody's house after Yom Kippur and I |
| wanted to show friends of mine the art that was in |
| the house and I started walking down the house and |
| the waiter said, oh, I'm sorry, you're not allowed in in that part of the house, that's the private |
| I , I |
| residence. And so I had to turn around and show my |
| friends the art that was in the public area, not the private area |
| O. Jeffrey Epstein's art consisted of 16:10:54 |
| photographs of young naked girls all over the house, |
| right? |
| A. Are you testifying? That's false. I 16:11:01 |
| never saw any such thing. Ever. Never saw a |
| picture, with one exception, of a nude. The one |
| exception was a sepia print of Rodin's model that |
| appeared on one of his desks. |
| But in all the times I was at Jeffrey 16:11:23 |
| Epstein's house in Palm Beach, the one time I was in |
| his house in on the island, certainly the one |
| time in in the ranch because there was nothing |
| there, it was just a construction site, I never saw |
| a picture or in his house in New York, I never |
| |

| | 174 | 176 |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | saw a picture of a naked woman, ever. | CERTIFICATE OF OATH |
| 2 | Q. The notice for deposition with which you 16:11:45 | |
| 3 | were served both initially a few months ago and for | |
| 4 | today's deposition is a notice of deposition duces | STATE OF FLORIDA |
| 5 | tecum. Could we please have the documents that | COUNTY OF BROWARD |
| 6 | you | |
| 7 | MR. SCOTT: We have a disk. I'll hand it 16:12:01 | |
| 8 | to you at the end of the depo with everything | I, the undersigned authority, certify |
| 9 | that's responsive | that ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ personally appeared |
| 10 | MR. SCAROLA: I would like it now, please. 16:12:04 | before me and was duly sworn on the 15th day of October, 2015. |
| 11 | MR. SCOTT: Let the record reflect I'm 16:12:13 | Signed this 15th day of October, 2015. |
| 12 | handing the disk. | Signed this four day of Octaber, 2015. |
| 13 | MR. SCAROLA: Thank you. 16:12:16 | |
| 14 | MR. SIMPSON: Just for the record, it's a 16:12:17 | Kinhuly Antalion |
| 15 | disk of all the documents that have been | KIMBERLY FONTALVO, RPR, FPR, CLR |
| 16 | produced in the case subject to the objections | Notary Public, State of Florida |
| 17 | and privilege assertions that have been made in | My Commission No. EE 161994 |
| 18 | the case. | Expires: 2/01/16 |
| 19 | MR. SCAROLA: All right. And so that the 16:12:25 | |
| 20 | record is clear, and hopefully you will be able | |
| 21 | to make these arrangements by tomorrow, one of | |
| 22 | the things that we want are the original of the | |
| 23 | handwritten documents so that we have an | |
| 24 | opportunity to examine those. | |
| 25 | MR. SCOTT: I'll talk to him 16:12:40 | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. SCAROLA: Calendars. 16:12:41 MR. SCOTT: whether we comply or not. 16:12:43 We'll discuss it off the record. MR. SCAROLA: The flight logs, anything 16:12:44 that's in handwritten form. And we will reconvene tomorrow. What time 16:12:50 would you like to start? MR. SCOTT: 9:30. 16:12:53 THE WITNESS: The earlier the better. 16:12:54 9:00. MR. SCAROLA: 9:00? 16:12:55 MR. SCAROLA: 9:00, good. 16:12:56 MR. SCAROLA: 8:00, want to go to 8:00? 16:12:57 MR. SCOTT: No, 9:00 is fine. 16:12:59 MR. SCAROLA: Okay. Thank you. 16:13:00 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The 16:13:00 time is approximately 4:13 p.m. (The proceedings ADJOURNED at 4:13 p.m., and will continue in Volume 2.) | CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF BROWARD I, KIMBERLY FONTALVO, Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing videotape deposition of ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ; pages 1 through 170; that a review of the transcript was requested; and that the transcript is a true record of my stenographic notes. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action. Dated this 15th day of October, 2015. KIMBERLY FONTALVO, RPR, FPR, CLR |
| 23 24 25 | | |
| | | 45 (Pages 174 to 177) |

Г

| Orcher 15, 2015 R:: Brailly Edwards, etc. v. Alam M. Deshowizz Difference in the 15 do of with your programments with your out | 178 | |
|--|---|--|
| Please take notice that on the 15th day of Oxtober, 2015, your gave your deposition in the bore cance. The above addressed attorney has ordered a coy of this fits transcript and how will make arrangements with you be the second of the post of the three terms of the second | October 15, 2015 | |
| 2015. you gave your deposition in the show cases. At that time, you do not wave your signature. The above safetsed attorney has ordered a copy of this transcript and brown at the source of the stranscript and brown at the source of the stranscript and sign the deposition within a reasonable anount of time, the original standard transcript and sign the deposition within a reasonable anount of time, the original standard transcript and sign the deposition within a reasonable anount of time, the original standard transcript and sign the deposition within a reasonable anount of time, the original standard your and extens to the advection of this letter and return out and devec blace blace your and extens to the advection of this letter and return out and devec blace blace with head State Blace blace West Palm Beach, Florida 3301 I do hereby waite my signature. | Re: Bradley Edwards, etc. v. Alan M. Dershowitz | |
| this transcript and will make arrangements with you to read the tory. Place sected the Fornt a Sheet, which can be found if the back of the distribution to all parties. It you to not real and sign the deposition within a reasonable amount of time, the original, which has a laterally been (revended to the ordering attorney, may be the filed with the Cliff of the Cant. If you visit, to waive your signature more, please sign your mane in the hash at the bott on the lateral the cliff of the Cant. If you visit, to waive your signature more, please sign your mane in the hash at the bott on the lateral the cliff. The cliff of the Cant. If you visit, to waive your signature more, please sign your mane in the hash at the bott on the lateral the cliff. The cliff of the Cant. If you visit, to waive your signature. The cliff of the Cant. If you visit, to waive your signature. The first Reporting. Inc. 163 Forum Place. Sume 500 West Plan Beach, Florida 3301 I do hereby waive my signature. The REPARCE NUMERAL YOUR WARE PLACE SHEET DO MOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE In Ke: BRADEY EDWARDS, ETC. V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ Okrober 15, 2015 Place II. NE: CHANGE REASON The CHANGE REASON The cliff of the Cant. If you waive reading the facts stated in the rune. The cliff of | 2015, you gave your deposition in the above cause. | |
| your mue in the blank at the bottom of this letter and return to the address listed below. Very truly yours. KIMBERLY FONTALYON, RPE, FPR, CLR Phipps Reporting, Inc. 1615 Forum Place, Suite 500 West Plan Beach, Florida 33401 I do hereby waive my signature. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ DI DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE In Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC. V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON Image: Suite Structure Image: Suite Structure Image: Suite Structure Image: Suite Structure ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE Image: Suite Structure Image: Suite Structure Image: Structure <td>this transcript and will make arrangements with you to read their copy. Please execute the Errata Sheet, which can be found at the back of the transcript, and have it returned to us for distribution to all parties. If you do not read and sign the deposition within a reasonable amount of time, the original, which has already been forwarded to the ordering attorney, may</td> <td></td> | this transcript and will make arrangements with you to read their copy. Please execute the Errata Sheet, which can be found at the back of the transcript, and have it returned to us for distribution to all parties. If you do not read and sign the deposition within a reasonable amount of time, the original, which has already been forwarded to the ordering attorney, may | |
| NIMBEL Y FONTALVO, RPR, FPR, CLR Phips Reporting. Inc. 1615 Form Place. State 500 West Plain Beach, Florida 33401 1do hereby waive my signature. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ Ido hereby waive my signature. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ DERATA SHEET DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE In Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC. V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON Image: REASON | your name in the blank at the bottom of this letter | |
| Phips Reporting. Inc 1615 Form Hack, Nite 500 West Palm Reach, Florida 33401 I do hereby waive my signature. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE In Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC. V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON | Very truly yours, | |
| ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ 179 ERRATA SHEET DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE In Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC. V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON Image: International content of the state stated in it are true. | Phipps Reporting, Inc. 1615 Forum Place, Suite 500 | |
| 179 ERRATA SHEET DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE IN Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC: V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON | I do hereby waive my signature. | |
| 179 ERRATA SHEET DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE IN Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC: V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON | ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ | |
| ERRATA SHEET DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE In Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC. V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ October 15, 2015 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON | | |
| Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have read the foregoing document and that the facts stated in it are true. | ERRATA SHEET DO NOT WRITE ON TRANSCRIPT - ENTER CHANGES HERE In Re: BRADLEY EDWARDS, ETC. V. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ | |
| read the foregoing document and that the facts stated in it are true. | PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON | |
| read the foregoing document and that the facts stated in it are true. | | |
| read the foregoing document and that the facts stated in it are true. | | |
| read the foregoing document and that the facts stated in it are true. | | |
| read the foregoing document and that the facts stated in it are true. | | |
| read the foregoing document and that the facts stated in it are true. | | |
| Date ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ | read the foregoing document and that the facts | |
| | Date ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ | |

46 (Pages 178 to 179)

| <u> </u> | absurdly (1) | 14:10 123:21 | 69:6 | 97:17 104:13 |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| $\frac{A}{a.m(9)}$ | 117:23 | 177:18,19 | affect (1) | 105:15 110:15 |
| 1:15 5:2,5 50:1 | abuse (6) | actions (1) | 21:1 | 124:20 128:11 |
| , | 93:6 94:7,9,13 | 64:23 | affidavit (10) | 151:22 165:19 |
| 50:2,2,4 99:2,3 | 97:15 153:18 | acts (2) | 42:5,6,17 114:3 | Aidala (2) |
| ABC (18) | abused (10) | 123:5 128:3 | 114:10 121:22 | 39:10,11 |
| 76:22 78:6,8,16 | 88:19,22 89:6 | actual (1) | 123:2 128:13 | air (3) |
| 79:11,12,13,17 | 89:14,19 90:13 | 101:24 | 128:18 130:9 | 78:18 79:13 |
| 79:21,23 80:1 | 91:8 92:23 | add (1) | affidavits (1) | 129:15 |
| 101:23 103:24 | 93:1 98:13 | 119:23 | 90:20 | airplane (18) |
| 103:25 111:20 | abusing (1) | addition (2) | afib (1) | 129:16,23 |
| 118:5 124:5 | 94:13 | 30:3 79:9 | 23:6 | 142:17,24 |
| 148:3 | academic (2) | additional (3) | afternoon (1) | 143:6,8 144:2 |
| Abigail (2) | 138:17 140:16 | 114:16 123:8 | 168:8 | 144:23 159:3,4 |
| 77:17,22 | academics (1) | 160:9 | age (4) | 159:9,13,15 |
| abilities (1) | 140:20 | address (3) | 19:9,23 137:4 | 164:4,6,14 |
| 146:25 | accept (2) | 72:8 84:6 | 140:5 | 165:23 168:16 |
| ability (3) | 32:4 152:19 | 178:12 | agent (1) | airplanes (2) |
| 53:18 96:13 | access (1) | addressed (1) | 114:16 | 142:25 159:6 |
| 147:23 | 8:24 | 108:11 | ages (2) | airport (3) |
| ablation (3) | accompanied | adjacent (3) | 136:25 137:6 | 136:9 141:1,25 |
| 23:25 24:18,19 | 135:20 165:22 | 132:14,15 | ago (13) | Al (4) |
| able (10) | 166:3,14,15,17 | 133:19 | 7:16 8:13,14 | 129:15,18,21 |
| 18:4 59:20 61:6 | accuracy (1) | ADJOURNE | 23:4,4,20,21 | 130:2 |
| 68:2 69:20 78 20 106 10 | 58:5 | 175:18 | 24:9 36:17 | Alan (26) |
| 78:20 106:10 | accurate (3) | Administrator | 40:12 48:8 | 1:7,11 5:5,7 6:5 |
| 108:15 121:3 | 9:2 13:8 149:3 | 1:21 | 60:1 174:3 | 6:17,24 84:11 |
| 174:20 | accusation (1) | admissible (1) | agree (19) | 84:12 105:12 |
| above-address | 31:24 | 83:14 | 9:5,17,20 10:2 | 105:17 123:14 |
| 178:5 | accusations (10) | admit (1) | 10:17 11:15 | 127:18,19 |
| Abrams (3) 26:5 28:8 30:15 | 10:18 11:10,17 | 104:25 | 12:1,9,15 13:7 | 154:10 156:6 |
| absolute (6) | 13:18,22,23 | admitted (2) | 14:2,16 31:5 | 158:20 161:13 |
| 112:18 125:24 | 14:7 21:14 | 23:22 104:7 | 66:11 98:8 | 161:13 176:9 |
| 12:18 123:24 126:10 127:23 | 22:1 23:1 | adopted (1) | 108:15 142:13 | 177:9 178:2,19 |
| 156:22 157:20 | accused (5) | 75:5 | 156:8,11 | 179:3,3,24 |
| absolutely (18) | 31:17 37:4 77:2 | advice (14) | agreed (3) | alcohol (1) |
| 26:23 42:24 | 127:11 146:5 | 17:10 25:18,20 | 31:7 99:18 | 21:1 |
| 43:2 54:21 | accusing (1) | 25:22 28:2 | 170:11 | alerted (1) |
| | 87:14 | 36:10,12,16,21 | agreement (2) | 146:12 |
| 77:8,11 78:7 80:12,12 94:1 | acknowledge (| 39:9,25 65:6,9 | 12:14 120:24 | Alex (2) |
| 97:3 110:12 | 18:23 163:15 | 154:16 | Aguiar (1) | 36:18,19 |
| 111:21 128:8 | act (3) | advised (8) | 35:21 | Alexi (4) |
| 150:12 153:10 | 48:17 87:14 | 16:4,11 17:18 | ahead (18) | 115:19,21,22 |
| 153:10 163:25 | 128:20 | 17:22 26:6 | 10:15 37:14,16 | 116:2 |
| absurd (2) | acted (2) | 37:8 43:4 | 43:1 52:12 | allegation (7) |
| 117:24 129:7 | 52:22 93:10 | 143:20 | 54:7 75:2,6 | 10:9 42:19 |
| 11/.471/27./ | action (4) | advocate (1) | 81:19 82:23 | 93:14,18,19,20 |
| | | | | |

| 129:13 | and/or (5) | 97:16,18 115:4 | appellate (1) | 53:11 57:6 |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| allegations (17) | 49:18 85:10 | 122:12 132:1 | 62:5 | 58:10,13 71:7 |
| 16:8 23:14,15 | 102:14 103:2 | answering (7) | applied (2) | 86:11 89:2 |
| 36:1 39:19 | 103:12 | 44:1 107:10 | 8:20 150:8 | 105:4,14 |
| 42:12 43:9 | Andrew (2) | 118:24,25 | appreciate (2) | 116:10 117:15 |
| 83:1 88:12 | 117:24 118:2 | 155:8 166:10 | 12:13 34:2 | 128:10 129:1 |
| 92:13 98:18 | announce (1) | 166:12 | approach (1) | 165:12 |
| 112:19,20 | 5:14 | answers (15) | 16:6 | Arps (1) |
| 116:24 117:19 | answer (81) | 24:16 34:22,24 | approaches (1) | 39:23 |
| 130:15 147:2 | 9:15,24 10:13 | 56:4,11,23 | 65:3 | arrange (4) |
| alleged (10) | 10:25 11:13 | 57:20,23 58:5 | appropriate (6) | 137:9,10,20,24 |
| 42:8 55:21 | 14:21,21 16:21 | 63:24 64:9 | 16:9 18:17 | arranged (1) |
| 93:10 94:4,6,7 | 17:25 18:8 | 104:16 119:5 | 63:10 84:8 | 138:11 |
| 98:11 123:5 | 19:13 30:10,14 | 156:2 158:16 | 107:7 147:4 | arrangements |
| 128:2,14 | 30:23 33:10,10 | Anthony (2) | appropriately | 72:9 174:21 |
| allegedly (5) | 33:23 34:9,16 | 32:24,25 | 26:15 | 178:6 |
| 49:18,19 107:14 | 37:16,16 46:6 | anxious (4) | approved (1) | arranging (1) |
| 107:15 111:24 | 46:8 53:5 57:7 | 65:15 108:13,14 | 124:15 | 140:13 |
| alleging (3) | 60:10 66:5,21 | 110:1 | approximatel | art (3) |
| 76:13 114:12 | 67:3,8 77:15 | anybody (5) | 5:4 7:20 8:13,14 | 173:5,10,12 |
| 116:6 | 82:6 93:8 | 94:14 113:6 | 8:17 15:17 | Arthur (2) |
| allow (3) | 95:15 96:3,9 | 131:17 133:3 | 50:1,4 99:2,5 | 39:10,11 |
| 86:20 94:22 | 96:12,19,25 | 162:22 | 116:4 145:8,11 | article (1) |
| 114:10 | 97:6,19,21 | apartment (5) | 160:2 175:17 | 148:18 |
| allowed (11) | 98:5,10 107:19 | 7:2,4 8:3,5 | April (1) | Ashe (11) |
| 15:10 19:3 | 107:21 108:13 | 46:22 | 148:10 | 41:1,2,18,20 |
| 78:18 114:6 | 108:14,16 | apologize (1) | architect (1) | 42:1 115:17,18 |
| 120:2 145:2 | 118:22,25 | 91:13 | 131:2 | 115:19,21,22 |
| 172:2,8,20 | 119:12,16 | apology (1) | area (16) | 116:2 |
| 173:2,7 | 121:4 122:16 | 13:21 | 47:23 71:22 | Ashes (2) |
| allowing (2) | 123:14,20,24 | apparently (1) | 72:6 78:11 | 41:15 115:16 |
| 6:8 54:13 | 124:10 127:9 | 90:19 | 84:6 130:19,22 | Ashley (1) |
| allows (1) | 128:11 142:8 | appeals (1) | 132:16 171:25 | 28:20 |
| 74:22 | 144:16 147:16 | 62:6 | 172:6,9,14,20 | asked (63) |
| alternative (3) | 152:7,10,20 | appear (1) | 172:22 173:10 | 13:4 18:9 21:22 |
| 146:10,14 147:1 | 153:20 154:13 | 80:4 | 173:11 | 22:12 30:2,9 |
| ambivalence (1) | 155:22 158:6 | appearances (5) | areas (2) | 30:11,12 41:21 |
| 71:16 | 158:17 162:8 | 2:1 3:1 5:15 | 171:17 172:15 | 44:5,6,10 45:2 |
| Amendment (3) | 162:25 163:3,4 | 121:10,13 | argue (3) | 45:8,11 50:13 |
| 26:6,7 117:5 | 163:6 164:17 | appeared (5) | 20:1 145:23 | 50:14,16,18 |
| American (2) | 165:13 169:14 | 78:22 117:20 | 147:20 | 51:1 55:19 |
| 117:4 163:10 | 171:15 | 133:2 173:19 | argued (1) | 57:9,24 63:7 |
| amount (4) | answered (13) | 176:9 | 125:21 | 63:25 64:2 |
| 13:16 17:3 | 13:14 43:24 | appearing (1) | arguing (1) | 67:14 72:18,21 |
| 161:6 178:9 | 57:25 64:2 | 6:8 | 46:10 | 75:7,11 81:16 |
| and (3) | 72:21 85:14 | appears (1) | argumentativ | 81:18,20,21 |
| 2:13,17 3:7 | 87:25 91:11 | 56:18 | 15:5 24:25 | 85:14 87:25 |
| | I | l | I | I |

