

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND
FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

CA FLORIDA HOLDINGS, LLC,
Publisher of *THE PALM BEACH POST*,

CASE NO.: 50-2019-CA-014681-XXXX-MB

DIVISION: AG

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVE ARONBERG, as State Attorney of
Palm Beach County, Florida; SHARON R.
BOCK, as Clerk and Comptroller of Palm
Beach County, Florida.

Defendants.

JOINT NOTICE OF FILING SEPTEMBER 6, 2022 AND SEPTEMBER 8, 2022
TRANSCRIPTS OF HEARING PROCEEDINGS

Plaintiff, CA Florida Holdings, LLC (“Plaintiff”), publisher of *The Palm Beach Post*, and
Defendant, Dave Aronberg, as State Attorney of Palm Beach County, Florida (“Defendant”)
(collectively, the “Parties”), by and through undersigned counsel, and pursuant to the Court’s
instructions at the conclusion of the hearing, hereby files the attached transcripts from the
September 6 and September 8, 2022 hearing proceedings on Defendant’s Amended Motion for
Attorneys’ Fees.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lauren Whetstone

LAUREN WHETSTONE

Florida Bar No. 45192

MARK F. BIDEAU

Florida Bar No. 564044

GREENBERG TRAURIG, P.A.

777 South Flagler Drive, Suite 300 East

West Palm Beach, FL 33401

/s/ Douglas A. Wyler

ARTHUR I. JACOBS

Florida Bar No. 10249

RICHARD J. SCHOLZ

Florida Bar No. 0021261

DOUGLAS A. WYLER

Florida Bar No. 119979

JACOBS SCHOLZ & WYLER, LLC

961687 Gateway Blvd., Suite 201-I

Tel.: 561.650.7900
whetstonel@gtlaw.com
bideaum@gtlaw.com
sandra.famadas@gtlaw.com
thomasd@gtlaw.com
FLService@gtlaw.com

STEPHEN A. MENDELSON
Florida Bar No. 849324
GREENBERG TRAUIG, P.A.
401 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2000
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Tel.: 954.768.8225
mendelsohns@gtlaw.com
smithl@gtlaw.com

MICHAEL J. GRYGIEL
(Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP
54 State Street, 6th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
Tel.: 518.689.1400
grygielm@gtlaw.com

NINA D. BOYAJIAN
(Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP
1840 Century Park East, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: 310.586.7700
boyajiann@gtlaw.com
riversaal@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff CA Florida Holdings, LLC,
Publisher of The Palm Beach Post*

Fernandina Beach, FL 32034
Tel.: 904.261.3693
jacobsscholzlaw@comcast.net

*Counsel for Defendant Dave Aronberg, as
State Attorney for Palm Beach County,
Florida*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing has been electronically filed with the Florida E-File Portal for e-service on all parties of record herein on this 4th day of October, 2022.

/s/ Lauren Whetstone
Lauren Whetstone

NOT A CERTIFIED COPY

CA Florida Holdings, L.L.C.

vs.

Dave Aronberg

Hearing Before:

Judge Luis Delgado

September 06, 2022

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 15TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA
CASE NO. 50-2019-CA-014681-XXXX-MB AG

CA FLORIDA HOLDINGS, LLC,
Publisher of the PALM BEACH POST,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DAVE ARONBERG, as State Attorney
of Palm Beach County, Florida;
SHARON R. BOCK, as Clerk and
Comptroller of Palm Beach County,
Florida,

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
PROCEEDINGS

RE: Defendant Dave Aronberg's Amended Motion for
Attorneys' Fees

DATE TAKEN: Tuesday, September 6, 2022

TIME: 1:42 p.m. - 4:53 p.m.

PLACE: PALM BEACH COUNTY COURTHOUSE

205 North Dixie Highway

Courtroom 10D

West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

BEFORE: LUIS DELGADO, JR., Circuit Judge

Stenographically reported by:
Lisa Begley, RPR, RMR

270569

1 APPEARANCES:

2 On behalf of the Plaintiff:
3 GREENBERG TRAURIG
4 777 South Flagler Drive
Suite 300 East
4 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
561-650-6420
5 BY: LAUREN R. WHETSTONE, ESQ.
whetstonel@gtlaw.com
6 MARK F. BIDEAU, ESQ.
bideaum@gtlaw.com
7 GERARD BUITRAGO, ESQ.
buitragog@gtlaw.com

8
9 On behalf of Defendant, Dave Aronberg:
10 JACOB, SCHOLZ & WYLER, LLC
961687 Gateway Boulevard
Suite 2011
11 Fernandina Beach, Florida 32034
904-261-3693
12 BY: DOUGLAS A. WYLER, ESQ.
doug@jswflorida.com

13 Also present: Dave Aronberg, State Attorney
14 Defendant
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	Opening Statement	
4	By Mr. Wyler	4
4	By Ms. Whetstone	23
5	WITNESS	
6	DAVID ARONBERG, STATE ATTORNEY	
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Wyler	43
8	Cross Examination by Mr. Bideau	63
8	Redirect Examination by Mr. Wyler	94
9	STEPHEN MENDELSON, ESQ.	
10	Direct Examination by Ms. Whetstone	98
11	Defense Rests	96
12		
13	EXHIBITS ENTERED IN EVIDENCE	
14	Joint Exhibits 1 - 37	95
15		
16		
17	Certificate of Reporter	141
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Thereupon,

2 the following proceedings began at 1:42 p.m.:

3 THE COURT: All right, please be seated.

4 All right, so we're here on the amended

5 motion for attorneys' fees.

6 Let's announce appearances.

7 MS. WHETSTONE: Good afternoon, Your Honor,

8 Lauren Whetstone. With me is Mark Bideau and

9 Gerard Buitrago and our paralegal, Jennifer

10 Thomson, from Greenberg Traurig on behalf of CA

11 Florida Holdings, the publisher of the Palm Beach

12 Post.

13 MR. WYLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My

14 name's Douglas Wyler. I'm here on behalf of

15 defendant, David Aronberg.

16 MR. ARONBERG: State Attorney Dave

17 Aronberg, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Thank you very much. It's your

19 motion.

20 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor. May I

21 approach?

22 THE COURT: (Nods head up and down.)

23 MR. WYLER: Hi, again, Your Honor. Thank

24 you. May it please the Court. As you know, we're

25 here today on Mr. Aronberg's amended motion for

1 attorney's fees. It was filed on November 9th,
2 2020, in conjunction with his 57.105 demand that
3 was made to the plaintiffs on June 8th, 2020.

4 That demand letter that was sent to the
5 plaintiff's counsel was sent on the same day that
6 Judge Marx entered her order granting the
7 defendant's motion to dismiss Count 2 of this case
8 with prejudice. And that motion, that 57.105
9 demand letter asserted that the plaintiff's sole
10 remaining count for declaratory action had no
11 basis in fact or law pursuant to 57.105.

12 Their declaratory relief claim is rooted in
13 Chapter 905.27 Florida Statute that governs the
14 exceptions for the release of grand jury -- grand
15 jury materials.

16 In our 57.105 letter, we specifically told
17 the plaintiffs that, under 57.105(1)(a), their
18 declaratory relief claim is unsupported by the
19 material facts necessary to establish it and also,
20 under 57.105(1)(b), that their declaratory relief
21 claim is unsupported by the application of the law
22 to those material facts:

23 There's a case, Davis v. Bailyson, it's
24 found at 268 So.3d 762. It's a Fourth DCA case
25 from 2019.

1 THE COURT: Give me that cite one more
2 time.

3 MR. WYLER: Yes, sir. It's Davis v.
4 Bailyson, B-a-i-l-y-n-s-o-n, 268 So.3d 762. It's
5 a Fourth DCA 2019. That case says, The central
6 purpose of 57.105 Florida Statute is and always
7 has been to deter meritless filings and, thus,
8 streamline the administration and the procedure of
9 the courts. Thus, the post-1999 version of the 57
10 -- 57.105 has expanded the circumstances where
11 fees should be awarded and the purpose is to defer
12 meritless filings.

13 57.105 -- The statute 57.105 provides the
14 following language authorizing the award of
15 attorneys' fees such as in the present litigation.
16 It says, "Upon the Court's initiative or motion of
17 any party, the Court shall award a reasonable
18 attorney's fee, including prejudgment interest, to
19 be paid to the prevailing party in equal amounts
20 by the losing party and the losing party's
21 attorney on any claim or defense at any time
22 during a civil proceeding or action in which the
23 Court finds that the losing party or the losing
24 party's attorney knew or should have known that a
25 claim or defense, when initially presented to the

1 Court or at any time before trial, was not
2 supported by the material facts necessary to
3 establish the claim or defense, or would not be
4 supported by the application of then existing law
5 to those material facts."

6 So, notably, the statute includes a lot of
7 key words in there, but here, the key words that
8 I'm focusing on is "knew or should have known."

9 Here, the plaintiff had a due diligence
10 obligation to know what the law was when they
11 filed the lawsuit. They should have known the
12 ultimate facts of the case all along, and they
13 should have known the proper legal mechanism for
14 obtaining the records that they were seeking.

15 Nonetheless, we've informed the plaintiff
16 multiple times throughout this case that not --
17 that Mr. Aronberg is an improper party, not only
18 -- because not only is it impossible for him to
19 produce the requested records since he has no
20 possession, custody or control over them, but also
21 because the statutes that govern the disclosure of
22 grand jury records clearly and unambiguously do
23 not grant such authority or power to the state
24 attorney.