| 91:11 92:2417:18 39:12177:1789:21 91:423:1493:2 96:10.20associations (1)attributed (3)97:4.10 99:423:23 73:1104:17.24assume (7)August (1)100:11,12103:17 138:10104:17.24assume (7)August (1)100:11,12103:17 138:10105:5 109:2357:21 66:2424:9115:16 119:3,4139:11 172:2116:21 120:17124:15,17,24authentic (1)119:6 120:12basis (4)122:1,11 129:5152:22 153:4100:3,17144:18 145:1036:7 155:8148:24 157:13102:4,7145:13160:6 178:7basketball (2)160:23 161:3assumed (1)attail (15)176:8130:11171:229:10 11:2521:15,19,25authorize (1)background (3)bathrooms (1)26:18 28:123:3,19,2462:9120:13bathrooms (1)26:18 28:123:3,19,2462:9120:13bathrooms (1)154:14 165:2156:4157:1129:8,9170:1776:19aspects (4)attach (1)Ave (1)bad (3)battle (1)38:3attempt (3)aware (26)Baker (2)Battle (1)174:1719:897:11,22,98:1139:776:19asserting (1)12:22 22:215:19 61:1836:3,4BIBC (1)174:1719:897:11,22,98:1139:72:4,57:246:22asserting (2)12:22 22:215:19 61:1836:3,4BIBC (1)174:1719:897:11,22,98:1139:72:4 | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 91.11 92.24 | 17.18 39.12 | 177.17 | 89.21 91.4 | 23.14 |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | , | | . , | | • • • |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | - | | , | , | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | , | • • | 0 () | , | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | | | , | |
| 137:22,23 assumed (2) author (1) 144:18 145:10 36:7 155:8 148:24 157:13 102:4,7 145:13 authority (3) background (3) 131:2,3 160:23 161:3 assumes (1) authority (3) background (3) 131:2,3 170:45.6 11:17 63:23 64:11 130:11 171:22 9:10 11:25 21:15,19,25 authorize (1) backgrounds (bathroom (1) 26:18 28:1 23:3,19,24 62:9 120:13 172:18 32:20 33:24 24:1,2,6,13,14 authorize (1) backgrounds (bathroom (1) 154:1,4 165:2 156:4 157:1 129:8,9 170:17 76:19 aspects (4) attack (1) Ave (1) badly (1) battlee (1) 38:3 attempt (3) aware (26) Baker (2) battlee (1) asserting (1) 12:22 22:2 15:19 61:18 36:3,4 147:12 144:11 44:18 78:2 79:18 bang (3) Bach (18) 17:4:17 119:8 97:11,22 98:1 139:7 2:4,5 | | , , | | | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | , | | author (1) | | |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | - | | 145:13 | 160:6 178:7 | basketball (2) |
| asking (13) atrial (15) 176:8 130:11 171:22 9:10 11:25 21:15,19,25 authorize (1) 62:9 120:13 backgrounds (32:20 33:24 24:12,26,13,14 authorize (2) backgrounds (170:11 16:25 126:23 attach (1) available (1) 154:1,4 165:2 156:4 157:1 129:8,9 170:17 76:19 aspects (4) attack (1) 4Ve (1) badly (1) battreed (1) 172:18 17:4 35:5 37:9 120:5 3:8 80:3 116:5 147:10 battle (2) 38:3 attempt (3) aware (26) Baker (2) badly (1) battle (1) 14:11 44:18 78:2 79:18 Bang (3) BBC (1) 18:5 353:18 168:19 73:16 118:8 93:13 94:2 93:13 94:2 139:7 2:4,5 7:2 46:22 asserting (1) 12:22 2:16:11 15:21 16:18 139:12 17:22 115:14:15 124:7,7 16:12 17:14:16 139:12 17:21 178:16:18 asserting (1) 3:17 5:20 33:16 | 160:23 161:3 | assumes (1) | authority (3) | background (3) | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 170:4,5,6 | 11:17 | 63:23 64:11 | 28:25 109:17 | bathroom (1) |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | asking (13) | atrial (15) | 176:8 | 130:11 | 171:22 |
| $32:20\ 33:24$ $24:1,2,6,13,14$ $24:16,17,18,20$ authorized (2) $124:3\ 177:8$ $available (1)$ backward (1) $160:4$ baths (1) $170:11$ $116:25\ 126:23$ aspects (4)attach (1) attack (1) $124:3\ 177:8$ $155:4$ $160:4$ $170:11$ $116:25\ 126:23$ aspects (4)attack (1) attack (1) $Ave\ (1)$ $157:1$ $badl\ (3)$ $129:8,9\ 170:17$ $76:19$ $battle\ (2)$ $165:14\ 710$ $17:4\ 35:5\ 37:9$ $38:3$ attempt (3) attempt (3)aware (26) $84:22\ 93:3.8$ $Baker\ (2)$ $36:3.4$ $battle\ (1)$ $145:18\ 192$ $174:17$ $174:17$ $19:8$ $174:17$ $119:8$ $97:11,22\ 98:1$ $174:17$ $38:3$ $97:11,22\ 98:1$ $197:14.16$ $38:7\ 97:12\ 298:1$ $139:7\ 2:4,5\ 7:2\ 46:22\ 23\ 23.64.5\ 115:9\ 123:12\ 17:18\ 26:18\ 114:24\ 154:71\ 106:20\ 150:14\ 15:22\ 16:11\ 61:8\ 71:22\ 154:12\ 172:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:12\ 154:12\ 173:21\ 173:20\ 133:16\ 151:18\ 152:1\ 155:19\ 132:5\ 115:9\ 155:19\ 132:5\ 115:9\ 132:5\ 115:9\ 132:25\ 135:19\ 132:25\ 134\ 130:22\ 141:13\ 136:8\ 136$ | 9:10 11:25 | 21:15,19,25 | authorize (1) | backgrounds (| bathrooms (1) |
| 87:16,22 $24:16,17,18,20$ $124:3 177:8$ $160:4$ $170:11$ $116:25 126:23$ attach (1)available (1) $129:8,9 170:17$ $76:19$ aspects (4)attack (1)Ave (1)badly (1)battle (2) $17:4 35:5 37:9$ $120:5$ $3:8$ $80:3$ $116:5 147:10$ asserting (1) $12:22 22:2$ $15:19 61:18$ $36:3,4$ $147:12$ $114:11$ $44:18$ $78:2 79:18$ bang (3) $BBC (1)$ assertions (3)attempted (3) $84:22 93:3,8$ $145:18,19,20$ $118:5$ $53:18 168:19$ $73:16 118:8$ $97:11,22 98:1$ $139:7$ $2:4,5 7:2 46:22$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $98:10,17 99:14$ $Bar (8)$ $47:22,22,23$ $124:7,7$ $16:12$ $107:14,16$ $15:22 16:11$ $61:8 71:22$ assessment (3)attention (1) $115:9 123:12$ $17:18 26:18$ $114:24 154:7$ $110:10 111:7,12$ $16:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:12 61:25$ $154:20,21$ assist (1) $3:17 5:20 33:16$ $B(3)$ $Barbara (2)$ $173:21 178:16$ $39:24$ $38:21 39:13$ $assit 10:32 171:21$ $Barbara (2)$ $56:11$ $assistant (9)$ $178:5,10$ $B(3)$ $Barbara (2)$ $17:23$ $29:20 35:11$ $41:10 115:25$ $B(3)$ $Barbara (2)$ $17:23$ $40:3 113:25$ $151:18 152:1$ $72:1 119 46:1$ $90:5 141:13$ $16:2:5 163:2,9$ $29:23 36:4,5$ $155:19$ $72:5 11:19 46:1$ $90:5 141:13$ $170:24 171:5,7$ $28:23 36:4,5$ <td>26:18 28:1</td> <td>23:3,19,24</td> <td>62:9</td> <td>120:13</td> <td>172:18</td> | 26:18 28:1 | 23:3,19,24 | 62:9 | 120:13 | 172:18 |
| 116:25 126:23 154:1,4 165:2attach (1) 154:1,4 165:2available (1) 157:1bad (3) 129:8,9 170:17battered (1) 76:19aspects (4) asserting (1)attack (1) 12:22 22:2Ave (1) 38:3badly (1) aware (26)badly (1) Baker (2)battle (2) battle (1)asserting (1) 144:1112:22 22:215:19 61:18 44:1836:3,4147:12 144:18asserting (3) assertins (3)attempted (3) attempted (3)84:22 93:3,8 93:13 94:2145:18,19,20 139:7Back (1) 24:5 7:2 46:22asserts (2) asserts (2) 124:7,7 16:12attention (1) 111:7,12119:8 16:19 astind (1)93:10,17 99:14 123:16,18Bar (8) 39:12 61:2547:22,22,31 47:22,22,3110:10 111:7,12 17:024 171:6,10attinde (1) 147:10 171:20 assistance (2)attinde (1) 114:1 153:6 171:20 assistance (2)attorney (11) 178:5,10Barak (2) 178:5,10130:2 171:21 154:19,23Barak (2) 168:256:11 bear (1) 32:25beaten (2) 162:25 163:2,9assistance (2) 40:3 113:25 25:0,21:11 40:3 113:25 assistant (3)151:18 152:1 76:12 babies (2) 151:19Barloa (2) 32:25Barloa (2) 162:25 163:2,9 162:25 163:2,9Beator (1) 171:23130:6 166:15 associate (3) 28:23 36:4,5 associate (5) 28:23 36:4,5 25:5,7,10,13,15151:19 5:14 31:1272:14 73:6 72:14 73:6baseless (4)170:24 171:5,7 | 32:20 33:24 | 24:1,2,6,13,14 | authorized (2) | backward (1) | baths (1) |
| $154:1,4\ 165:2$ $156:4$ $157:1$ $129:8,9\ 170:17$ $76:19$ aspects (4)attack (1) $Ave (1)$ badly (1)battle (2) $17:4\ 35:5\ 37:9$ $120:5$ $3:8$ $80:3$ $116:5\ 147:10$ asserting (1) $12:22\ 22:2$ $15:19\ 61:18$ $36:3,4$ $147:12$ assertins (3)attempted (3) $84:22\ 93:3,8$ $145:18,19,20$ $118:5$ $53:18\ 168:19$ $73:16\ 118:8$ $93:13\ 94:2$ $banks (1)$ $Beach (18)$ $174:17$ $119:8$ $97:11,22\ 98:11$ $139:7$ $2:4,5\ 7:2\ 46:22$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $98:10,17\ 99:14$ $Bar (8)$ $7:22,2:23$ $124:7,7$ $16:12$ $107:14,16$ $15:22\ 16:11$ $61:8\ 71:22$ assestment (3)attention (1) $115:9\ 123:12$ $17:18\ 26:18$ $114:24\ 154:7$ $110:10\ 111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:12\ 61:25$ $154:20,21$ assigned (4)attitude (1) $124:1\ 150:17$ $106:20\ 150:14$ $155:13\ 170:4,5$ $17:20$ attorney (11) $assitant (2)$ $38:21\ 39:13$ $as:2$ $as:21\ 39:13$ assistance (2) $114:1\ 153:6$ $15:9$ $attorney's (2)$ $76:12$ $bacd (11)$ $29:20\ 35:11$ $41:10\ 115:25$ $attorney's (2)$ $76:12$ $bacd (11)$ $29:20\ 35:11$ $41:10\ 115:25$ $attorney's (2)$ $76:12$ $bacd (11)$ $29:20\ 35:11$ $41:10\ 115:25$ $155:19\ 32:7\ 40:23\ 66:6$ $69:19\ 72:15$ $bed (68)$ $associate (3)$ $151:18\ 152:$ | 87:16,22 | 24:16,17,18,20 | 124:3 177:8 | 160:4 | 170:11 |
| aspects (4)attack (1)Ave (1)badly (1)battle (2) $17:4 35:5 37:9$ $120:5$ $3:8$ $80:3$ $116:5 147:10$ $38:3$ attempt (3) $aware (26)$ $Baker (2)$ $battles (1)$ $asserting (1)$ $12:22 22:2$ $15:19 61:18$ $36:3,4$ $147:12$ $114:11$ $44:18$ $78:2 79:18$ $Bag (3)$ $BBC (1)$ $assertions (3)$ attempted (3) $84:22 93:3,8$ $145:18,19,20$ $118:5$ $53:18 168:19$ $73:16 118:8$ $97:11,22 98:1$ $139:7$ $2:4,5 7:2 46:22$ $asserts (2)$ attemton (1) $107:14,16$ $15:22 16:11$ $61:8 71:22$ $asserts (2)$ attention (1) $115:9 123:12$ $17:18 26:18$ $114:24 154:7$ $110:10 111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:12 61:25$ $154:20,21$ $assigned (4)$ attorney (11) $124:1 150:17$ $106:20 150:14$ $155:13 170:4,5$ $39:24$ $38:21 39:13$ B $113:19 108:25$ $156:11$ $assistant (9)$ $178:5,10$ $115:9$ $Bartsara (2)$ $56:11$ $29:20 35:11$ $41:10 115:25$ $76:12$ $barister (1)$ $32:25 163:2,9$ $40:3 113:25$ $attorney-clien$ $balte (29)$ $72:14 73:6$ $69:19 72:15$ $bed (8)$ $associate (3)$ $151:18 152:1$ $50:3 62:22$ $90:5 141:13$ $170:3,21,23,23$ $28:23 36:4,5$ $155:19$ $50:3 62:22$ $90:5 141:13$ $170:3,21,23,23$ $associates (5)$ $attorney (5)$ $50:3 62:22$ $90:5 141:13$ <t< td=""><td>116:25 126:23</td><td>attach (1)</td><td>available (1)</td><td>bad (3)</td><td>battered (1)</td></t<> | 116:25 126:23 | attach (1) | available (1) | bad (3) | battered (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 154:1,4 165:2 | 156:4 | 157:1 | 129:8,9 170:17 | 76:19 |
| 38:3 asserting (1)attempt (3) $12:22 22:2$ aware (26) $15:19 61:18$ Baker (2) $36:3,4$ battles (1) $147:12$ $114:11$ $44:18$ $78:2 79:18$ $36:3,4$ $147:12$ assertions (3) $53:18 168:19$ attempted (3) $73:16 118:8$ $84:22 93:3,8$ $145:18,19,20$ $118:5$ $53:18 168:19$ $73:16 118:8$ $93:13 94:2$ $banks (1)$ $BBC (1)$ $174:17$ $119:8$ $97:11,22 98:1$ $139:7$ $2:4,5 7:2 46:22$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $98:10,17 99:14$ $Bar (8)$ $47:22,22,23$ $124:7,7$ $16:12$ $107:14,16$ $15:22 16:11$ $61:8 71:22$ assesment (3)attention (1) $115:9 123:12$ $17:18 26:18$ $114:24 154:7$ $110:10 111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:12 61:25$ $154:20,21$ assigned (4)attitude (1) $124:1 150:17$ $106:20 150:14$ $155:13 170:4,5$ $170:24 171:6,10$ $147:10$ $154:19,23$ $Barak (2)$ $173:21 178:16$ $171:20$ attorney (11) $168:2$ $30:2 171:21$ $bear (1)$ assistance (2) $114:1 153:6$ B $37:5,6$ $beaten (2)$ assistant (9) $178:5,10$ $115:9$ $Barlise (2)$ $18:16 44:4$ $162:13,14,15,24$ $29:20 35:11$ $41:10 115:25$ $76:12$ $based (11)$ $162:13,14,15,24$ $40:3 113:25$ attorney-clien $151:18 152:1$ $back (29)$ $72:15$ $bedford (1)$ $136:6 166:15$ $32:7 40:23 66:6$ $50:3 62:22$ $142:16 158:14$ | aspects (4) | attack (1) | Ave (1) | badly (1) | battle (2) |
| asserting (1) $12:22 22:2$ $15:19 61:18$ $36:3.4$ $147:12$ $114:11$ $44:18$ $44:18$ $78:2 79:18$ $3ang (3)$ $145:18,19,20$ $BBC (1)$ $assertions (3)$ $attempted (3)$ $73:16 118:8$ $93:13 94:2$ $banks (1)$ $BBC (1)$ $174:17$ $119:8$ $97:11,22 98:1$ $139:7$ $2:4,5 7:2 46:22$ $asserts (2)$ $attempts (1)$ $98:10,17 99:14$ $Bar (8)$ $47:22,22,23$ $124:7,7$ $16:12$ $107:14,16$ $15:22 16:11$ $61:8 71:22$ $assessment (3)$ $attention (1)$ $115:9 123:12$ $17:18 26:18$ $114:24 154:7$ $110:10 111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:21 61:25$ $154:20,21$ $assigned (4)$ $attirude (1)$ $124:1 150:17$ $106:20 150:14$ $155:13 170:4,5$ $171:20$ $attorney (11)$ $168:2$ $130:2 171:21$ $bear (1)$ $assistance (2)$ $114:1 153:6$ $B (3)$ $37:5,6$ $BARNHART \dots$ $40:20,21$ $154:15 177:15$ $103:19 108:25$ $15:9$ $attorney's (2)$ $29:20 35:11$ $41:10 115:25$ $76:12$ $barister (1)$ $32:7 40:23 66:6$ $136:6 166:15$ $32:7 40:23 66:6$ $100:5,10$ $back (29)$ $54:18,23 65:6$ $136:8$ $associate (5)$ $attorney (5)$ $50:3 62:22$ $142:16 158:14$ $170:3,21,23,23$ $associate (5)$ $attorney (5)$ $50:3 62:22$ $142:16 158:14$ $170:24 171:5,7$ $25:5,7,10,13,15$ $5:14 31:12$ $72:14 73:6$ $baseless (4)$ $171:8,10 $ | 17:4 35:5 37:9 | 120:5 | 3:8 | 80:3 | 116:5 147:10 |
| 114:1144:1878:2 79:18bang (3)BBC (1)assertions (3)attempted (3) $73:16\ 118:8$ $93:13\ 94:2$ $93:13\ 94:2$ $93:13\ 94:2$ $93:13\ 94:2$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $97:11,22\ 98:1$ $139:7$ $2:4,5\ 7:2\ 46:22$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $98:10,17\ 99:14$ $139:7$ $2:4,5\ 7:2\ 46:22$ assessment (3)attention (1) $115:9\ 123:12$ $17:18\ 26:18$ $114:24\ 154:7$ $110:10\ 111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:22\ 61:25$ $154:20,21$ assigned (4)attitude (1) $124:1\ 150:17$ $106:20\ 150:14$ $155:13\ 170:4,5$ $170:24\ 171:6,10$ $147:10$ $154:19,23$ $130:2\ 171:21$ $173:21\ 178:16$ $assistance (2)$ $114:1\ 153:6$ B (3) $30:2\ 171:21$ $168:2$ $assistant (9)$ $178:5,10$ $115:9$ $155:9$ $32:7\ 40:23\ 66:6$ $103:19\ 108:25$ $162:25\ 163:2,9$ $29:20\ 35:11$ $41:10\ 115:25\ 132:7\ 40:23\ 66:6$ $100:5,10$ $164:4$ $162:13,14,15,24$ $40:3\ 113:25\ 32:7\ 40:23\ 66:6$ $100:5,10\ 54:18,23\ 65:6\ 136:8\ 90:19\ 72:15\ 90:5\ 14:1:3\ 170:3,21,23,23\ 142:16\ 158:14\ 170:24\ 171:5,7\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:1:3\ 170:3,21,23,23\ 142:16\ 158:14\ 170:24\ 171:5,7\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ 90:5\ 14:3:12\ 72:14\ 73:6\ $ | 38:3 | attempt (3) | aware (26) | Baker (2) | battles (1) |
| assertions (3) $53:18\ 168:19$ attempted (3) $73:16\ 118:8$ $84:22\ 93:3,8$ $93:13\ 94:2$ $145:18,19,20$ $banks (1)$ $118:5$ Beach (18) $174:17$ $119:8$ $93:13\ 94:2$ $banks (1)$ $145:18,19,20$ $118:5$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $93:13\ 94:2$ $banks (1)$ $Beach (18)$ $124:7,7$ $16:12$ $107:14,16$ $15:22\ 16:11$ $61:8\ 71:22$ assessment (3)attention (1) $115:9\ 123:12$ $17:18\ 26:18$ $114:24\ 154:7$ $110:10\ 111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:12\ 61:25$ $154:20,21$ assigned (4)attitude (1) $124:1\ 150:17$ $106:20\ 150:14$ $155:13\ 170:4,5$ $170:24\ 171:6,10$ $147:10$ $168:2$ $130:2\ 171:21$ $bear\ (1)$ assist (1) $3:17\ 5:20\ 33:16$ $38:21\ 39:13$ $Brabara\ (2)$ $56:11$ $assistant\ (9)$ $178:5,10$ $115:9$ $B-I-L-L-I-O$ $37:5,6$ $Beaten\ (2)$ $29:20\ 35:11$ $41:10\ 115:25$ $76:12$ $barrister\ (1)$ $32:7\ 40:23\ 66:6$ $100:5,10$ $54:18,23\ 65:6$ $136:8$ $associate\ (3)$ $151:18\ 152:1$ $50:3\ 62:22$ $18:16\ 44:4$ $Bedford\ (1)$ $28:23\ 36:4,5$ $155:19$ $72:5\ 11:19\ 46:1$ $90:5\ 14:1:3$ $170:24\ 171:5,7$ $25:5,7,10,13,15$ $5:14\ 31:12$ $72:14\ 73:6$ $baselss\ (4)$ $171:8,10\ 172:4$ | asserting (1) | 12:22 22:2 | 15:19 61:18 | 36:3,4 | 147:12 |
| $53:18\ 168:19$ $73:16\ 118:8$ $93:13\ 94:2$ banks (1)Beach (18) $174:17$ $119:8$ $97:11,22\ 98:1$ $139:7$ $2:4,5\ 7:2\ 46:22$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $98:10,17\ 99:14$ Bar (8) $47:22,22,23$ $124:7,7$ $16:12$ $107:14,16$ $15:22\ 16:11$ $61:8\ 71:22$ assessment (3)attention (1) $115:9\ 123:12$ $17:18\ 26:18$ $114:24\ 154:7$ $110:10\ 111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:12\ 61:25$ $154:20,21$ assigned (4)attitude (1) $124:1\ 150:17$ $106:20\ 150:14$ $155:13\ 170:4,5$ $170:24\ 171:6,10$ $147:10$ $154:19,23$ Barak (2) $173:21\ 178:16$ $171:20$ attorney (11) $168:2$ $130:2\ 171:21$ bear (1)assist (1) $3:17\ 5:20\ 33:16$ B $37:5,6$ Barbara (2) $39:24$ $38:21\ 39:13$ $B^{B}(3)$ $37:5,6$ Beaten (2)assistance (2) $114:1\ 153:6$ $103:19\ 108:25$ $32:25$ $162:25\ 163:2,9$ $40:20,21$ $154:15\ 177:15$ $103:19\ 108:25$ $32:25$ $162:25\ 163:2,9$ $29:20\ 35:11$ $41:10\ 115:25$ $76:12$ $based (11)$ $171:23$ $40:3\ 113:25$ $32:7\ 40:23\ 66:6$ $100:5,10$ $54:18,23\ 65:6$ $136:8$ $associate (3)$ $151:18\ 152:1$ $50:3\ 62:22$ $142:16\ 158:14$ $170:3,21,23,23$ $38:23\ 36:4,5$ $155:19$ $50:3\ 62:22$ $142:16\ 158:14$ $170:24\ 171:5,7$ $25:5,7,10,13,15$ $5:14\ 31:12$ $72:14\ 73:6$ | 114:11 | 44:18 | 78:2 79:18 | bang (3) | BBC (1) |
| 174:17 $119:8$ $97:11,2298:1$ $139:7$ $2:4,57:246:22$ asserts (2)attempts (1) $98:10,1799:14$ Bar (8) $47:22,22,23$ $124:7,7$ $16:12$ $107:14,16$ $15:2216:11$ $61:871:22$ assessment (3)attention (1) $115:9123:12$ $17:1826:18$ $114:24154:7$ $110:10111:7,12$ $116:19$ $123:16,18$ $39:1261:25$ $154:20,21$ assigned (4)attitude (1) $124:1150:17$ $106:20150:14$ $155:13170:4,5$ $170:24171:6,10$ $147:10$ $154:19,23$ Barak (2) $173:21178:16$ $171:20$ attorney (11) $168:2$ $30:2171:21$ bear (1)assist (1) $3:175:2033:16$ B B B B $39:24$ $38:2139:13$ B B B B B assistance (2) $114:1153:6$ B (3) $37:5,6$ B eaten (2)assistant (9) $178:5,10$ $115:9$ B B B B $29:2035:11$ $41:10115:25$ $103:19108:25$ $32:5$ $162:25163:2,9$ $29:2035:11$ $41:10115:25$ $76:12$ $based (11)$ $171:23$ $40:3113:25$ $151:18152:1$ $72:11:1946:1$ $90:5141:13$ $170:3,21,23,23$ $138:64.5,5$ $155:19$ $50:362:22$ $142:16158:14$ $170:24171:5,7$ $25:5,7,10,13,15$ $5:1431:12$ $72:1473:6$ $baseless (4)$ $171:8,10172:4$ | assertions (3) | _ | 84:22 93:3,8 | 145:18,19,20 | 118:5 |
| asserts (2)attempts (1) $98:10,17\ 99:14$ Bar (8) $47:22,22,23$ 124:7,716:12107:14,1615:22 16:1161:8 71:22assessment (3)attention (1)115:9 123:1217:18 26:18114:24 154:7110:10 111:7,12116:19123:16,1839:12 61:25154:20,21assigned (4)attitude (1)124:1 150:17106:20 150:14155:13 170:4,5170:24 171:6,10147:10154:19,23Barak (2)173:21 178:16171:20attorney (11)168:2130:2 171:21bear (1)assist (1)3:17 5:20 33:16 B B 37:5,6beaten (2)assistance (2)114:1 153:6103:19 108:2515:9 $37:5,6$ beaten (2)assistant (9)178:5,10115:9 B $2:4$ bed (8)29:20 35:1141:10 115:2576:12based (11)171:2340:3 113:25attorney-clienbabies (2)18:16 44:4Bedford (1)136:6 166:1532:7 40:23 66:6back (29)69:19 72:15bedroom (10)28:23 36:4,5155:19 $50:3 62:22$ 142:16 158:14170:3,21,23,23associate (5)attorneys (5) $50:3 62:22$ 142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,15 $5:14 31:12$ $72:14 73:6$ baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | 53:18 168:19 | 73:16 118:8 | 93:13 94:2 | banks (1) | Beach (18) |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | 174:17 | 119:8 | 97:11,22 98:1 | 139:7 | 2:4,5 7:2 46:22 |
| assessment (3)attention (1)115:9 123:1217:18 26:18114:24 154:7110:10 111:7,12116:19123:16,1839:12 61:25154:20,21assigned (4)attitude (1)124:1 150:17106:20 150:14155:13 170:4,5170:24 171:6,10147:10154:19,23Barak (2)173:21 178:16171:20attorney (11)154:19,23Barak (2)173:21 178:16assist (1)3:17 5:20 33:16168:239:2438:21 39:13assistance (2)114:1 153:6103:19 108:2537:5,6bear (1)40:20,21154:15 177:15103:19 108:252:4bed (8)assistant (9)178:5,10115:932:25162:25 163:2,929:20 35:1141:10 115:2576:12based (11)171:2340:3 113:25attorney-clienbabies (2)18:16 44:4Bedford (1)136:6 166:1532:7 40:23 66:6100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:8associate (3)151:18 152:172:5 11:19 46:190:5 141:13170:3,21,23,2328:23 36:4,5155:1950:3 62:22142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,155:14 31:1272:14 73:6baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | asserts (2) | attempts (1) | 98:10,17 99:14 | Bar (8) | 47:22,22,23 |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | - | | , | | |
| assigned (4)attitude (1)124:1 150:17106:20 150:14155:13 170:4,5170:24 171:6,10147:10147:10154:19,23106:20 150:14155:13 170:4,5171:20attorney (11)154:19,23168:2130:2 171:21bear (1)assist (1)3:17 5:20 33:16168:2130:2 171:21bear (1)assistance (2)114:1 153:6 B (3)37:5,6Barbara (2)56:1140:20,21154:15 177:15103:19 108:25155:1980:2,6bed (8)assistant (9)178:5,10115:9B-I-L-L-I-O32:25162:25 163:2,929:20 35:1141:10 115:2576:12based (11)171:2340:3 113:25attorney-clien151:18 152:1100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:8associate (3)151:18 152:17:25 11:19 46:190:5 141:13170:3,21,23,2328:23 36:4,5155:1950:3 62:22142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,155:14 31:1272:14 73:6baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | , | | , | | , |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 0 | • • • | | | , |
| assist (1) $3:17 5:20 33:16$ $39:24$ $3:17 5:20 33:16$ $38:21 39:13$ $14:1 153:6$ Barbara (2) $37:5,6$ $56:11$ beaten (2)assistance (2) $40:20,21$ $114:1 153:6$ $154:15 177:15$ B (3) $178:5,10$ $30:19 108:25$ $115:9$ $30:2,6$ assistant (9) $29:20 35:11$ $40:3 113:25$ $178:5,10$ $41:10 115:25$ $B-I-L-L-I-O$ $76:12$ $Barbara (2)$ $32:25$ $56:11$ $beaten (2)$ $29:20 35:11$ $40:3 113:25$ $41:10 115:25$ $32:7 40:23 66:6$ $151:18 152:1$ $B-I-L-L-I-O$ $76:12$ $Based (11)$ $100:5,10$ $back (29)$ $162:13,14,15,24$ $162:25 163:2,9$ associate (3) $28:23 36:4,5$ $155:19$ $attorneys (5)$ $7:25 11:19 46:1$ $50:3 62:22$ $Bedford (1)$ $142:16 158:14$ associates (5) $25:5,7,10,13,15$ $attorneys (5)$ $5:14 31:12$ $72:14 73:6$ $72:14 73:6$ $Barbara (2)$ $171:8,10 172:4$ | | | | | |
| 39:2438:21 39:13 114:1 153:6B37:5,6beaten (2)assistance (2) 40:20,21114:1 153:6 154:15 177:15103:19 108:25 178:5,1037:5,6beaten (2)assistant (9) 25:19,21 29:14154:15 177:15 178:5,10103:19 108:25 115:92:4bed (8)29:20 35:11 40:3 113:25Attorney's (2) 41:10 115:25B-I-L-L-I-O 76:1232:25162:13,14,15,2440:3 113:25 136:6 166:15attorney-clien 32:7 40:23 66:6babies (2) 100:5,1018:16 44:4Bedford (1)136:6 166:15 associate (3) 28:23 36:4,5151:18 152:1 155:19100:5,10 back (29)54:18,23 65:6 90:5 141:13136:8associates (5) 25:5,7,10,13,15attorneys (5) 5:14 31:1250:3 62:22 72:14 73:690:5 141:13 142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,7 171:8,10 172:4 | | • • • | 168:2 | | |
| 39.24 $38.2139.13$ $\overline{B(3)}$ $37.3,0$ beaten (2)assistance (2)114:1153:6103:19108:25 $80:2,6$ $40:20,21$ 154:15177:15103:19108:25 $2:4$ assistant (9)178:5,10115:9 $2:4$ $25:19,2129:14$ Attorney's (2) $B-I-L-L-I-O$ $32:25$ $29:2035:11$ $41:10115:25$ $76:12$ $based (11)$ $162:13,14,15,24$ $40:3113:25$ attorney-clien $babies (2)$ $18:1644:4$ $Bedford (1)$ $136:6166:15$ $32:740:2366:6$ $100:5,10$ $54:18,2365:6$ $136:8$ $associate (3)$ $151:18152:1$ $7:2511:1946:1$ $90:5141:13$ $170:3,21,23,23$ $25:5,7,10,13,15$ $5:1431:12$ $72:1473:6$ $baseless (4)$ $171:8,10172:4$ | | | | . , | |
| 40:20,21154:15 177:15103:19 108:252:4bed (8)assistant (9)178:5,10115:9barrister (1)162:13,14,15,2425:19,21 29:14Attorney's (2)B-I-L-L-I-O32:25162:25 163:2,929:20 35:1141:10 115:2576:12based (11)171:2340:3 113:25attorney-clienbabies (2)18:16 44:4Bedford (1)136:6 166:1532:7 40:23 66:6100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:8associate (3)151:18 152:1100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:828:23 36:4,5155:197:25 11:19 46:190:5 141:13170:3,21,23,23associates (5)attorneys (5)50:3 62:22142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,155:14 31:1272:14 73:6baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | | | | , | × / |
| assistant (9)178:5,10115:9barrister (1)162:13,14,15,2425:19,21 29:14Attorney's (2)B-I-L-L-I-O32:25162:25 163:2,929:20 35:1141:10 115:2576:12based (11)171:2340:3 113:25attorney-clienbabies (2)18:16 44:4Bedford (1)136:6 166:1532:7 40:23 66:6100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:8associate (3)151:18 152:1100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:828:23 36:4,5155:197:25 11:19 46:190:5 141:13170:3,21,23,23associates (5)attorneys (5)50:3 62:22142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,155:14 31:1272:14 73:6baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | . , | | · · / | | , |
| associate (3)Attorney's (2)B-I-L-L-I-O32:25162:15,11,15,2140:3 113:2541:10 115:2576:12based (11)171:2340:3 113:25attorney-clienbabies (2)18:16 44:4Bedford (1)136:6 166:1532:7 40:23 66:6100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:8associate (3)151:18 152:1100:5,1054:18,23 65:6136:828:23 36:4,5155:197:25 11:19 46:190:5 141:13170:3,21,23,23associates (5)attorneys (5)50:3 62:22142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,155:14 31:1272:14 73:6baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | - | | | | · · / |
| 29:20 35:11 40:3 113:25 136:6 166:1541:10 115:25 attorney-clien76:12 babies (2)based (11) 18:16 44:4171:23136:6 166:15 associate (3)32:7 40:23 66:6 151:18 152:1100:5,10 back (29)54:18,23 65:6 69:19 72:15Bedford (1) 136:828:23 36:4,5 associates (5)155:19 attorneys (5)72:5 11:19 46:1 50:3 62:2290:5 141:13 142:16 158:14170:3,21,23,23 170:24 171:5,7 171:8,10 172:4 | | · · | | . , | |
| 40:3 113:25 136:6 166:15attorney-clien 32:7 40:23 66:6babies (2) 100:5,1018:16 44:4 54:18,23 65:6Bedford (1)associate (3)151:18 152:1 155:19back (29) 7:25 11:19 46:154:18,23 65:6 90:5 141:13136:8 bedroom (10)associates (5)attorneys (5) 5:14 31:1250:3 62:22 72:14 73:6142:16 158:14 baseless (4)170:24 171:5,7 171:8,10 172:4 | , | | | | |
| 136:6 166:15 associate (3)32:7 40:23 66:6 151:18 152:1100:5,10 back (29)54:18,23 65:6 69:19 72:15136:8 bedroom (10)28:23 36:4,5 associates (5)155:19 attorneys (5)7:25 11:19 46:1 50:3 62:2290:5 141:13 142:16 158:14170:3,21,23,23 170:24 171:5,7 171:8,10 172:4 | | | | · · / | |
| associate (3)151:18 152:1back (29)69:19 72:15bedroom (10)28:23 36:4,5155:197:25 11:19 46:190:5 141:13170:3,21,23,23associates (5)attorneys (5)50:3 62:22142:16 158:14170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,155:14 31:1272:14 73:6baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | | • | | | |
| 28:23 36:4,5 associates (5)155:19 155:197:25 11:19 46:1 50:3 62:2290:5 141:13 142:16 158:14170:3,21,23,23 170:24 171:5,7 170:24 171:5,725:5,7,10,13,155:14 31:1272:14 73:6baseless (4)171:8,10 172:4 | | | , | , | |
| associates (5) attorneys (5) 50:3 62:22 142:16 158:14 170:24 171:5,7 25:5,7,10,13,15 5:14 31:12 72:14 73:6 baseless (4) 171:8,10 172:4 | . , | | | | . , |
| 25:5,7,10,13,15 5:14 31:12 72:14 73:6 baseless (4) 171:8,10 172:4 | , | | | | |
| | · , | • • • | | | , |
| 1 A = 0.2 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.2 + 0.2 + 0.2 + 0.1 | | | | • • • | · · |
| $\begin{bmatrix} A350 Clation (2) \\ 40.11 51.6 \\ 00.25 07.2 \\ 10.19 15.18,24 \\ 000118 (3)$ | Association (2) | 40:11 51:8 | 00.23 07.2 | 10:19 13:18,24 | bedrooms (3) |

| 171:19,19 | best (14) | 107:20 108:8 | 144:17 145:5 | C (2) |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 172:18 | 49:2 51:4 57:17 | 129:18,20 | breakfast (1) | 103:20 108:25 |
| began (6) | 62:17 69:20 | 151:15 | 173:4 | cabin (2) |
| 5:2 116:5,14,14 | 70:3 84:18,21 | Boise (1) | brief (1) | 160:1,24 |
| 116:18,19 | 96:12,24 99:9 | 25:23 | 109:4 | CACE (1) |
| beginning (7) | 100:2,14 | bono (1) | briefly (1) | 1:2 |
| 8:13,14 23:12 | 105:22 | 26:14 | 75:15 | calendars (3) |
| 26:10 49:6 | better (2) | book (2) | bring (1) | 142:19,21 175:1 |
| 106:7 116:4 | 55:17 175:9 | 12:13 145:13 | 17:18 | call (49) |
| behalf (15) | beyond (3) | Bookshelves (1) | Britain (2) | 31:22 34:23 |
| 2:2,8 3:3,11 | 5:12 21:16 92:7 | 133:17 | 33:3 139:7 | 41:12,22 45:13 |
| 5:17,24 6:1,2,4 | big (1) | Borja (1) | British (3) | 46:1,23 48:18 |
| 6:9,11,13,15 | 17:16 | 28:17 | 32:25 90:18 | 48:19 50:23 |
| 123:13 124:2 | Bill (2) | Boston (2) | 91:4 | 58:2 59:5,6 |
| behavior (3) | 129:12 130:3 | 2:15 3:5 | broad (4) | 65:15,16 67:7 |
| 39:15 67:18 | billion (3) | bottom (1) | 93:7 141:9 | 69:24 70:5,6 |
| 68:10 | 76:12,12 103:21 | 178:12 | 157:3 169:15 | 70:23,25 71:1 |
| belief (7) | billionaire (5) | bought (1) | broadcast (1) | 71:3 72:23,23 |
| 57:18 64:15 | 76:8,11,24 77:1 | 41:19 | 18:21 | 72:25 73:1,6 |
| 68:9 106:18 | 77:18 | Boulevard (2) | Brodsky (2) | 73:10,10,13 |
| 116:18 123:11 | binding (1) | 2:4,10 | 29:8,10 | 74:19 79:8,9 |
| 127:10 | 62:8 | boyfriend (1) | broken (2) | 79:12,21 86:5 |
| believe (29) | bit (3) | 78:22 | 60:23 61:2 | 86:5,7 99:8,25 |
| 9:11,12 14:7,24 | 19:10 46:4 | Brad (1) | Brookline (1) | 100:11,19 |
| 16:16 18:7 | 64:17 | 78:9 | 22:16 | 102:19 109:5 |
| 28:23 54:9,9 | Blackmun (1) | Bradley (27) | Brooklyn (4) | 129:20,24 |
| 64:14 80:13,14 | 147:6 | 1:4 5:6,17 15:16 | 39:12,13 41:9 | 138:13,15 |
| 80:15 83:12 | blame (1) | 42:22 43:3,12 | 115:25 | called (41) |
| 92:3,3 93:19 | 161:19 | 51:22 52:21 | brother (1) | 26:18 31:13 |
| 94:20 120:14 | blank (2) | 54:25 55:21 | 38:20 | 35:12,23 36:5 |
| 122:23,24 | 51:1 178:12 | 58:8 81:14 | brought (3) | 40:20 41:3 |
| 123:1,7 124:4 | blinded (1) | 82:11,15,17 | 89:19 123:21 | 43:15 45:1,4 |
| 128:12,17 | 130:7 | 90:17 116:6 | 170:25 | 45:14,16,17,24 |
| 129:3 145:21 | blogger (1) | 117:12 118:9 | Broward (4) | 46:17 47:15,16 |
| 146:7 | 40:15 | 119:9 120:8 | 1:1 26:20 176:5 | 48:9 51:3 |
| believed (6) | blood (8) | 121:8 126:2 | 177:4 | 58:12,15 63:25 |
| 55:4 106:6 | 21:16 22:9,11 | 127:5 178:2 | bruises (1) | 74:17 75:7 |
| 110:18 122:8 | 22:15,20 23:8 | 179:3 | 80:4 | 77:16,22 80:24 |
| 140:11 145:20 | 23:11,16 | Brafman (2) | build (2) | 81:3 100:3,8 |
| belts (1) | blue (2) | 39:4,5 | 130:10,13 | 100:12,22 |
| 160:8 | 43:16 156:22 | break (17) | built (1) | 116:21,21 |
| Ben (4) | Blvd (1) | 18:15 19:14 | 131:1 | 117:2 118:5 |
| 29:8,10 39:4,5 | 3:12 | 47:8 48:13,13 | business (4) | 145:14 146:11 |
| beneath (1) | Boies (13) | 49:8,23 62:16 | 139:3,5 166:19 | 149:16 170:16 |
| 11:17 | 3:12 5:23 82:10 | 92:15 95:5,14 | 167:6 | 171:4 |
| benefits (1) | 82:17,24 83:17 | 96:14 97:7 | | calling (4) |
| 149:24 | 83:25 94:19 | 98:24 143:2 | C | 26:18 31:15 |
| | I | I | I | |

| 50:8 116:24 | case (61) | cause (2) | change (3) | 35:19 |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| calls (9) | 1:2 14:25 15:7 | 10:19 178:4 | 20:20,21 179:6 | chief (2) |
| 26:11 50:6,12 | 17:4 24:23 | caused (2) | changed (2) | 22:6 37:25 |
| 50:15 57:21 | 26:4 29:1 32:2 | 21:13 161:14 | 103:15,15 | child (3) |
| 60:21 61:16 | 32:14,18,22 | causing (1) | CHANGES (1) | 38:15 47:24 |
| 81:22 97:23 | 33:15,17,25 | 27:2 | 179:2 | 153:8 |
| Cambridge (4) | 34:4,17 35:3,5 | CBS (1) | characterizati | children (1) |
| 7:10,14 130:19 | 35:7,14,16,21 | 118:5 | 75:2,4 161:9 | 131:3 |
| 134:14 | 35:22 36:11,17 | cease (1) | characterize (3) | choice (1) |
| cameras (1) | 36:21 37:10,12 | 40:8 | 96:23,23 169:9 | 153:2 |
| 157:22 | 38:4,9,17,23 | cell (8) | charge (8) | chosen (2) |
| campaign (4) | 38:25 39:2,8 | 46:23,25 47:1,3 | 37:2 114:1 | 85:5,11 |
| 116:5 117:11 | 40:10,22 55:19 | 47:5 73:14 | 120:18,20 | chronology (2) |
| 121:15 122:14 | 70:12 73:18 | 102:20 142:20 | 121:8 122:15 | 56:1 78:6 |
| capacity (3) | 89:4 106:16 | Centre (1) | 122:16,19 | Church (2) |
| 38:16 40:23 | 108:10 114:1 | 2:9 | charges (23) | 137:13 140:19 |
| 160:11 | 115:22 116:1 | certainly (24) | 9:13,22 11:7 | CIRCUIT (2) |
| capital (1) | 123:13 129:19 | 7:21 9:20 15:6 | 17:19 22:3 | 1:1,1 |
| 146:18 | 145:23 146:18 | 23:15 33:19 | 23:13,14 36:25 | circumspect (1) |
| car (1) | 146:21 147:20 | 38:8 49:10 | 116:8 117:14 | 46:2 |
| 136:9 | 147:24,25 | 51:14 52:13 | 118:10,15 | circumstance |
| cardio (1) | 149:18,24 | 55:2,3 58:4 | 119:11,13 | 55:21 |
| 22:6 | 150:2,3 156:12 | 59:2 68:13 | 121:10,25 | circumstances |
| cardiogram (1) | 174:16,18 | 85:7 88:9 | 122:3,6,22 | 21:20 112:10 |
| 23:6 | cases (7) | 89:10,17 92:3 | 123:9,10 126:4 | 115:8 |
| cardiologist (2) | 20:1,3 38:22 | 104:23 135:5 | 153:23 | circus (1) |
| 21:22 22:4 | 120:11 125:21 | 135:15 150:1 | charging (3) | 60:22 |
| care (1) | 146:17 152:17 | 173:22 | 42:22 43:3 | City (1) |
| 164:2 | Cassell (27) | certainty (1) | 126:1 | 39:6 |
| career (7) | 1:4 5:7,18,19 | 141:13 | charity (7) | civil (1) |
| 17:3 115:24 | 15:16 31:16,22 | certificate (5) | 76:18 99:17 | 151:1 |
| 130:9,10,13 | 31:23 42:15,23 | 4:8,8 56:12 | 100:21 101:1,4 | claim (7) |
| 146:17 150:9 | 43:3 52:22 | 176:1 177:1 | 101:5,16 | 55:10,14 64:12 |
| career-destro | 55:1 81:15 | certify (3) | Charles (6) | 74:4 123:8 |
| 116:24 117:6 | 82:17 116:6 | 176:8 177:7,14 | 8:2 33:12,13 | 124:6 133:21 |
| careful (1) | 117:13 118:9 | cetera (1) | 40:1,2,8 | claimed (3) |
| 92:4 | 119:9,19 121:9 | 116:11 | Charleston (2) | 55:11 73:24,25 |
| carefully (1) | 124:5 126:2 | chair (1) | 36:15 164:25 | claiming (1) |
| 69:5 | 127:6,14 148:2 | 161:21 | check (6) | 117:24 |
| Carlos (2) | 148:5 | chairman (1) | 29:10 64:15 | claims (3) |
| 25:22 35:20 | categorical (3) | 137:16 | 65:23 89:21,24 | 93:15 119:23 |
| Carolina (2) | 163:4 168:17,23 | chairs (1) | 131:16 | 151:1 |
| 36:15 165:1 | categorically (5) | 133:12 | checked (3) | class (1) |
| Carolyn (1) | 94:1,12 98:20 | challenge (1) | 109:9,10,13 | 41:16 |
| 164:1 | 117:5 163:1 | 168:24 | checking (1) | classes (1) |
| cars (1) | categorize (1) | chances (1) | 130:16 | 69:4 |
| 141:4 | 137:3 | 101:18 | Chicago (1) | clear (12) |
| | I | I | I | 1 |

| 45:2 51:25 | 129:12 130:3 | 128:4 | 12:17,22 13:11 | 106:4 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 55:14 79:15 | close (6) | comfortable (1) | 13:20 | concluded (5) |
| 81:8,10 87:11 | 33:13 34:12 | 103:8 | complained (1) | 16:10 17:23 |
| 94:11 103:24 | 40:14,16 70:17 | coming (4) | 22:11 | 22:23 83:1 |
| 129:17 134:22 | 75:23 | 26:22 130:11 | complaint (9) | 109:25 |
| 174:20 | closed (1) | 138:24 170:8 | 80:9 106:21,23 | conclusion (7) |
| clearly (4) | 130:6 | commenced (1) | 107:11 108:2 | 12:19 14:5 |
| 11:8 31:19 86:2 | closer (6) | 149:21 | 114:18 123:15 | 20:17 64:13 |
| 129:10 | 47:15 128:4 | comment (2) | 124:10 126:8 | 91:19 106:17 |
| Clerk (1) | 136:22 139:10 | 74:6,9 | complaints (1) | 156:15 |
| 178:10 | 140:10,10 | comments (5) | 107:17 | conclusions (1) |
| client (19) | cloth (2) | 18:7 74:11 96:5 | complete (7) | 34:19 |
| 18:2,8,13,16 | 88:14 156:19 | 97:9 98:4 | 13:21 34:9 | concurring (1) |
| 23:1 31:16,22 | CLR (4) | Commission (1) | 45:18 79:2 | 147:7 |
| 42:4,16 63:7 | 1:20 176:15 | 176:16 | 112:18 156:17 | condition (3) |
| 78:9 121:2 | 177:22 178:15 | commit (1) | 168:13 | 19:5 21:11 |
| 122:25 130:8 | CNN (3) | 80:16 | completely (11) | 163:21 |
| 149:20 152:10 | 18:21 20:8 | commitment (2) | 79:1 88:13 | condo (1) |
| 152:12 153:2 | 118:5 | 161:20,20 | 90:23 93:13 | 7:2 |
| 162:7 | Code (2) | commitments | 94:1 99:7 | conduct (21) |
| client's (2) | 150:13,17 | 161:24 | 109:25 112:21 | 15:9,21,24 |
| 152:19 158:15 | coffee (1) | committed (2) | 112:21 129:17 | 16:18 17:20 |
| clients (45) | 140:14 | 114:15 125:15 | 169:12 | 26:12,24 36:24 |
| 10:23 11:10 | Coffey (2) | committee (2) | complexity (1) | 37:4 51:22 |
| 12:23 13:18,23 | 25:14 27:16 | 17:17 38:1 | 34:13 | 54:25 55:6,22 |
| 14:11,20,23 | Cole (2) | committing (1) | complicated (3) | 55:23,23 58:7 |
| 15:8 16:9,16 | 1:17 2:9 | 98:23 | 65:5,7 125:7 | 59:17 98:19 |
| 26:9,13,24 | colleague (1) | common (4) | complied (1) | 119:25 121:14 |
| 33:2 37:21 | 33:14 | 89:18 172:16,19 | 150:18 | 168:16 |
| 39:15 40:7 | college (4) | 172:24 | comply (2) | conducted (2) |
| 41:4 42:10,14 | 19:2 130:11,13 | communicate | 34:5 175:2 | 84:17,19 |
| 43:9 44:7 | 163:18 | 92:5 | comports (1) | confer (5) |
| 58:23 59:16 | Colorado (1) | communicatio | 143:23 | 33:3,17 36:7 |
| 64:23 67:17 | 38:2 | 49:17 59:2 | composition (2) | 39:19 64:4 |
| 68:10 79:6 | Columbus (7) | 66:20 67:11 | 134:8,11 | conference (1) |
| 80:14 109:21 | 76:8,24 77:19 | 72:10 78:10,16 | compound (6) | 40:11 |
| 113:7 116:13 | 101:6,22 | 99:11 103:1 | 15:5 58:13 59:8 | conferred (17) |
| 116:14 117:3 | 103:22 106:2 | communicatio | 89:3 126:6 | 16:3,24,25 17:5 |
| 117:23 122:15 | come (11) | 55:10,13,14 | 165:13 | 17:9 33:1,15 |
| 124:4 127:13 | 37:19 52:25 | 68:15,22 84:24 | concentrate (1) | 35:4,15 37:9 |
| 129:25 130:5 | 65:12 93:5 | 103:4,11 152:1 | 69:3 | 37:20 38:2,24 |
| 146:22 150:7,7 | 97:13 100:5 | company (4) | concern (1) | 38:24 39:8,24 |
| 150:20 | 114:5 129:6 | 164:23,25 | 60:20 | 40:21 |
| clients' (4) | 138:12 150:22 | 167:11,15 | concerned (4) | conferring (1) |
| 36:1,23 39:18 | 163:22 | compare (1) | 61:15,15 109:20 | 17:4 |
| 112:19 | comes (3) | 157:1 | 149:12 | confided (2) |
| Clinton (2) | 11:22 28:22 | compensation | conclude (1) | 76:2,2 |

| confident (1) | construction (2) | 158:11 168:13 | 85:17 87:5,6 | 140:3,6 149:7 |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 90:23 | 41:25 173:24 | continue (10) | 90:16 94:23 | 149:15 150:16 |
| confidential (1) | consultation (1) | 33:3,17 36:7,11 | 100:7 101:13 | 152:23 153:18 |
| 35:15 | 36:21 | 39:19 83:15.24 | 107:6,20 | 154:3,22 157:2 |
| confidentialit | consultations | 119:17 147:14 | 108:18,21,22 | 159:3 164:23 |
| 63:8,11,13 | 26:3 | 175:19 | 109:4 144:5,6 | 167:12 168:1 |
| 64:18 | consume (1) | continued (4) | conversing (1) | 170:22 |
| configuration | 161:6 | 3:1 16:18 74:25 | 106:3 | corresponden |
| 131:9 160:15,24 | contact (38) | 86:18 | convey (5) | 70:2 |
| confirm (1) | 25:8 50:21 | continues (1) | 118:8,14 119:8 | corroborate (5) |
| 106:10 | 52:16 54:10 | 147:9 | 119:13 168:14 | 78:20 111:23 |
| confirmation (| 71:4 73:25 | continuously (2) | conveyed (1) | 112:14 113:9 |
| 59:15,18,20 | 74:14,16 78:3 | 8:17,25 | 88:3 | 164:21 |
| 78:4 | 78:25 81:4,5,6 | continuum (4) | conveying (1) | corroborated |
| confirmed (6) | 81:7,13,23,24 | 125:22,24 128:5 | 119:19 | 77:8,10 78:21 |
| 55:3,7 67:17,19 | 84:4 89:9 | 128:6 | convince (1) | 79:22,25 80:7 |
| 68:9 88:11 | 91:22 93:21 | contradicts (1) | 117:12 | 80:13 81:4 |
| conflict (2) | 94:4 101:21,23 | 157:18 | convinced (2) | 111:17 112:2,9 |
| 26:2 114:7 | 113:6,15 | contributed (4) | 79:13 110:3 | 112:18,23 |
| confused (5) | 118:16 119:15 | 23:2,16 100:25 | cool (2) | couch (9) |
| 24:15 31:19 | 119:18 121:18 | 101:3 | 162:5,6 | 133:10 160:7,19 |
| 46:4,7 167:16 | 124:8 127:12 | contributing (1) | Coolidge (1) | 161:4 162:17 |
| connected (1) | 127:13,17,19 | 22:24 | 131:2 | 162:22,24 |
| 177:18 | 157:15,16,16 | contribution (3) | copy (3) | 163:7,9 |
| connection (4) | contacted (4) | 101:5,7,16 | 113:17 178:5,6 | counsel (15) |
| 93:5 97:14 98:9 | 82:5,9 99:20,21 | conversation (| Cork (2) | 5:17 18:2,13 |
| 113:5 | contacts (1) | 48:6 50:10 | 134:12,12 | 37:25 46:10 |
| consent (3) | 138:17 | 51:19 52:19 | correct (66) | 60:11 74:12 |
| 84:23 85:21 | contain (2) | 68:17 69:21,25 | 9:1,3 15:17,18 | 90:7 96:5,13 |
| 86:9 | 157:5,6 | 70:3 71:23 | 15:25 20:14,15 | 97:9 158:12 |
| consider (4) | contained (1) | 72:10 74:23 | 27:8,9,11,12 | 166:8 177:15 |
| 33:5 37:11 39:1 | 172:3 | 75:20 83:21 | 27:14,15,22 | 177:17 |
| 142:18 | contemporane | 84:16,19 86:17 | 28:6,9,12,13 | count (1) |
| consideration | 49:12 68:14,21 | 87:7 93:17 | 40:24 51:23 | 154:9 |
| 63:6 | 68:24 85:12 | 99:17 100:6,7 | 52:23 54:6 | counterclaim |
| considered (2) | contend (1) | 100:13 102:6 | 57:15 59:5 | 123:15 124:2,3 |
| 59:2 67:10 | 127:4 | 102:15,17 | 60:2 62:4,13 | 124:11 126:8 |
| considering (1) | content (2) | 108:7 109:8,9 | 67:1,11 68:6 | Counterclaim |
| 40:8 | 86:16 99:7 | 109:24 | 77:9,11 78:7 | 6:5 |
| consisted (1) | contention (3) | conversations | 79:11 82:11,14 | County (4) |
| 173:12 | 19:20,22 167:10 | 37:18 45:8 | 84:17,24 85:5 | 1:1 154:8 176:5 |
| conspiracy (1) | context (13) | 47:12 48:1 | 92:2 93:6 | 177:4 |
| 80:16 | 35:14 82:20 | 49:13,20,20,22 | 97:15 107:18 | couple (4) |
| constantly (2) | 83:4,9 89:4 | 55:18 60:11 | 112:16 113:3 | 7:15 8:5 95:25 |
| 103:6,14 | 94:23 125:6 | 62:15 69:16 | 116:8 117:14 | 135:14 |
| Constitution (1) | 146:5,10 | 82:19 83:21 | 117:16 124:16 | course (21) |
| 117:8 | 147:22 155:17 | 85:4,9,13,16 | 125:20 130:20 | 51:18 54:21 |
| | | , , - , - | | l |