25 Another case for you is Trust Mortgage,

1 LLC, v. Ferlanti. That's found at 193 So.3d 997.
2 That's also a Fourth DCA case from 2016. And it
3 can guide the Court here. This case says that, in
4 determining an award of sanctions under
5 Section 57.105, the trial court's findings must be
6 based on substantial competent evidence and the
7 trial court must make an inquiry into what the
8 losing party knew or should have known during the
9 fact establishment process both before and after
10 the suit was filed.

11 So, as to the 57.105(1)(a) claim,
12 Mr. Aronberg's position is that the newspaper
13 should have known when they were doing their
14 research that it was an impossibility, that he had
15 no access, custody or control of these records,
16 but that fact -- a bright line was drawn to that
17 fact by Judge Marx in the June 3rd, 2020, motion
18 to dismiss hearing. She made several statements
19 that put the plaintiff on notice, if they weren't
20 already.

21 And, if it would please the Court, I would
22 like to read those onto the record. You can find
23 these -- We've submitted a joint binder to you,
24 and if you -- --

25 THE COURT: I have it here. Tell me where

1 I'm looking.

2 MR. WYLER: Yes, sir. If you look at J13,
3 that's the condensed version of the transcript.
4 You can find the full version if you look at J29,
5 and I can give you the Bates stamp numbers.

6 THE COURT: Tell me where to look, and I'll
7 look.

8 MR. WYLER: Absolutely, Your Honor. Look
9 at Bates stamp 1353, and that will start you --

10 THE COURT: Of what exhibit?

11 MR. WYLER: Okay, Exhibit 29 is the full
12 version. I thought that might be easier for you
13 to read it. At 1353.

14 THE COURT: You said J29.

15 MR. WYLER: Yeah, J29, and, if you look in
16 the lower left corner, there's a Bates number that
17 says CA, slash, Aronberg, and you'll see the Bates
18 stamp numbers.

19 THE COURT: What's the number?

20 MR. WYLER: 1353.

21 THE COURT: Go ahead.

22 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm
23 going to go through this transcript, and I'll
24 direct you to the actual page number of the
25 transcript itself, okay? Page 3, lines 18 -- 4

1 through 1. "Not for nothing" -- This is all Judge
2 Marx. "Not for nothing, I think we all know that
3 they don't have control and custody of the
4 records."

5 Page 5, lines 17 through 19. "I think we
6 can all agree that the state attorney doesn't have
7 these records."

8 Page 8, line 4. "I'm asking you, how are
9 the clerk and the state attorney the proper
10 defendants?"

11 Page 8, line 8. "I'm puzzled by the
12 procedural posturing of this case naming the state
13 attorney, and, you know, I'm further stymied by
14 the fact that you allege in your complaint that
15 they have, particularly David Aronberg, the state
16 attorney, that he has these records."

17 Page 8, line 18. "Okay, let's run this all
18 the way out. Let's say you win and you get a
19 judgment against the state attorney, Dave
20 Aronberg. What's he supposed to do with it? He
21 can't release the grand jury testimony. He has no
22 authority whatsoever to do that."

23 Page 10, line 21. "And the only thing
24 we're here today about is why should the clerk and
25 the state attorney have to defend a civil action

1 when it's an impossibility of performance? They
2 even -- If you were to win and get a judgment
3 against them, they cannot give you what they don't
4 have."

5 Page 11, line 12. "I'm simply saying, why
6 should these two entities have to defend this
7 lawsuit when, even down the road, if you win, they
8 can't give you what they don't have?"

9 Page 16, line 12. "And, you know, really,
10 I want to you boil it down for me as to this:
11 Let's take it all the way down the road. You win.
12 You get a judgment against the clerk and the state
13 attorney. I know there's other reasons why you
14 might have filed it this way, but I'm just simply
15 puzzled because I do hear what the clerk and the
16 state attorney are saying, and that is,
17 performance is impossible. They don't have the
18 records and cannot, absolutely. There's not even
19 an inch of wiggle room that they could release the
20 records even if you got a judgment. It is solely
21 a determination for the Court. I frankly think
22 you know there's ways to get your records.
23 There's ways to get confidential records, but it
24 isn't by suing the state attorney and the clerk."

25 Page 17, line 6. "Even assuming, arguendo,

1 that they have the records, we know they don't.
2 You were to -- If you were to get a judgment
3 against them, how would you expect them to
4 perform?"

5 And then finally, on page 17, line 23.

6 "What do you mean? What do you mean? They're not
7 trying to block it? They're saying that, despite
8 the fact -- let's just talk about the clerk
9 because we all know the state attorney doesn't
10 have it."

11 I would ask the Court to enter the hearing
12 transcript found at J29, 1353 to 1374 as Defense's
13 Exhibit No. 1.

14 THE COURT: Any objection?

15 MS. WHETSTONE: All the joint exhibits are
16 in evidence, so...

17 MR. WYLER: They're in evidence, but I
18 don't know if you wanted to mark them for each
19 person. So if I don't need to do that, then I'll
20 dispense with that.

21 THE COURT: These joint exhibits have all
22 been stipulated to?

23 MR. WYLER: Yes.

24 THE COURT: No need then.

25 MR. WYLER: Then I'll leave it alone.

1 Thank you, Your Honor.

2 These statements, along with the upcoming
3 examination of Mr. Aronberg and Mr. Mendelsohn,
4 along with everything that's presented to the
5 Court, it shows that these sanctions are
6 justified, and there is no arguable basis in fact
7 or law the way those statutes are written that
8 Mr. Aronberg could ever provide the requested
9 materials that he was sued for.

10 As to the 57.105(1)(b) argument,
11 Mr. Aronberg's position here is that the
12 newspaper, plaintiffs and their attorneys, they
13 should have also known at the beginning when they
14 were doing their research that those statutes
15 precluded Mr. Aronberg from actually providing
16 these records. That's what they sued for. They
17 asked for Mr. Aronberg to provide these records so
18 that they could then be disclosed to the public.
19 But chapter -- or, Statute 905.27 states this:
20 And this -- this argument has been presented in
21 everything that we've said to the newspaper.

22 "When such disclosure is ordered by a Court
23 pursuant to subsection (1) for use in a civil
24 case, it may be disclosed to all parties to the
25 case and to their attorneys and by the latter to

1 their legal associates and employees. However,
2 the grand jury testimony afforded such persons by
3 the Court can only be used in the defense or
4 prosecution of the civil or criminal case and for
5 no other purpose whatsoever."

6 That argument was ultimately utilized in
7 Judge Hafele's final judgment in favor of the
8 clerk because, on top of other things, the
9 plaintiff admitted that they weren't seeking to
10 use these requested records in an underlying civil
11 or criminal case. They wanted to use it to -- for
12 public disclosure.

13 Chapter 905.17 of the Florida statutes also
14 applies here. This has also been made evident and
15 very clear to the plaintiff. That statute says,
16 in pertinent part, "The notes" -- and this is all
17 regarding the grand jury materials -- "The notes,
18 records and transcriptions are confidential and
19 exempt from the provisions of Chapter 119.07 and
20 Section 24(a), Article 1 of the State Constitution
21 and shall be released by the clerk only on a
22 request by a grand jury for use by the grand jury
23 or on an order of the Court pursuant to
24 Chapter 905.27."

25 So, like I said, these legal arguments have

1 been presented to plaintiff and its lawyers
2 several times. It was in the 57.105 demand
3 letter, but plaintiff dropped Mr. Aronberg from
4 the case too late. The statute had already taken
5 effect. There's a 21-day safe-harbor provision in
6 that statute. And the testimony and evidence
7 today will show that a motion for attorneys' fees
8 was filed appropriately with that statute, and
9 then following that, Mr. Aronberg was dropped from
10 the case. After that, an amended motion for
11 attorneys' fees was filed.

12 Plaintiff has an argument having to deal
13 with the timing of when our amended motion for
14 attorneys' fees was filed. They claim that we
15 don't comply with the 21-day safe-harbor
16 provision, and they use this case of Lago v Kame,
17 Lago v Kame By Design. It's K-a-m, like Mary,
18 K-a-m-e By Design, LLC. That's found at 120 So.3d
19 73. It's also a Fourth DCA case from 2013.

20 So that case held that, if a party files a
21 subsequent or amended motion for sanctions under
22 Section 57.105 and raises an argument that was not
23 raised in the original motion for Section 57.105
24 sanctions, then the subsequent motion must
25 independently comply with the 21-day safe-harbor

1 provision.

2 Okay, but the facts are different, totally
3 different.

4 See, in the Lago case, the party who was
5 served with the 57.105 demand never withdrew from
6 the case. They stayed in the case to the end.
7 The person that served the original 57.105 in
8 Lago, after serving it, served a second one, and
9 when they served the second 57.105 -- well, they
10 didn't serve a second 57.105 demand letter. They
11 filed a second motion for attorneys' fees, an
12 amended motion for attorneys' fees without
13 providing an additional letter, 57.105 letter
14 before they filed the amended motion. That didn't
15 happen in this case.

16 In this case, we filed our amended motion
17 -- our original motion for attorneys' fees on
18 November 9th, 2020, and then they dropped
19 Mr. Aronberg from the case on October 21st --
20 sorry, we filed -- I'm sorry. I apologize, Your
21 Honor. We filed our original motion for
22 attorneys' fees on July 1, 2020. I apologize.
23 They dropped Mr. Aronberg from the case on
24 October 21, 2020, and then we filed our amended
25 motion for attorneys' fees on November 9th, 2020.