| | | | | 0 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 62:10,14 71:3 | 156:13,14,20 | date (9) | December (7) | 2:3 |
| 74:23 93:17 | 156:21,25 | 23:5 24:8,10 | 23:21,22 93:3,9 | deny (1) |
| 106:3 110:14 | credible (2) | 56:7 58:2 | 94:3 97:12 | 116:25 |
| 111:17,25,25 | 120:15,15 | 146:2 155:1 | 113:12 | department (5) |
| 111.17,25,25 | crime (3) | 169:9 179:24 | decided (1) | 114:10,19 |
| 123:23,24 | 48:16 114:16 | dated (2) | 149:12 | 137:17 154:20 |
| , | 146:6 | 56:12 177:20 | deciding (1) | 155:13 |
| 148:2,19 | | dates (4) | 156:12 | |
| 153:16 157:25 158:2 | criminal (12) 39:5 64:23 | 7:17 24:4 49:7 | | depend (1) 156:12 |
| | | 128:2 | declare (1) 179:21 | |
| court (31) 1:1 11:4 34:10 | 67:19 68:12 | | | Depending (1) 157:3 |
| | 79:4 106:17,23 | daughter (6) | defamation (3) | |
| 62:16 63:14 | 107:11,17 | 38:6 41:8,15 | 33:4 123:21 | depends (1) |
| 90:21 97:11 | 108:2 128:19 | 163:17 164:25 | 125:7 | 157:7 |
| 108:12 116:15 | 153:23 | 166:20 | defamatory (2) | depo (1) |
| 119:7 123:3,9 | critique (1) | daughter's (1) | 42:19 124:8 | 174:8 |
| 145:14,23 | 137:23 | 42:2 | defamed (2) | deposed (2) |
| 146:6,15,24 | cross-examine | David (17) | 15:7 124:4 | 93:18 121:3 |
| 147:4,7,13,14 | 126:18 | 26:17 35:8,10 | defendant (7) | deposition (12) |
| 147:21,23 | cured (1) | 39:21,22 40:17 | 1:8 2:8 6:1,5 | 1:10 5:5,8 18:5 |
| 149:9,10,12,22 | 23:25 | 40:18 82:10,16 | 123:14 149:24 | 90:24 95:4 |
| 149:23 151:10 | current (3) | 82:24 83:17,25 | 149:25 | 174:2,4,4 |
| 159:20 178:10 | 17:7 22:1 73:7 | 94:19 107:20 | defended (1) | 177:9 178:4,9 |
| courtroom (2) | currently (2) | 108:8 129:17 | 117:4 | depositions (8) |
| 147:8,9 | 32:11,11 | 129:20 | defending (1) | 89:16,23 90:11 |
| courts (5) | cut (2) | day (14) | 149:9 | 90:12 91:2,8,9 |
| 20:2 65:3 125:4 | 62:20 69:1 | 5:3 19:4 23:7 | defense (2) | 91:16 |
| 125:22 146:16 | cutting (1) | 41:3,17 55:4 | 68:12 150:1 | Dershowitz (36) |
| cousin (1) | 166:7 | 78:14 129:24 | define (1) | 1:7,11 5:6,8 6:1 |
| 36:15 | CVRA (2) | 157:12 162:6 | 159:7 | 6:3,6,11,15,17 |
| covered (4) | 93:4 97:12 | 176:10,12 | degree (3) | 6:24 30:18 |
| 35:9 86:16,22 | Czech (1) | 177:20 178:3 | 11:2 20:18 | 37:23,24 38:5 |
| 99:7 | 139:8 | days (6) | 125:4 | 38:6,12,15,19 |
| covering (1) | | 36:17 40:12 | delays (2) | 38:20 105:13 |
| 150:4 | D | 73:6 75:24 | 161:14,19 | 105:18 127:18 |
| coverings (3) | D (2) | 162:4 163:17 | deliberate (3) | 127:20 145:13 |
| 133:23,25 134:3 | 4:1 108:25 | DC (1) | 14:8 15:9 | 152:22 156:11 |
| covers (3) | D.C (1) | 2:19 | 127:23 | 159:17 160:25 |
| 63:15,17 143:15 | 40:12 | deal (2) | deliberately (4) | 176:9 177:10 |
| crass (1) | Dadeland (2) | 146:18,21 | 12:24 15:8 | 178:2,19 179:3 |
| 120:23 | 2:9,10 | dealt (1) | 122:15 146:6 | 179:3,24 |
| creating (1) | Daily (1) | 65:4 | demonstrably | Dershowitz's (3) |
| 120:10 | 148:11 | Dean (1) | 129:11 | 75:4 123:14 |
| credibility (14) | damage (3) | 17:1 | demonstrate (1) | 156:7 |
| 76:23 103:25 | 10:19 12:22 | death (1) | 164:22 | describe (7) |
| 104:1 110:10 | 13:15 | 146:22 | denied (3) | 14:19 21:25 |
| 111:10,13 | Darren (3) | debate (2) | 94:10,12 117:6 | 130:24 131:21 |
| 119:23 120:2,5 | 3:8,9 6:12 | 19:3,3 | DENNEY (1) | 136:23,24 |
| | I | , - | | |

| | | | | - |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 140:25 | 125:2,9 | 144:11 | doctor (1) | 65:14 |
| described (9) | different (5) | disclosure (1) | 22:14 | drove (2) |
| 7:7 24:12 75:1 | 10:14 47:19 | 64:1 | doctors (1) | 141:21,24 |
| 128:7,13 | 88:25 109:3 | disclosures (2) | 22:22 | drugs (1) |
| 139:24 140:1 | 140:2 | 65:19 67:6 | document (4) | 21:1 |
| 142:5,6 | difficult (2) | discontinue (1) | 25:1 149:1 | duces (1) |
| describing (1) | 19:24 21:5 | 84:3 | 157:8 179:21 | 174:4 |
| 24:14 | Diner (1) | discovered (2) | documentary | duly (2) |
| description (4) | 26:20 | 19:6 26:1 | 157:2,4,4 | 6:18 176:10 |
| 10:21 78:24 | dining (2) | discovery (6) | documents (4) | duty (3) |
| 127:18 137:1 | 132:16 133:12 | 51:6,9 62:10 | 157:5 174:5,15 | 125:12,13 147:8 |
| deserved (1) | dinner (1) | 63:10 73:18 | 174:23 | |
| 17:21 | 76:1 | 83:16 | doing (10) | E |
| deserving (5) | direct (5) | discreet (1) | 28:25 38:18 | E (3) |
| 14:4,18,23 15:1 | 4:7 6:20 15:20 | 81:23 | 42:23 52:17 | 3:12 4:1 108:25 |
| 15:3 | 18:12 121:5 | discuss (4) | 76:5 90:8 | e-mail (8) |
| desirable (1) | directed (4) | 87:4 137:21 | 92:14 96:24 | 50:25 51:1,2,5 |
| 9:18 | 11:10 77:24 | 144:17 175:3 | 113:15 140:14 | 51:11,15 70:1 |
| desire (1) | 79:3,5 | discussed (4) | dollars (1) | 79:21 |
| 43:22 | directly (5) | 100:21 107:7 | 103:21 | earlier (3) |
| desk (1) | 43:3 52:2 80:18 | 115:22 116:1 | domo (1) | 7:24 128:7 |
| 133:15 | 104:6,21 | discussion (1) | 138:10 | 175:9 |
| desks (1) | disagree (8) | 94:24 | door (3) | easily (3) |
| 173:19 | 9:5,17 10:2,17 | discussions (3) | 131:8 147:8 | 127:24 129:25 |
| destroy (5) | 11:2,15 12:1 | 82:21 83:10,13 | 170:25 | 130:6 |
| 9:12,21 10:10 | 83:18 | dishonest (3) | double (2) | Easter (1) |
| 22:2 130:9 | disappeared (1) | 54:25 55:23 | 146:18 167:16 | 161:23 |
| destroyed (1) | 24:19 | 58:7 | doubt (1) | easy (1) |
| 157:23 | disbar (1) | dishonestly (1) | 93:23 | 132:25 |
| detail (3) | 16:13 | 52:22 | dozens (1) | Ed (1) |
| 45:10 72:16 | disbarment (6) | disk (3) | 26:12 | 137:19 |
| 74:21 | 14:10 15:11,15 | 174:7,12,15 | Dr (2) | edition (1) |
| details (11) | 16:11,15 17:21 | disruption (1) | 22:16,18 | 148:10 |
| 42:6,7 52:7,10 | disbarrable (2) | 27:3 | drabs (1) | education (1) |
| 108:18 109:2 | 16:17 55:6 | distinction (3) | 65:14 | 130:12 |
| 128:23 129:5,6 | disciplinary (1) | 86:4 88:18 | draft (1) | Edwards (34) |
| 129:7,10 | 14:10 | 125:18 | 123:2 | 1:4 5:7,17,18 |
| determination | disciplined (1) | distinguished | drafted (2) | 15:16 42:15,22 |
| 97:2 | 26:16 | 38:21 39:11 | 57:8 128:18 | 43:4,12 51:22 |
| determined (1) | disclose (10) | 120:19 122:5 | dramatically (1) | 52:21 54:25 |
| 130:1 | 45:6,12 58:16 | distribution (1) | 20:21 | 55:22 58:8 |
| developed (2) | 59:22 60:16 | 178:8 | draw (4) | 78:10 81:15 |
| 110:13 137:13 | 95:18 107:3,20 | district (3) | 34:19 91:19,23 | 82:11,15,17 |
| diagnosed (1) | 144:12,14 | 39:13 41:9 | 92:7 | 90:17 98:21 |
| 23:18 | disclosed (3) | 115:25 | drew (2) | 116:6 117:12 |
| difference (4) | 59:6 66:3 109:6 | divided (1) | 89:10 92:1 | 118:9 119:9 |
| 53:7 124:24 | disclosing (1) | 76:16 | dribs (1) | 120:8 121:1,8 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | I |

| | | | • | |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 126:2 127:6,13 | 140:20 | 91:19 | equivalent (1) | eventually (2) |
| 148:5 178:2 | emotional (1) | entourage (7) | 125:23 | 81:5 168:11 |
| 179:3 | 70:16 | 136:12,19 137:8 | erotic (2) | everybody (6) |
| EE (1) | emphasize (2) | 138:9,20 | 148:13 151:3 | 89:6 96:16,22 |
| 176:16 | 167:1,1 | 139:11,13 | Errata (3) | 162:2,5,6 |
| effect (1) | employee (2) | entries (1) | 4:9 178:6 179:1 | evidence (11) |
| 121:23 | 177:15,16 | 42:2 | especially (2) | 16:6 38:18 42:1 |
| effort (11) | encounter (2) | entry (5) | 12:3 13:22 | 42:3 54:24 |
| 9:12,21 36:22 | 42:8,12 | 131:21 132:6,7 | ESQ (9) | 117:1 122:24 |
| 64:17 76:7,7 | encounters (1) | 133:24 134:2 | 2:5,11,12,15,19 | 123:1 157:2,4 |
| 76:25 103:24 | 54:5 | episode (1) | 2:20 3:5,9,13 | 157:18 |
| 104:4 161:5,6 | encourage (1) | 23:23 | essays (1) | exact (7) |
| efforts (2) | 77:3 | episodes (2) | 133:1 | 7:17 23:5 24:4,7 |
| 78:8 104:2 | encouraged (4) | 21:23 23:11 | essence (1) | 24:10 58:2 |
| Efron (2) | 42:4,11 128:22 | Epstein (34) | 59:6 | 149:8 |
| 40:17,18 | 129:3 | 3:3 6:9,13 41:19 | essential (1) | exactly (6) |
| Ehud (2) | encourageme | 73:22 94:13,16 | 163:25 | 10:21 69:21 |
| 130:2 171:21 | 42:21 | 98:13 118:2 | establish (4) | 95:21 110:1 |
| eight (1) | encouraging (1) | 120:11 128:15 | 32:7 84:9 | 153:19 171:14 |
| 107:15 | 42:16 | 134:13 136:3 | 141:19 142:3 | examination (3) |
| Eiler (1) | engage (1) | 138:21 139:15 | established (3) | 4:4 6:20 105:25 |
| 28:20 | 15:9 | 139:23 141:1,8 | 73:22 129:21,25 | examine (2) |
| either (9) | engaged (14) | 141:16 148:12 | estimate (7) | 32:1 174:24 |
| 74:15 79:20 | 16:16 37:3 | 149:9,11 | 49:2 134:25 | examined (1) |
| 92:1 99:11 | 51:22 55:5,22 | 150:23 151:14 | 136:20 138:3,5 | 6:18 |
| 100:10,11 | 59:16 64:23 | 152:2,16 153:5 | 140:6,10 | example (6) |
| 109:7 135:4 | 67:18 68:10 | 153:8 155:7,18 | et (1) | 17:13,14 26:17 |
| 139:8 | 76:14 80:14 | 158:5,12 | 116:11 | 106:1 129:11 |
| electro (1) | 117:11 148:13 | 159:13 169:7 | ethical (5) | 157:9 |
| 22:6 | 151:2 | Epstein's (36) | 9:7 15:19 17:2 | exceeds (1) |
| elementary (1) | engagements (2) | 41:14 89:19 | 37:21 64:20 | 13:15 |
| 166:21 | 163:21,22 | 93:6 94:7,9 | ethics (7) | exception (2) |
| elicit (1) | engaging (1) | 97:14 114:24 | 16:3,12 17:7,17 | 173:17,18 |
| 68:18 | 119:24 | 115:6,14 | 17:19 34:12 | exchange (3) |
| elicited (1) | ensuing (1) | 129:16 136:19 | 37:9 | 13:17 18:6 77:4 |
| 59:21 | 20:9 | 137:8 138:8 | evaluate (1) | exchanged (2) |
| Ella (3) | enter (3) | 139:22 142:4 | 156:25 | 102:13,18 |
| 38:5,6 166:20 | 131:7 173:1 | 142:17 143:22 | evaluating (1) | exculp (1) |
| Ellen (2) | 179:2 | 149:17 151:17 | 156:13 | 167:2 |
| 38:12,13 | entire (5) | 154:21 156:5 | evening (1) | exculpatory (2) |
| Elon (2) | 17:2 48:10 | 157:23 159:6 | 78:14 | 155:24 156:3 |
| 38:14,15 | 86:16 125:2 | 164:6,14,22 | event (2) | excuse (2) |
| emerged (1) | 143:15 | 165:8,23 | 17:15 121:21 | 86:7 135:19 |
| 38:23 | entirely (4) | 166:19 167:24 | events (6) | execute (1) |
| EMERSON (1) | 88:13 93:20 | 170:4,22 | 20:1 22:9,21 | 178:6 |
| 2:11 | 153:4,6 | 171:17 172:3 | 23:9 26:11 | executed (2) |
| eminent (1) | entitled (1) | 173:12,21 | 106:15 | 154:20 155:3 |

| execution (1) | 132:3 | 92:8 106:11 | 173:15 | 24:13 |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| 4:9 | extensive (2) | 108:10 120:16 | falsely (8) | fight (7) |
| exerted (1) | 17:3 82:25 | 146:17 156:18 | 43:13 73:25 | 98:3,7 147:10 |
| 54:17 | extent (5) | 162:24 163:20 | 87:14 94:10 | 149:20,21,22 |
| exhausted (2) | 82:19 151:8,24 | 164:4 | 98:11 106:12 | 149:23 |
| 108:17,23 | 152:14,18 | factor (1) | 124:7 127:21 | figure (1) |
| exhibit (2) | exterior (2) | 22:24 | falsifying (1) | 144:21 |
| 56:9,15 | 130:24 131:5 | facts (12) | 122:15 | file (8) |
| exhibits (1) | extortion (12) | 34:18,20 48:23 | family (1) | 16:4 42:16,19 |
| 4:11 | 48:11 77:24 | 102:12 145:18 | 130:12 | 106:23 114:2 |
| exist (1) | 79:3,4,6 80:15 | 145:19,22 | far (10) | 114:10,18 |
| 120:11 | 80:16 106:5,7 | 147:20,25 | 115:13 117:20 | 128:12 |
| exists (1) | 106:9,17 | 147.20,25 | 124:19 142:24 | filed (16) |
| 156:6 | 100.9,17 | | | 52:6 56:5 80:9 |
| | extortionists (1) | 179:21 | 143:1,5 149:11 150:3 162:14 | 90:20 93:4 |
| exonerate (4) | . , | factual (1) | | |
| 74:4 159:3 | 106:24 | 14:17 | 163:7 | 97:13 107:11 |
| 164:21 165:5 | extraordinary | failure (2) | father (1) | 107:17 108:2 |
| expectation (1) | 19:1 | 125:12,13 | 139:7 | 123:3,12,20 |
| 18:4 | extremes (1) | fair (1) | favor (1) | 124:2,4,13 |
| expected (1) | 125:11 | 124:23 | 41:21 | 178:10 |
| 101:7 | eyes (1) | fairly (1) | FBI (6) | filing (3) |
| experience (3) | 130:7 | 86:22 | 113:18,21,24 | 33:2 48:16 |
| 110:21 170:17 | F | fall (1) | 114:14,16,19 | 116:14 |
| 171:3 | | 7:3 | Fe (1) | filled (3) |
| experienced (1) | Fabiani (4) | false (59) | 41:17 | 11:8 160:10 |
| 68:12 | 25:19 27:18 | 9:13,21 10:9 | February (9) | 162:20 |
| experiences (2) | 28:5 30:7 | 11:10 13:22,24 | 49:5,5 56:5,12 | film (1) |
| 21:16 22:14 | fabricate (1) | 21:14 22:1,2 | 57:22 63:22 | 41:8 |
| expert (2) | 126:4 | 23:1,12,13 | 64:8,9,15 | finally (1) |
| 16:25 17:7 | fabricated (9) | 31:23 36:1,25 | federal (7) | 109:5 |
| experts (4) | 116:8 117:14 | 39:18 42:6 | 42:20 90:21 | financial (3) |
| 16:4,12,23 | 118:10,16,18 | 43:8 52:11 | 116:15 120:3 | 11:9 12:24 |
| 17:12 | 119:10,14 | 78:18,19 83:6 | 120:18 122:2 | 120:23 |
| Expires (1) | 122:22,24 | 90:20 93:20 | 123:9 | financially (1) |
| 176:17 | fabricating (2) | 94:8 98:14,17 | feeling (1) | 177:18 |
| explain (4) | 121:10 122:25 | 112:21 113:8 | 103:7 | financier (1) |
| 21:24 80:5 | fabrication (1) | 113:13 114:12 | feelings (1) | 148:11 |
| 162:16 171:14 | 127:8 | 116:8,9,12,14 | 73:7 | find (7) |
| explained (2) | facing (1) | 117:6,14,19 | feet (1) | 44:18 69:2 73:7 |
| 96:14 168:4 | 160:4 | 118:10,15 | 132:4 | 79:10 127:15 |
| explaining (3) | fact (27) | 119:10,14 | felt (2) | 168:24 169:2 |
| 31:16 161:1,4 | 15:14 56:21,22 | 120:6,18,20 | 70:8 119:23 | finding (1) |
| expressed (2) | 61:8,9,18 69:3 | 121:10,25 | fib (3) | 111:20 |
| 26:8 31:13 | 69:10,12 77:8 | 122:3,6,22,24 | 24:18,19,20 | fine (5) |
| expressly (1) | 77:10 78:9,21 | 123:1,10 126:4 | fibrillation (7) | 66:12 115:4 |
| 92:12 | 79:18,22 80:8 | 128:17 129:11 | 21:15,19,25 | 151:16 157:12 |
| extends (1) | 80:9 88:12 | 130:15 147:2 | 23:3,19 24:1 | 175:14 |
| 1 | | | | |

| finish (3) | 3:12 5:23 | 6:19 97:10 | fought (1) | 115:23 |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 18:4 95:12 | flight (3) | Fontalvo (5) | 117:8 | fully (2) |
| 166:9 | 74:3 165:22 | 1:20 176:15 | found (7) | 16:15 150:17 |
| finished (1) | 175:4 | 177:6,22 | 44:7 65:11 78:7 | fund (2) |
| 95:9 | flights (1) | 177:0,22 | 79:16 127:24 | 101:4,15 |
| fire (1) | 162:23 | food (1) | 130:6 178:7 | fundraiser (1) |
| 11:17 | floor (9) | 160:7 | foundation (1) | 161:23 |
| firm (9) | 131:21 132:10 | foregoing (2) | 84:9 | furnished (1) |
| 5:23 17:16 25:5 | 132:11 132:10 | 177:9 179:21 | founded (1) | 132:24 |
| 25:10,23 38:22 | 132:11 135:25 | form (34) | 16:8 | furniture (1) |
| 40:21 68:9 | 133.25 134.3,5 | 12:19 14:6 15:4 | four (4) | 133:11 |
| 112:18 | Florida (16) | | 123:4 160:2,18 | further (4) |
| | · · · | 20:12,16 24:24 | 123:4 100:2,18 | 102:17 103:4 |
| firms (2) | 1:1,18 2:5,10 | 27:24 33:9 | | |
| 28:24 29:1 | 3:13 5:10 | 37:14 42:25 | foyer (1) | 111:15 177:14 |
| first (46) | 17:15,18 35:21 | 44:2 50:17 | 132:3 | G |
| 6:18 22:12 26:6 | 40:19 78:1 | 51:24 52:12 | FPR (3) | G (3) |
| 26:7,11 41:3 | 85:18 176:4,16 | 53:10 54:20 | 176:15 177:22 | 1:4 3:4,5 |
| 44:15 45:1,4 | 177:3 178:16 | 55:24 57:24 | 178:15 | Gabe (1) |
| 47:15 48:6,18 | flow (1) | 62:11 68:7 | fragile (5) | · · / |
| 50:9,10 51:19 | 65:17 | 69:11 71:6 | 10:5,8,8,11,11 | 29:5 |
| 52:19 55:16,17 | Floyd (3) | 74:24 81:19 | frame (1) | Gallagher (2) |
| 57:21 59:4,5 | 26:5 28:8 30:15 | 82:12 93:7 | 142:11 | 3:18 5:11 |
| 61:7 65:9,11 | flutter (7) | 105:3 118:13 | fraudulently (1) | gatekeeper (1) |
| 67:7 69:21,25 | 23:24 24:2,6,14 | 121:12 126:5 | 120:10 | 100:4 |
| 70:24,25 71:1 | 24:17,17,18 | 141:9 145:25 | free (2) | gather (8) |
| 71:22 72:9,23 | fly (5) | 164:15 175:5 | 59:11,13 | 16:6 29:25 38:7 |
| 72:25 73:1 | 73:3 136:8 | formal (3) | Freedman (1) | 38:17 40:6 |
| 82:6 84:19 | 141:18 160:5 | 63:19 91:17 | 17:1 | 41:5 42:1 |
| 109:7,9 117:5 | 166:23 | 114:18 | French (1) | 73:16 |
| 120:16 125:16 | flying (2) | former (12) | 138:4 | general (9) |
| 130:12 132:10 | 167:3,4 | 25:19,21 35:10 | frequently (1) | 3:17 12:9 18:16 |
| 132:11 154:7 | focus (2) | 37:25 39:13 | 170:20 | 21:11,17 22:7 |
| fit (2) | 68:19 69:13 | 40:2 64:25 | friend (6) | 28:2 33:18 |
| 106:13 137:1 | focused (1) | 119:20 120:2 | 33:14 36:5 | 39:6 |
| fits (1) | 55:9 | 120:18 122:2 | 43:15 52:2 | General's (1) |
| 127:17 | focusing (1) | 137:15 | 70:17 150:23 | 5:21 |
| five (3) | 132:19 | Fort (3) | friends (6) | generally (5) |
| 92:16 123:5 | folks (1) | 1:18 3:13 5:9 | 43:6 47:23 | 19:7 20:2 68:23 |
| 160:18 | 61:22 | forth (1) | 75:23 89:19 | 69:2 72:6 |
| fix (2) | follow (5) | 62:22 | 173:5,10 | genome (1) |
| 79:7,8 | 152:23,24 153:1 | forum (3) | front (4) | 137:13 |
| Fl (1) | 154:14,15 | 149:20 150:6 | 20:2,3 126:20 | gentleman (1) |
| 3:8 | following (9) | 178:16 | 131:7 | 151:11 |
| flew (3) | 5:2 9:5,18 10:3 | forward (2) | full (4) | gently (1) |
| 164:22,24 | 10:18 11:3,16 | 53:1 150:22 | 6:22 109:6 | 104:17 |
| 166:18 | 145:16 146:4 | forwarded (2) | 123:10 127:9 | George (2) |
| Flexner (2) | follows (2) | 4:9 178:10 | full-time (1) | 137:13 171:20 |

| Gertner (5) | 130:12 136:9 | 109:14,15 110:6 | 17:2 | harm (1) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 30:21 31:12,21 | 141:25 142:1 | Gorani (1) | guy (2) | 125:15 |
| 31:25 32:5 | 151:22 161:15 | 18:20 | 103:21 106:1 | Harold (1) |
| getting (6) | 162:11 165:15 | Gore (4) | | 22:16 |
| 61:15 65:14 | 165:18 172:17 | 129:15,18,21 | <u> </u> | harshly (1) |
| 70:1 79:10,20 | 172:17,22 | 130:2 | Hala (1) | 106:15 |
| 101:17 | 173:2 175:13 | gotten (2) | 18:20 | Harvard (11) |
| Ghislaine (6) | goal (1) | 18:11 65:13 | half (6) | 7:11 8:1 25:20 |
| 136:5 138:1,2,2 | 117:17 | gradually (1) | 23:20,21 24:4,9 | 25:21 33:14 |
| 138:16 172:13 | goes (3) | 58:21 | 76:12 103:21 | 37:24 136:10 |
| Gillers (5) | 26:21 163:13,16 | graduate (1) | Halloween (1) | 137:12,14,16 |
| 17:6 37:5,6,7,8 | going (49) | 37:25 | 75:25 | 137:17 |
| girlfriend (2) | 14:9 15:10 47:7 | grandson (1) | hand (3) | Harvey (1) |
| 139:1,24 | 48:13 49:25 | 166:16 | 56:3 125:19 | 30:4 |
| girlfriends (1) | 50:3 55:8 56:8 | gratifying (1) | 174:7 | hassled (1) |
| 140:2 | 56:14 59:19 | 67:20 | handing (1) | 60:18 |
| girls (4) | 70:8 74:1 | gray/blue (1) | 174:12 | hate (1) |
| 114:25 150:24 | 79:16,18 82:18 | 131:6 | handled (1) | 163:24 |
| 159:14 173:13 | 83:3,7,19,20 | great (5) | 51:8 | head (5) |
| give (21) | 84:3 89:5,14 | 9:19 14:20 33:3 | hands (1) | 28:23 45:21 |
| 17:12 24:4,10 | 90:12 91:7 | 45:10 139:7 | 10:22 | 46:15 121:2,4 |
| 32:16 34:15,18 | 92:16 94:22 | greater (1) | handwritten (2) | health (4) |
| 44:10 45:5,11 | 95:2 99:1,4 | 81:5 | 174:23 175:5 | 21:12,17 22:25 |
| 45:20,24 58:18 | 101:4 103:20 | Groisman (1) | happen (1) | 23:2 |
| 62:10 66:16 | 103:23 104:15 | 29:5 | 77:1 | healthcare (2) |
| 76:23 78:5 | 112:3,4 115:24 | grown (2) | happened (10) | 21:18 22:8 |
| 86:20 103:25 | 121:3,4 126:19 | 75:21 163:17 | 10:22 31:18 | hear (2) |
| 146:1,7 168:13 | 145:7,10 | Guadalupe (1) | 50:24 60:7 | 151:11 159:21 |
| given (7) | 151:12,13 | 165:1 | 82:20 83:4,9 | heard (1) |
| 24:21 33:20 | 152:7,23,24 | guess (1) | 94:23 110:2 | 41:18 |
| 61:8 66:9,25 | 153:1 154:11 | 96:22 | 157:14 | hears (1) |
| 82:15 136:12 | 175:16 | guest (6) | happening (2) | 75:16 |
| giving (1) | good (21) | 134:14,16 | 31:14 43:17 | heinous (1) |
| 102:12 | 5:25 9:18,21 | 170:24 171:18 | happy (8) | 146:5 |
| go (41) | 10:7 11:6 19:6 | 171:19 172:6 | 45:20 73:2,3 | held (3) |
| 10:15 37:14,16 | 19:10,23 20:5 | guests (3) | 144:12,14 | 5:8 50:2 99:3 |
| 43:1 52:12 | 21:8 74:2 | 171:21 172:14 | 155:22 156:20 | help (15) |
| 54:7 69:16 | 78:14 92:17 | 172:21 | 168:3 | 10:10 26:19,25 |
| 74:14 75:2,6 | 96:6 98:25 | guilty (6) | harassed (2) | 31:14,15 34:10 |
| 81:19 82:23 | 110:17,18 | 43:10 150:24 | 60:19 61:16 | 35:14,24 36:6 |
| 83:22 89:20 | 157:7,9 170:9 | 153:8,17,20 | harassing (1) | 39:7,14 40:6 |
| 90:3 91:4 92:7 | 175:12 | 154:9 | 104:20 | 41:5 104:1 |
| 97:17 99:10 | Google (5) | Gulfstream (2) | hard (8) | 148:22 |
| 104:3,13 | 109:10 110:8 | 160:1 163:8 | 64:19 65:2 | helped (2) |
| 105:14 110:15 | 131:13,17 | Guma (1) | 114:9 127:19 | 78:17 123:2 |
| 112:4 115:16 | 133:5 | 35:21 | 127:25 128:1 | helpful (1) |
| 124:20 128:11 | Googled (3) | guru (1) | 130:10,13 | 101:9 |

| [| | | | |
|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| helping (3) | 36:22 | 55:20 58:6 60:4 | 120:25 140:22 | 59:3 63:25 |
| 29:24 38:7,17 | horrified (1) | 60:18 61:22 | 157:16 168:16 | 64:11 |
| Henry (1) | 43:17 | identifying (2) | 169:10,12 | indoor (1) |
| 137:14 | Hospital (2) | 43:13 61:10 | improperly (2) | 131:4 |
| Heymann (2) | 22:7 23:22 | identity (2) | 76:14 119:21 | Indyke (4) |
| 35:2,4 | hospitalized (2) | 45:12,19 | inability (1) | 3:8,9 6:12,12 |
| high (9) | 80:3,10 | 45.12,19 II (1) | 147:23 | inescapable (2) |
| 21:16 22:9,11 | Hotel (1) | 2:9 | inappropriate | 89:8,11 |
| 22:15,20 23:11 | 8:2 | illness (1) | 74:11 96:5,8 | inference (8) |
| 41:16 138:4 | o.2 hour (3) | 20:19 | , | 88:10,11 89:7 |
| 163:18 | 41:24 48:14 | | inappropriate 93:11 | , |
| | | imagine (2) | | 89:10,11 91:20 |
| hint (1) | 92:17 | 141:17 169:24 | incidents (1) | 91:23,25 |
| 140:21 | house (34) | immediately (6) | 128:14 | Inferred (3) |
| history (2) | 41:25 131:9,13 | 28:22 31:13 | include (3) | 87:18,19,21 |
| 10:3 130:8 | 131:22 132:2 | 40:20 41:13 | 42:5,11 92:12 | influence (1) |
| Hofstra (1) | 133:6 134:14 | 116:21 170:15 | included (1) | 20:25 |
| 17:1 | 135:14 136:11 | immunity (2) | 54:13 | informal (1) |
| hold (1) | 136:11 139:18 | 146:7 147:3 | includes (1) | 91:18 |
| 27:1 | 144:20 170:22 | impeach (1) | 162:7 | information (|
| home (23) | 171:17,22 | 53:18 | including (10) | 16:7 29:25 |
| 7:2,10,14 | 172:1,3,6,9,14 | impeachment | 14:10 25:5,10 | 33:20 38:17 |
| 114:24 115:7 | 172:15,17,20 | 169:10 | 42:1 43:8,8 | 40:7 41:5 48:8 |
| 115:14 130:19 | 172:22 173:1,2 | imperative (1) | 52:7 91:14 | 51:20 52:21,25 |
| 130:22,25 | 173:4,6,6,8,13 | 119:24 | 128:15 146:17 | 53:3 58:16,20 |
| 131:1,8 132:8 | 173:21,22,25 | implication (1) | inconceivable | 58:21,22 59:22 |
| 132:9 133:2,22 | houses (1) | 87:11 | 167:7 | 61:11,22,23 |
| 136:4 138:22 | 172:16 | implied (1) | increase (2) | 62:9,19,20,21 |
| 138:24 141:1,7 | Huh (1) | 87:17 | 23:8 101:18 | 63:6 64:21,22 |
| 141:15 157:23 | 100:16 | implying (1) | incredibly (1) | 65:2,12,17 |
| 170:4 | Huh-huh (1) | 114:13 | 110:23 | 66:16,25 67:22 |
| honest (1) | 106:22 | importance (1) | independent (7) | 68:18 78:18 |
| 109:25 | hurt (1) | 68:13 | 127:4 153:5,6 | 80:8 83:8 |
| honorable (1) | 10:11 | important (9) | 153:11,14 | 93:24 99:15 |
| 109:22 | husband (8) | 62:18 68:16 | 155:9,10 | 102:13,17 |
| honored (1) | 45:4 46:1 50:16 | 69:3 70:14 | indicate (5) | 103:14,18 |
| 146:21 | 77:25 80:2,2,6 | 120:4,7,12,21 | 81:11 101:2 | 105:20 109:18 |
| hoop (1) | 80:9 | 148:7 | 119:24 120:12 | 120:6 151:25 |
| 131:3 | husband's (1) | impossible (2) | 120:21 | 153:7 |
| hope (1) | 47:18 | 34:14 37:3 | indicated (1) | informed (3) |
| 108:15 | | impression (5) | 47:10 | 41:4 50:7,9 |
| hoped (1) | <u> </u> | 52:20 54:16 | indicating (1) | informing (2) |
| 76:11 | idea (5) | 55:2,3 168:14 | 51:21 | 51:21 79:21 |
| hopefully (2) | 51:7 77:6 94:15 | imprimatur (1) | individual's (1) | initial (1) |
| 97:6 174:20 | 143:9 163:8 | 120:4 | 157:1 | 24:17 |
| hoping (2) | identified (1) | improper (10) | individuals (7) | initially (7) |
| 101:15 147:3 | 61:7 | 54:17 98:19 | 18:10 32:21 | 16:25 23:18 |
| horrible (1) | identify (5) | 119:25 120:1 | 33:24 34:3 | 31:15 45:25 |
| | l | | | |