1 So the significant thing about this, Your
2 Honor, is the 21-day safe-harbor provision is
3 there to provide the -- provide an opportunity to
4 reevaluate your position and change your position
5 and withdraw your case based on the demands in the
6 57.105.

7 There was no opportunity for the plaintiff
8 to reevaluate and change their position. They had
9 already made their mind up. They had already
10 dropped Mr. Aronberg from the case. So, by asking
11 or saying that we failed to provide the 21-day
12 safe-harbor provision, that is misleading, Your
13 Honor, because there was no way they could change
14 their position with another demand letter sent to
15 them. They had already made their decision and
16 dropped Mr. Aronberg from the case. It was
17 impossible for them to change their position. So
18 he had no obligation to serve his amended motion
19 prior to filing with the Court because he was
20 already dropped, and a previous motion for
21 attorneys' fees was already filed.

22 Another interesting part of that Lago case
23 is that, in that case, the Court did find that the
24 amended motion was filed improperly because they
25 were still in the case, but, instead, the Court

1 picked up the originally-filed motion for
2 attorneys' fees in that case. And we would ask
3 Your Honor, in the alternative, should you find
4 that, that you would rule on our original motion
5 for attorneys' fees if it came down to it because,
6 in the end, the arguments are the same, and the
7 real difference in the filing of the amended
8 motion for attorneys' fees is that it included the
9 final tabulation of my firm's fees, as well as
10 affidavits -- my affidavit of reasonable -- of
11 fees and an affidavit of reasonable fees from our
12 expert.

13 The other interesting thing here, the other
14 argument that you'll hear plaintiff make is that
15 Mr. Aronberg was a proper party to the case. Now,
16 again, the clerk is the person -- the only entity
17 that has authority to provide these records under
18 statute, and that alone should be enough to show
19 that Mr. Aronberg is not a proper party defendant.
20 But Judge Hafele's final judgment actually helps
21 out this because Judge Hafele's final judgment
22 actually instructed plaintiff on the right way to
23 go about trying to get the records that they were
24 seeking. It points out that they followed --
25 failed to follow the right procedure.

1 In that final judgment, Judge Hafele makes
2 it clear that all that they had to do was file --
3 follow the Rules of Judicial Administration
4 Rule 2.42 and file a motion seeking disclosure in
5 the underlying case, and then serve the parties to
6 that case and anybody who might be interested in
7 it.

8 That underlying case is State of Florida
9 vs. Jeffrey Epstein. It's case number
10 2006-CF-9454, and Mr. Aronberg nor his office is a
11 party to that case. So he is an improper party.
12 They never needed to sue him to get these records.

13 There's a big difference between suing the
14 state attorney to get records versus filing a
15 motion in a case that was already open.

16 Okay, now they make one other defense here
17 under 57.105(3)(a), but that does not apply here
18 in any sense, and I'll explain to you why. First,
19 let me read you the statutory language.

20 This is 57.105(3)(a), and it says,
21 "Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2), monetary
22 sanctions may not be awarded; (a), Under
23 paragraph (1)(b) if the Court determines that the
24 claim or defense was initially presented to the
25 Court as a good faith argument for the extension,

1 modification or reversal of existing law or the
2 establishment of new law, as it applied to the
3 material facts, and with a reasonable expectation
4 of success."

5 So here, the plaintiff tries to twist the
6 language of that statute in two different ways to
7 suit its argument. First, they entirely failed to
8 recognize that the 57.103(a) (sic) defense applies
9 only to claims made under 57.105(1)(b), and that
10 has to do with the law not being correct as
11 applied to the facts to establish the case.

12 The law here cannot be applied to the case
13 in such a way that would support their claim as I
14 went through with those statutes with you. That
15 is the only scenario under (1)(b), when you're
16 making a legal argument, not a factual argument,
17 where you can come up with a good faith defense.
18 So there is no good faith defense at all that
19 applies to the factual argument that it is
20 impossible for Mr. Aronberg to provide these
21 materials, that he has no access, custody or
22 control over them and he never has. That is
23 unchanged by this defense of theirs.

24 But the interesting thing is that this
25 defense fails in another way, too, because, if you

1 recall, their only remaining count is for
2 declaratory relief, and when declaratory relief is
3 asked of the Court, that is an asked for
4 interpretation, and admittedly so by the
5 plaintiff. Their -- They state that -- Where did
6 I just put it? They argue that their declaratory
7 relief claim was presented to the Court as a,
8 quote, good faith argument for the interpretation
9 of existing law or at least the establishment of a
10 new law. But that doesn't work here because, if
11 you go back to the statutory language, the
12 statute, it's only for the extension, modification
13 or reversal of existing law. It doesn't say
14 anything about interpretations.

15 They did not ask for the extension of
16 57.105 -- or, of 905.27. They didn't ask for it
17 to be modified. They didn't ask for it to be
18 reversed. They asked the Court to interpret it
19 and tell them whether or not they had the ability
20 to have the grand jury records disclosed to them.
21 That is totally -- That is an interpretation that
22 they asked for. The Court only got to address
23 that as to the clerk because, again, we were
24 dropped before then.

25 So the other part of that statute talks

1 about -- it says, or creation of a new law, okay?
2 They weren't asking to create a new law with their
3 declaratory relief claim. The only place where
4 they were trying to create a new statutory cause
5 of action was in their Count 2 that was dismissed
6 with prejudice by Judge Marx and is not at all a
7 part of Mr. Aronberg's 57.105 demand.

8 The 57.105 demand only regards the claim
9 for declaratory relief. So the defense under
10 57.105(3)(a) fails as to both of Mr. Aronberg's
11 57.105 claims.

12 I would just like to reiterate to the Court
13 that the clerk is in actual possession of the
14 requested records, is the only entity that is
15 statutorily authorized to release grand jury
16 records pursuant to a Court order, and despite
17 plaintiff's arguments to the contrary, the record
18 evidence will show that plaintiff and its lawyers
19 knew or should have known at the time they were
20 served -- at least at the time they were served
21 with the 57.105 demand that the declaratory relief
22 claim fails under 57.105(1)(a) because it is
23 unsupported by the material facts necessary to
24 establish it, and under 57.105(1)(b) because it is
25 unsupported by the application of the law to the

1 material facts.

2 Plaintiff and its attorneys have exposed
3 themselves to sanctions under 57.105, and
4 Mr. Aronberg requests such relief.

5 THE COURT: Thank you.

6 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 MS. WHETSTONE: May I approach, Your Honor?

8 THE COURT: Please.

9 MS. WHETSTONE: And if I may, I'll flip
10 over this timeline. Your Honor should have a copy
11 in your binder.

12 THE COURT: Is that the -- Yes, give me --
13 I think I actually...

14 Is this it?

15 MS. WHETSTONE: Yes.

16 THE COURT: Whenever you're ready.

17 MS. WHETSTONE: May it please the Court.

18 The Post filed a complaint seeking access to
19 materials from Jeffrey Epstein's grand jury
20 investigation which was run by the Palm Beach
21 County's former state attorney in 2006.

22 The Post felt a duty to inform the public
23 as to how this sexual predator got the deal of the
24 century and got off with such leniency. It is a
25 matter of genuine public interest and concern as

1 this Court has noted.

2 The Post named two defendants, number one,
3 the clerk of Court as the public office tasked
4 with custody of grand jury records and, number
5 two, the state attorney's office because it
6 actually ran the investigation and because it is
7 the public office tasked with protecting grand
8 jury secrecy.

9 The state attorney's office says they
10 should have never been named a party. Of course
11 they had to be named a party. Not only were they
12 the public office that conducted the investigation
13 and presumably had possession of certain documents
14 at some time, but, more importantly, they're the
15 public office with the power and authority to
16 prevent the clerk from producing grand jury
17 documents.

18 Your Honor, we heard in the state
19 attorney's counsel's opening that this is about
20 custody, whether the state attorney had the
21 documents, whether he had possession or custody of
22 the documents, but it's not just about that. It
23 is not just about custody. And it's -- We'll get
24 into this, but the important point is, the state
25 attorney's office has as its task the protection

1 of the grand jury system.

2 And it's important to remember, we're here
3 today on a motion for 57.105 sanctions relating to
4 the declaratory relief claim, not the statutory
5 claim. We heard reading from the transcript
6 before Judge Marx relating to the motion to
7 dismiss Count 2, which was on a statutory claim
8 under Florida Statute 905.27.

9 Of course, we are here on the declaratory
10 relief claim that also involved constitutional law
11 and First Amendment law, not just Florida
12 statutory law.

13 So, starting off, we went as to the merits,
14 but you don't even need to get there, Your Honor.
15 There are two noncurable, case dispositive
16 jurisdictional issues which require denial of the
17 motion without any consideration of underlying
18 facts. And this is not just an argument. These
19 are jurisdictional defects.

20 Number one, the Court lacks jurisdiction
21 because the amended motion for sanctions was filed
22 after the state attorney was dismissed as a party.
23 And I'll indicate -- Hopefully you can hear me,
24 but here is where the state attorney filed his
25 amended motion for fees. It was November 2020.

1 And we dismissed -- the Post had dismissed him as
2 a party 19 days before, on October 21st, 2020.

3 The case law is clear that the Court has no
4 jurisdiction over a motion for sanctions after a
5 voluntary dismissal, like the motion here. And
6 this is case law, including Sidlosca vs. Olympus,
7 and that is in Authorities tab -- the Authorities
8 binder that Your Honor has at tab 26, and I'll
9 read the case cite for the record. 276 So.3d 987.
10 It's a Third DCA 2019 case.