| | _ | | | _ |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 58:18 146:19 | 16:15 | investigating (1) | 98:3 108:5 | job (1) |
| 174:3 | intended (2) | 80:8 | jail (1) | 40:5 |
| initials (1) | 118:14 119:13 | investigation (3) | 120:9 | Johnson (3) |
| 100:22 | intending (1) | 82:25 111:15 | Jamin (1) | 40:1,2,9 |
| initiated (3) | 56:23 | 114:4 | 30:18 | Jones (2) |
| 74:16 99:25 | intention (2) | investigative (2) | January (5) | 3:17 5:21 |
| 100:19 | 14:9 15:15 | 38:18 155:13 | 18:21 20:7 49:5 | Joni (2) |
| injury (10) | intentional (6) | involve (4) | 116:4 163:11 | 3:17 5:21 |
| 12:16,17 13:10 | 14:25 15:2 | 108:7 144:6 | Jeanne (2) | journal (2) |
| 13:10 14:2,16 | 125:19 127:7 | 158:16,22 | 36:3,4 | 42:2,2 |
| 14:25 15:2 | 128:5,8 | involved (9) | Jeffrey (69) | journalist (1) |
| 120:19 122:5 | intentionally (3) | 42:15 53:1,2 | 3:3 6:9,13 41:14 | 40:15 |
| injustice (4) | 14:17 122:21,23 | 62:3,6 70:19 | 41:18 73:21 | journalistic (1) |
| 26:25 35:25 | interest (2) | 71:17 79:6 | 89:18 93:6 | 40:5 |
| 36:23 39:17 | 26:2 114:7 | 86:9 | 94:7,8,13,16 | JR (1) |
| innocence (3) | interested (2) | involvement (1) | 97:14 98:13 | 2:11 |
| 11:4,7 156:18 | 41:20 177:19 | 21:20 | 113:25 114:2,8 | jsx@searcyla |
| innocent (1) | interesting (3) | involves (1) | 114:20,24 | 2:6 |
| 121:24 | 159:16,18,23 | 144:4 | 115:6,14 118:2 | judge (14) |
| inquiries (1) | interior (5) | involving (1) | 120:11 128:15 | 25:4 42:15 43:3 |
| 117:17 | 133:4,5 159:17 | 108:21 | 129:16 134:13 | 66:1 83:19,22 |
| inserted (1) | 159:24 160:16 | irrelevant (1) | 136:3,19 137:7 | 84:4,6 97:1 |
| 146:13 | interrogatorie | 116:16 | 138:8,13,21 | 116:15 119:20 |
| insist (2) | 55:19 56:5,11 | irreversible (1) | 139:15,22,23 | 120:3,18 122:2 |
| 91:16 151:2 | 56:25 57:20,23 | 10:20 | 140:15,25 | judgment (1) |
| insisted (1) | 63:24 64:10 | island (4) | 141:8,16 142:4 | 110:19 |
| 119:19 | interrupt (3) | 129:12,16,22 | 142:16 143:22 | judicial (4) |
| insisting (1) | 34:8 118:19,23 | 173:22 | 148:12 149:9 | 1:1 146:13 |
| 96:9 | interrupted (1) | issue (5) | 149:11 150:23 | 147:2,3 |
| installed (1) | 119:16 | 36:11 84:6 | 153:5,7 154:21 | Julius (2) |
| 131:15 | interrupting (2) | 125:21 156:20 | 155:18 156:5 | 32:24,25 |
| instance (1) | 118:20 160:21 | 156:21 | 157:23 158:12 | junior (1) |
| 11:9 | interview (11) | issues (5) | 159:6,13 164:6 | 138:18 |
| instances (1) | 18:20 76:22 | 22:25 26:4 | 164:14,22 | justice (8) |
| 36:20 | 78:12 79:11,13 | 63:17 137:21 | 165:8,22 | 89:6,14,20 |
| instruct (2) | 79:17,19,23 | 156:12 | 166:18 167:24 | 90:13 91:8 |
| 152:18 154:12 | 80:1 90:16 | IV (1) | 169:7 170:3,22 | 114:9,19 147:6 |
| instruction (4) | 91:3 | 160:1 | 171:16 172:2 | |
| 152:19,23,25 | interviewed (4) | IVs (1) | 173:12,20 | <u> </u> |
| 153:1 | 20:8 78:8 102:8 | 163:8 | Jeffrey's (2) | K (3) |
| instructions (1) | 103:24 | | 172:11,14 | 2:18 3:8,9 |
| 155:25 | interviews (7) | J | Jeremy (1) | keep (4) |
| instrumental (1) | 89:17 90:18 | J (2) | 22:5 | 23:5 104:18 |
| 29:24 | 91:4,17 101:24 | 1:4 5:6 | Jewish (1) | 150:2,3 |
| intelligences (1) | 102:1,5 | Jack (7) | 19:4 | keeps (1) |
| 137:18 | investigate (2) | 2:5 5:16 10:15 | Joanne (2) | 26:18 |
| intend (1) | 64:21 110:5 | 18:7 92:18 | 115:17,18 | Kellen (6) |
| | 1 | 1 | I | I |

| | | | _ | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 136:6,16,18 | 121:20 123:3 | 158:1 162:15 | 1:18 3:13 5:10 | lawyer-client (|
| 138:18 172:13 | 127:22 128:16 | 162:24 163:5,8 | launch (2) | 33:21 34:14 |
| 172:13 | 130:9 | 165:11 167:5 | 160:11 162:19 | 35:6,15 37:19 |
| Kellen's (1) | knocked (1) | knowing (6) | law (31) | 107:5 |
| 137:7 | 127:15 | 113:8 123:10 | 5:23 7:11 15:10 | lawyering (2) |
| Ken (3) | know (102) | 125:13,14,23 | 17:1,8 25:5,10 | 129:8,9 |
| 6:4 27:13 65:22 | 13:23 25:2,6 | 150:21 | 28:24 29:1 | lawyers (73) |
| Kendall (2) | 27:3 28:24 | knowingly (1) | 33:14 35:12 | 10:10 15:9 |
| 25:14 27:16 | 31:11 37:15 | 126:3 | 36:10 37:6,25 | 16:13 17:12,20 |
| Kenneth (2) | 42:18 44:17 | knowledge (9) | 38:21 40:21 | 24:22 25:4,16 |
| 2:15 25:11 | 48:23 50:20 | 15:21 55:20 | 62:16 85:23 | 26:4,12,15 |
| kept (3) | 53:4,4,5 59:10 | 57:18 58:6 | 89:20 122:3 | 28:25 32:10,12 |
| 30:2 103:9 | 59:19 60:23 | 67:17 106:8 | 124:23 145:17 | 32:13,18 33:6 |
| 171:1 | 64:25 65:1 | 112:19,22 | 145:18,22 | 33:19,25 34:3 |
| kidding (2) | 66:12 67:16,21 | 137:9 | 146:16,24 | 35:7,23 37:12 |
| 31:9,10 | 72:6 73:13,19 | known (7) | 147:19,24 | 39:1,6,6 40:4 |
| Kimberly (5) | 76:10 77:23 | 41:18 42:17 | 148:1,6 149:10 | 43:7,20 52:5,6 |
| 1:20 176:15 | 81:14 83:11 | 55:4 125:23 | lawsuit (3) | 52:17 54:12 |
| 177:6,22 | 84:25 85:23 | 127:23 129:13 | 22:24 33:7 77:3 | 57:5,8 60:9,14 |
| 178:15 | 89:24 91:22 | 161:25 | lawsuits (1) | 64:4 65:12,15 |
| kind (9) | 94:6 96:6,11 | knows (1) | 33:2 | 65:18 67:6 |
| 17:2 38:10 64:5 | 98:4 100:24 | 30:1 | lawyer (49) | 73:19 76:11,18 |
| 100:4 133:23 | 102:9,9 103:3 | Kosslyn (1) | 15:20,20 26:5 | 76:20 77:25 |
| 134:6 137:25 | 103:7,14 | 137:16 | 26:20 30:12 | 80:20 81:2,8,9 |
| 138:17 170:9 | 105:17 106:2 | ksweder@swe | 32:22 35:2 | 81:11 82:9 |
| kindly (1) | 106:20 110:17 | 2:16 | 36:14,19 38:1 | 87:13 88:9 |
| 16:12 | 110:20 113:7 | | 38:9 40:9,15 | 92:14 100:25 |
| kinds (2) | 113:10,23 | | 40:18 41:2 | 101:2,2 103:20 |
| 13:18 116:23 | 114:11,11,17 | Lakes (1) | 53:23 62:5 | 107:8 111:19 |
| Kippur (1) | 114:22 115:2,3 | 2:4 | 63:7 68:12 | 113:14 116:7 |
| 173:4 | 115:5,13 | landline (5) | 76:5 81:3,7,9 | 117:13 118:10 |
| Kissane (2) | 117:18 121:1 | 46:24 73:14 | 81:11 82:7 | 119:10 120:13 |
| 1:17 2:9 | 123:20 124:24 | 102:20,22,24 | 96:6 115:17,18 | 123:12,25 |
| kitchen (7) | 125:14 129:21 | language (1) | 115:19,21 | 143:18 146:6 |
| 132:6,10,11,14 | 131:16 133:3 | 116:17 | 116:2,23 | 147:2 |
| 132:15 133:19 | 135:25 142:2 | large (4) | 120:20 122:5 | leading (5) |
| 172:6 | 142:24 143:5 | 41:19 76:24 | 127:16,17 | 16:3,23 17:6 |
| knees (1) | 143:10 144:18 | 132:15 150:25 | 129:18 144:4,6 | 26:5 39:5 |
| 170:15 | 147:24 149:3 | largely (1) | 144:15 147:8 | learned (8) |
| knew (21) | 149:25 150:1 | 121:13 | 150:1 151:13 | 58:19 78:9 82:8 |
| 37:1,2 41:12 | 152:22 153:4 | Larry (2) 137:14 140:18 | 151:18 152:9 | 148:2,4 151:25 |
| 42:17 50:21 | 153:11,13,17 | | 152:20 154:12 | 152:15 158:10 |
| 53:2 59:15,17 | 153:21 154:24 | Las (1) 3:12 | 155:25 163:10 | led (1) |
| 68:2 73:21 | 154:25 155:2,6 | late (1) | lawyer's (6) | 106:4 |
| 77:18 85:3 | 155:8,10,12 | 162:6 | 57:1,4 154:16 | left (8) |
| 88:11 101:24 | 157:14,15,17 | Lauderdale (3) | 155:25 158:14 | 46:20 50:23 |
| 112:22 113:7 | 157:21,25 | | 158:15 | 73:4,19 100:8 |

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 132:11 171:3 | 4:9 81:20,21 | 70:18 170:19 | live (7) | 112:4 |
| 171:18 | 82:3 124:5 | limitations (1) | 6:25 7:1,3 18:21 | lounge (1) |
| legal (40) | 178:12 | 121:23 | 20:8 47:21 | 132:13 |
| 14:5 25:18,22 | letters (1) | limited (5) | 61:8 | love (1) |
| 32:1 34:12,19 | 98:20 | 76:9 77:19 | lived (7) | 107:21 |
| 35:13,14 36:5 | level (7) | 149:22 161:6 | 61:9 71:22 72:7 | loving (1) |
| 36:6,6,10,12 | 120:18,20 | 172:15 | 109:11,11,15 | 30:3 |
| 36:16 37:9 | 131:21 132:6,7 | limits (1) | 109:16 | lunch (3) |
| 38:10,22 39:9 | 133:24 134:2 | 172:11 | lives (2) | 137:20 144:17 |
| 39:25 40:6 | leveled (1) | limousine (3) | 35:11 76:8 | 145:6 |
| 64:13,19 65:6 | 14:7 | 141:8,16 142:2 | living (5) | lying (4) |
| 65:9 85:11 | leveling (1) | Limousines (2) | 132:13,17 | 93:22 94:1 |
| 91:18 94:2 | 36:25 | 141:5,6 | 133:18 134:10 | 114:16 130:8 |
| 123:18,24 | Lexington (1) | line (2) | 134:11 | Lynch (1) |
| 126:16 145:22 | 3:8 | 125:25 179:6 | LLP (2) | 97:1 |
| 146:9 147:20 | liar (1) | lines (1) | 2:14 3:12 | |
| 152:15,17 | 10:9 | 91:17 | lobby (1) | M |
| 155:6,17 | liars (1) | list (2) | 118:1 | M (13) |
| 156:15 158:11 | 110:18 | 40:4,13 | locations (1) | 1:7,11 5:6,7 6:5 |
| 158:12 | liberty (1) | listed (1) | 73:23 | 123:14 176:9 |
| legally (1) | 117:9 | 178:12 | logs (2) | 177:9 178:2,19 |
| 8:20 | lie (5) | listen (5) | 74:4 175:4 | 179:3,3,24 |
| lengthier (1) | 127:23 168:17 | 24:15 69:5,5 | long (6) | MA (2) |
| 30:23 | 168:21,23,23 | 75:16 109:23 | 8:3 48:16 61:24 | 2:15 3:5 |
| lengthy (1) | lied (8) | litigated (1) | 130:7 132:4 | MacDonald (2) |
| 155:13 | 130:1,1,1,1,2,2 | 62:3 | 171:15 | 36:18,19 |
| Les (1) | 130:3,3 | litigating (1) | long-term (1) | machine (2) |
| 92:25 | lies (15) | 39:22 | 36:4 | 24:5,11 |
| Leslie (19) | 11:8,17,18 41:4 | litigation (34) | longer (3) | magazines (2) |
| 77:16,20,21 | 94:2 118:6 | 16:5,10,14 | 7:14 10:6 98:10 | 133:2,14 |
| 79:4,5 80:15 | 127:8 128:23 | 17:22 21:21 | look (6) | Mail (1) |
| 80:17,18 82:5 | 128:24 129:4 | 22:10,21 23:9 | 16:12 41:22 | 148:11 |
| 82:9 83:1 | 146:10,13 | 23:13 27:22 | 57:9 106:15 | main (1) |
| 101:5,16,19 | 157:5,5 167:8 | 28:6,9,12,15 | 127:14 168:3 | 25:16 |
| 106:10 111:18 | life (5) | 28:18,21 29:3 | looked (6) | maintain (1) |
| 111:19 112:3,4 | 20:6,21 22:14 | 29:6,9,13,17 | 41:23 57:9 | 62:17 |
| let's (20) | 130:14 145:14 | 29:19,21,23 | 133:4,6,7 | maintained (3) |
| 18:17 23:21 | lifetime (1) | 30:5,8,13,16 | 144:25 | 8:8,16,19 |
| 34:8 48:13 | 18:5 | 30:19,22 33:19 | looking (1) | maintains (1) |
| 49:4,23 55:13 | light (4) | 38:3 67:23 | 41:24 | 10:6 |
| 55:16 69:16 | 12:14 13:7 | 164:20 | loosely (1) | Maisel (2) |
| 70:20,21 74:14 | 108:10 131:12 | litigator (1) | 91:13 | 29:18,20 |
| 74:24 88:15 | liked (1) | 35:19 | lose (1) | major (1) |
| 91:4 95:5 | 31:2 | little (6) | 119:1 | 138:10 |
| 98:25 99:10 | likelihood (1) | 27:3 46:4 55:17 | lot (5) | making (9) |
| 162:1,7 | 125:14 | 60:1 131:2 | 31:7 38:22 | 13:17 15:14 |
| letter (6) | likes (2) | 147:17 | 104:16 110:21 | 27:2 81:17 |
| | I | I | I | I |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 86:4,5 150:15 | 3:4,5 6:7 | 3:13 5:22,22 | 44:4 69:8,12 | Miami (7) |
| 163:15 169:22 | Marty (2) | 35:21 82:10,18 | 69:20 70:3 | 2:10 7:2 26:17 |
| malice (2) | 151:22 152:9 | 83:3,7,18 84:1 | 72:16 74:22 | 35:11 40:19 |
| 14:3,8 | marty@marti | 84:3 94:21 | 75:1 90:1 | 46:22 170:8 |
| malicious (2) | 3:6 | 95:1 | 141:14 143:24 | Michael (29) |
| 9:13 22:3 | Marvin (1) | mean (9) | 148:23 | 47:19 48:1 |
| maliciously (2) | 140:19 | 26:10 55:4 | mendacious (6) | 49:18 57:20 |
| 10:9 12:23 | Mary (1) | 110:16 123:23 | 9:22 14:11 36:1 | 58:9,14 70:4,7 |
| man (6) | 28:17 | 129:8 134:17 | 36:24 39:18 | 70:7 71:3 |
| 17:15 101:5,22 | mass (4) | 139:18 143:1,5 | 42:7 | 74:15,17 75:7 |
| 120:9 137:13 | 116:5,10 117:11 | meaning (1) | mention (9) | 75:8,12 85:10 |
| 137:17 | 121:9 | 125:5 | 43:5,6,22 52:4 | 86:23 87:4 |
| manifest (7) | Massachusetts | meant (1) | 53:22 54:4 | 92:1 99:12,22 |
| 159:5 165:7,21 | 7:11 22:6,17 | 91:14 | 76:3 87:13 | 100:8,9 102:14 |
| 166:6 167:13 | 36:20 85:16,19 | media (26) | 103:18 | 103:2,12 |
| 167:14,23 | 85:21 86:6,8 | 60:22 61:14,16 | mentioned (18) | 108:19 109:13 |
| manifests (18) | 100:20 102:24 | 89:17 90:18 | 34:15 43:20 | 110:6 |
| 142:24 143:6,7 | 134:14 139:19 | 91:4,18 92:11 | 52:14,15 54:11 | middle-aged (1) |
| 143:10,11 | 150:14 | 116:5,11 117:2 | 70:11 77:5 | 137:5 |
| 144:3,24 145:1 | massage (11) | 117:9,11,21 | 78:22,24 87:12 | mile (1) |
| 159:3,10,12 | 169:5,18,19,23 | 118:4 120:17 | 88:7 92:10 | 7:11 |
| 164:4,19 165:2 | 169:25 170:6,7 | 121:9,13,14,15 | 104:3 113:5,11 | million (2) |
| 167:2,10 168:3 | 170:12,16,21 | 121:16 122:1 | 113:14 117:23 | 13:17,20 |
| 168:4 | 170:25 | 122:14 146:11 | 117:25 | mind (8) |
| mansion (1) | massaged (2) | 146:11,12 | mentioning (6) | 7:18 67:20 |
| 154:21 | 170:13 171:1 | meet (2) | 43:21,21 53:23 | 79:22 89:1 |
| Maps (1) | massages (6) | 138:12,14 | 70:13 88:9 | 103:16 128:18 |
| 131:17 | 148:12,13 151:3 | meeting (5) | 103:19 | 137:1,19 |
| March (1) | 170:18,19,19 | 72:12,19,22,24 | merging (1) | mine (3) |
| 49:6 | masseuse (1) | 129:11 | 139:3 | 9:12 35:11 |
| mark (5) | 170:8 | meetings (6) | message (4) | 173:5 |
| 25:18 27:18 | massive (4) | 43:18 137:10,11 | 0 | minors (5) |
| 28:5 30:7 | 48:11 116:19 | 137:12,21 | 88:4 100:9 | 93:6 97:15 |
| 56:14 | 118:3 122:14 | 140:16 | messengers (1) | 148:14 151:3 |
| marked (1) | material (1) | member (4) | 120:5 | 153:18 |
| 4:11 | 38:7 | 15:22 39:11 | met (14) | Minsky (1) |
| market (2) | matter (7) | 61:24 130:12 | 19:25 77:21 | 140:19 |
| 7:16,25 | 5:6 20:18 39:9 | members (1) | 86:24 87:10,23 | minute (7) |
| marks (1) | 39:24 59:4 | 138:20 | 88:18,21 93:12 | 95:6,17,18,18 |
| 149:4 | 108:11 125:4 | memories (1) | 104:7,25 | 139:17 151:7 |
| Markus (3) | matters (6) | 20:18 | 105:12,17 | 164:10 |
| 26:17 35:8,10 | 33:4,6 40:9 62:3 | memory (28) | 129:14 139:12 | minutes (3) |
| married (1) | 64:5 65:10 | 18:22,25 19:2,7 | metaphorical | 92:16 171:2,2 |
| 163:12 | Maxwell (4) | 19:9,10,21,23 | 12:8 | misconduct (6) |
| Martha's (2) | 136:5,16 138:1 | 19:24 20:5,8 | Mexico (5) | 36:25 37:21 |
| 7:5 131:11 | 138:2 | 20:18,22 21:2 | 41:7,15,20 42:9 | 76:14 77:2 |
| Martin (3) | McCAWLEY | 24:21 25:2 | 42:13 | 92:13 128:14 |
| | | | | |

| missed (1) | 19:1,3 164:2 | 113:11,14 | neither (1) | 84:17,20,22 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| 56:7 | motivation (1) | 114:3,4 119:22 | 145:19 | 85:11,15,18 |
| misstated (1) | 11:9 | 137:18 178:12 | nephew (2) | 86:5,6 102:1,4 |
| 98:16 | motor (1) | named (5) | 166:4,14 | 102:5,8,11,22 |
| mistake (1) | 140:25 | 26:20 76:25 | net (2) | 103:13,16 |
| 31:18 | Mount (1) | 104:4 128:1 | 76:13 103:21 | 109:3 162:10 |
| mistaken (2) | 23:22 | 131:2 | neuropsychol | 162:11 173:25 |
| 78:13 169:25 | move (14) | names (20) | 110:21 | news (3) |
| misuses (1) | 9:14,23 10:12 | 18:9 19:25 25:3 | never (78) | 76:22 78:14 |
| 120:3 | 10:24 11:12 | 28:24 34:15 | 43:19 50:14,18 | 148:3 |
| Mitch (3) | 13:5 14:12 | 45:5,6,9 49:14 | 52:4,14 53:22 | newspaper (1) |
| 28:11 32:13 | 16:20 17:24 | 58:18,19 61:7 | 54:11 71:14 | 117:21 |
| 166:15 | 19:12 83:8 | 62:24 63:24 | 76:3 78:21,23 | newspapers (4) |
| Mitchell (2) | 84:5 96:4 | 64:1,11,14,16 | 86:10,12,14,24 | 48:9 133:2,14 |
| 25:20 171:20 | 147:15 | 64:17 65:21 | 87:10,12,14,23 | 149:25 |
| | | | | |
| model (1) 173:18 | moved (4) 7:15,23,24,24 | naming (2) 58:24 113:1 | 88:7,21,21 91:21 92:10,24 | Nicholas (2) |
| | | | , | 29:18,20 |
| molester (1) | multiple (8) | Nancy (5) | 93:2,9,14 94:2 | Nicole (3) |
| 153:8 | 88:19 90:14 | 30:21 31:12,21 | 94:3,8 98:18 | 2:20 6:14 29:2 |
| moment (4) | 98:11,12,15 | 31:25 32:4 | 101:13 104:7 | niece (1) |
| 49:9 56:16 | 137:18 163:12 | narrow (1) | 104:25 105:12 | 37:24 |
| 68:18 99:20 | 169:4 | 135:24 | 105:17 106:20 | night (5) |
| monetary (2) | <u> </u> | Nathan (2) | 113:5,23 114:3 | 21:9 45:15,17 |
| 12:17,22 | | 38:19,20 | 115:7,13,13 | 46:18,19 |
| money (15) | N (1) | nature (4) | 118:16 119:14 | night's (1) |
| 13:16 50:13,14 | 4:1 | 157:8 164:16 | 119:17 127:11 | 21:8 |
| 50:16,18 76:16 | naked (2) | 165:12,13 | 127:12 129:5 | Nightline (2) |
| 76:25 77:4 | 173:13 174:1 | necessary (1) | 129:22,23 | 78:15,15 |
| 101:1,3,19 | name (52) | 41:6 | 134:18,23 | noise (1) |
| 104:2,5 112:5 | 5:11,16 6:22 | need (7) | 139:12 142:16 | 27:2 |
| 151:1 | 9:18,21 17:16 | 20:2 25:1 33:22 | 145:20 146:19 | non-prosecuti |
| Monroe (1) | 22:4 24:22 | 83:22,23 98:6 | 146:20 150:19 | 120:24 |
| 17:1 | 28:22 32:16 | 99:19 | 157:15 160:9 | Normally (3) |
| month (7) | 40:4 44:11,14 | needed (2) | 162:14,22,25 | 99:21 136:5 |
| 23:4,4 24:3,3,8 | 44:15,15,17,18 | 41:12,25 | 163:24 164:22 | 141:24 |
| 24:8 48:21 | 44:19,25 45:11 | Neely (2) | 168:20,25 | Notary (1) |
| months (7) | 45:19,19 47:18 | 29:12,14 | 169:5,18,23 | 176:16 |
| 15:17 20:9 48:8 | 47:19 51:1 | negative (1) | 172:1,5 173:16 | note (3) |
| 49:4 107:13,15 | 52:7 53:2 | 167:17 | 173:16,24,25 | 69:6 82:22 |
| 174:3 | 54:13 58:8 | negligence (7) | new (40) | 149:4 |
| morality (2) | 60:4,16 76:10 | 124:25 125:3,9 | 3:9,9 7:4 8:4,9 | notes (21) |
| 148:7,8 | 77:4 82:15 | 125:11,18 | 8:17,21,25 | 19:5,8 20:3 |
| morning (3) | 86:20 88:20 | 127:7 128:6 | 36:9 38:21 | 44:21 49:12,14 |
| 5:25 45:14,17 | 89:7 91:20 | negligent (1) | 39:6,23 41:7 | 49:15,16,21 |
| Morton (1) | 93:5 97:13 | 126:3 | 41:15,20 42:9 | 68:21,24 69:2 |
| 6:24 | 98:1 106:12 | negotiations (2) | 42:13 73:12 | 69:4,9,13 |
| mother (3) | 109:6,9,12 | 83:7 114:6 | 74:20 80:24 | 85:12 93:17,23 |
| - \- / | I | | | |

| 137:24 140:13 | 126:5 131:18 | obligation (4) | October (9) | 126:13 132:22 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 177:13 | 145:25 151:13 | 15:19 147:13 | 1:15 5:4 154:19 | 132:22 133:11 |
| notice (3) | 152:2,18 155:7 | 150:5,10 | 176:11,12 | 135:11 142:19 |
| 174:2,4 178:3 | 155:16 158:13 | observed (1) | 177:20 178:1,3 | 143:15,20 |
| NPA (2) | 161:8 164:15 | 141:2 | 179:4 | 144:10 145:4 |
| 127:15,16 | 165:10,24 | obtain (5) | offender (1) | 153:15 154:2 |
| nrichardson@ | objected (1) | 62:21 64:17 | 41:9 | 158:17 165:17 |
| 2:21 | 96:13 | 65:2 104:2,5 | offer (1) | 165:17 170:2 |
| nude (1) | objecting (1) | obviously (14) | 32:4 | 175:15 |
| 173:17 | 95:2 | 10:14 19:9 27:7 | offered (13) | Olas (1) |
| number (33) | objection (80) | 45:22 64:4,20 | 13:16 25:22 | 3:12 |
| 37:20 45:22,25 | 12:19 13:12 | 67:10 71:15,15 | 26:21 31:14 | old (3) |
| 46:3,3,9,13,14 | 14:5 15:4 | 77:18 109:19 | 35:13,13,23 | 136:18 138:1 |
| 46:15,16 47:6 | 20:12,16 24:24 | 118:2 146:12 | 36:6,16,21 | 145:17 |
| 47:9,16,17 | 20.12,10 24.24 27:24 33:9 | 156:8 | 39:23 40:6,20 | older (1) |
| 50:23 51:3 | 37:15 42:25 | occasion (7) | offering (3) | 136:21 |
| 63:2,15 70:1 | 44:12 50:17 | 35:16 163:19 | 26:13,14,24 | oldest (1) |
| 72:5 75:24 | 51:24 52:12 | 166:14,16,17 | offers (1) | 38:15 |
| 99:8,23,24 | 53:10,20 54:7 | 166:23 168:15 | 26:22 | Oliver (1) |
| 121:17 142:19 | 54:20 55:24 | | office (8) | 2:14 |
| | | occasionally (2) 8:21 19:23 | 3:17 5:21 41:10 | |
| 142:20,21,21 142:23,23 | 57:6,24 58:10 59:8 60:8 61:1 | occasions (18) | 115:25 136:10 | Olympic (1) 38:1 |
| 142:25,25 | 61:13 62:11 | 35:5 37:20 38:3 | 136:10 137:12 | |
| | | 38:25 77:21 | 138:13 | omitted (1) 58:8 |
| numerous (2) | 64:2,13 66:5 | | | |
| 38:2,25 NW (1) | 66:18 67:2,8 67:13 69:11 | 88:20 90:15 135:15 137:23 | Ogletree (2) 33:12,13 | once (7) |
| 2:18 | | 141:2 163:12 | oh (8) | 129:15,15,16 |
| 2.18 NYU (2) | 71:6,11,24 72:21 81:19 | | 50:24 60:5 78:2 | 135:4,5,7,16 |
| 17:8 37:6 | 82:12,22 84:25 | 164:6,7,9 166:3,18,20 | 101:25 135:4 | one-party (2) 84:22 85:21 |
| 17.0 57.0 | 85:14 86:11 | 169:4 | 158:24 173:3,7 | one-story (2) |
| 0 | 87:25 88:23 | occur (5) | Ohio (4) | 132:8,9 |
| oath (13) | 89:2 90:6 | 24:6 48:6 | 76:8,24 77:19 | ones (2) |
| 4:8 34:20 42:11 | 91:11 93:7 | 101:25 103:2 | 103:22 | 164:20 165:5 |
| 54:6 64:10 | 95:1,20 97:16 | 121:21 | okay (47) | ongoing (2) |
| 91:6,15 93:15 | 104:13 105:3 | occurred (22) | 19:17 32:24 | 16:5,14 |
| 94:18 114:23 | 104.13 105.3 | 24:8,17 26:11 | 60:6 66:14 | , |
| 115:10 121:3 | 116:10 117:15 | 35:22 42:7 | 69:18,23 70:25 | open (2) 120:24 170:25 |
| 176:1 | 118:13,20 | 55:18 57:22 | 75:6 77:15 | opinion (13) |
| obey (1) | 121:12 126:17 | 70:12 71:14 | 82:22 84:14 | 11:4 26:8 55:6 |
| 155:24 | 121:12 120:17 128:10 129:1 | 81:23,24 86:12 | 85:3 86:1,3 | 145:23 146:15 |
| object (30) | 128:10 129:1 | 86:14 87:15 | 87:3,16 90:3 | 145:25 140:15 |
| 37:14 44:2 68:4 | 140:8 141:9 | 103:6,11 | 91:25 95:6,22 | 147:21 149:10 |
| 74:7,24 76:7,7 | 151:23 152:6 | 106:16 123:6 | 91.23 93.0,22 99:10 102:13 | 149:13 151:9 |
| 82:18 83:3 | 155:5,9,15,20 | 128:3 170:2,3 | 107:4,13 | |
| 94:21,21 97:8 | 156:15 158:5,9 | 128:5 170:2,5 | 107.4,15 | opponents (1) 149:17 |
| 98:2,4 106:9 | objections (1) | occurring (2) | 110:5 112:9 | opportunity (3) |
| 121:15 124:19 | 174:16 | 22:14 137:11 | 119:17 124:18 | 39:16 146:9 |
| | 1/4.10 | 22.14 137.11 | 117.17 124.10 | 57.10 140.7 |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 21 |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 174:24 | overlapping (1) | part (22) | 77:4 163:22 | 132:18 135:13 |
| opposed (3) | 138:19 | 7:3 15:21 16:13 | paying (1) | 135:16 141:10 |
| 28:2 88:20 | overly (3) | 32:1,17 33:21 | 76:24 | 141:18,22 |
| 126:23 | 93:7 141:9 | 38:10 48:11 | PC (1) | 142:5,7,11,14 |
| opposing (1) | 169:15 | 54:25 58:8 | 3:4 | 142:17,25 |
| 150:4 | overnight (2) | 60:21 88:10 | penalties (1) | 143:9,12,15,16 |
| option (1) | 8:24 52:3 | 117:22 122:14 | 179:21 | 143:23 144:3 |
| 12:5 | overtures (1) | 129:9 132:16 | pending (2) | 144:24 153:22 |
| oral (3) | 106:11 | 132:17 136:18 | 148:25 165:18 | 159:7 166:22 |
| 94:17 128:16 | owned (6) | 159:15 161:2 | people (40) | 166:22 171:23 |
| 157:5 | 7:10 77:19,19 | 172:3 173:8 | 19:25 26:22 | periods (3) |
| order (9) | 101:6 130:19 | participant (1) | 41:3 50:20 | 73:21 115:11 |
| 12:5 18:3 63:14 | 139:7 | 98:19 | 52:15 60:15,17 | 167:8 |
| 76:23 84:7 | owns (1) | participate (1) | 69:14 75:23 | perjurious (5) |
| 110:5 116:19 | 76:9 | 114:6 | 78:10,24 89:8 | 42:5,16,18,18 |
| 118:3 152:10 | | particular (3) | 92:21 93:1 | 123:2 |
| ordered (1) | P | 26:4 36:11 69:6 | 104:4 106:10 | perjury (11) |
| 178:5 | P.A (2) | particularly (8) | 110:11,17 | 42:23 43:4,10 |
| ordering (1) | 2:4,9 | 11:7 19:24 | 114:9 130:4 | 44:8 64:24 |
| 178:10 | p.m (9) | 23:12 59:14 | 136:17 139:11 | 98:23 106:24 |
| | 1:15 99:3,5 | 64:22 125:6 | 139:12 140:17 | 107:14 128:8 |
| orders (3) | 145:8,9,9,11 | 156:4 157:7 | 140:23 143:20 | 128:19 179:21 |
| 62:16 63:8,12 | 175:17,18 | | 140:23 143:20 | |
| ordinary (1) 162:21 | Page (2) | parties (4) | | permission (7) |
| | 4:4 179:6 | 86:9 150:16 | 160:3,9,18,20 | 45:13,18 58:17 |
| organizing (1) | pages (3) | 177:16 178:8 | 162:18 167:7 | 59:23,25 60:3 |
| 138:17 | 1:13 4:6 177:10 | parties' (1) 177:17 | 171:20 172:10 | 65:13 |
| original (2) | paid (4) | | 172:12,19,21 | permit (1) |
| 174:22 178:9 | 90:19 148:12 | partner (3) | 172:21 | 30:24 |
| Oscar (2) | 150:23,25 | 25:23 39:23 | perceived (2) | permitted (2) |
| 35:8,10 | Palm (16) | 120:8 | 16:13 104:20 | 86:7 155:23 |
| ought (1) | 2:4,5 47:22,22 | partners (5) | perfect (1) | permitting (1) |
| 77:23 | 47:23 61:8 | 25:7,10,12,15 | 10:21 | 84:23 |
| outdoors (1) | 71:22 114:24 | 25:25 | perfectly (1) | perpetrated (2) |
| 41:21 | 154:7,20,21 | party (1) | 156:20 | 35:25 39:17 |
| outer (1) | 155:13 170:4,5 | 146:8 | perform (4) | persecution (1) |
| 160:14 | 173:21 178:16 | passenger (3) | 29:16 30:2 | 150:7 |
| outrage (1) | | 159:15 164:13 | 125:12,13 | person (12) |
| 31:13 | paralegal (7) | 167:24 | performed (1) | 41:8 44:14 |
| outraged (3) | 29:15,16,21 | Paul (16) | 140:12 | 47:13 50:7 |
| 26:12,23 39:14 | 30:2 38:7,16 | 1:4 5:7,18 15:16 | performs (1) | 51:20,21 58:6 |
| outrageous (4) | 40:3 | 42:22 52:22 | 40:5 | 71:19 109:22 |
| 23:14,15 94:18 | paralegals (3) | 55:1 81:15 | period (38) | 114:23 138:17 |
| 116:23 | 25:6,7,11 Bandon (1) | 82:17 116:6 | 8:7,11 45:9 52:3 | 138:18 |
| outside (6) | Pardon (1) | 117:13 118:9 | 61:10 62:2 | personal (8) |
| 131:9,12 167:11 | 123:17 | 119:9 121:9 | 104:19 114:3 | 33:13,16 36:19 |
| 167:14 168:20 | Park (1) | 126:1 127:6 | 115:7,11,14,15 | 110:10 111:7 |
| 168:25 | 3:4 | pay (2) | 130:18 131:10 | 120:19 122:5 |
| | | | | |