11 Number two, the Court also lacks
12 jurisdiction because the amended motion, which is
13 the only motion we are here on, violated 57.105
14 subsection (4)'s safe-harbor notice provision
15 which requires a motion for fees be served at
16 least 21 days before its filed.

17 It is undisputed that the state attorney
18 never served a copy of the amended motion for
19 sanctions at any time before filing it on November
20 9th. I believe Mr. Wyler also mentioned that and
21 agreed with that in his opening. As a result, the
22 amended motion cannot be considered. The state
23 attorney tries to rely on a prior, what he calls,
24 quote, unquote, place-marker motion for fees that
25 was served on June 8th, 2020, in an attempt to get

1 around the safe-harbor requirement of 57.105. He
2 cannot do so. First, the statute is in derogation
3 of the common law, so it must be strictly
4 construed.

5 More importantly, the case law says, and
6 this is Lago vs. Kame, the case law says that the
7 initial place-marker motion is not sufficient to
8 comply with 57.105 because, once they filed an
9 amended motion making new arguments, then that
10 21-day safe-harbor notice was required anew. And,
11 again, Lago says -- this is tab 14 in Your Honor's
12 binder -- that they must independently comply with
13 the 21-day safe harbor.

14 The state attorney tries to argue that,
15 because we dismissed him prior to him filing the
16 amended motion for fees, he's no longer required
17 to comply with the 21-day safe harbor, but the
18 dismissal is exactly what the 21-day safe-harbor
19 provision is aimed at encouraging from parties in
20 litigation.

21 There was nothing to ask us to withdraw
22 with a 21-day notice because it had already been
23 withdrawn, so 57.105 doesn't even apply to the
24 situation here, and that's actually a situation
25 that came up in the Ferere, F-e-r-e-r-e, vs. Shore

1 case, and that's tab 6 in Your Honor's binder and
2 that's a Fourth DCA case. And in that case, the
3 Court said that 57.105 subsection (1) was not
4 applicable where there was no way for plaintiff's
5 counsel to withdraw an allegation after a
6 post-trial motion. So if 57.105 -- the
7 safe-harbor notice was not available, then 57.105
8 doesn't apply at all.

9 And, here, it's obvious that the amended
10 motion made new arguments not in the first
11 place-marker motion. And we're going to pull up
12 the first place-marker motion and the amended
13 motion to compare them, and those are exhibits,
14 Joint Exhibits 14 and 25.

15 So, first, here is -- So the first
16 place-marker motion, Exhibit 14, it's -- the
17 motion itself is one page. There's an enclosure
18 letter that came with it, and it's two pages. So
19 three pages total. The motion itself says nothing
20 except we're going to prevail, and this is your
21 notice, we want fees.

22 But the enclosure letter says, along the
23 lines I believe Mr. Wyler said this in his
24 opening, that the defendant Aronberg nor the
25 office of the state attorney is in custody or

1 control of the 2006 grand jury materials sought
2 therein.

3 However, the first motion completely failed
4 to address the main reason why the state attorney
5 was a party to the lawsuit, because it could
6 object to the clerk providing the grand jury
7 records.

8 So now let's pull up Exhibit 25, which is
9 the amended motion. And, Your Honor, here, so you
10 can have an idea, here's the first motion. It's
11 Joint Exhibit 14. Here's the amended motion.
12 This is three pages. This is 59 pages with
13 exhibits, 11 pages of a motion. And one page of a
14 motion. So clearly there's new stuff in the
15 amended motion for fees. But Mr. Wyler said they
16 said the same arguments. That's not -- That's not
17 true.

18 The amended motion clearly makes new
19 arguments not in the first place-marker motion.
20 It also references new documents, like the state
21 attorney's motion for summary judgment and
22 Mr. Aronberg's affidavit, both which were filed in
23 August of 2020. So here (indicating).

24 Importantly, the amended motion also raises
25 new positions. Just as an example -- and, Gerard,

1 if you could pull up paragraph 20 of the amended
2 motion -- it says, "The state attorney has no
3 objection to the clerk producing and disclosing
4 the requested materials should the Court grant an
5 order to that effect." And then in paragraph 25
6 it says, "Likewise, the state attorney has no
7 objection and never has had any objection to the
8 clerk releasing the records sought by the
9 plaintiff."

10 That's not true, though. As you will see
11 in the evidence, the position that the state
12 attorney had, quote, no objection, or, quote,
13 never had any objection to the clerk producing
14 grand jury materials was new, and you'll hear from
15 Greenberg Traurig attorney Stephen Mendelsohn that
16 this is exactly the position that the Post was
17 trying to get and Mr. Mendelsohn was trying to get
18 from the state attorney.

19 And you'll hear, in a June 23rd, 2020,
20 letter Mr. Mendelsohn wrote to the state attorney,
21 he said the state attorney is named here because
22 they are a party that is tasked with protection of
23 the grand jury system. You have the right to
24 object to the release of grand jury materials.
25 That's why you're here. And, once we had this

1 notice right here of saying they don't object, we
2 dismissed him.

3 So he first said on the record, on
4 October 14th, I have no objection to the
5 production of the Epstein grand jury materials.
6 We dismissed him October 21st.

7 So, to close out on the jurisdictional
8 argument, the amended motion raised new arguments
9 and cited new record evidence that did not exist
10 at the time of the first place-marker motion. So
11 the amended motion had independently complied with
12 the strict 21-day safe-harbor requirement, and the
13 state attorney failed to serve it before filing;
14 therefore, the amended motion must be denied
15 outright.

16 Your Honor, even if the Court -- sorry --
17 even if the state attorney could overcome the
18 jurisdictional defects, the evidence will show
19 there's absolutely no basis for sanctions under
20 the statute, and let's turn to the statute now and
21 the standard under it as applied by the case law.

22 And this will be tab 18.

23 THE COURT: Are you talking to me, or --

24 MS. WHETSTONE: Sorry, I was indicating to
25 Gerard.

1 And, Your Honor, here's the standard for
2 sanctions under Florida Statute 57.105. The
3 statute is behind it. Mr. Wyler read from that.
4 And this is a case that interprets -- interprets
5 this high standard, and this is the same -- I note
6 that Davis vs. Bailyson -- I'm going to botch
7 that name, sorry, but the case that Mr. Wyler read
8 from has the same exact standard as to how you --
9 you interpret whether somebody has met the
10 requirements of 57.105. So this is a high burden.
11 This is not a who won. This is not a prevailing
12 party standard.

13 They have the burden of showing that the
14 claim was so frivolous and devoid of merit both on
15 the facts and the law as to be completely
16 untenable, and we know the claim was not
17 frivolous, number one, because they admitted in
18 their answer to this very claim --

19 And, Gerard, if you could pull up the
20 comparison.

21 They admitted in their answer to this very
22 claim that a good faith dispute exists between the
23 parties. And here you're seeing -- Your Honor is
24 seeing a comparison of Exhibit 9, which is the
25 amended complaint, this count for declaratory

1 relief, and Exhibit 10, which is the state
2 attorney's answer. And it says, "The Palm Beach
3 Post has sought from defendants, and defendants --
4 but defendants have refused to provide access to
5 the testimony, minutes and other evidence
6 presented in 2006 to the Palm Beach County grand
7 jury. Indeed, defendants have each filed motions
8 to dismiss the complaint and the relief it sought
9 under Florida Statute Section 905.27(1).

10 Accordingly, a good faith dispute exists between
11 the parties." And, in response, the state
12 attorney simply said, "Admitted."

13 By that admission, they lose this motion
14 for sanctions. They cannot now argue this claim
15 was without merit. And, in addition, we will go
16 through the evidence that shows the Post and
17 Greenberg Traurig acted only in good faith and
18 with thoughtful deliberation and that this was not
19 a frivolous claim by any means.

20 So backing up a bit and to what we believe
21 the evidence will show. After Epstein's arrest
22 here in Palm Beach County in 2005, the Post began
23 an investigation into Epstein and then what
24 happened with the prosecution in 2006, how he got
25 this sweetheart deal from the former state

1 attorney, to inform the public what went wrong.

2 The Post made a number of public records
3 requests. No luck. The limited documents they
4 received shed no light on how Epstein got off with
5 such leniency.

6 So, in the summer of 2019 -- we again have
7 this timeline -- after years of investigation on
8 Epstein, the Post brought in a team at Greenberg
9 Traurig, including Stephen Mendelsohn here who you
10 will hear from today, and other experienced
11 attorneys in First Amendment and constitutional
12 law and criminal law.

13 The Post and its attorneys spent months
14 researching and determining how do we get these
15 records. And you'll see the first box is from
16 July -- July 2019 through November 2019, research
17 and -- legal research and due diligence regarding
18 what claims to bring and how. You will hear that
19 Mr. Mendelsohn tried contacting the state
20 attorney's office and requesting what was missing
21 from the public records requests.

22 And if you want to pull up Exhibit 1.

23 Exhibit 1 is an example of such, and it was
24 a letter from Mr. Mendelsohn that you'll hear
25 about where he requests specific documents. And

1 you will hear that [REDACTED] was not the only
2 attorney to write the state attorney's office in
3 addition to the Post. You will hear that
4 Mr. Mendelsohn's specific records request to the
5 state attorney's office went unanswered, and you
6 will hear from Mr. Mendelsohn and the Post that
7 the Post was left with no other option. So the
8 Post filed this lawsuit seeking access to grand
9 jury materials naming two defendants, the clerk
10 and the state attorney.