| | • | • | | • |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 130:14 | photographs (4) | 163:3,7 164:23 | 106:5,7,9,17 | possible (6) |
| personally (4) | 42:3 121:21 | 165:8 166:19 | 107:16 117:22 | 12:21 13:16,21 |
| 112:16 125:8 | 157:14 173:13 | 167:7,25 | plural (1) | 104:19 135:15 |
| 144:23 176:9 | phrase (2) | planes (1) | 91:2 | 150:4 |
| persons (2) | 111:6 142:10 | 143:22 | point (22) | possibly (4) |
| 55:20 107:7 | physical (1) | plausibly (1) | 7:13 19:6 60:24 | 31:17 67:19 |
| persuade (1) | 21:4 | 124:6 | 65:25 67:21 | 72:17 113:10 |
| 78:17 | physiology (1) | played (1) | 71:21 79:19 | postponed (1) |
| pertinent (1) | 22:6 | 131:3 | 81:8,10 98:25 | 80:1 |
| 116:17 | pick (1) | Plaza (1) | 100:20 101:24 | potential (1) |
| Ph.D (1) | 99:22 | 3:4 | 102:1 104:3 | 62:8 |
| 110:20 | picking (1) | plead (1) | 136:12 143:3 | Potentially (2) |
| Philip (2) | 142:12 | 154:9 | 147:4 148:5 | 67:12,15 |
| 35:2,4 | picture (4) | pleaded (1) | 150:5 154:8 | power (1) |
| philosophical | 33:18 173:17,25 | 153:19 | 159:16,23 | 39:16 |
| 9:6 | 174:1 | pleading (9) | police (3) | practically (1) |
| Phipps (1) | pictured (1) | 48:17 54:14 | 154:20 155:13 | 118:4 |
| 178:15 | 133:13 | 93:4 94:3 | 158:3 | practice (2) |
| phone (76) | pied-à-terre (1) | 97:13 123:13 | Ponzi (1) | 15:10 110:14 |
| 2:12 3:5,9 27:2 | 8:20 | 146:7,8 147:3 | 120:10 | practices (1) |
| 27:4 31:22 | Pildes (2) | pleadings (8) | pool (2) | 35:12 |
| 45:5,7,25 46:3 | 36:8,9 | 52:4,5,6 76:4 | 131:4,5 | precisely (2) |
| 46:3,9,13,14 | pinpoint (1) | 123:19 124:20 | poor (1) | 92:6 110:2 |
| 46:15,16,23,25 | 55:16 | 126:18 127:5 | 130:11 | precision (1) |
| 47:1,3,5,12 | place (9) | please (33) | portion (10) | 14:20 |
| 48:1,18,19 | 7:5 79:11 102:7 | 5:14 6:22 9:4 | 9:15,24 10:13 | prefer (3) |
| 49:13 50:6,12 | 102:19 109:16 | 18:13 24:15,21 | 10:25 11:13 | 146:16 149:22 |
| 50:15 51:3 | 146:2 150:8 | 25:2 34:1,9 | 16:21 87:2 | 160:4 |
| 57:21 59:5,5 | 160:7 178:16 | 45:8 47:6 | 97:10 119:6 | preference (1) |
| 60:21 63:2,15 | placed (6) | 56:15 69:1 | 173:2 | 146:23 |
| 67:7 70:1,5,6 | 69:24 70:2,3,5,6 | 70:20 72:14 | portions (2) | prepared (5) |
| 70:23,25 71:1 | 98:12 | 90:6 95:18 | 17:25 19:13 | 53:4 114:2 |
| 71:3 72:5 73:3 | places (3) | 97:5 105:5 | posing (1) | 123:24 145:1 |
| 73:10,10,13,14 | 7:1 98:12 123:5 | 108:5 118:19 | 14:15 | 154:8 |
| 74:18,23 75:17 | plain (1) | 118:22,23 | position (10) | preposterous (|
| 75:20 77:17,23 | 162:21 | 119:5 130:24 | 10:15 12:2 66:7 | 94:19 |
| 79:8,9,12,21 | Plaintiffs (2) | 131:22 133:7 | 66:10 96:15 | presence (4) |
| 81:22 86:4,5,7 | 1:5 2:2 | 148:20 174:5 | 126:15 144:8 | 139:23 140:23 |
| 99:8,23,24,25 | plan (2) | 174:10 178:3,6 | 144:10 158:15 | 168:20,25 |
| 100:6 102:19 | 117:22 131:21 | 178:11 | 158:15 | present (5) |
| 102:20 104:18 | plane (24) | pled (2) | positive (3) | 3:16 5:19 |
| 109:5 129:20 | 141:18,25 142:4 | 150:24 153:17 | 51:18 65:25 | 114:24 115:6 |
| 129:24 142:20 | 145:1 159:10 | PLLC (1) | 66:1 | 137:22 |
| photographed | 159:19,24,25 | 3:8 | posse (1) | presented (1) |
| 133:3 | 160:6,10,10,16 | plot (12) | 139:11 | 137:22 |
| photographic | 160:23 162:13 | 48:11 77:24 | possibility (1) | preserving (1) |
| 133:1 | 162:14,15,20 | 79:3,4,6 80:15 | 33:2 | 51:15 |

| president (2) | 150:8 | procuring (1) | properly (1) | 103:8 119:20 |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| 39:12 137:14 | principles (1) | 150:24 | 21:6 | 120:8,14 |
| press (13) | 12:15 | produce (3) | property (2) | 145:23 146:15 |
| 61:19 116:19,20 | print (1) | 12:7 67:23 | 8:23,24 | 147:5,13,14,21 |
| 116:21 117:17 | 173:18 | 73:20 | propounded (1) | 149:10,13 |
| 146:20,20 | prior (2) | produced (5) | 55:19 | 150:11 168:19 |
| 149:16,17,18 | 8:7 154:1 | 51:5 93:16 | prosecution (1) | 169:22 172:15 |
| 150:2,3,4 | private (4) | 164:5,20 | 150:6 | 173:10 176:16 |
| pressed (3) | 165:23 171:11 | 174:16 | prosecutor (4) | publically (1) |
| 127:25 128:1 | 173:8,11 | product (5) | 41:9 106:14 | 78:23 |
| 129:4 | privilege (9) | 66:6 152:2 | 115:23 146:19 | publicity (1) |
| pressure (11) | 33:21 35:7 | 153:7 155:19 | prosecutor's (1) | 118:3 |
| 21:16 22:9,12 | 37:19 66:6 | 156:5 | 41:16 | publicly (4) |
| 22:15,20 23:8 | 124:6 156:3,6 | professional (6) | prosecutors (3) | 106:12 159:2,4 |
| 23:11,17 54:17 | 156:7 174:17 | 20:6 150:9,13 | 65:1,1 118:1 | 169:4 |
| 60:19 76:23 | privileged (4) | 150:18 152:15 | prostitution (1) | published (1) |
| pressured (19) | 33:20 36:7 | 177:7 | 150:25 | 12:4 |
| 43:7,13,20 52:6 | 148:3 153:7 | professor (28) | protect (1) | publishing (1) |
| 52:17 53:23 | privileges (1) | 5:18 6:1,3,11,15 | 96:16 | 9:9 |
| 54:12 58:23,24 | 152:13 | 17:5,8,9 31:16 | protected (1) | Puerto (1) |
| 70:13 76:4 | pro (1) | 31:22,23 36:9 | 84:10 | 40:19 |
| 87:13 88:8 | 26:14 | 37:6 42:22 | protective (1) | punished (1) |
| 92:14 103:19 | probably (22) | 81:15 116:6 | 84:7 | 26:15 |
| 112:25 113:15 | 8:12 26:5 31:4 | 117:13 118:9 | prove (4) | punishment (5) |
| 122:25 127:21 | 47:14 48:7,21 | 119:9,19,21 | 41:6,12 123:4 | 14:4,18,23 15:1 |
| pressuring (1) | 49:4,5 62:24 | 120:3 121:9 | 156:17 | 15:3 |
| 64:24 | 65:23,23,24,24 | 122:3 124:23 | proved (1) | purposefully (1) |
| presumably (1) | 100:18,20 | 126:1,7 148:2 | 80:12 | 14:3 |
| 25:12 | 109:8 128:18 | proffer (2) | provide (5) | purposes (5) |
| presume (1) | 131:13 132:3 | 64:22 131:23 | 47:9 52:21,24 | 35:6 56:3 73:17 |
| 11:7 | 136:22 139:9 | programs (1) | 61:23 117:1 | 83:16 84:23 |
| presumption (1) | 139:10 | 78:13 | provided (5) | pursue (1) |
| 11:3 | problem (2) | prominent (5) | 53:3 59:18 | 65:15 |
| pretty (2) | 96:16,21 | 36:14 38:1 | 91:12 128:23 | put (15) |
| 23:6 105:1 | problems (2) | 40:18 41:8 | 142:20 | 7:25 60:19 94:2 |
| prevented (1) | 21:4 23:2 | 171:21 | provider (2) | 118:2 129:5,10 |
| 68:20 | procedure (1) | promise (10) | 21:18 22:8 | 129:13 130:8 |
| previously (8) | 99:22 | 45:12 58:15 | providing (2) | 130:15 146:6,8 |
| 43:20 54:12 | proceed (3) | 59:21 60:15,17 | 155:17 158:12 | 147:2 155:21 |
| 70:12 88:8 | 18:17 19:16 | 60:24 61:2 | provost (2) | 156:21 170:14 |
| 92:22 127:25 | 96:17 | 62:8 74:1,3 | 137:15,15 | putting (3) |
| 149:19 171:6 | proceeding (2) | promises (3) | psychologicall | 78:17 100:4,10 |
| priceless (2) | 42:20 146:14 | 64:18 65:2,4 | 68:8 | |
| 10:4 13:9 | proceedings (2) | proof (1) | psychology (1) | $\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\mathbf{Q}}$ |
| Prince (2) | 5:2 175:18 | 42:3 | 137:17 | question (97) |
| 117:24 118:2 | process (1) | proper (1) | public (20) | 9:10 13:4,13 |
| principle (1) | 17:10 | 16:6 | 11:4 15:14 | 14:13,15,21,22 |
| | | | • | |

| | | | | • |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 18:9 30:9 | 155:23 165:14 | 179:21 | 17:16 45:16 | recollections (1) |
| 33:23 35:8 | quite (5) | reading (4) | 48:24 49:21 | 146:3 |
| 40:14,16 43:2 | 46:2 64:16,17 | 12:3,4,12 96:1 | 55:18 58:14,15 | recommend (1) |
| 43:23,25 45:3 | 87:11 92:19 | ready (2) | 71:25 72:5,17 | 114:20 |
| 46:8 53:6 64:7 | quitting (1) | 48:12 161:15 | 74:22 102:16 | reconvene (1) |
| 65:5,7,20 | 161:16 | real (3) | 103:3,3 105:5 | 175:6 |
| 68:25 74:5 | quotation (1) | 106:8 120:13 | 145:16 155:4 | record (24) |
| 77:15 82:4 | 149:4 | 138:4 | receive (2) | 5:15 23:6 34:11 |
| 91:5 92:24 | quote (1) | realistic (1) | 48:18 169:19 | 49:25 50:3 |
| 93:2,8 95:13 | 43:7 | 146:9 | received (8) | 68:14 85:5,13 |
| 95:15,16,23 | quoted (1) | realized (2) | 17:10 51:12 | 86:7,8 94:11 |
| 96:2,3,9,12 | 148:10 | 62:23 148:5 | 60:1,3 73:9 | 94:11 99:1,4 |
| 97:5,18,21 | quoting (1) | really (5) | 169:5,18,23 | 134:22 145:7 |
| 98:5 104:11,21 | 12:6 | 49:14 70:15 | receiving (3) | 145:10 155:21 |
| 105:8 107:10 | | 73:1 98:4 | 60:20 94:17 | 174:11,14,20 |
| 107:19,21 | <u> </u> | 170:18 | 128:16 | 175:3,16 |
| 108:12 112:7 | R-U-S-K-I-N (| Realtime (1) | recess (5) | 177:12 |
| 115:5 118:22 | 22:5 | 1:21 | 50:2 60:5,7 99:3 | recorded (1) |
| 119:3,4,7,15 | raise (2) | reason (10) | 145:9 | 85:4 |
| 121:7 122:10 | 95:19 103:20 | 46:5,7 50:8 | recited (1) | recording (1) |
| 122:13,17 | raises (2) | 141:17,20,23 | 92:9 | 84:24 |
| 126:13,14 | 159:16,23 | 142:1 163:25 | reckless (1) | records (12) |
| 127:1,9 135:21 | raising (1) | 167:6 179:6 | 126:3 | 29:25 30:1,1 |
| 144:16 148:25 | 101:19 | reasonable (3) | recklessness (7) | 65:23 73:17,20 |
| 151:24 152:4,5 | Rana (2) | 18:3 91:19 | 124:25 125:3,6 | 73:22 79:10 |
| 152:8,11 | 37:23,24 | 178:9 | 125:10,12,19 | 141:19 142:3 |
| 153:20 154:1,2 | ranch (8) | reasons (4) | 127:7 | 142:21 143:21 |
| 154:6 157:3 | 41:14,19,19,23 | 12:25 69:12 | recognize (5) | recur (1) |
| 158:6,21,23,24 | 42:4,9,13 | 120:23,25 | 68:13 86:3 | 23:3 |
| 159:21 161:2 | 173:23 | Rebecca (37) | 88:17 125:8,17 | recurred (2) |
| 162:8,10,11 | range (2) | 44:15 47:13 | recognized (3) | 24:2,3 |
| 163:2,3,4,6 | 140:5,10 | 48:1,19 49:18 | 10:4 13:8 51:14 | recurrence (5) |
| 166:11,13 | rare (2) | 50:7 52:9 | recollection (32) | 21:14,15,19,24 |
| 167:19 169:14 | 163:19,19 | 55:12 57:20 | 51:4,4,13 55:25 | 24:13 |
| 171:13 172:23 | reaching (1) | 58:9,14 70:7 | 56:4 58:1 | recurring (1) |
| questions (28) | 71:15 | 70:15 74:15 | 65:22 84:18,21 | 23:11 |
| 18:3,8,12,14 | reaction (2) | 76:3,6,10 79:2 | 90:14 99:9,13 | reduced (1) |
| 21:6 22:12 | 11:16 116:22 | 80:11 85:10 | 100:2 103:5 | 118:1 |
| 34:22,23 63:25 | read (21) | 87:5,7,9,22 | 105:22 108:17 | reference (2) |
| 64:20 90:7 | 4:9 11:19 12:7 | 92:1,4,21 | 109:3 110:7 | 57:19 165:25 |
| 96:20,25 | 12:15 57:16 | 99:11 102:3,14 | 133:20 135:10 | referenced (1) |
| 104:16,24 | 86:25 87:2 | 103:2,11 104:6 | 135:12 138:23 | 48:18 |
| 105:21,25 | 95:24 97:4,10 | 108:18 112:12 | 141:3,21 | references (1) |
| 120:16 121:5 | 119:3,4,6 | 112:15,25 | 142:23 144:25 | 89:22 |
| 121:16,17 | 124:10 155:12 | Rebecca's (3) | 149:2 159:25 | referred (1) |
| 122:4,7 126:24 | 155:16 158:3 | 44:25 111:10,13 | 169:17,20,21 | 171:6 |
| 132:1 144:19 | 172:4 178:6,9 | recall (17) | 170:1 | referring (1) |

| [| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 148:12 | 69:20 | remembered (1) | 26:1 35:13 36:6 | 151:24 171:15 |
| reflect (2) | related (6) | 103:16 | 152:1,16 155:7 | research (6) |
| 164:5 174:11 | 22:21 23:9 | remembering | 155:18 158:11 | 25:19,21 29:20 |
| reflected (1) | 48:10,10 | 19:25 135:14 | representative | 35:11 40:2 |
| 164:12 | 112:12,24 | remind (1) | 61:19 | 166:15 |
| refresh (2) | relating (3) | 120:7 | represented (8) | residence (6) |
| 25:2 148:22 | 33:4,7 40:10 | rendition (1) | 24:22 25:4,9,11 | 7:7 8:8,16,19 |
| refreshing (1) | relation (2) | 149:4 | 25:14 153:21 | 171:11 173:9 |
| 56:4 | 70:8 151:18 | rented (1) | 154:5,7 | residential (1) |
| refuse (1) | relationship (3) | 141:3 | representing (| 130:22 |
| 34:7 | 32:8 34:14 | repeat (1) | 5:12 27:7,10,13 | resort (1) |
| regard (36) | 152:16 | 37:2 | 27:16,18,20,21 | 149:12 |
| 28:6,9,12,15,18 | relative (2) | repeated (2) | 28:5,8,11,14 | respond (16) |
| 28:21 29:3,6,9 | 177:15,16 | 89:21 163:11 | 28:17,20 29:2 | 18:13 21:6 |
| 29:13,19,22 | | repeatedly (9) | 28:17,20 29:2 29:5,8,12,18 | 34:22 51:2 |
| | relevancy (3) | | , , , , | |
| 30:5,8,13,16 | 131:18,24 | 18:11 35:12 | 29:22 30:4,7 | 121:16 126:9 |
| 30:19,22 32:11 | 144:19 | 38:16 40:22 | 30:13,15,18,21 | 126:20 146:9 |
| 32:20 33:6,18 | relevant (19) | 93:5 97:14 | 32:22 33:6 | 146:11,14,16 |
| 33:19 35:6 | 73:20 115:10 | 120:17 159:2 | 34:16 35:2 | 146:24,25 |
| 37:18 38:8,8,9 | 135:1,2,13,16 | 170:6 | 151:14 | 147:23 150:5 |
| 40:9,14 49:16 | 135:22,25 | repeating (2) | represents (1) | 150:10 |
| 52:10 66:17 | 141:10 142:5,6 | 32:17 123:8 | 151:15 | responded (6) |
| 68:21 93:11 | 142:10,14,17 | repetitions (1) | Reprographic | 51:2 98:20 |
| 156:4 | 143:8 156:16 | 103:5 | 5:13 | 117:16 118:6 |
| regarded (3) | 159:7 165:25 | repetitious (3) | Republic (1) | 122:4,6 |
| 17:6 33:16 | 166:22 | 67:13 128:11 | 139:8 | responding (1) |
| 60:22 | reliable (1) | 129:2 | reputation (16) | 73:17 |
| regarding (5) | 71:18 | Rephrase (1) | 9:7,11 10:4,7,11 | response (8) |
| 13:9 33:1 36:2 | relied (5) | 167:21 | 11:6 12:16,23 | 13:3 18:11 |
| 112:16 156:22 | 20:5 110:9,16 | report (5) | 13:9,10,15 | 21:25 74:9 |
| regards (1) | 111:7,12 | 15:24 16:5 | 14:3,16 15:1,2 | 97:24 121:14 |
| 65:10 | relieved (1) | 150:22 155:14 | 22:2 | 142:15 147:4 |
| register (1) | 24:1 | 177:8 | request (6) | responses (6) |
| 151:5 | reluctant (3) | Reported (1) | 63:4,20 72:12 | 56:24 57:1,3,4,8 |
| Registered (1) | 52:25 75:9,14 | 1:20 | 72:19,22,24 | 116:20 |
| 177:6 | rely (2) | reporter (8) | requested (6) | Responsibility |
| regretted (1) | 151:24 152:14 | 4:8 34:11 97:11 | 87:2 97:10 | 150:13,18 |
| 170:13 | remain (1) | 119:7 151:10 | 98:24 119:6 | responsible (1) |
| regular (3) | 75:17 | 159:20 177:1,7 | 145:4 177:11 | 127:6 |
| 139:1,24 140:2 | remember (19) | Reporting (1) | requests (2) | responsive (2) |
| REIN (1) | 20:1,3,4 43:23 | 178:15 | 73:18 121:14 | 18:2 174:9 |
| 2:18 | 66:23,25 73:15 | reports (1) | required (2) | rest (1) |
| reiterate (2) | 79:20 102:21 | 158:3 | 62:10 152:14 | 19:4 |
| 13:14 103:15 | 122:10 125:16 | represent (4) | requires (8) | result (7) |
| reiterated (1) | 134:7,9 138:24 | 25:24 26:13,21 | 12:16 13:11 | 21:13 23:9 |
| 31:23 | 139:2 146:4 | 35:24 | 30:23 98:9 | 69:25 151:25 |
| relate (1) | 149:6,8 169:3 | representatio | 107:19 150:14 | 152:15 155:6 |
| | | | | |

| 158:10 | 119:11 126:10 | 173:18 | 9:7,11 | 10:1,12,16,24 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| return (1) | 126:19 134:2 | role (2) | Safra (4) | 11:1,12,14,24 |
| 178:12 | 139:25 150:12 | 137:7 138:8 | 2:12 6:10,10 | 12:10 13:2,5,6 |
| returned (3) | 153:9 154:11 | roles (1) | 28:14 | 14:1,12,14 |
| 23:24 24:20 | 163:5 164:14 | 138:19 | sanctioned (1) | 15:13 16:20,22 |
| 178:7 | 173:14 174:19 | Ronald (1) | 116:16 | 17:24 18:9,18 |
| reveal (6) | rights (3) | 17:9 | sanctions (2) | 18:19 19:12,17 |
| 45:18 59:11,13 | 26:7 48:17 | room (12) | 15:12 83:8 | 19:19 20:13,24 |
| 83:20 93:23 | 100:24 | 61:19 96:17 | Santa (1) | 27:6 28:1,4 |
| 94:22 | rise (2) | 132:13,14,16 | 41:17 | 31:4,7,11 32:3 |
| revealed (5) | 21:20 88:10 | 132:17,24 | Sarah (8) | 33:11 35:1,17 |
| 58:17 62:24 | Roberts (71) | 132:17,24 | 29:12,14 136:5 | 37:22 43:11 |
| 77:5 83:9 | 3:11 36:2 42:5 | 134:10,11 | 136:16,18 | 44:3,9,13 |
| 106:13 | 42:11 43:5,13 | rooms (2) | 137:7 138:18 | 46:12 47:11 |
| reveals (1) | 43:15,18,19 | 133:19 172:4 | 172:13 | 48:15 49:1,9 |
| 82:19 | 47:24 52:2,10 | Rosen (2) | sarcastic (1) | |
| | 52:14 53:22 | 36:13,14 | 18:7 | 49:11,24 50:5 |
| review (4) | | <i>'</i> | | 50:19 51:10 |
| 63:9,18 126:8 | 54:3,4,11,11 | Rosovsky (1) | sat (1) | 52:8,18 53:13 |
| 177:10 | 54:18 58:24 | 137:15 DOSS (1) | 127:14 | 54:1,15,22 |
| reviewing (1) | 61:9 73:21,24 | ROSS (1) | satellite (2) | 56:2,10,16,17 |
| 149:1 | 75:22,24 76:2 | 2:14 | 160:12 162:19 | 57:11 58:3,11 |
| Richard (3) | 76:15,17,22 | Rothstein (1) | satisfactory (1) | 59:1,24 60:12 |
| 2:19 6:2 27:10 | 78:19 88:18,21 | 120:9 | 21:17 | 61:3,17 62:12 |
| Richardson (4) | 89:5,13 90:11 | Rotunda (1) | satisfied (2) | 63:1,11,15,21 |
| 2:20 6:14,14 | 90:12 91:1,7 | 17:10 | 79:1 104:15 | 64:6 65:8 66:2 |
| 29:2 | 92:6,9 93:11 | rough (2) | satisfies (1) | 66:7,12,15,19 |
| riches (1) | 94:5,17 99:16 | 134:25 170:14 | 122:16 | 66:22 67:4,9 |
| 9:19 | 100:23 102:7 | row (1) | save (1) | 68:1,5,11 69:7 |
| Rick (2) | 104:7 105:6,12 | 146:22 | 108:12 | 69:15 71:9,12 |
| 36:8,9 | 105:17 111:23 | RPR (4) | saw (11) | 72:2 73:8 74:8 |
| Rico (1) | 112:2,15,25 | 1:20 176:15 | 94:13 144:2 | 74:13 75:3,10 |
| 40:19 | 113:5,11,18 | 177:22 178:15 | 160:9,10 | 82:1,13 84:5 |
| right (46) | 114:22 119:18 | RSimpson@w | 162:14,20,25 | 84:15 85:2,20 |
| 9:4 15:18,23 | 121:18 124:9 | 2:20 | 173:16,16,24 | 86:13 87:8 |
| 22:19 26:25 | 127:11 128:22 | rug (1) | 174:1 | 88:2,24 89:12 |
| 46:20 47:2,4 | 129:3 133:21 | 134:5 | saying (9) | 90:8,9 91:24 |
| 55:1,9 58:25 | 156:18,23 | Ruskin (1) | 17:19 59:7 | 92:19,20 95:9 |
| 59:25 60:4 | 157:16 159:11 | 22:5 | 103:7,9 145:17 | 95:12 96:1,8 |
| 62:21 64:20 | 167:3,9 | Russian (2) | 146:4 158:17 | 96:19 97:1,4 |
| 71:2 77:13 | Roberts' (8) | 170:10,10 | 169:17,24 | 97:20 98:6,14 |
| 85:1,11 87:20 | 53:18 80:2 81:7 | | says (4) | 98:24 99:6 |
| 95:19 105:13 | 82:6 112:20 | $\frac{S}{2}$ | 57:16 92:21 | 104:22 105:7 |
| 109:14 110:11 | 117:18 156:13 | S-O-L-O-M-O | 93:22 109:11 | 106:19 107:9 |
| 110:12,14 | 157:11 | 22:16 | Scarola (223) | 108:1,9 110:24 |
| 111:9,11,14 | Roberts-Gray | Sabbath (1) | 2:3,5 4:7 5:16 | 117:3,10 118:7 |
| 112:11,13,13 | 5:24 | 19:4 | 5:16 6:21 9:10 | 118:17,21 |
| 114:25 118:11 | Rodin's (1) | sacrosanct (2) | 9:14,16,23 | 121:6 122:9 |
| | l | - | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 124:22 126:12 | 122:3 137:19 | 98:25 104:13 | 160:4,8,8 | 120:10 |
| 124.22 120.12 | 139:3,6 163:18 | 105:3,14 | seated (1) | semester (2) |
| 120.22,25 | 166:21 | 107:24 108:5 | 160:1 | 8:1 125:2 |
| 130:17 131:20 | Scott (206) | 110:15 116:10 | seats (2) | Senator (1) |
| 130.17 131.20 | 1:17 2:9,11 5:25 | 117:15 118:13 | 160:3 162:23 | 171:20 |
| 131.25 132.5 | 5:25 9:8 10:14 | 117.13 118.13 | second (12) | senior (2) |
| 134.19 135.0 | 11:19 12:2,19 | | 32:17 70:23 | 39:22 138:16 |
| | , | 119:3 121:12 | | Sensational (1) |
| 136:2,14 138:7 | 13:12 14:5 | 124:19 126:5 | 72:23 74:14,16 | |
| 139:20,21 | 15:4 18:1,6,15 | 126:15,23 | 79:8,9 84:16 | 10:18 |
| 140:24 141:12 | 19:15,16 20:12 | 127:2 128:10 | 86:17 109:7,8 | sense (3) |
| 143:4 144:1,7 | 20:16 24:24 | 129:1 131:18 | 109:24 | 71:19,20 171:8 |
| 144:9,22 145:4 | 25:4 27:1,7,23 | 131:23 135:1,3 | secret (4) | sent (3) |
| 145:12 147:15 | 28:2 31:4,9 | 135:11,21 | 49:7 76:9 77:20 | 50:24,25 78:10 |
| 147:18 148:9 | 33:9 34:8,10 | 138:4 139:17 | 101:6 | sentence (1) |
| 148:21 149:5 | 35:9 37:14 | 140:8 141:9 | secretary (1) | 118:1 |
| 151:12,16,20 | 42:25 44:2,12 | 143:2 144:4,8 | 136:7 | sentences (1) |
| 152:3,21 153:3 | 46:10 47:7 | 144:15 145:6 | secretly (1) | 95:25 |
| 154:3,6,18 | 48:12,22 49:8 | 145:25 148:17 | 93:16 | separate (1) |
| 155:11 156:1 | 49:10,23 50:17 | 148:20,24 | section (1) | 164:6 |
| 156:10,24 | 51:24 52:12 | 151:7,14,17 | 171:11 | sepia (1) |
| 159:1,22 | 53:10,20 54:7 | 152:24 153:25 | see (20) | 173:18 |
| 160:22 161:17 | 54:20 55:24 | 154:14 155:15 | 12:5 23:21 | sequence (2) |
| 162:3,7,9,12 | 56:8,14 57:6 | 156:8,15 158:5 | 26:14 41:22 | 55:25 106:15 |
| 164:11,18 | 57:24 58:10,13 | 158:8,14,21,23 | 70:21 71:18 | serial (2) |
| 165:20 166:2,5 | 59:8 60:8,10 | 160:21 161:8 | 88:15 89:21 | 10:9 153:8 |
| 166:10,24 | 61:1,13 62:11 | 161:12 162:1,5 | 109:15 126:20 | series (2) |
| 167:22 169:13 | 63:4,13,17 | 162:11 164:10 | 131:8,13,17 | 45:7 105:24 |
| 169:16 172:7 | 64:2,13 65:20 | 164:15 165:10 | 141:19 144:23 | serious (5) |
| 174:10,13,19 | 65:24,25 66:1 | 165:12,16,18 | 148:17,20,25 | 12:16,17 13:10 |
| 175:1,4,11,13 | 66:5,10,14,18 | 165:24 166:7 | 162:13 170:18 | 13:11 137:21 |
| 175:15 | 66:21,24 67:1 | 166:12 167:18 | seek (10) | serve (1) |
| scenes (1) | 67:2,8,13 68:4 | 167:21 169:8 | 15:11,15 16:10 | 160:7 |
| 98:12 | 68:7 69:1,11 | 169:15 171:12 | 16:15 36:12 | served (5) |
| schedule (1) | 71:6,11,24 | 174:7,11,25 | 65:9 89:5,14 | 38:7,16 113:8 |
| 142:22 | 72:21 74:7,10 | 175:2,8,12,14 | 90:13 91:7 | 160:8 174:3 |
| scheduled (1) | 74:24 75:6 | sculptor (1) | seeking (2) | serves (1) |
| 78:12 | 81:19 82:12,22 | 131:11 | 14:9 37:2 | 132:16 |
| scheme (1) | 83:11,16,23 | sculpture (3) | seen (17) | service (3) |
| 120:10 | 84:12,25 85:14 | 131:11,12,14 | 17:19 51:11 | 30:2,3 56:12 |
| Schiller (2) | 86:11,25 87:3 | Seals (1) | 89:20 113:20 | serving (1) |
| 3:12 5:23 | 87:25 88:23 | 161:23 | 140:17,18,18 | 140:14 |
| scholars (1) | 89:2 90:6 | search (3) | 140:17,10,10 | set (2) |
| 140:21 | 91:11 92:15 | 133:5 154:20 | 143:7,11,21 | 12:24 109:20 |
| school (14) | 93:7 95:5,11 | 155:2 | 159:5 160:18 | setting (1) |
| 7:12 17:1,8 | 95:21,23 96:4 | SEARCY (1) | 160:19 162:17 | 76:19 |
| 33:14 36:10 | 96:11,22 97:3 | 2:3 | 172:5 | settle (2) |
| 37:7,25 41:16 | 97:8,16 98:2,8 | seat (3) | sell (1) | 77:3 151:1 |
| 57.7,25 41.10 | 77.0,10 70.2,0 | scar (3) | | //.5 151.1 |

| | | | | _ |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| settlement (6) | 11:21 56:8 77:1 | simpler (1) | 173:24 | 77:2 122:2,4 |
| 82:20 83:5,10 | 78:14,14 81:21 | 147:17 | sitting (3) | 136:7 |
| 83:12,20 94:24 | 82:3 133:5 | simplistic (1) | 61:19 162:18,23 | somebody's (4) |
| setup (2) | 148:16 159:5 | 34:23 | six (4) | 27:1 172:17 |
| 109:22 110:4 | 159:10,13 | simply (7) | 47:14,14 128:13 | 173:1,4 |
| SEVENTEEN | 165:2 167:2,3 | 34:15 55:7 | 128:14 | son (2) |
| 1:1 | 167:11 169:8 | 87:14 88:11 | Skadden (1) | 38:15 166:16 |
| sex (10) | 173:5,9 | 96:19 121:4 | 39:23 | soon (3) |
| 41:9,10 94:17 | shown (2) | 157:19 | skill (1) | 35:22 38:23 |
| 114:13 115:23 | 145:2 157:13 | Simpson (17) | 110:13 | 67:6 |
| 115:24 128:16 | shows (5) | 2:19 6:2,2 27:10 | sleazy (1) | sorry (14) |
| 148:13 150:23 | 165:7,21 167:14 | 51:8 65:21,24 | 116:7 | 34:5 37:18 |
| 151:2 | 167:24,25 | 66:17 84:2 | sleep (3) | 70:24 73:11 |
| sexual (27) | shut (1) | 95:17 107:3,5 | 21:8 100:5,10 | 75:11 87:1 |
| 36:25 42:8 54:5 | 65:17 | 143:19 158:7 | sleeping (2) | 90:1 99:19 |
| 73:25 76:14 | side (16) | 158:20 161:13 | 134:17,20 | 101:9 151:10 |
| 77:2 78:25 | 128:5,6 131:4,5 | 174:14 | slept (2) | 154:10 158:25 |
| 89:9 91:21 | 145:18,19,22 | Simpson's (1) | 134:18,23 | 159:20 173:7 |
| 92:13 93:21 | 147:11,20,25 | 25:9 | slipped (1) | sort (1) |
| 94:4,9 113:6 | 148:1,6,6,8 | Sinai (1) | 19:10 | 131:8 |
| 118:16 119:15 | 149:21 171:18 | 23:22 | slipping (1) | sought (9) |
| 119:18 121:18 | sign (3) | single (3) | 137:18 | 25:18,20 36:10 |
| 124:8 127:11 | 4:9 178:9,11 | 117:21 167:23 | slips (1) | 39:8,15,25 |
| 127:12,17,19 | signature (6) | 168:13 | 19:24 | 42:19 65:6 |
| 128:14 140:22 | 56:19,21,22 | Single-family | Sloman (4) | 123:7 |
| 153:17 157:15 | 178:4,11,17 | 130:22 | 113:25 114:2,8 | sounded (3) |
| sexually (2) | signed (4) | sir (27) | 114:21 | 109:25 110:22 |
| 88:19,22 | 57:10,12 64:9 | 6:23 14:15 | Slovakia (1) | 110:22 |
| shake (1) | 176:12 | 24:15 30:11 | 139:9 | source (1) |
| 121:4 | significance (2) | 37:17 44:10 | small (2) | 105:20 |
| shaking (1) | 51:14 59:4 | 48:22 53:8 | 7:2 23:6 | sources (7) |
| 121:2 | significant (15) | 55:8 68:25 | smccawley@b | 62:20 153:4,6 |
| Shame (1) | 59:10,14 67:11 | 85:23 88:16 | 3:14 | 153:12,16 |
| 130:16 | 67:15,16 68:3 | 102:12 105:8 | smoke (2) | 155:9,10 |
| Sheet (3) | 68:8,14 85:3 | 107:22 118:18 | 11:18,18 | South (3) |
| 4:9 178:7 179:1 | 86:4 104:24 | 132:21 142:8 | Sobeit (1) | 2:10 36:15 |
| SHIPLEY (1) | 105:1,11,16,18 | 152:7 161:18 | 97:3 | 165:1 |
| 2:4 | Sigrid (4) | 161:19 164:8 | sold (2) | Southeast (2) |
| shocked (1) | 3:13 5:22 35:21 | 165:3 168:18 | 7:17,21 | 1:17 5:9 |
| 116:22 | 82:10 | 168:23 169:2 | solicited (1) | southern (1) |
| short (1) | Silverglate (1) | 172:23 | 17:11 | 111:5 |
| 104:18 | 30:4 | Sires (2) | solicitor (1) | space (1) |
| shortly (1) | simple (8) | 25:23 35:20 | 33:1 | 160:14 |
| 55:9 | 124:25 125:3,9 | sit (4) | Solomon (2) | speak (8) |
| shoulder (1) | 125:11,18 | 49:2 127:10 | 22:16,18 | 18:16 47:8 67:1 |
| 170:15 | 129:20,24 | 150:21 160:3 | somebody (6) | 80:18 99:22 |
| show (19) | 133:4 | site (1) | 13:17 38:10 | 114:20 146:19 |
| | - | - | - | - |