11 And the state attorney was a necessary
12 party to the claim here. I believe I've gone over
13 that, but, quickly, number one, the state attorney
14 ran -- conducted the grand jury investigation in
15 2006. At some point, the state attorney's office
16 had to have records. But, number two, more
17 importantly, as the public official with
18 responsibility and control over the grand jury
19 system, the state attorney had to be named. As
20 the public office with that control, the state
21 attorney had the power to object to the clerk
22 producing records. And this is something that the
23 state attorney has never refuted or even
24 addressed, and that goes hand in hand with number
25 two, that the state attorney also had the ability

1 to request access to records from the clerk. This
2 was not on a whim, not to harass and certainly not
3 frivolous.

4 In doing all this background research, you
5 will hear that Mr. Mendelsohn came across Fourth
6 DCA and federal case law supporting the conclusion
7 that the state attorney was a necessary party.
8 Mr. Mendelsohn provided the state attorney with
9 that case law and explained what we needed from
10 the state attorney in this case. We needed the
11 state attorney to represent that he would not
12 object to the release of grand jury materials by
13 the clerk if ordered by the Court. They ignored
14 that request.

15 You will hear from Mr. Mendelsohn --
16 Exhibit 16 -- about a June 23rd, 2020, letter he
17 sent to the state attorney in response to the
18 state attorney's place-marker motion for fees that
19 was in early June. And, in this letter dated
20 June 23rd, Mr. Mendelsohn set forth three reasons
21 why the state attorney was named as a party.
22 Again, number one, custody; number two, they had
23 the power to make arguments against release of
24 grand jury materials; number three, there was
25 nothing that prohibits the state attorney from

1 requesting copies of the clerk during and after
2 the close of criminal prosecution.

3 So, as Mr. Mendelsohn says in this letter,
4 even if the state attorney's office did not have
5 possession or custody of the [REDACTED] materials,
6 that did not end the need for his office to be a
7 party to the declaratory relief claim. The state
8 attorney still had the right to object to the
9 clerk producing records. That's exactly why we
10 included them in the case.

11 You'll hear they previously did oppose
12 release by filing a motion to dismiss -- this is
13 Count 2, I'm sorry, the statutory count -- and
14 then, by filing the answer to Count 1 admitting
15 that a good faith dispute exists as to this very
16 claim.

17 So in the timeline, for months after
18 Mr. Mendelsohn's letter, they -- they refused to
19 respond, and we also reminded them on October 2nd,
20 2020, in a later filing, what we needed. What we
21 needed from the state attorney to release him from
22 this case was that he would not object to the
23 clerk's release of materials, and this was in our
24 reply -- sorry -- response to the first
25 place-marker motion for fees, and that was

1 Exhibit 20.

2 In that exhibit -- or, in that document,

3 [REDACTED] again raises the In re Grand Jury

4 case that you just saw in the June 23rd letter.

5 It was not until after this, on October 14th,

6 2020, that the state attorney's office finally

7 stated in a court filing they would not object to

8 the clerk's production if ordered, and he took a

9 position of neutrality. Days later, we dismissed

10 the state attorney.

11 It's important to note the dismissal of the

12 state attorney does not make him a prevailing

13 party, not even under the 57.105 sanctions

14 standard, which is much higher than a prevailing

15 party standard, but even under a regular

16 prevailing party standard, the state attorney is

17 not a prevailing party here. Just because a

18 plaintiff voluntarily dismisses a defendant does

19 not make a defendant a prevailing party. Where a

20 plaintiff gets something or a compromise out of

21 litigation, a dismissal becomes an appropriate

22 course of action as a result, then neither party

23 is the prevailing party for purposes of

24 contractual attorneys' fees. And that's pursuant

25 to the Kelly vs. BankUnited case that is -- it

1 should be in tab 38 of Your Honor's Authorities
2 binder. We sent it included in the supplement.

3 THE COURT: I think I --

4 MS. WHETSTONE: It should have been on last
5 Thursday, but --

6 THE COURT: I got it.

7 MS. WHETSTONE: As Mr. Wyler even said, the
8 purpose of 57.105 is to deter misuse of the
9 judicial system and to discourage needless
10 litigation, but here, to declare the state
11 attorney a prevailing party and entitled to
12 attorneys' fees under these facts would be
13 contrary to that goal.

14 Again, you'll hear from Mr. Mendelsohn that
15 the Post dismissed the state attorney only after
16 it got what it needed from him, changing his
17 opposition to release of grand jury records to
18 getting his affirmative statement that his office
19 did not object. And, Your Honor, the cases here
20 -- sorry -- the Court's rulings here actually
21 support this finding of no basis for sanctions
22 even further.

23 With regard to -- We heard a lot from the
24 transcript before Judge Marx from the motion to
25 dismiss Count 2. First, that was with regard to a

1 motion to dismiss Count 2, not the count we're on
2 here today, which is Count 1 for declaratory
3 relief.

4 It's important to note that Count 1 for
5 declaratory relief involves issues of First
6 Amendment and constitutional law, not just that
7 Florida Statute 905.27.

8 In number two, respectfully, what -- what
9 Judge Marx said during a hearing is not evidence
10 as to whether the state attorney actually has
11 custody or control of records. So we heard her
12 statements on the record but no evidence about
13 whether the state attorney did or did not have
14 custody of the documents. And he did say in his
15 filings he does not have custody or control of the
16 documents, but, again, we're not just here about
17 his own custody or control; we're here about his
18 right as the state attorney to object to the clerk
19 releasing grand jury records.

20 And when Judge Marx entered an order on
21 Count 2 dismissing Count 2, that was a limited
22 order on whether there was a private cause of
23 action under that statute.

24 In addition, there was Judge Hafele's final
25 judgment that was Exhibit 30 in the binder, and

1 Judge Hafele, when he entered the final judgment,
2 that was as to the same claim that's at issue
3 here, the declaratory relief claim as it remained
4 against the clerk, because you'll recall the state
5 attorney had already been dismissed as a party
6 once they said they had no objection to the clerk
7 releasing grand jury materials.

8 In the final judgment, Judge Hafele noted
9 this was a case of first impression involving
10 issues of genuine public concern. The arguments
11 by the Post's attorneys in support of the
12 declaratory relief claim were strong, sincere,
13 palatable and persuasive. He commended everyone
14 for their hard work. This is the opposite of a
15 frivolous claim. And, while the Court ultimately
16 did not rule in the Post's favor for declaratory
17 relief as to the clerk, we respectfully disagree,
18 and that decision is currently on appeal. But,
19 more importantly, that is not the standard for
20 57.105. Again, it is not a prevailing party
21 standard.

22 They have not met the high burden for
23 sanctions to prove that the fact -- the claim was
24 so frivolous or so devoid of merit under both the
25 facts and the law as to be completely untenable,

1 and, at the very least, this is a case -- in this
2 case of first impression, the claim for
3 declaratory relief was a good faith argument for
4 extension of the law. And, according to
5 57.105(3)(a) sanctions cannot be awarded.

6 A reminder here, too, that it was not just
7 the statutory -- the Florida statute at issue.
8 It's constitutional and First Amendment law at
9 issue in the declaratory relief claim.

10 Finally, it's worth noting that, if there
11 are no sanctions imposed, there are no fees to be
12 paid by the state attorney's office, by
13 Mr. Aronberg personally or by taxpayers, by
14 anybody.

15 Mr. Wyler, who represents state attorneys
16 across the state of Florida, had a contingency
17 agreement with the state of Florida in this case
18 -- sorry -- state attorney in this case and, from
19 the outset, no fee obligations arose unless there
20 was a Court order awarding fees. And that's
21 Exhibit 5 in the joint exhibit binder. So the
22 only way they were going to get fees was under a
23 57.105 motion. However, there has never been any
24 basis for 57.105 sanctions.

25 In closing, Your Honor, 57.105 is reserved

1 for egregious conduct. There's nothing even
2 remotely close to that conduct that exists here.

3 The motion must be denied, and the Post
4 respectfully requests the Court deny the amended
5 motion for sanctions in its entirety.

6 Thank you, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: How many witnesses are you
8 calling?

9 MR. WYLER: Just one. Mr. Aronberg.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm
12 that the evidence you are about to give will be
13 the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the
14 truth?

15 THE WITNESS: I do.

16 Thereupon,

17 DAVID ARONBERG, STATE ATTORNEY,
18 having been duly sworn by the Clerk of the Court,
19 responded and testified as follows:

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. WYLER:

22 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Aronberg.

23 Will you please introduce yourself to the
24 Court and tell us how long you've held your position.

25 A. Good afternoon.

1 I'm David Aronberg. I go by Dave. And
2 I've been state attorney since I was elected in 2012.

3 Q. Thank you. We're here today on your
4 amended motion for attorneys' fees filed November 9,
5 2020, against the plaintiff, correct?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. And did you engage my law firm, Jacobs
8 Scholz & Wyler, to defend you in this action?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. I'm going to show you our Joint Exhibit 5.
11 Do you recognize this as a copy of our firm's engagement
12 letter with your office signed by Jeanne Howard?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Thank you.

15 MR. WYLER: Joint Exhibit 5, Your Honor,
16 our firm's engagement letter, contingency fee
17 agreement.

18 THE COURT: Thank you.

19 BY MR. WYLER:

20 Q. Mr. Aronberg, have you reviewed or are you
21 otherwise familiar with the pleadings and filings
22 submitted with the Court in this hearing?

23 A. I am.

24 Q. So then you're familiar with the
25 newspaper's original summons and complaint filed against

1 you on November 14th, 2019, and then the amended
2 complaint filed January 17, 2020?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And what has the newspaper sued you for?

5 A. They sued me to obtain the Jeffrey Epstein
6 grand jury documents.

7 Q. Did they sue to just obtain them, or to
8 also produce them and provide them to them?

9 A. They wanted me to produce them and to give
10 it -- give those documents to them.

11 Q. And do you know what they wanted to do with
12 those documents once they got them?

13 A. They wanted to publish the documents.

14 Q. Okay. And do you have possession, custody
15 or control of those requested grand jury documents?

16 A. No. I've never had possession, custody or
17 control of those documents.

18 Q. And, by control of those documents, do you
19 mean that you couldn't -- you have no power to release
20 them if you had them?

21 A. I have no power to release these documents.
22 I don't have them. I've never had them. They knew I've
23 never had them.

24 Q. But, in their complaint, didn't they allege
25 that you and your office are, quote, in possession of the

1 documents that are the subject of this action?

2 A. That's this whole case. It's whether I had
3 possession, custody or control of these documents.
4 That's why they sued me and my office. And I never had
5 possession, custody or control of these documents.

6 Q. Okay.

7 MR. WYLER: Your Honor, you can find that
8 on J9 of the amended complaint if you're looking.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 MR. WYLER: You can find it at Bates stamp
11 118.

12 BY MR. WYLER:

13 Q. Mr. Aronberg, are you familiar with the
14 newspaper's allegation in their complaint that you,
15 quote, have denied to the Palm Beach Post and to the
16 public at large the grand jury materials sought to be
17 disclosed?

18 A. I am.

19 Q. Did you ever deny the newspaper those
20 requested materials?

21 A. From the beginning, we informed the
22 newspaper that I've never had these documents. In our
23 motion to dismiss, we had two arguments. The first one,
24 the very first one was that we do not possess, have
25 custody or control of these documents.

1 In the second argument, we then make an
2 argument of law, because it's a motion to dismiss and we
3 have to argue as a matter of law and we couldn't rely on
4 the matter of fact that I didn't have the documents. So
5 they put us in a position to argue as a matter of law
6 that, even if we did have them, under the law we could
7 not provide them.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. And, since then, they've been using that as
10 a cudgel.

11 MR. WYLER: And, Your Honor, if I can, I'll
12 direct you to J6 and J10. Those are the two
13 motions to dismiss that do make that assertion.

14 THE COURT: 6 and 10?

15 MR. WYLER: Yes, Your Honor. And I'll read
16 that on the record. J6, Bates stamp 103, it says,
17 "It is significant to note that, despite
18 plaintiff's allegations to the contrary, Defendant
19 Aronberg is not in custody or control of the
20 records sought and is, therefore, not a proper
21 party to this action."

22 And, in the second motion to dismiss, I'll
23 read that to the Court as well. That's at J10,
24 Bates stamp 222. "It is significant to emphasize
25 that, despite plaintiff's allegations to the

1 contrary, Defendant Aronberg and the Office of the
2 State Attorney for the 15th Judicial Circuit are
3 not in custody or control of the records sought
4 herein, and, therefore, Defendant Aronberg is not
5 a proper party to this action. In fact, Defendant
6 Sharon R. Bock as clerk and comptroller of Palm
7 Beach County, Florida, admits that she is the
8 custodian in possession of the documents that are
9 the subject of this action."

10 BY MR. WYLER:

11 Q. Mr. Aronberg, after these initial filings,
12 did you take any other steps to further notify the
13 newspaper and its lawyers that your office lacks
14 possession, custody and control of the requested records?

15 A. Yes, and that is because, when the articles
16 came out that I was somehow stonewalling the Palm Beach
17 Post and trying to prevent public access to these
18 documents, I started to get calls and texts from people
19 asking why I was doing that. I had a Facebook message
20 that said I should resign.

21 Peter Antonacci, my predecessor down in
22 Broward, reached out to me, wanted to know why I was
23 covering for the grand jury -- or, for Barry Krischer or
24 for others. And I told him I don't have the documents,
25 because that seemed to be lost in the articles written.

1 And so I took an extraordinary step. I
2 made a decision to create a Web portal and to release
3 every document that my office had relating to Jeffrey
4 Epstein and put it on the Internet, and that was -- and I
5 have just to refresh my recollection, the dates up here
6 -- that was January 30th.

7 Q. Okay, great. On January 30th, did -- I'm
8 going to show you joint Exhibit No. 12. Do you recognize
9 this as the press release that your office released that
10 you were just explaining?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And can you read it to the Court, please?

13 A. This is a press release that my office put
14 out when we established this Web portal, and it says
15 this: "Palm Beach County State Attorney Dave Aronberg
16 creates Web portal for public access to Jeffrey Epstein
17 records."

18 And then there's a statement from me: "In
19 response to a large number of requests, my office is
20 posting online all the public records from the
21 investigation and prosecution of Jeffrey Epstein. These
22 records, which have all been released previously pursuant
23 to public records requests, can be accessed through the
24 following link," and it gives the link.

25 "The Jeffrey Epstein case occurred several

1 years and multiple state attorney administrations before
2 I became Palm Beach County State Attorney in 2013." I
3 was elected as -- As an aside, I was elected in 2012, but
4 I started in 2013. "As such, I have never seen or had
5 access to the Epstein grand jury transcripts as the state
6 attorney's office has never possessed them. As lawsuits
7 and investigations continue to move forward, I hope that
8 Epstein's victims are able to achieve justice and closure
9 they deserve."

10 Q. Thank you. Now, in addition to that press
11 release, did you make any other steps to further notify
12 plaintiff that you don't have the records they were
13 seeking?

14 A. In addition to putting out that press
15 release and sending it to the Palm Beach Post and every
16 other media outlet in our database from around the
17 country, I also put that press release on my Twitter page
18 and, not only that, I pinned it so it would be the first
19 thing on my Twitter page.

20 I also put it out on my Facebook page, and,
21 as a result, it received national media coverage,
22 including coverage from the Sun-Sentinel, the competitor
23 to the Palm Beach Post. But, curiously, the one paper
24 that did not report on this Web portal, the one paper
25 that did not report on my releasing all the documents in

1 my possession was the Palm Beach Post.

2 To this day, they still have never
3 acknowledged that I posted every document onto my Web
4 page, onto my Twitter page, onto my Facebook page, onto
5 our Web portal. To this day, even though I've had that
6 tweet pinned to my page for months in the past, they have
7 never acknowledged that it existed.

8 Q. Thank you, Mr. Aronberg. I'm going to show
9 you our joint Exhibit No. 11. Do you recognize this as
10 the Twitter post that you were just referencing?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And does it say the same thing as the press
13 release?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Thank you.

16 A. It also looks like this could be from
17 Facebook as well.

18 Q. Okay. All right, are you aware and
19 familiar with the June 3rd motion to dismiss hearing and
20 statements made on the record by Judge Marx, the ones I
21 just read to the Court previously?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. What did you think of those remarks?

24 MR. BIDEAU: Objection, Your Honor,
25 irrelevant what Mr. Aronberg thinks of remarks.

1 THE COURT: Sustained.

2 BY MR. WYLER:

3 Q. So following those remarks from Judge Marx,
4 do you believe that the newspaper knew or should have
5 known that you were not in possession, custody or control
6 of those records and that they should have dropped you
7 from the lawsuit even then?

8 MR. BIDEAU: Objection. Again, Your Honor,
9 I don't know how Mr. Aronberg could know what the
10 newspaper knew or should have known.

11 THE COURT: So your objection is
12 speculation. Sustained.

13 MR. WYLER: Okay.

14 THE COURT: All right, you know, generally,
15 we have a jury here, but let's keep objections
16 short. I'll answer them if I need to, or I'll ask
17 for more.

18 MR. BIDEAU: Okay, Your Honor.

19 BY MR. WYLER:

20 Q. Can you -- Mr. Aronberg, can you please
21 explain to the Court how it is impossible for you to
22 provide these records?

23 A. Well, first, I never had these records, so
24 obviously it's impossible for me to provide them. I told
25 them that. They knew that.

1 Secondly, I have no custody or control over
2 these documents. I've never had them. They know that,
3 which is why they now are moving the goal posts to change
4 this whole lawsuit, this whole action from custody,
5 possession, control, into keeping me on the sidelines so
6 I don't object to the clerk's ability to release the
7 documents. So it's a new -- it's a new ball game now
8 apparently.

9 But the newspaper obviously knew that I
10 never had these documents, that I never had custody or
11 control over them because I repeatedly told them.

12 Q. All right. And then so, following Judge
13 Marx's order that I just referenced on June 3rd, what
14 action did you then direct me to take?

15 A. Well, after Judge Marx's order and I was
16 dismissed from one of the two counts, I asked you to seek
17 sanctions, well, to start the ball rolling, 57.105, so to
18 send a letter that gives the 21-day notice.

19 Q. That's correct. And let me show you a copy
20 of that letter.

21 MR. WYLER: Your Honor, if you see our J14,
22 it's a copy of the 57.105 demand letter and the
23 email to Mr. Mendelsohn that accompanied it, and
24 just for a point of clarification, there is the
25 motion for attorneys' fees at the end, but that

1 was not filed on June 8th. Pursuant to the
2 statute, you have to wait at least 21 days, and as
3 you'll see later, that was followed.

4 THE COURT: The way this is -- I assume
5 this was attached to the letter?

6 MR. WYLER: It is, Your Honor. It's at
7 Bates stamp 235, yes, Your Honor.

8 BY MR. WYLER:

9 Q. Do you recognize that, Mr. Aronberg, as a
10 copy of the email to Mr. Mendelsohn and then the 57.105
11 demand that we issued to the plaintiff?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And, in that letter, did we assert our
14 position that their demand to produce the 2006 grand jury
15 records, that there was no basis in fact or law?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. Do you know if the newspaper dropped you
18 from the lawsuit within the 21-day safe-harbor provision
19 provided by statute 57.105?

20 A. They did not.

21 Q. But they eventually did drop you?

22 A. A long time later, they did finally drop
23 me.

24 Q. Okay, but, before they dropped you, did we
25 not file a motion for summary judgment?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. And did that include an accompanying
3 affidavit from you?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. Let me show you a copy of that affidavit.

6 That's at J18. Do you recognize this as a copy of your
7 affidavit?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Will you please read it aloud for the
10 Court?

11 A. The entire page?

12 Q. Yep.

13 A. "My name is David (Dave) Aronberg, and I'm
14 the State Attorney for the 15th Judicial Circuit, Palm
15 Beach County, Florida, since 2013 and a defendant in the
16 above-captioned matter. Plaintiff is seeking declaratory
17 relief pursuant Florida Statute 905.21(1)(c) and the
18 Court's inherent authority allowing plaintiff access to
19 the testimony, minutes and other evidence presented in
20 2006 to the Palm Beach County grand jury, the requested
21 materials, and to use those materials for the purpose of
22 informing the public."

23 "Despite plaintiff's above-described action
24 for declaratory relief, neither myself nor the Office of
25 the State Attorney for the 15th Judicial Circuit (SAO) is

1 in control, custody or possession of the required" --

2 excuse me -- " of the requested materials."

3 "As such, the declaratory relief sought by
4 the plaintiff seeks materials that are impossible for me
5 or my office to produce. To be clear, neither myself nor
6 the SAO has the legal authority to obtain and deliver the
7 requested materials. I've repeatedly made these facts
8 evident to the plaintiff and the public through not only
9 the pleadings and correspondence in this matter, but also
10 through an office press release and my public social
11 media accounts."

12 "Despite the contentions of plaintiff,
13 neither myself nor the SAO has the authority to demand
14 that the clerk grant the SAO access to grand jury
15 materials after a criminal case has concluded. Moreover,
16 during my administration, neither myself nor my office
17 has access to grand jury materials from the clerk's
18 office in this or any other instance."

19 "As provided in Section 905.17(1) Florida
20 Statutes, the clerk has sole authority and possession of
21 the requested materials, which can only be released by
22 the clerk pursuant to an order of the Court."

23 Q. Thank you. Do you know of any other
24 substantive action regarding plaintiff's claim for
25 declaratory relief after you filed your motion for

1 summary judgment?

2 A. After we filed the motion for summary
3 judgment, we included the affidavit, and then there was a
4 -- at some point I was dismissed, and then there was an
5 amended motion after that.

6 Q. That's correct. And I'm going to show you
7 J23. Do you recognize this as a copy of the notice where
8 you were dropped as a party from the lawsuit?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. What date is that? It's on the top, the
11 very, very top.

12 A. This was October 21st, 2020.

13 Q. Thank you. And, after you were dismissed,
14 are you aware -- yeah, after you were dismissed, are you
15 aware that the Court eventually granted the clerk summary
16 judgment in their favor, a summary judgment in favor of
17 the clerk?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. Just a couple more questions for
20 you.

21 There's been some references to maybe the
22 newspaper not just suing you just to get these records
23 for public disclosure. Even Judge Marx said that she
24 thought that there was something else going on. What do
25 you think is the underlying reason here for this lawsuit?

1 MR. BIDEAU: Objection, Your Honor,
2 irrelevant as to what the reason is.

3 MR. WYLER: It goes to good faith, Your
4 Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right, overruled.

6 A. Look, it was clear to me from the beginning
7 that this whole lawsuit was a twofer for the Palm Beach
8 Post. Number one, they were able to try to overcome the
9 fact that the Miami Herald, a newspaper 90 miles away,
10 scooped them on the Jeffrey Epstein story, and they
11 wanted to catch up and be the hero of their own
12 narrative. And so they made themselves the center of
13 this whole thing by suing to get these transcripts.

14 And, number two, they can do it on the back
15 of someone they have extreme dislike for, and it's no
16 secret in this community that the Palm Beach Post and I
17 have had numerous battles over the years, usually
18 one-sided, where the Palm Beach Post has, for the past
19 12 years, has attacked me, written many misleading
20 articles, which stems from a personal vendetta from a
21 leader of the Palm Beach Post, Randy Schultz, and me.
22 And then, after he was removed from his position, his
23 acolytes believed that I had something to do with it, and
24 they -- the attacks continued.

25 I mean, they continue even today where

1 there's a front page article about some exaggerated -- a
2 misleading front-page article about a criminal defendant
3 in Broward who is making claims and trying to get my
4 ex-wife's deposition. And the Palm Beach Post, instead
5 of writing the facts about it, sued to get the ex-wife's
6 deposition released.

7 I mean, for years, this has been an ongoing
8 issue between the Palm Beach Post and me, and it's not a
9 secret. For example, when they hired a reporter to cover
10 my office, who my office, prior to my being there,
11 prosecuted for crack cocaine. So I was thinking maybe at
12 some point they could find a reporter to cover our office
13 who our office did not prosecute for crack cocaine. So
14 this has been an ongoing thing.

15 So this whole matter stems from two things:
16 The Palm Beach Post trying to get the Jeffrey Epstein
17 story back, sell newspapers and to go after me, and
18 they're able to do it. And that's why I insisted that we
19 at least get the taxpayers some of their money back
20 because they had to fight and pay for your legal fees to
21 fight a lawsuit that was, in my mind, frivolous from the
22 beginning because this newspaper knew I never had these
23 documents, I never had control or custody. And it's very
24 telling that now they're trying to move the goal posts
25 and make this about something entirely different.

1 BY MR. WYLER:

2 Q. Let's talk about that, moving the goal
3 posts. We talked earlier about the wording in the
4 complaint against you. Do you recall the statements were
5 that you somehow denied the Palm Beach Post and the
6 citizens of Palm Beach County the grand jury records they
7 were requesting? Do you recall that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And now it appears that we're hearing a
10 whole new argument from plaintiff today; is that correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And that argument, correct me if I'm wrong,
13 is that they were fine once you said you didn't object to
14 the records being released and that, for that reason,
15 they dropped you; is that accurate?

16 A. Correct.

17 MR. BIDEAU: Objection, Your Honor,
18 leading.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 BY MR. WYLER:

21 Q. Can you please explain your -- your
22 perception of how they moved the goal posts?

23 A. Look, I mean, this lawsuit from the
24 beginning was about whether I had possession, custody,
25 control of the Jeffrey Epstein grand jury transcripts.

1 That's a series of articles they wrote about this. They
2 wrote a long series of articles attacking me for trying
3 to obstruct. Those articles were misleading.

4 The fact that we're here today and now it's
5 not about that, it's about keeping me on the sidelines so
6 I didn't have -- that I didn't object to the clerk's
7 production of these documents is something that I haven't
8 heard before, and I think is so misleading because this
9 whole thing was about the grand jury transcripts. It's
10 not about trying to prevent me from saying something to
11 the clerk.

12 It was clear from the beginning I never had
13 these documents. Judge Marx made it clear on the record,
14 and that's why we pursued these sanctions.

15 Q. Thank you. And isn't it -- isn't there a
16 big difference between objecting to the release or
17 intervening in the release and actually being able to
18 release the records?

19 A. They sued me to get the records. They
20 didn't sue me to prevent me from speaking up.

21 Q. There's nowhere in the complaint that says
22 that they're suing to you keep you from objecting to the
23 release?

24 A. Not only is there nothing in the complaint,
25 there's nothing in all the articles they wrote. They

1 wanted this thing to continue, to continue to write
2 articles. It would have been embarrassing for them to
3 admit that they filed a frivolous lawsuit and then they
4 had to dismiss me. So they continued these articles way
5 past the 21-day period, and now, when they got called on
6 it, they're trying to change the whole case into
7 something about how they needed me to stay silent so I
8 wouldn't tell the clerk to do something.

9 I mean, this thing was about production,
10 custody and control of grand jury documents, and I just
11 don't believe the Palm Beach Post should be able to
12 change it after the fact.

13 Q. So do you believe they have an agenda
14 against you and were intentionally targeting you when
15 they filed this lawsuit?

16 A. They've always had an agenda against me.

17 MR. BIDEAU: Objection, Your Honor,
18 relevance.

19 THE COURT: I think you have already
20 covered it. So I'm going to sustain the
21 objection. That's fine.

22 BY MR. WYLER:

23 Q. Have your friends and family been impacted
24 by the plaintiff's agenda-driven reporting?

25 MR. BIDEAU: Again, Judge, objection,

1 relevance.

2 THE COURT: Sustained as to relevance.

3 MR. WYLER: Thank you.

4 BY MR. WYLER:

5 Q. Do you believe that plaintiff's
6 relationship with you prevented them from accepting the
7 ultimate fact that you have no legal right to possession,
8 custody or control of the release of the requested grand
9 jury records?

10 MR. BIDEAU: Objection, cumulative, Judge.
11 I think we've been over this. He asked the same
12 question before.

13 THE COURT: We've covered this.

14 MR. WYLER: No further questions.

15 THE COURT: Cross examination.

16 MR. BIDEAU: Thank you, Judge.

17 CROSS EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. BIDEAU:

19 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Aronberg.

20 A. Hi.

21 Q. You said a couple minutes ago to your
22 lawyer that you filed this motion to get the taxpayers
23 back some of their money, right?

24 A. Uh-huh.

25 Q. That's what you said? The taxpayers are

1 not out any money, are they?

2 A. It is a contingency-fee basis.

3 Q. Right, and so the answer to question is:

4 The taxpayers are not out any money, are they? You don't
5 owe your counsel a nickel today, right?

6 A. I think that's fair to say.

7 Q. You haven't paid your counsel a nickel
8 today, right?

9 A. We have not.

10 Q. And the only way that your counsel gets any
11 money is if he wins this 57.105 motion, right?

12 A. That's a good point.

13 Q. So under no circumstance are the taxpayers
14 out any money, correct?

15 A. Yeah, I guess so. You're right.

16 Q. Okay. So, when you testified a few minutes
17 ago that you filed this motion in order to get the
18 taxpayers back their money, that was wrong, right?

19 A. Look, the fact that our office --

20 Q. Is that right, or wrong?

21 A. Look, I have to dispute with you on that
22 one. Look, look, the fact that our office has spent
23 months having to deal with this frivolous lawsuit, that's
24 taxpayer money. And, yes, so perhaps I misspoke when I
25 said that because the money wouldn't go directly to him

1 unless we got something today. But it's clear the
2 taxpayers are out money when you divert my attention from
3 real business to focus on your frivolous lawsuit that has
4 been filed for nothing more than to sell newspapers and
5 make a profit for your client.

6 Q. So the only person involved in this lawsuit
7 -- I haven't seen you -- Have you testified in any
8 hearings in this case?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Have you been deposed in this case?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Okay. So the only thing you've done in
13 this case presumably is chat with your lawyer, correct?

14 A. Are you saying our office has done nothing,
15 has not been distracted about this case?

16 Q. I'm talking about you, Mr. Aronberg.

17 A. Oh, I've spent plenty of time about this
18 case. I have spent way more time than I ever should have
19 in a case that I had nothing to do with.

20 Q. Mr. Aronberg, you said that this idea that
21 -- Well, let me back up for a second.

22 You said that you thought the Palm Beach
23 Post brought this case for two reasons: One, they
24 brought this case because they don't like you and they
25 wanted to embarrass you somehow, and they brought this

1 case because they've been scooped by the Miami Herald, I
2 think you said, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. On the Epstein matter. I mean, you agree
5 that an investigation into the Epstein matter and what
6 your predecessors did in the Epstein matter is a
7 legitimate matter of public interest, right?

8 A. The investigation of Jeffrey Epstein?
9 Absolutely.

10 Q. Absolutely. And the -- And the
11 investigation of what your office by your predecessor --
12 By the way, nobody has ever suggested, Mr. Aronberg, in
13 any of the pleadings filed in this case that you
14 personally were involved in whatever happened with
15 Mr. Epstein. That's not in the complaint, right?
16 There's no reference to you personally having been
17 involved. In fact, the complaint makes it very clear
18 that this was your predecessor who was involved, correct,
19 not you?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. Now, so the pleadings we drafted didn't --
22 didn't accuse you of having done anything wrong with
23 respect to Mr. Epstein or the plea deal that got cut or
24 whatever happened with the feds, correct? We acknowledge
25 you weren't around in the pleadings that we filed in this

1 case, right?

2 A. You acknowledged that I had nothing to do
3 with the stuff in the past, but you are accusing me of
4 hiding grand jury transcripts that I've never possessed.

5 Q. There's nothing in the pleading that said
6 you hid grand jury transcripts, correct? The request --
7 The lawsuit for declaratory relief was to declare that
8 you either turn over what you had, correct?

9 A. Then you don't read your own newspaper.

10 Q. I'm talking about the pleadings that are
11 filed in this case. I understand that you are concerned
12 about the press side of this. I'm concerned about the
13 legal side, okay?

14 A. The legal side sued me to get grand jury
15 transcripts, and the press side accused me of hiding
16 them.

17 Q. Okay, so we can agree that the legal side,
18 the thing we're here on in this case today, is about
19 getting grand jury testimony, correct, getting grand jury
20 transcripts?

21 A. Possession, custody and control, correct.

22 Q. Incidentally, when my firm first got
23 involved -- Do you have the exhibit binder in front of
24 you?

25 A. I do not.

1 MR. BIDEAU: Okay. Can we get an extra
2 copy of it?

3 MS. WHETSTONE: We can pull it up on the
4 screen.

5 MR. BIDEAU: Exhibit 1.

6 THE COURT: I'm sorry, what number?

7 MR. BIDEAU: Exhibit 1, Your Honor.

8 MS. WHETSTONE: Your Honor, may I approach
9 with the exhibit binder?

10 THE COURT: Yes.

11 BY MR. BIDEAU:

12 Q. Mr. Aronberg, it might be a little quicker
13 if I just hand you the binder, okay? That way you don't
14 have to turn around and look at it.

15 A. Okay, what exhibit is it?

16 Q. Exhibit 1.

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. Exhibit 1 is an August 27, 2019, letter
19 from Mr. Mendelsohn to you, correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. And this was a request for -- Now, prior to
22 this, your office had received a number of public records
23 requests from the Palm Beach Post, correct?

24 A. About -- About this?

25 Q. About the Jeffrey Epstein matter. All my

1 questions are about the Jeffrey Epstein matter.

2 A. Okay, yes.

3 Q. Okay, and this was the first letter you
4 received from my office, correct? From Mr. Mendelsohn
5 about the Jeffrey Epstein matter, right?

6 A. I don't know if this is the first letter.
7 If you say it, I assume that's true.

8 Q. And, in this letter, Mr. Mendelsohn
9 requests a number of documents and records with respect
10 to the grand jury matter concerning Mr. Epstein, correct?

11 A. I'd have to read it, but, yes, I'll take
12 your --

13 Q. By the way, your office never actually
14 responded to this particular letter, did it?

15 A. I don't know.

16 Q. And, in fact, after this letter, if you
17 look at tab 37, which is the very last tab -- and I
18 apologize, the binder is so big, it's hard to move
19 around. This letter is dated of August of 2019.

20 THE COURT: What exhibit?

21 MR. BIDEAU: Exhibit 37, Your Honor.

22 MS. WHETSTONE: It's also on the screen if
23 that's easier.

24 THE WITNESS: Maybe I can look at the
25 screen.

1 MR. BIDEAU: You can look there, okay.

2 THE COURT: I'm going to slow you down a
3 little bit. I can't see the writing on the screen
4 from that far, so I'm going to flip to 37.

5 MR. BIDEAU: And, I apologize, I hate these
6 big binders.

7 THE COURT: It's okay. I just want to see
8 what you're talking about as you're talking about
9 it.

10 You're right, they're not easy to navigate.

11 All right, please continue.

12 BY MR. BIDEAU:

13 Q. Exhibit 37 is an October 9th, 2019, letter
14 and that's from Mike Grygiel, another lawyer in my
15 office, to your office, and it's following up on
16 Mr. Mendelsohn's October (sic) 27th letter, okay, and his
17 September 17th letter. Do you see that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. And up to that point in time, we had
20 not yet received responses to our letters, correct? Do
21 you know?

22 A. I don't know.

23 Q. Okay. And then -- And then after that,
24 sir, it was on January -- it was on -- it was in 2019,
25 shortly after that, November of 2019 that we filed the

1 first lawsuit against you, correct?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. So, after having sent your office two
4 letters, you don't know if we ever got responses to those
5 letters, we went and filed a lawsuit, and in that lawsuit
6 we named you in your official capacity, correct, not a
7 personal capacity?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. And whenever you sue the state attorney's
10 office, and your office gets sued for things all the
11 time, it doesn't have anything to do with you personally,
12 right?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. You sue -- You sue an entity like the state
15 attorney's office in its -- by the state attorney who is
16 in his official capacity, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And you talked about your original motion
19 to dismiss, J6, so let's take a look at J6, if you want
20 to look at Exhibit 6 in the binder, or can you look at it
21 up there. I don't really care.

22 A. Okay.

23 Q. Let's look at the second page. On the
24 second page, you --

25 MR. BIDEAU: Could you highlight, Gerard,

1 where it starts with, "Plaintiff has
2 improperly..." Down at the bottom, last
3 paragraph.

4 BY MR. BIDEAU:

5 Q. You see you indicate -- your lawyer
6 responded by saying, "Plaintiff," that would be the Palm
7 Beach Post, "is improperly seeking requested 2006 grand
8 jury materials for the purpose of public disclosure
9 pursuant to the Court's inherent authority and
10 supervisory powers over the grand jury." Do you see
11 that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. So at least at that point, you were
14 objecting saying the Post shouldn't get these, they're
15 not entitled to them, so that they can't -- because they
16 want to give them out to the public, right? And that's
17 what the sentence says.

18 A. See --

19 Q. Is that what it says?

20 A. Look, you are -- this is exactly the
21 problem, what you guys did. You filed a lawsuit against
22 us, and the first defense that we had was that we didn't
23 have the documents, but because, as you know, in a motion
24 to dismiss you have to argue as a matter of law. So the
25 only way we could dismiss this frivolous lawsuit is to

1 argue as a matter of law. And this -- this was the legal
2 position that says, by the way, under the law you're not
3 entitled to these documents. And then you -- then your
4 client then wrote all these articles saying, see, he's
5 trying to block us, he's trying to obstruct us