| 146:20 | 75:8,12 | 13:8 15:15 | stopped (1) | suborning (5) |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| speaking (3) | spread (1) | 89:22 91:2,14 | 30:25 | 42:23 43:4,10 |
| 17:14 121:15 | 41:4 | 91:14,16 | stories (1) | 107:14 128:8 |
| 163:22 | spring (1) | 112:23 113:4 | 117:20 | subsequent (2) |
| speakings (1) | 7:4 | 116:15 117:6 | story (8) | 72:10 109:4 |
| 163:21 | Square (1) | 148:4 150:11 | 45:7,10 48:9,10 | subsequently (|
| special (2) | 136:10 | 150:15 157:1,6 | 78:19 88:10 | 82:8,16 |
| 14:24 15:6 | stairway (1) | 157:11 | 120:15 156:19 | substance (10) |
| specialist (1) | 171:18 | States (3) | straight (1) | 49:15,17 86:21 |
| 170:9 | stand (5) | 17:7 114:1 | 125:25 | 87:5 101:12,13 |
| specializes (1) | 33:8,10 94:10 | 117:7 | strange (1) | 103:17 108:20 |
| 41:10 | 94:16 154:25 | stating (1) | 71:13 | 108:23 109:1 |
| specific (5) | standing (5) | 127:22 | strategy (2) | substantial (2) |
| 48:7 49:6 58:1 | 94:25 95:1,4,8 | stationery (1) | 16:14 38:3 | 101:7,16 |
| 103:5 121:5 | 128:15 | 119:22 | Street (4) | substantive (3) |
| specifically (3) | start (6) | status (1) | 1:17 2:14,18 5:9 | 100:6,13 103:10 |
| 72:7 133:8 | 25:3 101:1,3 | 25:6 | strike (12) | suddenly (1) |
| 141:21 | 161:10,10 | statute (1) | 9:14,23 10:12 | 20:20 |
| specifics (1) | 175:7 | 121:23 | 10:24 11:12 | sue (1) |
| 128:2 | started (2) | stay (5) | 13:5 14:12 | 112:3 |
| specified (1) | 147:12 173:6 | 8:23 55:9 75:24 | 16:20 17:24 | suggest (2) |
| 27:25 | starts (1) | 171:21 172:17 | 19:12 96:4 | 52:9 54:3 |
| speculate (1) | 147:11 | stayed (3) | 147:15 | suggested (2) |
| 48:22 | state (9) | 8:1 52:2 171:23 | strong (1) | 52:13 75:14 |
| speculating (1) | 6:22 79:14 | Ste (1) | 146:23 | suggestion (2) |
| 48:20 | 84:23 85:22 | 3:12 | struck (1) | 140:22 156:1 |
| speculation (2) | 141:13 150:14 | stenographic (1) | 116:15 | Suite (4) |
| 12:20 14:6 | 176:4,16 177:3 | 177:12 | student (3) | 2:9 3:4 5:9 |
| speech (5) | stated (11) | stenographica | 35:10 139:2,5 | 178:16 |
| 18:10 95:10,13 | 77:7 78:23 | 1:20 177:8 | students (2) | sum (1) |
| 96:10 161:12 | 121:19,20,22 | Stephen (2) | 69:4 150:2 | 76:25 |
| speeches (2) | 121:24 149:19 | 17:5 137:16 | stuff (1) | summer (5) |
| 18:12 161:5 | 159:2,4 169:4 | steps (1) | 92:11 | 7:5 115:12,12 |
| spend (2) | 179:22 | 147:9 | subject (5) | 159:8,8 |
| 7:3 125:1 | statement (28) | Steven (5) | 22:10 105:24 | Summers (2) |
| spending (1) | 9:6 10:3,18 11:3 | 2:12 6:10 28:14 | 125:7 133:1 | 137:14 140:18 |
| 120:9 | 11:16 12:1,8 | 37:7,8 | 174:16 | sums (1) |
| spent (2) | 18:24 19:1 | steven.safra@ | submit (2) | 150:25 |
| 17:3 41:24 | 91:6,15 98:14 | 2:12 | 121:22 123:8 | superb (15) |
| split (1) | 98:15 112:24 | stone (4) | submitted (1) | 18:22,25 19:21 |
| 125:5 | 113:9,17,21 | 3:13 131:8,12 | 42:6 | 20:9,10 24:21 |
| spoke (10) | 116:12 146:1 | 131:14 | subornation (2) | 44:4 69:8,20 |
| 41:15 60:9,13 | 148:3,15 149:3 | stood (2) | 64:24 128:19 | 72:16 74:21,25 |
| 60:14 70:4,6 | 156:2 163:11 | 100:23 131:12 | suborned (1) | 90:2 141:14 |
| 72:4 75:7 | 163:15 168:24 | stop (3) | 44:7 | 148:22 |
| 80:21,25 | 169:2,22 | 75:17 99:19 | suborners (1) | supported (1) |
| spoken (2) | statements (17) | 147:8 | 106:25 | 157:10 |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| supposed (1) | 1:21 | 174:5 | tense (2) | 88:25 137:25 |
| 172:22 | | teenager (1) | 21:23 22:13 | 140:14 145:24 |
| Supreme (1) | T | 137:5 | tension (1) | 174:22 |
| 147:7 | table (3) | teenagers (1) | 22:13 | think (84) |
| sure (24) | 133:13 145:20 | 140:12 | tension-causin | 10:6 11:5 12:21 |
| 16:7 27:4 51:16 | 170:25 | teeth (1) | 21:23 | 13:13,15,20 |
| 51:17 52:24 | take (30) | 93:22 | tensions (1) | 14:22,22 15:6 |
| 59:9,12 67:23 | 10:14 18:15 | telephone (9) | 21:13 | 15:7,8 18:17 |
| 72:20,22 77:16 | 19:5,8,14 | 6:8 45:22 73:17 | term (1) | 22:22 23:12 |
| 88:15 90:22 | 41:22 47:5 | 73:20,22 79:10 | 91:13 | 24:9 27:23,24 |
| 95:7 96:14 | 48:12,13 49:8 | 80:21 90:16 | term's (1) | 38:8 40:3,5 |
| 109:10,21 | 49:12,23 63:5 | 91:3 | 8:20 | 44:6 45:16 |
| 112:6 120:14 | 63:9,20 65:18 | television (8) | terms (1) | 61:6,21 62:20 |
| 123:23 124:12 | 68:23 69:2,4 | 78:8,13,23 | 142:12 | 62:23 64:19 |
| 124:14 134:21 | 83:19 92:15 | 79:17,19,25 | terrible (1) | 70:21 71:19,25 |
| 166:16 | 95:5,14 96:14 | 80:4 101:18 | 70:8 | 72:1,5 73:4,5 |
| surprise (1) | 97:7 136:9 | tell (38) | test (1) | 73:12 74:11,17 |
| 72:25 | 137:24 143:2 | 9:4 34:2,21 44:6 | 168:18 | 74:20 75:3,25 |
| surprised (1) | 145:6 178:3 | 45:8 47:6 | testified (3) | 77:22,23 79:17 |
| 78:4 | taken (3) | 66:24 69:4,19 | 6:19 98:22 | 80:24 83:18 |
| surrounding (1) | 40:3 146:22 | 70:11 71:21 | 105:19 | 85:1,6,7,15,16 |
| 112:9 | 157:22 | 72:16 74:21 | testifying (1) | 85:17,18 86:18 |
| surveillance (1) | talents (1) | 78:19 82:2,4 | 173:15 | 86:22 89:7,10 |
| 157:22 | 146:25 | 86:23 87:9 | testimony (4) | 92:17 93:22 |
| Susan (2) | talk (16) | 90:4,10 92:8 | 66:9 91:1 164:8 | 98:21 99:16,21 |
| 36:13,14 | 70:9,10,15,22 | 93:25 101:25 | 164:21 | 100:22 101:23 |
| swearing (1) | 71:5,16 73:2,3 | 104:14,15 | testing (1) | 104:2 109:24 |
| 42:10 | 75:9,14,15 | 105:22,25 | 71:17 | 122:18 126:17 |
| Sweder (12) | 91:3 94:16 | 117:20 122:18 | text (1) | 127:18,18 |
| 2:14,15 6:4,4 | 101:11 145:3 | 132:25 133:7 | 70:2 | 128:4 134:12 |
| 25:12 27:13 | 174:25 | 138:11 142:15 | Thank (10) | 137:11 141:22 |
| 65:22 66:4 | talked (2) | 153:19 159:17 | 6:8 12:11,12 | 143:13,13,17 |
| 84:11 95:24 | 99:17 107:1 | 159:23 170:2 | 18:18 71:2 | 145:1 146:24 |
| 134:16,21 | talking (6) | 172:19 | 87:3 127:2 | 147:24 154:9 |
| swimming (2) | 91:9 101:12 | telling (13) | 153:15 174:13 | 156:17 157:6 |
| 131:4,5 | 111:18,19,19 | 53:17 54:24 | 175:15 | 170:10 172:16 |
| swore (3) | 166:21 | 63:19 79:2,12 | Thanks (1) | third (11) |
| 57:14 59:25 | tasks (1) | 79:23 117:17 | 27:5 | 76:17,17,19 |
| 94:18 | 140:12 | 144:16 154:15 | theme (2) | 99:17,25 100:6 |
| sworn (10) | teach (2) | 156:21 157:19 | 89:18 145:21 | 100:13 102:15 |
| 6:18 52:10 54:6 | 8:1 150:1 | 160:17 165:4 | themself (1) | 102:16 109:8 |
| 56:24 58:4 | teaching (3) | ten (13) | 130:7 | 150:15 |
| 114:2,23 115:9 | 34:12 125:2 | 7:6 15:17 20:9 | thing (5) | Thomas (5) |
| 121:22 176:10 | 142:22 | 40:12 47:15,15 | 106:1 111:22 | 2:11 35:18,19 |
| symptoms (1) | team (3) | 107:13 160:2,3 | 148:7 158:18 | 35:22 41:2 |
| 24:1 | 19:3 32:1 38:11 | 164:6 167:23 | 173:16 | thomas.scott |
| Systems (1) | tecum (1) | 168:2 169:11 | things (5) | 2:11 |

| thoroughly (1) | 141:10,14,19 | 24:7 43:6,12,16 | 115:24 | 113:7,8 114:11 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 86:22 | 141:22 142:5,7 | 43:19 44:7,24 | trafficking (2) | 164:2,24 167:9 |
| thought (7) | 142:11,11,14 | 45:7,10 50:22 | 41:11 115:23 | 177:12 179:22 |
| 65:16 85:6 | 142:17,25 | 52:1 53:21 | train (1) | truly (1) |
| 101:17,20 | 143:9,23 145:8 | 54:2,8,14,18 | 119:1 | 178:13 |
| 110:22,22 | 145:11 146:2 | 62:14 65:11,15 | transcript (6) | trustworthy (1) |
| 119:2 | 148:1 153:22 | 70:7 75:21 | 20:4 177:11,12 | 110:1 |
| three (16) | 159:7 160:10 | 76:10,21 79:24 | 178:6,7 179:2 | truth (24) |
| 7:1,19,21 16:3 | 160:19,23 | 79:25 80:11,25 | transportatio | 11:5 34:21,21 |
| 16:23 18:10 | 161:6 162:16 | 81:24 82:16,24 | 137:10,24 | 34:22 53:21,24 |
| 76:16 78:12 | 162:20 164:13 | 83:24 84:16 | trauma (1) | 67:23 79:2,23 |
| 134:23,24 | 165:9 166:2,20 | 86:21 87:23 | 20:19 | 91:23 98:21 |
| 135:9 160:2,9 | 166:22,23 | 92:2,5,6,11,22 | travel (9) | 117:7,9,17 |
| 162:4,17 | 167:8,25 168:7 | 93:2,15,20 | 138:11,25 | 118:6,8,12,14 |
| 171:19 | 168:10,12 | 102:3,10,11 | 139:10 140:15 | 119:8,12 122:7 |
| three-year (1) | 169:9 171:24 | 103:17 108:20 | 141:1,7,15 | 156:22 157:6 |
| 115:11 | 173:21,23 | 109:1 112:15 | 163:20 164:3 | 157:20 |
| thrust (1) | 175:6,17 178:4 | 113:23,25 | traveled (7) | truthful (2) |
| 12:9 | 178:9 | 117:6,9 143:17 | 136:7 138:21,25 | 110:23 150:15 |
| Thursday (1) | timeframe (7) | 144:2,13 145:3 | 142:16 164:5 | truthfully (2) |
| 1:15 | 135:1,2,22,25 | 151:4 153:5 | 168:20,25 | 26:8 150:11 |
| Tile (1) | 164:16 165:25 | 163:10 167:9 | traveling (3) | truthfulness (1) |
| 134:4 | 166:1 | 170:7,16 171:4 | 163:24 167:11 | 57:14 |
| time (100) | Timeout (2) | 172:8,10,24 | 167:14 | try (15) |
| 5:4 7:13 8:8,11 | 162:1,1 | Tom (2) | travels (1) | 13:4 39:16 |
| 16:9 17:3 | times (16) | 5:25 31:8 | 163:18 | 45:18 55:16 |
| 19:24 20:8 | 31:5 47:17 64:3 | tomorrow (2) | Travis (2) | 64:21 65:1 |
| 33:22 37:1 | 67:14 73:24 | 174:21 175:6 | 3:18 5:11 | 68:17 77:1 |
| 41:6,13 45:9 | 97:17 128:2 | top (1) | treasure (1) | 78:8 79:7 |
| 46:17 50:1,4,9 | 134:13,24,24 | 45:21 | 10:5 | 112:4 121:7 |
| 52:3 57:22 | 135:5,19 | torts (1) | treat (1) | 147:16 150:2,3 |
| 58:19,22 59:10 | 165:15 168:6 | 125:16 | 104:17 | trying (18) |
| 61:10 62:2 | 169:11 173:20 | total (1) | treated (1) | 18:8 37:16 |
| 68:19 69:17 | timing (1) | 85:9 | 22:15 | 45:13 71:20 |
| 71:21 73:21 | 59:4 | totally (5) | tried (4) | 76:21 96:11,16 |
| 75:18,19 79:7 | title (2) | 43:8 88:13 | 31:1,3 114:9 | 98:3 117:25 |
| 79:9 82:16 | 123:13,18 | 112:21 116:22 | 149:17 | 120:22,23,25 |
| 85:7,8 89:18 | today (7) | 117:19 | trip (3) | 135:23 162:16 |
| 99:2,5 104:19 | 20:25 49:2 | touch (3) | 41:17 167:5 | 165:13 168:14 |
| 106:12 108:12 | 127:10 150:21 | 78:6 81:3 99:16 | 168:13 | 168:18,22 |
| 115:11,15 | 154:25 161:11 | touched (1) | triple (1) | turn (2) |
| 122:8 128:12 | 163:17 | 93:12 | 167:16 | 105:20 173:9 |
| 130:18 131:10 | today's (1) | tough (1) | true (17) | turned (1) |
| 132:18 135:13 | 174:4 | 170:14 | 37:1 57:17 | 13:19 |
| 135:16,23 | toilet (1) | traditions (1) | 59:15,17 80:12 | twice (3) |
| 136:1,3,13 | 160:7 | 9:7 | 94:20 96:7 | 45:17 129:14 |
| 138:5 139:14 | told (67) | traffickers (1) | 98:15 111:21 | 135:17 |
| | I | l | I | |

| two (25) | 152:5 167:18 | 9:15,24 10:13 | vehicle (1) | 42:4,11 43:5 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| 23:20,21 36:17 | 171:12 | 10:25 11:13 | 140:25 | 43:13,15,18,19 |
| 48:21 49:4,4 | understandin | 14:13 16:21 | veracity (1) | 47:23 52:2,10 |
| 52:5 58:23 | 63:22 64:8 | 17:25 19:13 | 168:19 | 52:14 53:18,22 |
| 76:1 77:21 | 88:16 | 147:16 | verification (2) | 54:3,4,10,11 |
| 85:15 88:25 | undo (4) | unscrupulous | 56:13,18 | 54:17 58:24 |
| 90:20 111:1 | 26:25 35:24 | 77:25 | verified (1) | 61:9 70:12,17 |
| 113:4 125:25 | 36:22 39:17 | unsolicited (1) | 57:23 | 70:18 73:21,24 |
| 135:9 136:17 | unequivocal (1) | 17:11 | verifying (2) | 75:22,23 76:2 |
| 137:23 139:3 | 112:19 | unspeakable (1) | 56:23 57:1 | 76:11,15,17,22 |
| 160:2,8 162:17 | unequivocally | 146:5 | versus (1) | 78:19 80:2 |
| 166:3 171:17 | 121:19,24 | urging (1) | 5:7 | 81:7 82:6 |
| | unethical (22) | 78:11 | victim (2) | 86:23 87:6,9 |
| U | 10:10 14:11 | use (8) | 80:17,17 | 87:23 88:18,21 |
| U.S (1) | 15:21,24 16:17 | 59:11,20 67:22 | victims (2) | 89:5,13 90:11 |
| 38:1 | 17:20 26:12,24 | 74:25 86:19,20 | 98:13 100:24 | 90:12 91:1,7 |
| ugly (1) | 39:15,18 51:22 | 120:2 126:18 | Victims' (1) | 92:6,9,22,22 |
| 11:16 | 54:24 55:5,22 | uses (1) | 48:17 | 93:1,11 94:4 |
| Uh-huh (1) | 58:7 59:16 | 120:3 | Victoria's (3) | 94:17 99:16 |
| 154:17 | 68:10 116:7 | usual (1) | 76:9 77:20 | 100:23 102:3,7 |
| ultimate (1) | 117:13 118:10 | 11:16 | 101:6 | 104:7,25 105:6 |
| 106:9 | 119:10,25 | usually (6) | videographer | 105:12,17 |
| ultimately (8) | unethically (1) | 136:7,8,9,15 | 3:18 5:3,12 | 111:23 112:2 |
| 11:25 46:2 | 52:22 | 139:23 140:5 | 49:25 50:3 | 112:15,20,25 |
| 62:23,23 72:24 | Unfortunately | Utah (2) | 99:1,4 145:7 | 113:5,11,18 |
| 80:7 82:24 | 168:5 | 3:17 5:20 | 145:10 175:16 | 114:22 117:18 |
| 97:1 | United (3) | | videos (1) | 119:18 121:18 |
| unblemished (1) | 17:7 114:1 | V | 121:20 | 124:9 127:10 |
| 130:14 | 117:7 | v (2) | videotape (5) | 128:22 129:3 |
| unclear (1) | university (3) | 178:2 179:3 | 1:10 157:9,10 | 133:21 156:13 |
| 147:25 | 36:10 119:22 | vague (1) | 157:13 177:9 | 156:18,23 |
| underage (4) | 120:4 | 139:17 | videotaped (1) | 157:11,16 |
| 115:7 150:22,24 | unjustified (2) | vagueness (1) | 5:5 | 159:11 167:3,9 |
| 159:14 | 12:18 13:10 | 126:24 | videotapes (1) | Virginia's (1) |
| undercut (1) | unpleasant (1) | value (2) | 157:21 | 87:5 |
| 157:11 | 171:3 | 13:9 69:9 | view (6) | virtue (1) |
| undergarment | unprofessiona | variation (2) | 23:16 55:6 79:3 | 66:8 |
| 171:1 | 16:17 17:21 | 23:16 145:21 | 106:14 119:22 | visible (1) |
| undersigned (1) | 26:23 36:24 | variety (3) | 150:5 | 159:14 |
| 176:8 | 54:24 55:5,22 | 17:11 26:3 | Vineyard (2) | visit (3) |
| understand (18) | 58:7 59:17 | 140:1 | 7:5 131:11 | 41:14 42:3 |
| 21:5 31:21 | 67:18 | various (5) | violate (1) | 135:20 |
| 32:18,19 34:13 | unprompted (1) | 63:17 90:18 | 62:15 | visited (2) |
| 43:25 53:12,14 | 105:23 | 133:13 140:14 | violated (1) | 8:21 136:3 |
| 53:15 62:7 | unquestioned | 145:2 | 150:19 | visiting (1) |
| 66:10 112:6 | 105:23 | varying (1) | Virginia (93) | 41:7 |
| 126:16 152:4,5 | unresponsive | 65:3 | 3:11 5:24 36:2 | volume (5) |
| | - | l | | |

| 1:13 4:6,11 | 96:17 104:19 | 157:10 160:4 | Wexner (16) | willing (3) |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| 151:21 175:19 | 105:19,24 | 170:14 | 77:16,17,20,21 | 45:11 70:9 |
| voluntarily (1) | 115:16 127:15 | ways (1) | 79:4,5 80:15 | 86:19 |
| 66:8 | 134:21 135:25 | 76:17 | 80:17,18 82:5 | willingly (2) |
| volunteered (4) | 137:3 158:6,17 | we'll (7) | 83:1 92:25 | 130:8,15 |
| 25:24 31:25 | 174:22 175:13 | 47:7,9 63:5 84:5 | 101:17,19,21 | winters (1) |
| 39:7,14 | wanted (22) | 97:5 108:12 | 112:4 | 7:3 |
| volunteering (1) | 31:15 52:4 | 175:3 | Wexner's (5) | wish (2) |
| 36:22 | 53:22 62:17 | we're (13) | 82:9 106:10 | 150:19 178:11 |
| VR (1) | 71:16,18,19 | 55:8 74:1 78:2 | 107:8 111:18 | withdraw (4) |
| 100:22 | 75:18 76:3 | 83:18,20 84:1 | 111:19 | 22:25 25:25 |
| vs (1) | 81:22 96:13 | 88:15 90:25 | whatsoever (2) | 91:15 126:13 |
| 1:6 | 104:14,18 | 92:19 132:18 | 113:24 114:4 | withdrawal (1) |
| 1.0 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | . , |
| W | 105:22,25 109:21 161:10 | 151:12,12 166:21 | Whoa (1) | 13:22 with drawing (2) |
| Wait (6) | | | 107:24 | withdrawing (2) |
| 95:17,17,18 | 161:10 170:5,7 | we've (5) | wide (1) | 126:25 153:25 |
| 139:17,17,18 | 170:14 173:5 | 31:7 37:20 40:3 | 132:3 | withhold (3) |
| 164:10 | wanting (1) | 92:16 108:23 | Wiegand (3) | 62:9 63:23 |
| waiter (1) | 88:20 | wealthy (1) | 35:18,19,22 | 64:11 |
| · , | wants (1) | 139:6 | wife (42) | witness (32) |
| 173:7 | 95:20 | Webber (4) | 29:22,24 30:3 | 4:9 46:11 52:20 |
| waive (4) | warrant (2) | 25:20 28:11 | 37:7 41:7 48:5 | 53:5 62:8 |
| 152:12 178:4,11 | 154:21 155:2 | 32:13 166:15 | 70:7 71:4 73:2 | 63:16 84:14 |
| 178:17 | Washington (2) | website (2) | 75:8,12 77:17 | 93:18,19 94:7 |
| waived (3) | 2:19 40:12 | 50:22,25 | 77:22 80:19,20 | 94:8,12,25 |
| 66:8 121:23 | wasn't (12) | week (1) | 109:23 110:20 | 95:3,7,22 |
| 144:7 | 37:1 52:24 59:9 | 16:19 | 111:2,3,5,19 | 98:18,22 107:4 |
| waiver (1) | 59:12 67:23 | Weinberg (14) | 129:15 163:16 | 126:11,18 |
| 156:3 | 74:6 77:16 | 3:4,5 6:7,7 | 163:20,22 | 144:21 148:19 |
| walk (5) | 81:8,8,10 | 151:5,8,23 | 164:3,12,23,25 | 151:22 152:9 |
| 132:2 133:10 | 100:8 109:22 | 152:12 154:10 | 165:8,22 166:3 | 154:17 155:21 |
| 134:2 171:16 | watch (3) | 155:5,16 158:7 | 166:23 167:11 | 158:18,24 |
| 171:17 | 78:11 160:11 | 158:8,9 | 167:15,25 | 165:17 167:20 |
| walking (1) | 162:18 | welcome (2) | 168:20,25 | 175:9 |
| 173:6 | waters (1) | 106:16 168:12 | 170:16,18 | witnesses (6) |
| want (41) | 71:18 | went (13) | 171:4,23 | 32:2 47:25 |
| 11:19 43:5,6 | way (24) | 23:23 40:12 | wife's (4) | 64:12,24 98:11 |
| 45:6,16 49:8 | 13:14 39:7 51:2 | 41:14 50:22,25 | 36:16 110:10 | 98:15 |
| 53:1,2 54:4 | 60:5 67:22 | 69:22 91:3 | 111:12 142:21 | woman (14) |
| 55:9 60:20,21 | 79:8 93:10 | 102:1 140:15 | wildly (1) | 54:9,19,23 |
| 62:19 63:5,10 | 96:23 104:20 | 160:11 162:18 | 17:6 | 136:23,24 |
| 63:20 69:19 | 105:20 114:5 | 163:18 173:3 | WILEY (1) | 137:2,3,4,5,6 |
| 70:18 71:5,17 | 117:24 124:8 | weren't (2) | 2:18 | 139:7,8 163:13 |
| 72:15 80:5 | 129:9,13 | 83:13 92:8 | willful (2) | 174:1 |
| 81:14 87:12 | 140:12,15 | West (3) | 36:24 127:7 | women (4) |
| 89:7 91:20 | 147:1 149:6 | 2:5 47:22 | willfully (2) | 76:19 115:7 |
| 92:12 95:24 | 156:25 157:7 | 178:16 | 126:4 130:7 | 150:22 167:4 |
| | 150.25 157.7 | 170.10 | 120.1150.7 | 150.22 107.7 |

| won (1) | wrote (3) | 136:23 137:2 | 6:25 | 09:35:22 (1) |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 146:21 | 94:9 124:5 | 167:4 173:13 | 0.25 | 9:3 |
| wood (2) | 137:17 | younger (1) | 7:1 | 09:35:23 (1) |
| 131:6 134:4 | 137.17 | 136:20 | 09:33:21 (1) | 9:4 |
| wooden (1) | X | 150.20 | 7:6 | 09:35:39 (1) |
| 131:1 | X (1) | Z | 09:33:27 (2) | 9:8 |
| word (3) | 4:1 | Zornow (2) | 7:8,9 | 09:35:41 (1) |
| 58:23 74:25 | | 39:21,22 | 09:33:30 (1) | 9:10 |
| 98:9 | Y | | 7:10 | 09:35:43 (1) |
| word-for-wor | yeah (17) | 0 | 09:33:39 (1) | 9:11 |
| 69:21 | 31:9 50:24 85:1 | 02110 (1) | 7:13 | 09:35:53 (1) |
| words (7) | 111:3 112:8,8 | 2:15 | 09:33:45 (1) | 9:14 |
| 88:1,3,6 92:4,8 | 125:25 132:4,4 | 02116 (1) | 7:15 | 09:35:56 (2) |
| 92:10 149:8 | 134:12 141:6,6 | 3:5 | 09:33:57 (1) | 9:16,17 |
| work (9) | 142:12 143:14 | 09:31:40 (2) | 7:19 | 09:36:02 (1) |
| 28:25 29:16 | 143:17 151:20 | 5:3,11 | 09:34:02 (1) | 9:20 |
| 38:18 66:6 | 171:14 | 09:31:46 (1) | 7:21 | 09:36:09 (1) |
| 152:2 153:7 | year (4) | 5:14 | 09:34:04 (1) | 9:23 |
| 154:11 155:19 | 18:21 24:9 | 09:31:48 (1) | 7:23 | 09:36:12 (1) |
| 156:4 | 63:23 125:16 | 5:16 | 09:34:06 (1) | 10:1 |
| worked (8) | years (23) | 09:31:58 (1) | 7:24 | 09:36:13 (1) |
| 17:16 35:20 | 7:6,15,19,22 8:6 | 5:20 | 09:34:20 (1) | 10:2 |
| 127:16 129:19 | 8:12,12,13,14 | 09:32:06 (1) | 8:3 | 09:36:28 (1) |
| 130:10 137:11 | 8:18,22,25 | 5:22 | 09:34:23 (1) | 10:6 |
| 138:18 170:10 | 10:7 23:20,21 | 09:32:12 (1) | 8:5 | 09:36:59 (1) |
| working (1) | 29:15 34:13 | 5:25 | 09:34:26 (1) | 10:12 |
| 130:13 | 62:1 93:3 | 09:32:18 (1) | 8:7 | 09:37:01 (1) |
| world (7) | 97:12 110:14 | 6:2 | 09:34:31 (1) | 10:14 |
| 26:6 117:12,18 | 120:9 163:13 | 09:32:22 (1) | 8:10 | 09:37:04 (1) |
| 117:21 118:4,4 | Yom (1) | 6:4 | 09:34:32 (1) | 10:16 |
| 140:21 | 173:4 | 09:32:29 (1) | 8:11 | 09:37:05 (1) |
| worth (2) | York (30) | 6:7 | 09:34:37 (1) | 10:17 |
| 76:13 103:21 | 3:9,9 7:4 8:4,9 | 09:32:37 (1) | 8:12 | 09:37:15 (1) |
| wouldn't (9) | 8:17,21,25 | 6:10 | 09:34:42 (1) | 10:21 |
| 45:24 60:16 | 36:9 38:21 | 09:32:43 (1) | 8:13 | 09:37:24 (1) |
| 72:25 81:21 | 39:6,23 73:12 | 6:12 | 09:34:46 (1) | 10:24 |
| 82:2,3 105:1 | 74:20 80:24 | 09:32:46 (1) | 8:14 | 09:37:26 (1) |
| 105:16 143:10 | 84:17,20,22 | 6:14 | 09:34:49 (1) | 11:1 |
| write (3) | 85:11,15,18 | 09:32:47 (4) | 8:16 | 09:37:27 (1) |
| 19:5 44:25 | 86:5,6 102:1,4 | 6:16,17,18,20 | 09:34:56 (1) | 11:2 |
| 179:2 | 102:5,8,11,22 | 09:32:54 (1) | 8:19 | 09:37:35 (1) |
| written (2) | 173:25 | 6:21 | 09:35:07 (1) | 11:5 |
| 44:19 46:16 | you-all (1) | 09:32:55 (1) | 8:23 | 09:38:06 (1) |
| wrong (1) | 27:4 | 6:22 | 09:35:20 (1) | 11:12 |
| 26:25 | young (8) | 09:32:57 (1) | 9:1 | 09:38:08 (1) |
| wrongdoing (1) | 47:24 75:23 | 6:24 | 09:35:21 (1) | 11:14 |
| 125:19 | 114:25 115:7 | 09:32:59 (1) | 9:2 | 09:38:09 (1) |
| | I | I | 1 | |

| | | | | 55 |
|--------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 11:15 | 09:41:38 (1) | 18:1 | 09:49:24 (1) | 24:15 |
| 09:38:25 (1) | 14:14 | 09:46:26 (1) | 21:7 | 09:55:13 (1) |
| 11:19 | 09:41:39 (1) | 18:6 | 09:49:25 (1) | 24:21 |
| 09:38:31 (1) | 14:15 | 09:46:32 (1) | 21:8 | 09:55:22 (1) |
| 11:21 | 09:41:58 (1) | 18:9 | 09:49:28 (2) | 24:24 |
| 09:38:34 (2) | 14:19 | 09:46:45 (1) | 21:10,11 | 09:55:29 (1) |
| 11:23,24 | 09:42:09 (1) | 18:15 | 09:49:31 (1) | 25:1 |
| 09:38:35 (1) | 14:24 | 09:46:54 (2) | 21:13 | 09:55:34 (1) |
| 11:25 | 09:42:24 (1) | 18:18,19 | 09:49:58 (1) | 25:3 |
| 09:38:38 (1) | 15:4 | 09:46:55 (1) | 21:18 | 09:55:54 (1) |
| 12:2 | 09:42:26 (1) | 18:20 | 09:50:15 (1) | 25:9 |
| 09:38:53 (1) | 15:6 | 09:47:08 (1) | 21:22 | 09:56:15 (1) |
| 12:8 | 09:42:49 (1) | 18:23 | 09:50:39 (1) | 25:14 |
| 09:38:58 (1) | 15:13 | 09:47:10 (1) | 22:4 | 09:56:34 (1) |
| 12:10 | 09:42:50 (1) | 18:25 | 09:50:41 (1) | 25:18 |
| 09:38:59 (1) | 15:14 | 09:47:41 (1) | 22:5 | 09:56:52 (1) |
| 12:11 | 09:43:03 (1) | 19:9 | 09:50:53 (1) | 25:22 |
| 09:39:01 (1) | 15:18 | 09:47:48 (1) | 22:8 | 09:57:18 (1) |
| 12:12 | 09:43:05 (1) | 19:12 | 09:51:01 (1) | 26:3 |
| 09:39:10 (1) | 15:19 | 09:47:51 (1) | 22:11 | 09:57:51 (1) |
| 12:14 | 09:43:16 (2) | 19:14 | 09:51:24 (1) | 26:10 |
| 09:39:28 (1) | 15:23,24 | 09:47:55 (1) | 22:18 | 09:58:17 (1) |
| 12:19 | 09:43:19 (1) | 19:16 | 09:51:27 (2) | 26:17 |
| 09:39:32 (1) | 16:1 | 09:47:56 (1) | 22:19,20 | 09:58:28 (1) |
| 12:21 | 09:43:20 (1) | 19:17 | 09:51:34 (1) | 26:20 |
| 09:39:47 (3) | 16:2 | 09:47:57 (1) | 22:22 | 09:59:00 (1) |
| 13:1,2,3 | 09:43:21 (1) | 19:18 | 09:52:00 (1) | 27:1 |
| 09:39:50 (1) | 16:3 | 09:47:58 (2) | 23:3 | 09:59:16 (1) |
| 13:5 | 09:44:10 (1) | 19:19,20 | 09:52:07 (1) | 27:6 |
| 09:39:52 (1) | 16:15 | 09:48:00 (1) | 23:4 | 09:59:21 (1) |
| 13:6 | 09:44:28 (1) | 19:22 | 09:52:23 (1) | 27:7 |
| 09:39:53 (1) | 16:20 | 09:48:29 (1) | 23:8 | 09:59:24 (1) |
| 13:7 | 09:44:32 (1) | 20:7 | 09:52:31 (1) | 27:9 |
| 09:40:17 (1) | 16:22 | 09:48:41 (2) | 23:10 | 09:59:25 (1) |
| 13:12 | 09:44:33 (1) | 20:11,12 | 09:53:07 (1) | 27:10 |
| 09:40:18 (1) | 16:23 | 09:48:42 (3) | 23:18 | 09:59:27 (1) |
| 13:13 | 09:44:37 (1) | 20:13,14,15 | 09:53:17 (1) | 27:12 |
| 09:41:02 (1) | 16:25 | 09:48:44 (1) | 23:20 | 09:59:28 (1) |
| 14:1 | 09:44:59 (1) | 20:16 | 09:53:48 (1) | 27:13 |
| 09:41:03 (1) | 17:5 | 09:48:48 (1) | 23:25 | 09:59:30 (2) |
| 14:2 | 09:45:12 (1) | 20:18 | 09:54:16 (1) | 27:15,16 |
| 09:41:13 (1) | 17:9 | 09:49:11 (2) | 24:6 | 09:59:33 (1) |
| 14:5 | 09:45:33 (1) | 20:24,25 | 09:54:20 (1) | 27:17 |
| 09:41:18 (1) | 17:14 | 09:49:18 (1) | 24:7 | 09:59:35 (1) |
| 14:7 | 09:46:07 (1) | 21:3 | 09:54:33 (1) | 27:18 |
| 09:41:36 (1) | 17:24 | 09:49:19 (1) | 24:12 | 09:59:37 (1) |
| 14:12 | 09:46:10 (1) | 21:4 | 09:54:42 (1) | 27:19 |
| | <u>.</u> | I | I. | <u>I</u> |

| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} 5 \\ 2:43 (1) \\ 2:43 (1) \\ 2:44 (1) \\ 2:44 (1) \\ 2:45 (1) \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |
|--|---|
| 27:2029:410:02 $09:59:45(1)$ 10:00:46(1)31:127:2329:510:02 $09:59:48(1)$ 10:00:49(1)31:228:129:710:02 $09:59:50(1)$ 10:00:51(1)31:328:229:810:02 $09:59:52(1)$ 10:00:59(1)31:428:329:1010:02 $09:59:53(2)$ 10:01:06(1)31:728:4,529:1210:02 $09:59:57(1)$ 10:01:09(1)31:928:729:1410:02 $09:59:58(1)$ 29:1810:0128:829:1010:01 $1(11)$ 10:01:39(1)31:211:13,13 4:6,6,1129:2010:0376:12,1210:01:42(1)31:25121:17 142:1929:2410:031:00 (1)30:410:031:30 (1)30:610:03161:1110:02:09(1)32:6,710:02:09(1)30:710:0413:17,2010:02:12(1)32:9,10:00:01(1)30:910:0428:1010:02:20(1)32:1310:00:02(1)30:1410:0428:1110:02:20(1)32:1310:00:02(1)30:1510:0428:1310:02:25(1)32:1610:00:15(2)30:1710:0428:1410:02:26(1)32:1910:00:15(2)30:1710:0428:1910:02:30(1)32:20 | 2:43 (1) 33:8 10:08:51 (1) 10:05:01 (1) 36:8 2:44 (1) 33:9 10:08:53 (1) 10:05:02 (1) 36:9 2:45 (1) 33:10 10:09:03 (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10:05:01 (1)36:833:910:08:53 (1)10:05:02 (1)36:933:1010:09:03 (1) |
| 27:23 $29:5$ $10:02$ $09:59:48$ (1) $10:00:49$ (1) $31:2$ $28:1$ $29:7$ $10:02$ $09:59:50$ (1) $10:00:51$ (1) $31:3$ $28:2$ $29:8$ $10:02$ $09:59:52$ (1) $10:00:59$ (1) $31:4$ $28:3$ $29:10$ $10:02$ $09:59:53$ (2) $10:01:06$ (1) $31:7$ $28:4,5$ $29:12$ $10:02$ $09:59:57$ (1) $10:01:09$ (1) $31:9$ $28:7$ $29:14$ $10:02$ $09:59:58$ (1) $10:01:27$ (1) $31:11$ $28:8$ $29:18$ $10:02$ $10:01:31$ (1) $31:21$ $29:20$ $10:03$ $1(11)$ $10:01:39$ (1) $31:21$ $1:13,13 4:6,6,11$ $29:22$ $10:03$ $76:12,12$ $10:01:42$ (1) $31:25$ $121:17 142:19$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $159:8 177:10$ $10:02:04$ (1) $32:3$ $1:00$ (1) $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:09$ (1) $32:4$ $1:30$ (1) $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09$ (1) $32:6,7$ $10:00:01$ (1) $30:7$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:12$ (1) $32:13$ $10:00:02$ (1) $30:14$ $10:04$ $28:11$ $10:02:20$ (1) $32:13$ $10:00:15$ (2) $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:25$ (1) $32:16$ $10:00:15$ (2) $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:26$ (1) $32:19$ $10:00:19$ (1) $30:18$ | 2:44 (1)33:910:08:53 (1)10:05:02 (1)36:92:45 (1)33:10 |
| 09:59:48 (1) $10:00:49$ (1) $31:2$ $28:1$ $29:7$ $10:02$ $09:59:50$ (1) $10:00:51$ (1) $31:3$ $28:2$ $29:8$ $10:02$ $09:59:52$ (1) $10:00:59$ (1) $31:4$ $28:3$ $29:10$ $10:02$ $09:59:53$ (2) $10:01:06$ (1) $31:7$ $28:4,5$ $29:12$ $10:02$ $09:59:57$ (1) $10:01:09$ (1) $31:9$ $28:7$ $29:14$ $10:02$ $09:59:58$ (1) $10:01:27$ (1) $31:11$ $28:8$ $29:18$ $10:02$ $10:01:31$ (1) $31:21$ $11:13,13 4:6,6,11$ $29:20$ $10:03$ $76:12,12$ $10:01:42$ (1) $31:25$ $121:17 142:19$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $160:11$ $10:02:04$ (1) $32:3$ $10:01:11$ $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:09$ (1) $32:6,7$ $10:02:09$ (1) $30:7$ $10:04$ $13:17,20$ $10:02:12$ (1) $32:9,$ $10:00:01$ (1) $30:7$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:20$ (1) $32:11$ $10:00:02$ (1) $30:14$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:25$ (1) $32:15$ $10:00:15$ (2) $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:26$ (1) $32:19$ $10:00:19$ (1) $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30$ (1) $32:20$ | 10:05:02 (1)36:933:1010:09:03 (1) |
| 28:129:710:02 $09:59:50 (1)$ 29:810:02 $29:59:52 (1)$ 10:00:59 (1)31:428:329:1010:02 $09:59:53 (2)$ 10:01:06 (1)31:728:4,529:1210:02 $09:59:57 (1)$ 29:1410:02 $09:59:57 (1)$ 29:1410:02 $09:59:58 (1)$ 29:1810:02 $10:01:27 (1)$ 31:1128:829:1810:02 $11:11$ 29:2010:03 $1(11)$ 10:01:39 (1)31:21 $1:13,13 4:6,6,11$ 29:2210:03 $76:12,12$ 10:01:42 (1)31:25 $12:1:17 142:19$ 29:2410:03 $16:1:1$ 10:02:04 (1)32:3 $1:00 (1)$ 30:410:03 $143:3$ 10:02:08 (1)32:4 $1:30 (1)$ 30:610:03 $161:11$ 10:02:09 (1)32:6,7 $10:00:01 (1)$ 30:710:04 $28:10$ 10:02:12 (1)32:9,9 $10:00:02 (1)$ 30:1110:04 $28:11$ 10:02:20 (1)32:13 $10:00:06 (1)$ 30:1410:04 $28:13$ 10:02:25 (1)32:16 $10:00:15 (2)$ 30:1710:04 $28:16,17$ 10:02:26 (1)32:19 $10:00:19 (1)$ 30:1810:04 $28:19$ 10:02:30 (1)32:20 | 2:45 (1) 33:10 10:09:03 (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | |
| 28:2 $29:8$ $10:02$ $09:59:52 (1)$ $10:00:59 (1)$ $31:4$ $28:3$ $29:10$ $10:02$ $09:59:53 (2)$ $10:01:06 (1)$ $31:7$ $28:4,5$ $29:12$ $10:02$ $09:59:57 (1)$ $10:01:09 (1)$ $31:9$ $28:7$ $29:14$ $10:02$ $09:59:58 (1)$ $29:14$ $10:02$ $09:59:58 (1)$ $29:14$ $10:02$ $10:01:27 (1)$ $31:11$ $28:8$ $29:18$ $10:02$ $1(11)$ $10:01:31 (1)$ $31:21$ $1:13,13 4:6,6,11$ $29:20$ $10:03$ $76:12,12$ $10:01:42 (1)$ $31:25$ $121:17 142:19$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $159:8 177:10$ $10:02:04 (1)$ $32:3$ $1:00 (1)$ $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:09 (1)$ $32:6,7$ $13:0 (1)$ $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09 (1)$ $32:6,7$ $10:00:01 (1)$ $30:9$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:12 (1)$ $32:11$ $10:00:02 (1)$ $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:22 (1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:11 (1)$ $30:15$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:25 (1)$ $32:16$ $10:00:15 (2)$ $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30 (1)$ $32:20$ | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 2:47 (1) 33:11 10:09:04 (1) |
| 28:3 $29:10$ $10:02$ $09:59:53$ (2) $10:01:06$ (1) $31:7$ $28:4,5$ $29:12$ $10:02$ $09:59:57$ (1) $10:01:09$ (1) $31:9$ $28:7$ $29:14$ $10:02$ $09:59:58$ (1) $10:01:27$ (1) $31:11$ $28:8$ $29:18$ $10:02$ $10:01:31$ (1) $31:12$ $28:8$ $29:18$ $10:02$ $11:13,13$ 4:6,6,11 $29:20$ $10:03$ $1:13,13$ 4:6,6,11 $29:22$ $10:03$ $1:17,12$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $1:10$ (1) $30:44$ $32:3$ $1:00$ (1) $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:08$ (1) $32:4$ $1:30$ (1) $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09$ (1) $32:6,7$ $10:02:12$ (1) $32:9,$ $10:00:01$ (1) $30:7$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:14$ (1) $32:13$ $10:00:02$ (1) $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:11$ $10:02:20$ (1) $32:13$ $10:00:06$ (1) $30:14$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:25$ (1) $32:16$ $10:00:15$ (2) $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:16,17$ $10:02:26$ (1) $32:19$ $10:00:19$ (1) $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30$ (1) $32:20$ | 10:05:05 (1) 36:14 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 2:52 (1) 33:12 10:09:24 (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10:05:06 (1) 36:18 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 2:55 (1) 33:13 10:09:25 (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10:05:47 (1) 36:19 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 2:57 (1) 33:22 10:10:05 (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | |
| $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | 2:58 (1) 34:1 10:10:06 (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | |
| 1 (11)10:01:39 (1) $31:21$ $1:13,134:6,6,11$ $29:22$ $10:03$ $76:12,12$ $10:01:42 (1)$ $31:25$ $121:17142:19$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $159:8177:10$ $10:02:04 (1)$ $32:3$ $1:00 (1)$ $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:08 (1)$ $32:4$ $1:30 (1)$ $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09 (1)$ $32:6,7$ $10 (2)$ $30:7$ $10:04$ $13:17,20$ $10:02:12 (1)$ $32:9,7$ $10:00:01 (1)$ $30:9$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:20 (1)$ $32:11$ $10:00:02 (1)$ $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:22 (1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:11 (1)$ $30:15$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:25 (1)$ $32:16$ $10:00:15 (2)$ $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:16,17$ $10:02:26 (1)$ $32:19$ $10:00:19 (1)$ $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30 (1)$ $32:20$ | 3:29 (1) 34:5 10:10:19 (1) |
| 1:13,134:6,6,11 $29:22$ $10:03$ $76:12,12$ $10:01:42(1)$ $31:25$ $121:17142:19$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $159:8177:10$ $10:02:04(1)$ $32:3$ $1:00(1)$ $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:08(1)$ $32:4$ $1:30(1)$ $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09(1)$ $32:6,7$ $10(2)$ $30:7$ $10:04$ $13:17,20$ $10:02:12(1)$ $32:9,7$ $10:00:01(1)$ $30:9$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:14(1)$ $32:11$ $10:00:02(1)$ $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:20(1)$ $32:13$ $10:00:11(1)$ $30:15$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:25(1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:15(2)$ $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:16,17$ $10:02:26(1)$ $32:19$ $10:00:19(1)$ $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30(1)$ $32:20$ | |
| 76:12,12 $10:01:42(1)$ $31:25$ $121:17 142:19$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $159:8 177:10$ $10:02:04(1)$ $32:3$ $1:00(1)$ $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:08(1)$ $32:4$ $1:30(1)$ $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09(1)$ $32:6,7$ $10(2)$ $30:7$ $10:04$ $13:17,20$ $10:02:12(1)$ $32:9,7$ $10:00:01(1)$ $30:9$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:14(1)$ $32:11$ $10:00:02(1)$ $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:20(1)$ $32:13$ $10:00:06(1)$ $30:14$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:25(1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:15(2)$ $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:16,17$ $10:02:26(1)$ $32:19$ $10:00:19(1)$ $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30(1)$ $32:20$ | 3:42 (1) 34:7 10:10:22 (1) |
| $121:17 \ 142:19$ $29:24$ $10:03$ $159:8 \ 177:10$ $10:02:04 \ (1)$ $32:3$ $1:00 \ (1)$ $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:08 \ (1)$ $32:4$ $1:30 \ (1)$ $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09 \ (1)$ $32:6,$ $10 \ (2)$ $30:7$ $10:04$ $13:17,20$ $10:02:12 \ (1)$ $32:9,$ $10:00:01 \ (1)$ $30:9$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:14 \ (1)$ $32:11$ $10:00:02 \ (1)$ $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:11$ $10:02:20 \ (1)$ $32:13$ $10:00:06 \ (1)$ $30:14$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:22 \ (1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:11 \ (1)$ $30:15$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:25 \ (1)$ $32:16$ $10:00:15 \ (2)$ $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:16,17$ $10:02:26 \ (1)$ $32:19$ $10:00:19 \ (1)$ $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30 \ (1)$ $32:20$ | |
| $159:8\ 177:10$ $10:02:04\ (1)$ $32:3$ $1:00\ (1)$ $30:4$ $10:03$ $143:3$ $10:02:08\ (1)$ $32:4$ $1:30\ (1)$ $30:6$ $10:03$ $161:11$ $10:02:09\ (1)$ $32:6$, $10\ (2)$ $30:7$ $10:04$ $13:17,20$ $10:02:12\ (1)$ $32:9$, $10:00:01\ (1)$ $30:9$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:14\ (1)$ $32:11$ $10:00:02\ (1)$ $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:11$ $10:02:20\ (1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:06\ (1)$ $30:14$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:22\ (1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:11\ (1)$ $30:15$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:25\ (1)$ $32:16\ (1)$ $10:00:15\ (2)$ $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:16,17$ $10:02:26\ (1)$ $32:19$ $10:00:19\ (1)$ $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30\ (1)$ $32:20$ | 3:55 (1) 34:8 10:10:23 (1) |
| 1:00 (1) $30:4$ 10:03143:310:02:08 (1) $32:4$ 1:30 (1) $30:6$ 10:03161:1110:02:09 (1) $32:6,7$ 10 (2) $30:7$ 10:0413:17,2010:02:12 (1) $32:9,7$ 10:00:01 (1) $30:9$ 10:0428:1010:02:14 (1) $32:11$ 10:00:02 (1) $30:11$ 10:0428:1110:02:20 (1) $32:13$ 10:00:06 (1) $30:14$ 10:0428:1310:02:22 (1) $32:15$ 10:00:11 (1) $30:15$ 10:0428:1410:02:25 (1) $32:16$ 10:00:15 (2) $30:17$ 10:0428:16,1710:02:26 (1) $32:19$ 10:00:19 (1) $30:18$ 10:0428:1910:02:30 (1) $32:20$ | 10:06:16 (1) 37:14 |
| 1:30 (1) $30:6$ $10:03$ 161:11 $10:02:09 (1)$ $32:6$ 10 (2) $30:7$ $10:04$ 13:17,20 $10:02:12 (1)$ $32:9$ 10:00:01 (1) $30:9$ $10:04$ 28:10 $10:02:14 (1)$ $32:11$ 10:00:02 (1) $30:11$ $10:04$ 28:11 $10:02:20 (1)$ $32:13$ 10:00:06 (1) $30:14$ $10:04$ 28:13 $10:02:22 (1)$ $32:15$ 10:00:11 (1) $30:15$ $10:04$ 28:14 $10:02:25 (1)$ $32:16$ 10:00:15 (2) $30:17$ $10:04$ 28:16,17 $10:02:26 (1)$ $32:19$ 10:00:19 (1) $30:18$ $10:04$ 28:19 $10:02:30 (1)$ $32:20$ | 3:56 (1) 34:9 10:10:29 (1) |
| 1:30 (1) $30:6$ 10:03161:1110:02:09 (1) $32:6$,10 (2) $30:7$ 10:0413:17,2010:02:12 (1) $32:9$,10:00:01 (1) $30:9$ 10:0428:1010:02:14 (1) $32:11$ 10:00:02 (1) $30:11$ 10:0428:1110:02:20 (1) $32:13$ 10:00:06 (1) $30:14$ 10:0428:1310:02:22 (1) $32:15$ 10:00:11 (1) $30:15$ 10:0428:1410:02:25 (1) $32:16$ 10:00:15 (2) $30:17$ 10:0428:16,1710:02:26 (1) $32:19$ 10:00:19 (1) $30:18$ 10:0428:1910:02:30 (1) $32:20$ | 10:06:17 (1) 37:18 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 3:59 (2) 34:10 10:10:43 (2) |
| 13:17,20 $10:02:12 (1)$ $32:9,$ $10:00:01 (1)$ $30:9$ $10:04$ $28:10$ $10:02:14 (1)$ $32:11$ $10:00:02 (1)$ $30:11$ $10:04$ $28:11$ $10:02:20 (1)$ $32:13$ $10:00:06 (1)$ $30:14$ $10:04$ $28:13$ $10:02:22 (1)$ $32:15$ $10:00:11 (1)$ $30:15$ $10:04$ $28:14$ $10:02:25 (1)$ $32:16$ $10:00:15 (2)$ $30:17$ $10:04$ $28:16,17$ $10:02:26 (1)$ $32:19$ $10:00:19 (1)$ $30:18$ $10:04$ $28:19$ $10:02:30 (1)$ $32:20$ | 7 10:06:19 (1) 37:22,23 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 1:04 (2) 34:12 10:10:45 (1) |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10 10:06:39 (1) 37:24 |
| 10:00:02 (1) 30:11 10:04 28:11 10:02:20 (1) 32:13 10:00:06 (1) 30:14 10:04 28:13 10:02:22 (1) 32:15 10:00:11 (1) 30:15 10:04 28:14 10:02:22 (1) 32:16 10:00:15 (2) 30:17 10:04 28:16,17 10:02:26 (1) 32:19 10:00:19 (1) 30:18 10:04 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | 1:05 (1) 34:18 10:11:05 (1) |
| 28:11 10:02:20 (1) 32:13 10:00:06 (1) 30:14 10:04 28:13 10:02:22 (1) 32:15 10:00:11 (1) 30:15 10:04 28:14 10:02:25 (1) 32:16 10:00:15 (2) 30:17 10:04 28:16,17 10:02:26 (1) 32:19 10:00:19 (1) 30:18 10:04 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | 1 10:07:01 (2) 38:5 |
| 10:00:06 (1)30:1410:0428:1310:02:22 (1)32:1510:00:11 (1)30:1510:0428:1410:02:25 (1)32:1610:00:15 (2)30:1710:0428:16,1710:02:26 (1)32:1910:00:19 (1)30:1810:0428:1910:02:30 (1)32:20 | 1:08 (1) 35:1,2 10:11:06 (1) |
| 28:13 10:02:22 (1) 32:15 10:00:11 (1) 30:15 10:04 28:14 10:02:25 (1) 32:16 10:00:15 (2) 30:17 10:04 28:16,17 10:02:26 (1) 32:19 10:00:19 (1) 30:18 10:04 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 10:11:29 (1) |
| 28:14 10:02:25 (1) 32:16 10:00:15 (2) 30:17 10:04 28:16,17 10:02:26 (1) 32:19 10:00:19 (1) 30:18 10:04 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | 5 10:07:18 (1) 38:12 |
| 10:00:15 (2) 30:17 10:04 28:16,17 10:02:26 (1) 32:19 10:00:19 (1) 30:18 10:04 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | 10:11:32 (1) 35:8 |
| 28:16,17 10:02:26 (1) 32:19 10:00:19 (1) 30:18 10:04 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | 5 10:07:22 (1) 38:13 |
| 10:00:19 (1) 30:18 10:04 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | 10:11:33 (1) |
| 28:19 10:02:30 (1) 32:20 | |
| | 10:07:23 (1) 38:14 |
| | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{10:07:23(1)} \\ \textbf{1:22(1)} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{10:07:23(1)} \\ \textbf{35:10} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{38:14} \\ \textbf{10:11:34(1)} \end{array}$ |
| | 1:22 (1) 35:10 10:11:34 (1) |
| 28:20 10:02:32 (1) 32:23 | 1:22 (1) 35:10 10:11:34 (1) |
| | 1:22 (1) 35:10 10:11:34 (1) 10:07:49 (2) 38:15 130 (2) 35:17,18 10:11:52 (2) |
| 28:22 10:02:36 (1) 32:25 | 1:22 (1) 35:10 10:11:34 (1) 10:07:49 (2) 38:15 130 (2) 35:17,18 10:11:52 (2) |
| | 1:22 (1) $35:10$ $10:11:34 (1)$ 0 $10:07:49 (2)$ $38:15$ $1:30 (2)$ $35:17,18$ $10:11:52 (2)$ $3,24$ $10:07:51 (1)$ $38:19,20$ $1:35 (1)$ $35:19$ $10:12:14 (1)$ |
| 29:2 10:02:41 (1) 33:5 | 1:22 (1) $35:10$ $10:11:34 (1)$ 0 $10:07:49 (2)$ $38:15$ $1:30 (2)$ $35:17,18$ $10:11:52 (2)$ $3,24$ $10:07:51 (1)$ $38:19,20$ $1:35 (1)$ $35:19$ $10:12:14 (1)$ |

| | | | | 51 |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 10:12:17 (1) | 43:1 | 10:20:50 (1) | 47:18 | 10:26:09 (1) |
| 39:4 | 10:18:37 (1) | 45:4 | 10:23:44 (1) | 49:23 |
| 10:12:19 (1) | 43:2 | 10:21:35 (1) | 47:19 | 10:26:10 (1) |
| 39:5 | 10:19:06 (2) | 45:16 | 10:23:50 (1) | 49:24 |
| 10:12:36 (1) | 43:11,12 | 10:21:52 (1) | 47:21 | 10:26:12 (1) |
| 39:10 | 10:19:17 (1) | 45:22 | 10:23:51 (1) | 49:25 |
| 10:12:38 (1) | 43:15 | 10:21:54 (1) | 47:22 | 10:26:16 (1) |
| 39:11 | 10:19:55 (1) | 45:24 | 10:24:03 (1) | 50:2 |
| 10:13:15 (1) | 43:23 | 10:22:10 (1) | 47:25 | 10:44 (2) |
| 39:21 | 10:19:57 (1) | 46:4 | 10:24:10 (1) | 50:2,4 |
| 10:13:17 (1) | 43:24 | 10:22:12 (3) | 48:3 | 10:44:08 (1) |
| 39:22 | 10:19:59 (1) | 46:5,6,7 | 10:24:11 (2) | 50:3 |
| 10:13:31 (1) | 43:25 | 10:22:14 (1) | 48:4,5 | 10:44:11 (1) |
| 40:1 | 10:20:01 (2) | 46:8 | 10:24:14 (1) | 50:5 |
| 10:13:32 (1) | 44:2,3 | 10:22:19 (3) | 48:6 | 10:44:13 (1) |
| 40:2 | 10:20:02 (1) | 46:10,12,13 | 10:24:17 (1) | 50:6 |
| 10:14:02 (1) | 44:4 | 10:22:21 (1) | 48:7 | 10:44:29 (1) |
| 40:8 | 10:20:07 (1) | 46:15 | 10:24:39 (1) | 50:9 |
| 10:14:10 (1) | 44:6 | 10:22:27 (1) | 48:12 | 10:44:31 (1) |
| 40:11 | 10:20:14 (2) | 46:17 | 10:24:43 (1) | 50:10 |
| 10:14:32 (1) | 44:9,10 | 10:22:29 (2) | 48:15 | 10:44:32 (1) |
| 40:17 | 10:20:17 (1) | 46:18,19 | 10:24:44 (1) | 50:11 |
| 10:14:33 (1) | 44:12 | 10:22:30 (1) | 48:16 | 10:44:34 (1) |
| 40:18 | 10:20:18 (2) | 46:20 | 10:24:58 (1) | 50:12 |
| 10:14:54 (1) | 44:13,14 | 10:22:32 (1) | 48:20 | 10:44:38 (1) |
| 40:23 | 10:20:20 (1) | 46:21 | 10:25:03 (1) | 50:14 |
| 10:14:57 (2) | 44:15 | 10:22:33 (1) | 48:22 | 10:44:40 (1) |
| 40:25 41:1 | 10:20:25 (1) | 46:22 | 10:25:06 (3) | 50:15 |
| 10:14:58 (1) | 44:16 | 10:22:41 (1) | 48:24 49:1,2 | 10:44:43 (2) |
| 41:2 | 10:20:26 (1) | 46:23 | 10:25:08 (1) | 50:17,18 |
| 10:15:49 (1) | 44:17 | 10:22:44 (1) | 49:4 | 10:44:45 (1) |
| 41:12 | 10:20:28 (1) | 46:25 | 10:25:22 (1) | 50:19 |
| 10:16:15 (1) | 44:18 | 10:22:49 (1) | 49:8 | 10:44:47 (1) |
| 41:18 | 10:20:30 (1) | 47:1 | 10:25:24 (1) | 50:20 |
| 10:16:35 (1) | 44:19 | 10:22:54 (1) | 49:9 | 10:44:54 (1) |
| 41:24 | 10:20:32 (1) | 47:3 | 10:25:26 (2) | 50:22 |
| 10:17:30 (1) | 44:20 | 10:22:56 (1) | 49:10,11 | 10:45:26 (1) |
| 42:10 | 10:20:34 (1) | 47:5 | 10:25:30 (1) | 51:5 |
| 10:17:49 (1) | 44:21 | 10:23:00 (1) | 49:12 | 10:45:28 (1) |
| 42:14 | 10:20:40 (1) | 47:7 | 10:25:36 (1) | 51:7 |
| 10:18:21 (1) | 44:23 | 10:23:07 (1) | 49:14 | 10:45:30 (1) |
| 42:21 | 10:20:41 (1) | 47:11 | 10:25:48 (1) | 51:8 |
| 10:18:34 (1) | 44:24 | 10:23:12 (1) | 49:16 | 10:45:33 (1) |
| 42:24 | 10:20:43 (1) | 47:12 | 10:25:58 (1) | 51:10 |
| 10:18:35 (1) 42:25 | 44:25 | 10:23:21 (1) 47:14 | 49:19 | 10:45:34 (1) |
| 42:25 10:18:36 (1) | 10:20:45 (1) 45:1 | 47:14 10:23:43 (1) | 10:26 (2) 50:1,2 | 51:11 10:45:39 (1) |
| 10.10.30 (1) | 43.1 | 10.23.43 (1) | 50.1,2 | 10.43.37 (1) |
| 1 | | | | |

| | | | | 50 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 51:13 | 10:49:07 (1) | 56:17 | 10:54:23 (1) | 61:13,14 |
| 10:45:40 (1) | 54:7 | 10:52:19 (1) | 58:21 | 10:57:25 (2) |
| 51:14 | 10:49:09 (1) | 56:18 | 10:54:43 (1) | 61:17,18 |
| 10:45:46 (1) | 54:8 | 10:52:22 (1) | 59:1 | 10:57:29 (1) |
| 51:16 | 10:49:31 (1) | 56:20 | 10:54:53 (1) | 61:21 |
| 10:45:47 (1) | 54:15 | 10:52:23 (1) | 59:2 | 10:57:37 (1) |
| 51:17 | 10:49:32 (1) | 56:21 | 10:55:10 (1) | 61:24 |
| 10:45:48 (1) | 54:16 | 10:52:24 (1) | 59:8 | 10:57:47 (1) |
| 51:18 | 10:49:47 (1) | 56:22 | 10:55:11 (1) | 62:1 |
| 10:45:55 (1) | 54:20 | 10:52:25 (1) | 59:9 | 10:57:48 (1) |
| 51:19 | 10:49:48 (1) | 56:23 | 10:55:24 (1) | 62:2 |
| 10:46:19 (1) | 54:21 | 10:52:30 (1) | 59:12 | 10:57:56 (1) |
| 51:24 | 10:49:50 (1) | 57:1 | 10:55:42 (1) | 62:5 |
| 10:46:20 (1) | 54:23 | 10:52:35 (1) | 59:19 | 10:58:01 (1) |
| 51:25 | 10:50:04 (1) | 57:3 | 10:55:55 (1) | 62:7 |
| 10:46:52 (1) | 55:2 | 10:52:38 (1) | 59:24 | 10:58:22 (3) |
| 52:8 | 10:50:20 (1) | 57:5 | 10:55:56 (1) | 62:11,12,13 |
| 10:46:53 (1) | 55:8 | 10:52:40 (1) | 59:25 | 10:58:23 (1) |
| 52:9 | 10:50:28 (1) | 57:6 | 10:56:01 (1) | 62:14 |
| 10:47:08 (1) | 55:11 | 10:52:42 (2) | 60:3 | 10:58:49 (1) |
| 52:12 | 10:50:29 (1) | 57:7,8 | 10:56:10 (1) | 62:22 |
| 10:47:09 (1) | 55:12 | 10:52:47 (1) | 60:5 | 10:59:02 (2) |
| 52:13 | 10:50:30 (1) | 57:11 | 10:56:15 (1) | 63:1,2 |
| 10:47:28 (1) | 55:13 | 10:52:48 (2) | 60:7 | 10:59:04 (1) |
| 52:18 | 10:50:39 (1) | 57:12,13 | 10:56:17 (1) | 63:3 |
| 10:47:29 (1) | 55:16 | 10:52:49 (1) | 60:8 | 10:59:06 (1) |
| 52:19 | 10:51:13 (1) | 57:14 | 10:56:18 (1) | 63:4 |
| 10:47:48 (1) | 55:24 | 10:52:51 (1) | 60:9 | 10:59:17 (1) |
| 52:24 | 10:51:14 (1) | 57:16 | 10:56:19 (1) | 63:11 |
| 10:48:09 (1) | 55:25 | 10:52:57 (1) | 60:10 | 10:59:19 (1) |
| 53:7 | 10:51:17 (1) | 57:17 | 10:56:20 (2) | 63:13 |
| 10:48:16 (1) | 56:2 | 10:53:05 (1) | 60:12,13 | 10:59:21 (1) |
| 53:10 | 10:51:18 (1) | 57:19 | 10:56:21 (1) | 63:15 |
| 10:48:18 (2) | 56:3 | 10:53:26 (1) | 60:14 | 10:59:24 (1) |
| 53:12,13 | 10:51:55 (1) | 57:24 | 10:56:29 (1) | 63:17 |
| 10:48:19 (2) | 56:7 | 10:53:28 (1) | 60:15 | 10:59:33 (1) |
| 53:14,15 | 10:51:58 (1) | 58:1 | 10:56:36 (1) | 63:21 |
| 10:48:22 (1) | 56:8 | 10:53:32 (2) | 60:17 | 10:59:37 (1) |
| 53:17 | 10:52:00 (1) | 58:3,4 | 10:56:57 (1) | 63:22 |
| 10:48:31 (1) | 56:10 | 10:53:57 (1) | 60:23 | 10:59:58 (1) |
| 53:20 | 10:52:01 (1) | 58:10 | 10:57:01 (3) | 64:2 |
| 10:48:32 (1) | 56:11 | 10:53:58 (2) | 60:25 61:1,2 | 1000 (1) |
| 53:21 | 10:52:15 (1) | 58:11,12 | 10:57:02 (4) | 3:4 |
| 10:48:46 (1) | 56:14 | 10:54:01 (1) | 61:3,4,5,6 | 1001 (1) |
| 54:1 | 10:52:17 (1) | 58:13 | 10:57:18 (1) | 114:16 |
| 10:48:47 (1) | 56:16 | 10:54:03 (1) | 61:12 | 11:00:00 (1) |
| 54:2 | 10:52:18 (1) | 58:14 | 10:57:19 (2) | 64:4 |
| | I | 1 | I | I |

| | | | | 57 |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 11:00:05 (2) | 66:21 | 11:05:08 (1) | 71:11,12,13 | 11:11:25 (1) |
| 64:6,7 | 11:02:59 (1) | 69:2 | 11:07:53 (1) | 74:5 |
| 11:00:27 (1) | 66:22 | 11:05:23 (2) | 71:14 | 11:11:26 (1) |
| 64:13 | 11:03:00 (1) | 69:7,8 | 11:08:16 (1) | 74:6 |
| 11:00:28 (1) | 66:23 | 11:05:28 (1) | 71:21 | 11:11:28 (1) |
| 64:14 | 11:03:08 (1) | 69:10 | 11:08:25 (1) | 74:7 |
| 11:00:41 (1) | 67:2 | 11:05:29 (1) | 71:24 | 11:11:29 (2) |
| 64:19 | 11:03:14 (1) | 69:11 | 11:08:26 (1) | 74:8,9 |
| 11:01:00 (1) | 67:4 | 11:05:30 (1) | 71:25 | 11:11:31 (1) |
| 64:25 | 11:03:15 (1) | 69:12 | 11:08:31 (2) | 74:10 |
| 11:01:18 (1) | 67:5 | 11:05:37 (2) | 72:2,3 | 11:11:36 (1) |
| 65:5 | 11:03:29 (1) | 69:15,16 | 11:08:32 (1) | 74:13 |
| 11:01:24 (1) | 67:8 | 11:05:40 (1) | 72:4 | 11:11:37 (1) |
| 65:8 | 11:03:33 (1) | 69:18 | 11:08:52 (1) | 74:14 |
| 11:01:25 (1) | 67:9 | 11:05:41 (1) | 72:9 | 11:11:48 (1) |
| 65:9 | 11:03:37 (1) | 69:19 | 11:08:56 (1) | 74:17 |
| 11:01:29 (1) | 67:10 | 11:05:55 (1) | 72:11 | 11:11:53 (1) |
| 65:11 | 11:03:41 (1) | 69:23 | 11:08:59 (1) | 74:19 |
| 11:01:53 (1) | 67:12 | 11:05:56 (1) | 72:12 | 11:11:54 (1) |
| 65:18 | 11:03:42 (1) | 69:24 | 11:09:02 (1) | 74:20 |
| 11:02:02 (1) | 67:13 | 11:05:59 (1) | 72:13 | 11:12:02 (1) |
| 65:20 | 11:03:44 (1) | 69:25 | 11:09:05 (1) | 74:21 |
| 11:02:04 (1) | 67:15 | 11:06:19 (1) | 72:14 | 11:12:14 (1) |
| 65:21 | 11:04:07 (1) | 70:5 | 11:09:28 (1) | 74:24 |
| 11:02:05 (1) | 67:21 | 11:06:20 (1) | 72:20 | 11:12:24 (1) |
| 65:22 | 11:04:16 (1) | 70:6 | 11:09:29 (1) | 75:3 |
| 11:02:32 (1) | 68:1 | 11:07:04 (1) | 72:21 | 11:12:29 (1) |
| 66:2 | 11:04:17 (1) | 70:14 | 11:09:30 (1) | 75:6 |
| 11:02:33 (1) | 68:2 | 11:07:07 (1) | 72:22 | 11:12:31 (1) |
| 66:3 | 11:04:21 (2) | 70:16 | 11:09:41 (1) | 75:7 |
| 11:02:38 (1) | 68:4,5 | 11:07:21 (1) | 73:1 | 11:12:41 (2) |
| 66:5 | 11:04:22 (1) | 70:20 | 11:10:09 (2) | 75:10,11 |
| 11:02:41 (1) | 68:6 | 11:07:29 (1) | 73:8,9 | 11:12:46 (1) |
| 66:7 11:02:45 (1) | 11:04:23 (1) | 70:23 | 11:10:14 (1) | 75:13 |
| 66:10 | 68:7 | 11:07:31 (1) | 73:12 | 11:13:07 (1) 75:19 |
| | 11:04:24 (1) | 70:24 | 11:10:23 (1) 73:13 | |
| 11:02:47 (1) 66:12 | 68:8 11:04:34 (2) | 11:07:33 (1) 70:25 | 11:10:26 (1) | 11:14:09 (1) 76:6 |
| 11:02:49 (2) | 68:11,12 | 11:07:36 (1) | 73:15 | 11:15:12 (1) |
| 66:14,15 | 11:04:45 (1) | 71:2 | 11:10:37 (1) | 76:16 |
| 11:02:50 (1) | 68:16 | 11:07:46 (1) | 73:16 | 11:15:35 (1) |
| 66:16 | 11:04:56 (1) | 71:6 | 11:10:47 (1) | 76:21 |
| 11:02:54 (2) | 68:20 | 11:07:48 (2) | 73:19 | 11:16:44 (1) |
| 66:18,19 | 11:05:04 (1) | 71:8,9 | 11:11:15 (1) | 77:6 |
| 11:02:55 (1) | 68:23 | 11:07:49 (1) | 74:1 | 11:17:09 (1) |
| 66:20 | 11:05:07 (2) | 71:10 | 11:11:18 (2) | 77:10 |
| 11:02:57 (1) | 68:25 69:1 | 11:07:51 (3) | 74:2,3 | 11:17:15 (1) |
| | | | ,2,5 | |

| 77:13 | 11:23:15 (1) | 82:24 | 11:26:31 (1) | 87:4 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 11:17:20 (1) | 81:6 | 11:25:05 (1) | 84:25 | 11:29:18 (1) |
| 77:14 | 11:23:17 (1) | 83:3 | 11:26:34 (1) | 87:8 |
| 11:17:21 (1) | 81:7 | 11:25:07 (2) | 85:1 | 11:29:19 (1) |
| 77:15 | 11:23:26 (1) | 83:6,7 | 11:26:40 (1) | 87:9 |
| 11:17:47 (1) | 81:9 | 11:25:12 (1) | 85:2 | 11:29:25 (1) |
| 77:21 | 11:23:27 (1) | 83:11 | 11:26:41 (1) | 87:11 |
| 11:18:09 (1) | 81:10 | 11:25:21 (1) | 85:3 | 11:29:44 (1) |
| 78:2 | 11:23:31 (1) | 83:15 | 11:26:52 (1) | 87:16 |
| 11:18:24 (1) | 81:12 | 11:25:22 (1) | 85:6 | 11:29:47 (1) |
| 78:5 | 11:23:32 (2) | 83:16 | 11:27:00 (1) | 87:18 |
| 11:18:41 (1) | 81:13,14 | 11:25:23 (1) | 85:9 | 11:29:49 (1) |
| 78:9 | 11:23:35 (1) | 83:17 | 11:27:20 (1) | 87:19 |
| 11:19:10 (1) | 81:16 | 11:25:24 (1) | 85:14 | 11:29:50 (1) |
| 78:16 | 11:23:36 (2) | 83:18 | 11:27:21 (1) | 87:20 |
| 11:19:28 (1) | 81:17,18 | 11:25:31 (1) | 85:15 | 11:29:51 (1) |
| 78:20 | 11:23:37 (1) | 83:23 | 11:27:33 (2) | 87:21 |
| 11:19:53 (1) | 81:19 | 11:25:33 (1) | 85:20,21 | 11:29:53 (1) |
| 79:1 | 11:23:39 (1) | 83:24 | 11:27:36 (1) | 87:22 |
| 11:20:16 (1) | 81:20 | 11:25:35 (1) | 85:23 | 11:30:03 (1) |
| 79:7 | 11:23:52 (1) | 84:1 | 11:27:38 (2) | 87:25 |
| 11:20:51 (1) | 82:1 | 11:25:37 (1) | 85:24,25 | 11:30:04 (1) |
| 79:14 | 11:23:53 (1) | 84:2 | 11:27:39 (2) | 88:1 |
| 11:20:53 (1) | 82:2 | 11:25:38 (1) | 86:1,2 | 11:30:06 (2) |
| 79:16 | 11:23:55 (1) | 84:3 | 11:27:40 (1) | 88:2,3 |
| 11:21:05 (1) | 82:3 | 11:25:41 (1) | 86:3 | 11:30:09 (1) |
| 79:20 | 11:23:58 (1) | 84:5 | 11:27:58 (2) | 88:5 |
| 11:21:27 (1) | 82:4 | 11:25:46 (1) | 86:10,11 | 11:30:10 (1) |
| 79:24 | 11:24:07 (1) | 84:9 | 11:28:00 (1) | 88:6 |
| 11:21:56 (1) | 82:6 | 11:25:50 (1) | 86:12 | 11:30:12 (1) |
| 80:7 | 11:24:11 (1) | 84:11 | 11:28:02 (2) | 88:7 |
| 11:22:08 (1) | 82:8 | 11:25:51 (1) | 86:13,14 | 11:30:37 (1) |
| 80:11 | 11:24:24 (1) | 84:12 | 11:28:03 (1) | 88:15 |
| 11:22:36 (1) | 82:11 | 11:25:53 (1) | 86:15 | 11:30:44 (1) |
| 80:18 | 11:24:27 (1) | 84:14 | 11:28:09 (1) | 88:17 |
| 11:22:41 (1) | 82:12 | 11:25:55 (1) | 86:16 | 11:31:12 (2) |
| 80:20 | 11:24:28 (1) | 84:15 | 11:28:25 (1) | 88:23,24 |
| 11:22:42 (1) | 82:13 | 11:26:00 (1) | 86:18 | 11:31:13 (1) |
| 80:21 | 11:24:29 (1) | 84:16 | 11:28:46 (1) 86:23 | 88:25 |
| 11:22:43 (1) | 82:14 | 11:26:06 (1) | | 11:31:15 (1) |
| 80:22 | 11:24:30 (1) | 84:18 | 11:28:53 (1) | 89:2 |
| 11:22:44 (1) | 82:15 | 11:26:09 (1) | 86:25 11:28:54 (1) | 11:31:17 (1) |
| 80:23 11:22:48 (1) | 11:24:43 (1) 82:18 | 84:19 11:26:12 (1) | 11:28:54 (1) 87:2 | 89:4 11:31:45 (2) |
| | 82:18 11:24:48 (1) | 84:21 | 87:2 11:29:00 (1) | |
| 80:24 11:23:00 (1) | 82:22 | 84:21 11:26:17 (1) | 87:3 | 89:12,13 11:31:50 (1) |
| 81:2 | 82:22 11:24:52 (1) | 84:22 | 87:5 11:29:04 (1) | 89:16 |
| 01.2 | | 04.22 | | 07.10 |

| | | | | 11 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 11:32:17 (1) | 92:25 | 11:40:22 (1) | 99:2,3 | 12:03:55 (2) |
| 89:23 | 11:36:21 (1) | 96:1 | 11:43:04 (1) | 100:19,20 |
| 11:32:18 (1) | 93:2 | 11:40:27 (1) | 98:24 | 12:04:04 (1) |
| 89:24 | 11:36:48 (1) | 96:4 | 11:43:06 (1) | 100:21 |
| 11:32:22 (1) | 93:3 | 11:40:33 (1) | 98:25 | 12:05:02 (1) |
| 90:1 | 11:37:16 (1) | 96:8 | 11:43:07 (1) | 101:8 |
| 11:32:26 (1) | 93:7 | 11:40:37 (1) | 99:1 | 12:05:04 (1) |
| 90:3 | 11:37:17 (1) | 96:11 | 11:43:11 (1) | 101:9 |
| 11:32:29 (2) | 93:8 | 11:40:52 (1) | 99:3 | 12:05:07 (1) |
| 90:4,6 | 11:37:48 (1) | 96:19 | 110 (2) | 101:11 |
| 11:32:32 (2) | 93:15 | 11:40:59 (1) | 1:17 5:9 | 12:05:17 (1) |
| 90:8,9 | 11:38:24 (1) | 96:22 | 12:00 (1) | 101:15 |
| 11:32:33 (1) | 93:25 | 11:41:05 (1) | 161:11 | 12:05:37 (1) |
| 90:10 | 11:38:46 (1) | 97:1 | 12:02 (2) | 101:20 |
| 11:32:44 (1) | 94:6 | 11:41:08 (2) | 99:3,5 | 12:06:04 (1) |
| 90:14 | 11:39:18 (1) | 97:3,4 | 12:02:12 (1) | 102:2 |
| 11:33:18 (1) | 94:15 | 11:41:14 (1) | 99:4 | 12:06:05 (1) |
| 90:22 | 11:39:40 (1) | 97:8 | 12:02:16 (1) | 102:3 |
| 11:33:25 (1) | 94:21 | 11:41:16 (1) | 99:6 | 12:06:17 (1) |
| 90:24 | 11:39:46 (1) | 97:10 | 12:02:17 (1) | 102:6 |
| 11:33:27 (1) | 94:25 | 11:41:39 (1) | 99:7 | 12:06:25 (1) |
| 90:25 | 11:39:47 (1) | 97:11 | 12:02:22 (1) | 102:9 |
| 11:33:35 (1) | 95:1 | 11:41:41 (1) | 99:9 | 12:06:26 (1) |
| 91:1 | 11:39:49 (1) | 97:16 | 12:02:25 (1) | 102:10 |
| 11:33:50 (1) | 95:3 | 11:41:45 (1) | 99:10 | 12:06:27 (1) |
| 91:6 | 11:39:51 (1) | 97:18 | 12:02:37 (1) | 102:11 |
| 11:34:05 (1) | 95:5 | 11:41:50 (2) | 99:13 | 12:06:31 (1) |
| 91:10 | 11:39:54 (1) | 97:20,21 | 12:03:01 (1) | 102:13 |
| 11:34:06 (1) | 95:7 | 11:41:51 (1) | 99:19 | 12:06:44 (1) |
| 91:11 | 11:39:57 (1) | 97:22 | 12:03:08 (1) | 102:16 |
| 11:34:08 (1) | 95:9 | 11:41:52 (1) | 99:21 | 12:06:50 (1) |
| 91:13 | 11:39:58 (1) | 97:23 | 12:03:18 (1) | 102:19 |
| 11:34:47 (2) | 95:11 | 11:41:54 (1) | 99:25 | 12:06:54 (1) |
| 91:24,25 | 11:39:59 (1) | 97:25 | 12:03:22 (1) | 102:21 |
| 11:34:57 (1) | 95:12 | 11:41:55 (1) | 100:2 | 12:06:58 (1) |
| 92:3 | 11:40:02 (1) | 98:1 | 12:03:23 (1) | 102:22 |
| 11:35:24 (1) | 95:15 | 11:41:57 (1) | 100:3 | 12:07:00 (1) |
| 92:10 | 11:40:04 (1) | 98:2 | 12:03:48 (1) | 102:23 |
| 11:35:47 (1) | 95:17 | 11:42:02 (1) | 100:13 | 12:07:01 (1) |
| 92:15 | 11:40:13 (1) | 98:6 | 12:03:51 (1) | 102:24 |
| 11:35:55 (1) | 95:21 | 11:42:04 (1) | 100:15 | 12:07:05 (1) |
| 92:19 | 11:40:14 (1) | 98:8 | 12:03:52 (1) | 102:25 |
| 11:35:58 (2) | 95:22 | 11:42:05 (1) | 100:16 | 12:07:07 (1) |
| 92:20,21 | 11:40:17 (1) | 98:9 | 12:03:53 (1) | 103:1 |
| 11:36:10 (1) | 95:23 | 11:42:35 (1) | 100:17 | 12:07:16 (1) |
| 92:24 11:36:14 (1) | 11:40:20 (1) | 98:17 | 12:03:54 (1) | 103:3 |
| 11.30:14 (1) | 95:24 | 11:43 (2) | 100:18 | 12:07:47 (1) |
| | | | | |

| | | | | 42 |
|---------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 103:10 | 12:11:53 (2) | 109:13 | 12:17:01 (1) | 114:8 |
| 12:07:54 (1) | 107:3,4 | 109.15 12:14:43 (1) | 111:22 | 12:20:14 (1) |
| 103:13 | 10 7.3,4 12:11:54 (1) | 109:15 | 111.22 12:17:10 (1) | 114:15 |
| 12:08:25 (1) | 107:5 | 109.15 12:14:46 (1) | 111:25 | 12:20:33 (1) |
| 103:23 | 107.5 | 109:17 | 12:17:12 (1) | 114:20 |
| 12:08:58 (1) | 107:6 | 10 9.17 12:14:49 (1) | 112:1 | 12:20:35 (1) |
| 104:6 | 12:12:07 (1) | 109:19 | 112:17:13 (1) | 114:22 |
| 12:09:08 (1) | 107:9 | 109.19 | 112:2 | 12:20:54 (1) |
| 104:9 | 107.5 | 110:5 | 112:22 | 115:1 |
| 12:09:09 (1) | 107:10 | 12:15:32 (1) | 112:6 | 12:20:55 (1) |
| 104:10 | 12:12:12 (1) | 110:7 | 12:17:27 (1) | 115:2 |
| 12:09:13 (1) | 107:12 | 12:15:35 (1) | 112:8 | 12:20:57 (1) |
| 104:12 | 12:12:14 (1) | 110:9 | 12:17:28 (1) | 115:3 |
| 12:09:15 (2) | 107:13 | 12:15:44 (1) | 112:9 | 12:20:59 (1) |
| 104:13,14 | 12:12:40 (1) | 110:12 | 12:17:36 (2) | 115:4 |
| 12:09:41 (2) | 107:19 | 12:15:46 (1) | 112:11,12 | 12:21:02 (1) |
| 104:22,23 | 12:12:48 (1) | 110:13 | 12:17:40 (1) | 115:6 |
| 12:09:52 (1) | 107:22 | 12:15:52 (2) | 112:13 | 12:21:12 (1) |
| 105:1 | 12:12:49 (2) | 110:15,16 | 12:17:41 (1) | 115:9 |
| 12:09:55 (1) | 107:23,24 | 12:16:06 (1) | 112:14 | 12:21:36 (1) |
| 105:3 | 12:12:51 (2) | 110:20 | 12:17:53 (1) | 115:16 |
| 12:09:57 (1) | 108:1,2 | 12:16:16 (1) | 112:17 | 12:21:42 (1) |
| 105:5 | 12:12:52 (1) | 110:24 | 12:18:14 (1) | 115:18 |
| 12:10:00 (2) | 108:4 | 12:16:17 (1) | 112:24 | 12:21:44 (1) |
| 105:7,8 | 12:12:53 (1) | 110:25 | 12:18:24 (1) | 115:19 |
| 12:10:02 (1) | 108:5 | 12:16:19 (1) | 113:2 | 12:21:46 (1) |
| 105:10 | 12:12:54 (1) | 111:1 | 12:18:25 (1) | 115:20 |
| 12:10:03 (1) | 108:7 | 12:16:20 (1) | 113:3 | 12:21:49 (1) |
| 105:11 | 12:12:57 (2) | 111:2 | 12:18:26 (1) | 115:21 |
| 12:10:10 (1) | 108:9,10 | 12:16:21 (1) | 113:4 | 12:21:53 (1) |
| 105:14 | 12:13:05 (1) | 111:3 | 12:18:45 (1) | 115:22 |
| 12:10:11 (1) | 108:13 | 12:16:24 (2) | 113:10 | 12:22:09 (1) |
| 105:16 | 12:13:09 (1) | 111:4,5 | 12:18:54 (1) | 116:2 |
| 12:10:37 (1) | 108:14 | 12:16:27 (1) | 113:13 | 12:22:11 (1) |
| 105:24 | 12:13:10 (1) | 111:7 | 12:19:11 (1) | 116:3 |
| 12:10:52 (1) | 108:15 | 12:16:30 (2) | 113:17 | 12:22:23 (1) |
| 106:6 | 12:13:20 (1) | 111:9,10 | 12:19:16 (1) | 116:4 |
| 12:11:21 (1) | 108:17 | 12:16:32 (1) | 113:19 | 12:22:46 (3) |
| 106:14 | 12:13:27 (1) | 111:11 | 12:19:17 (1) | 116:9,10,12 |
| 12:11:37 (2) | 108:20 | 12:16:33 (1) | 113:20 | 12:22:49 (1) |
| 106:19,20 | 12:13:40 (2) | 111:12 | 12:19:20 (1) | 116:13 |
| 12:11:39 (2) | 108:24,25 | 12:16:37 (1) | 113:21 | 12:23:10 (1) |
| 106:22,23 | 12:14:01 (1) | 111:14 | 12:19:22 (1) | 116:18 |
| 12:11:47 (1) | 109:5 | 12:16:38 (1) | 113:22 | 12:23:47 (1) |
| 107:1 | 12:14:19 (1) | 111:15 | 12:19:23 (1) | 117:2 |
| 12:11:50 (1) | 109:7 | 12:16:44 (1) | 113:23 | 12:24:10 (1) |
| 107:2 | 12:14:39 (1) | 111:17 | 12:19:55 (1) | 117:10 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | I |

| | | | | 19 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 12:24:11 (1) | 121:7 | 12:33:06 (1) | 127:2,3,4 | 12:42:16 (1) |
| 117:11 | 12:29:16 (1) | 124:10 | 12:36:02 (1) | 131:16 |
| 12:24:30 (1) | 121:8 | 12:33:10 (1) | 127:9 | 12:42:20 (1) |
| 117:15 | 12:29:29 (1) | 124:12 | 12:36:48 (1) | 131:18 |
| 12:24:31 (1) | 121:12 | 12:33:11 (2) | 127:21 | 12:42:23 (1) |
| 117:16 | 12:29:33 (1) | 124:13,14 | 12:37:18 (1) | 131:20 |
| 12:25:26 (1) | 121:13 | 12:33:13 (1) | 128:4 | 12:42:24 (1) |
| 118:7 | 12:30:01 (1) | 124:15 | 12:37:35 (1) | 131:21 |
| 12:25:27 (1) | 121:20 | 12:33:17 (1) | 128:7 | 12:42:26 (1) |
| 118:8 | 12:30:29 (1) | 124:17 | 12:37:40 (1) | 131:23 |
| 12:25:42 (1) | 122:1 | 12:33:18 (1) | 128:10 | 12:42:29 (1) |
| 118:12 | 12:30:55 (1) | 124:18 | 12:37:44 (1) | 131:25 |
| 12:25:43 (1) | 122:9 | 12:33:20 (1) | 128:12 | 12:42:33 (1) |
| 118:13 | 12:30:57 (1) | 124:19 | 12:38:20 (1) | 132:2 |
| 12:25:44 (1) | 122:10 | 12:33:23 (1) | 128:21 | 12:42:58 (1) |
| 118:14 | 12:30:58 (1) | 124:22 | 12:38:21 (1) | 132:5 |
| 12:25:52 (2) | 122:12 | 12:33:24 (1) | 128:22 | 12:42:59 (1) |
| 118:17,18 | 12:31:00 (1) | 124:23 | 12:38:30 (1) | 132:6 |
| 12:25:54 (1) | 122:13 | 12:33:32 (1) | 128:25 | 12:43:03 (1) |
| 118:19 | 12:31:03 (1) | 125:1 | 12:38:32 (1) | 132:7 |
| 12:25:55 (3) | 122:14 | 12:33:51 (1) | 129:1 | 12:43:05 (1) |
| 118:20,21,22 | 12:31:18 (1) | 125:8 | 12:38:33 (1) | 132:8 |
| 12:25:56 (1) | 122:18 | 12:33:58 (1) | 129:3 | 12:43:06 (1) |
| 118:23 | 12:31:22 (1) | 125:11 | 12:38:49 (1) | 132:9 |
| 12:25:57 (1) | 122:20 | 12:34:17 (1) | 129:8 | 12:43:07 (1) |
| 118:24 | 12:31:23 (1) | 125:17 | 12:39:21 (1) | 132:10 |
| 12:26:02 (1) | 122:21 | 12:34:27 (1) | 129:17 | 12:43:11 (1) |
| 119:1 | 12:31:28 (1) | 125:21 | 12:39:46 (1) | 132:11 |
| 12:26:05 (1) | 122:23 | 12:34:48 (1) | 129:24 | 12:43:13 (1) |
| 119:3 | 12:31:59 (1) | 126:1 | 12:40:06 (1) | 132:13 |
| 12:26:08 (3) | 123:7 | 12:35:11 (1) | 130:5 | 12:43:22 (1) |
| 119:6,7,12 | 12:32:14 (1) | 126:5 | 12:40:49 (1) | 132:15 |
| 12:26:42 (1) | 123:12 | 12:35:13 (1) | 130:17 | 12:43:29 (1) |
| 119:17 | 12:32:23 (1) | 126:7 | 12:40:50 (1) | 132:18 |
| 12:27:18 (1) | 123:16 | 12:35:21 (1) | 130:18 | 12:43:38 (1) |
| 120:1 | 12:32:24 (1) | 126:11 | 12:41:04 (2) | 132:20 |
| 12:27:43 (1) | 123:17 | 12:35:23 (2) | 130:21,22 | 12:43:39 (1) |
| 120:7 | 12:32:25 (1) | 126:12,13 | 12:41:07 (2) | 132:21 |
| 12:28:22 (1) | 123:18 | 12:35:26 (1) | 130:23,24 | 12:43:40 (1) |
| 120:16 | 12:32:28 (1) | 126:15 | 12:41:12 (1) | 132:22 |
| 12:28:36 (1) | 123:20 | 12:35:37 (1) | 131:1 | 12:43:42 (1) |
| 120:21 | 12:32:34 (1) | 126:22 | 12:41:41 (1) | 132:23 |
| 12:28:55 (1) | 123:23 | 12:35:38 (1) | 131:7 | 12:43:47 (1) |
| 121:1 | 12:32:40 (1) | 126:23 | 12:41:56 (1) | 132:25 |
| 12:29:11 (1) | 124:1 | 12:35:40 (1) | 131:10 | 12:44:07 (1) |
| 121:6 | 12:32:43 (1) | 126:25 | 12:42:10 (1) | 133:7 |
| 12:29:12 (1) | 124:3 | 12:35:43 (3) | 131:14 | 12:44:08 (1) |
| | l | I | I | I |

| | | | | 11 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| 133:8 | 12:45:46 (1) | 136:14 | 12:51:43 (1) | 142:8 |
| 12:44:11 (1) | 134:16 | 12:47:42 (1) | 139:17 | 12:54:52 (1) |
| 133:9 | 12:45:51 (1) | 136:15 | 12:51:47 (2) | 142:9 |
| 12:44:12 (1) | 134:18 | 12:47:43 (1) | 139:20,21 | 12:54:53 (1) |
| 133:10 | 12:45:52 (2) | 136:16 | 12:51:48 (1) | 142:10 |
| 12:44:14 (1) | 134:19,20 | 12:47:49 (1) | 139:22 | 12:54:54 (1) |
| 133:11 | 12:45:54 (1) | 136:18 | 12:51:58 (1) | 142:12 |
| 12:44:15 (1) | 134:21 | 12:47:56 (1) | 139:25 | 12:55:03 (1) |
| 133:12 | 12:45:55 (1) | 136:20 | 12:51:59 (1) | 142:15 |
| 12:44:27 (1) | 134:23 | 12:48:06 (1) | 140:1 | 12:55:15 (1) |
| 133:15 | 12:46:12 (1) | 136:23 | 12:52:06 (2) | 142:19 |
| 12:44:31 (1) | 135:1 | 12:48:08 (1) | 140:4,5 | 12:55:33 (1) |
| 133:16 | 12:46:15 (1) | 136:24 | 12:52:13 (1) | 142:23 |
| 12:44:33 (1) | 135:2 | 12:48:15 (1) | 140:7 | 12:55:49 (1) |
| 133:17 | 12:46:16 (1) | 137:1 | 12:52:14 (1) | 143:1 |
| 12:44:34 (1) | 135:3 | 12:48:19 (1) | 140:8 | 12:55:50 (1) |
| 133:18 | 12:46:17 (1) | 137:3 | 12:52:15 (1) | 143:2 |
| 12:44:37 (1) | 135:4 | 12:48:32 (1) | 140:9 | 12:55:53 (1) |
| 133:19 | 12:46:24 (1) | 137:7 | 12:52:25 (1) | 143:4 |
| 12:44:41 (1) | 135:6 | 12:48:37 (1) | 140:11 | 12:55:54 (1) |
| 133:20 | 12:46:27 (1) | 137:9 | 12:52:45 (1) | 143:5 |
| 12:44:47 (1) | 135:7 | 12:49:23 (1) | 140:17 | 12:55:57 (1) |
| 133:21 | 12:46:29 (2) | 137:20 | 12:53:09 (2) | 143:7 |
| 12:44:50 (1) | 135:8,9 | 12:49:40 (1) | 140:24,25 | 12:56:07 (1) |
| 133:23 | 12:46:31 (1) | 138:1 | 12:53:20 (1) | 143:11 |
| 12:44:57 (1) | 135:10 | 12:49:45 (1) | 141:3 | 12:56:12 (1) |
| 133:25 | 12:46:32 (1) | 138:2 | 12:53:24 (2) | 143:13 |
| 12:44:59 (1) | 135:11 | 12:49:48 (1) | 141:5,6 | 12:56:14 (1) |
| 134:1 | 12:46:33 (1) | 138:4 | 12:53:26 (1) | 143:15 |
| 12:45:02 (1) | 135:12 | 12:49:50 (1) | 141:7 | 12:56:17 (1) |
| 134:2 | 12:46:46 (1) | 138:5 | 12:53:35 (1) | 143:17 |
| 12:45:09 (1) | 135:18 | 12:49:55 (2) | 141:9 | 12:56:20 (1) |
| 134:4 | 12:46:47 (1) | 138:7,8 | 12:53:37 (1) | 143:19 |
| 12:45:13 (1) | 135:19 | 12:49:58 (1) | 141:10 | 12:56:21 (1) |
| 134:5 | 12:46:55 (1) | 138:10 | 12:53:41 (1) | 143:20 |
| 12:45:16 (1) | 135:21 | 12:50:19 (1) | 141:12 | 12:56:34 (2) |
| 134:6 | 12:46:59 (1) | 138:16 | 12:53:43 (1) | 144:1,2 |
| 12:45:18 (2) | 135:24 | 12:50:34 (1) | 141:13 | 12:56:44 (1) |
| 134:7,8 | 12:47:02 (1) | 138:20 | 12:54:03 (1) | 144:4 |
| 12:45:20 (2) | 136:2 | 12:50:41 (1) | 141:17 | 12:56:46 (1) |
| 134:9,10 | 12:47:03 (1) | 138:23 | 12:54:25 (1) | 144:6 |
| 12:45:26 (1) | 136:3 | 12:51:03 (1) | 141:24 | 12:56:48 (1) |
| 134:12 | 12:47:07 (1) | 139:5 | 12:54:37 (1) | 144:7 |
| 12:45:34 (1) | 136:5 | 12:51:38 (1) | 142:3 | 12:56:50 (1) |
| 134:13 | 12:47:20 (1) | 139:14 | 12:54:46 (1) | 144:8 |
| 12:45:44 (1) | 136:8 12:47:41 (1) | 12:51:42 (1) 139:16 | 142:6 12:54:51 (1) | 12:56:52 (1) 144:9 |
| 134:15 | | 139.10 | 12.34.31 (1) | 144.7 |

| | | | | т. |
|---------------|--------------|--|--------------|--------------|
| 12:56:53 (1) | 15:44:19 (1) | 149:11 | 15:52:11 (1) | 154:25 |
| 12.30.35 (1) | 145:25 | 149.11 15:48:45 (2) | 152:21 | 15:53:52 (1) |
| 12:56:54 (1) | 15:44:25 (1) | 149:14,15 | 15:52:12 (1) | 155:2 |
| 144:12 | 146:4 | 1 49.14,15 15:48:46 (1) | 152:22 | 15:53:54 (1) |
| 12:56:56 (1) | 15:45:16 (1) | 149:16 | 15:52:15 (1) | 155:4 |
| 144:13 | 146:16 | 15:49:09 (1) | 152:24 | 15:53:55 (1) |
| 12:56:57 (1) | 15:45:34 (1) | 149:24 | 15:52:16 (1) | 155:5 |
| 144:14 | 146:23 | 15:49:42 (1) | 153:1 | 15:54:08 (1) |
| 12:57 (2) | 15:46:00 (1) | 150:10 | 15:52:19 (1) | 155:10 |
| 145:8,9 | 147:6 | 15:49:47 (1) | 153:3 | 15:54:10 (1) |
| 12:57:00 (1) | 15:46:16 (1) | 150:12 | 15:52:20 (1) | 155:11 |
| 144:15 | 147:12 | 15:49:48 (1) | 153:4 | 15:54:11 (1) |
| 12:57:10 (1) | 15:46:25 (1) | 150:13 | 15:52:37 (1) | 155:12 |
| 144:21 | 147:15 | 15:49:58 (1) | 153:10 | 15:54:19 (1) |
| 12:57:15 (2) | 15:46:31 (1) | 150:17 | 15:52:39 (1) | 155:15 |
| 144:22,23 | 147:19 | 15:50:07 (1) | 153:11 | 15:54:20 (1) |
| 12:57:23 (1) | 15:46:39 (1) | 150:21 | 15:52:41 (1) | 155:16 |
| 144:25 | 147:22 | 15:50:45 (1) | 153:13 | 15:54:31 (1) |
| 12:57:41 (1) | 15:47:22 (1) | 151:4 | 15:52:43 (2) | 155:21 |
| 145:4 | 148:9 | 15:50:46 (4) | 153:15,16 | 15:54:43 (1) |
| 12:57:44 (2) | 15:47:24 (1) | 151:5,7,8,10 | 15:52:45 (1) | 156:1 |
| 145:6,7 | 148:10 | 15:50:52 (1) | 153:17 | 15:55:01 (1) |
| 1200 (1) | 15:47:53 (1) | 151:12 | 15:52:54 (1) | 156:8 |
| 3:12 | 148:15 | 15:50:57 (1) | 153:19 | 15:55:03 (1) |
| 13:10:50 (1) | 15:47:54 (1) | 151:14 | 15:52:58 (1) | 156:10 |
| 145:9 | 148:16 | 15:51:01 (1) | 153:21 | 15:55:04 (1) |
| 13:35:41 (1) | 15:47:56 (1) | 151:16 | 15:53:06 (1) | 156:11 |
| 145:10 | 148:17 | 15:51:02 (1) | 153:25 | 15:55:14 (1) |
| 131 (1) | 15:47:58 (1) | 151:17 | 15:53:09 (1) | 156:15 |
| 2:14 | 148:19 | 15:51:12 (1) | 154:3 | 15:55:17 (1) |
| 1400 (1) | 15:48:04 (1) | 151:20 | 15:53:10 (2) | 156:17 |
| 2:9 | 148:20 | 15:51:13 (1) | 154:5,6 | 15:55:39 (1) |
| 15 (4) | 15:48:05 (1) | 151:22 | 15:53:11 (1) | 156:24 |
| 1:15 163:11 | 148:21 | 15:51:16 (1) | 154:7 | 15:55:40 (1) |
| 178:1 179:4 | 15:48:06 (1) | 151:23 | 15:53:24 (1) | 156:25 |
| 15-000072 (1) | 148:22 | 15:51:31 (1) | 154:10 | 15:55:48 (1) |
| 1:2 | 15:48:09 (1) | 152:3 | 15:53:32 (1) | 157:3 |
| 15:43:41 (1) | 148:24 | 15:51:32 (1) | 154:14 | 15:56:04 (1) |
| 145:12 | 15:48:16 (1) | 152:4 | 15:53:36 (1) | 157:9 |
| 15:43:43 (1) | 149:2 | 15:51:33 (1) | 154:17 | 15:56:27 (1) |
| 145:13 | 15:48:24 (1) | 152:5 | 15:53:37 (2) | 157:17 |
| 15:43:47 (1) | 149:5 | 15:51:36 (1) | 154:18,19 | 15:56:37 (1) |
| 145:15 | 15:48:25 (1) | 152:7 | 15:53:45 (1) | 157:21 |
| 15:43:49 (1) | 149:6 | 15:51:38 (1) | 154:23 | 15:56:47 (1) |
| 145:16 | 15:48:28 (1) | 152:9 | 15:53:46 (1) | 157:25 |
| 15:44:17 (1) | 149:8 | 15:51:46 (1) | 154:24 | 15:56:48 (1) |
| 145:24 | 15:48:37 (1) | 152:12 | 15:53:48 (1) | 158:1 |

| 15:56:49 (1) | 160:14,15 | 162:14 | 16:03:19 (2) | 168:5,6 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 158:2 | 15:59:25 (1) | 16:00:36 (1) | 165:16,17 | 16:05:25 (1) |
| 15:56:50 (1) | 160:17 | 162:21 | 16:03:20 (1) | 168:7 |
| 158:3 | 15:59:29 (1) | 16:00:57 (1) | 165:18 | 16:05:27 (2) |
| 15:56:52 (1) | 160:20 | 163:2 | 16:03:21 (2) | 168:9,10 |
| 158:5 | 15:59:30 (1) | 16:01:05 (1) | 165:20,21 | 16:05:29 (1) |
| 15:56:59 (1) | 160:21 | 163:6 | 16:03:30 (1) | 168:12 |
| 158:7 | 15:59:31 (1) | 16:01:15 (1) | 165:24 | 16:05:45 (1) |
| 15:57:00 (2) | 160:22 | 163:10 | 16:03:34 (1) | 168:18 |
| 158:8,9 | 15:59:32 (1) | 16:01:29 (1) | 166:2 | 16:05:57 (3) |
| 15:57:12 (1) | 160:23 | 163:15 | 16:03:35 (1) | 168:21,22,23 |
| 158:14 | 15:59:35 (2) | 16:01:30 (1) | 166:3 | 16:06:08 (1) |
| 15:57:21 (1) | 161:1,2 | 163:16 | 16:03:39 (2) | 169:1 |
| 158:18 | 15:59:37 (1) | 16:01:51 (1) | 166:5,6 | 16:06:09 (1) |
| 15:57:23 (2) | 161:4 | 163:24 | 16:03:40 (1) | 169:2 |
| 158:20,21 | 15:59:38 (1) | 16:02:07 (1) | 166:7 | 16:06:10 (1) |
| 15:57:24 (1) | 161:5 | 164:4 | 16:03:41 (2) | 169:3 |
| 158:22 | 15:59:44 (2) | 16:02:22 (1) | 166:9,10 | 16:06:17 (1) |
| 15:57:25 (1) | 161:8,10 | 164:8 | 16:03:43 (1) | 169:6 |
| 158:23 | 15:59:48 (2) | 16:02:23 (1) | 166:12 | 16:06:18 (1) |
| 15:57:26 (1) | 161:12,13 | 164:9 | 16:03:45 (1) | 169:7 |
| 158:24 | 15:59:49 (1) | 16:02:25 (2) | 166:14 | 16:06:20 (1) |
| 15:57:28 (1) | 161:14 | 164:10,11 | 16:04:04 (1) | 169:8 |
| 159:1 | 15:59:55 (2) | 16:02:26 (1) | 166:18 | 16:06:28 (1) |
| 159.1 15:57:29 (1) | 161:17,18 | 164:12 | 16:04:24 (2) | 169:13 |
| 159:2 | 15:59:56 (1) | 16:02:32 (1) | 166:24,25 | 16:06:29 (2) |
| 159.2 15:57:35 (1) | 161:19 | 164:15 | 16:04:25 (1) | 169:14,15 |
| 159:4 | 15:59:58 (1) | 16:02:35 (2) | 167:1 | 16:06:30 (2) |
| 15:57:52 (1) | 161:20 | 164:18,19 | 16 7.1 16:04:35 (1) | 169:16,17 |
| 159:9 | 15:59:59 (2) | 16:02:50 (1) | 167:5 | 16:06:32 (1) |
| 15:58:01 (1) | 161:22,23 | 164:24 | 167.5 16:04:49 (1) | 169:19 |
| 159:12 | 15th (5) | 16:03:00 (1) | 167:10 | 16:06:34 (1) |
| 15:58:13 (1) | 5:3 176:10,12 | 165:2 | 16 7.10 16:04:58 (1) | 169:20 |
| 159:16 | 177:20 178:3 | 16:03:02 (1) | 167:13 | 16:06:35 (1) |
| 15:58:16 (1) | 16:00:00 (1) | 165:4 | 16 /04:59 (1) | 169:21 |
| 159:18 | 161:24 | 16:03:03 (1) | 167:14 | 16:06:36 (1) |
| 15:58:18 (3) | 16:00:02 (2) | 165:5 | 16:05:02 (1) | 169:22 |
| 159:19,20,22 | 161:25 162:1 | 16:03:05 (1) | 167:16 | 16:06:39 (1) |
| 15:58:20 (1) | 16:00:03 (2) | 165:6 | 16:05:07 (2) | 169:24 |
| 159:23 | 162:3,4 | 16:03:06 (1) | 167:18,20 | 16:06:43 (1) |
| 15:58:24 (1) | 16:00:05 (1) | 165:7 | 16:05:09 (2) | 170:2 |
| 159:25 | 162:5 | 16:03:11 (1) | 167:21,22 | 16:06:45 (1) |
| 15:58:52 (1) | 16:00:14 (1) | 165:10 | 16:05:10 (1) | 170:3 |
| 160:6 | 162:9 | 16:03:13 (2) | 167:23 | 16:07:25 (1) |
| 15:59:19 (1) | 16:00:15 (4) | 165:11,12 | 16:05:18 (1) | 170:13 |
| 160:13 | 162:10,11,12,13 | 16:03:18 (1) | 168:2 | 16:07:55 (1) |
| 15:59:20 (2) | 16:00:16 (1) | 165:15 | 16:05:24 (2) | 170:21 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |

| | | | | 17 |
|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 16:07:59 (1) | 174:10 | 179 (3) | 163:11 176:11 | 138:14 |
| 170:23 | 16:12:13 (1) | 1:13 4:6,9 | 176:12 177:20 | 4:13 (3) |
| 16:08:28 (1) | 174:11 | 1850 (1) | 178:1,4 179:4 | 1:15 175:17,18 |
| 171:5 | 16:12:16 (1) | 5:9 | 2139 (1) | 4:30 (2) |
| 16:08:34 (1) | 174:13 | 1998 (4) | 2:4 | 138:15 161:16 |
| 171:8 | 16:12:17 (1) | 130:18 132:19 | 22 (1) | 40 (2) |
| 16:08:38 (1) | 174:14 | 132:20,23 | 140:9 | 34:13 138:6 |
| 171:10 | 16:12:25 (1) | 1999 (10) | 23 (6) | 401 (1) |
| 16:08:46 (1) | 174:19 | 115:12 135:3,4 | 56:5,12 57:22 | 3:12 |
| 171:12 | 16:12:40 (1) | 141:15 142:9 | 64:9,15 140:10 | 4th (1) |
| 16:08:47 (1) | 174:25 | 142:13 143:12 | 25 (10) | 3:8 |
| 171:14 | 16:12:41 (1) | 144:3,24 159:8 | 136:21,21,25 | |
| 16:08:52 (1) | 175:1 | | 137:4,6 139:9 | 5 |
| 171:16 | 16:12:43 (1) | 2 | 139:10 140:6,9 | 5 (4) |
| 16:09:26 (1) | 175:2 | 2 (4) | 171:2 | 18:21 20:7 |
| 171:25 | 16:12:44 (1) | 99:8 142:20 | 25-year-old (1) | 142:23 161:16 |
| 16:09:45 (1) | 175:4 | 159:9 175:19 | 20:23 | 5:30 (1) |
| 172:7 | 16:12:50 (1) | 2/01/16 (1) | 28 (1) | 161:15 |
| 16:09:47 (1) | 175:6 | 176:17 | 163:13 | 50 (3) |
| 172:8 | 16:12:53 (1) | 20 (6) | | 10:7 62:1 120:9 |
| 16:09:50 (1) | 175:8 | 3:4 132:4 139:9 | 3 | 50-year (1) |
| 172:10 | 16:12:54 (1) | 140:6 154:19 | 3 (3) | 130:10 |
| 16:09:54 (1) | 175:9 | 171:2 | 116:4 142:21 | 500 (1) |
| 172:12 | 16:12:55 (1) | 2000- (1) | 159:12 | 178:16 |
| 16:09:56 (1) | 175:11 | 142:7 | 3:43 (2) | 575 (1) |
| 172:13 | 16:12:56 (1) | 20006 (1) | 145:9,11 | 3:8 |
| 16:10:11 (1) | 175:12 | 2:19 | 30 (14) | 6 |
| 172:19 | 16:12:57 (1) | 2002 (11) | 8:12,12,13,14 | |
| 16:10:15 (1) | 175:13 | 115:12 130:19 | 8:18,22,25 | 6 (2) |
| 172:21 | 16:12:59 (1) | 132:23 135:3,4 | 136:21,22,22 | 4:7 142:24 |
| 16:10:19 (1) | 175:14 | 141:15 142:13 | 136:25 137:4,6 | 6-foot (1) |
| 172:23 | 16:13:00 (2) | 143:12 144:3 | 150:22 | 132:3 |
| 16:10:22 (2) | 175:15,16 | 144:24 159:8 | 33156 (1) | 6th (2) 1:17 5:9 |
| 172:25 173:1 | 1615 (1) | 2005 (1) | 2:10 | 1.17 5.9 |
| 16:10:26 (1) | 178:16 | 154:19 | 33301 (2) | 7 |
| 173:3 | 161994 (1) | 2007 (1) | 3:13 5:10 | 77 (2) |
| 16:10:54 (1) | 176:16 | 148:10 | 33401 (1) | 19:9,23 |
| 173:12 | 170 (1) | 2009 (1) | 178:16 | 77-year-old (1) |
| 16:11:01 (1) | 177:10 | 142:7 | 33402-3626 (1) | 20:22 |
| 173:15 | 176 (1) | 2011 (2) | 2:5 | |
| 16:11:23 (1) | 4:8 | 93:16,20 | 35 (1) | 8 |
| 173:20 | 177 (1) | 2014 (5) | 138:6 | 8:00 (2) |
| 16:11:45 (1) | 4:8 | 93:4,9 94:3 | 4 | 175:13,13 |
| 174:2 | 17769 (1) | 97:12 113:12 | $\frac{-1}{4(2)}$ | 80,000 (2) |
| 16:12:01 (1) | 2:18 | 2015 (14) | 116:4 142:21 | 101:1,3 |
| 174:7 | 178 (1) | 1:15 5:4 56:6,12 | 4:10 (1) | |
| 16:12:04 (1) | 4:9 | 64:8,9 116:5 | | 9 |
| | 1 | | 1 | |

| | | 48 |
|--|--|----|
| 9:00 (4) 175:10,11,12,14 9:30 (1) 175:8 9:31 (3) | | |
| 1:15 5:2,4 9150 (1) 2:10 96-year-old (1) 164:2 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |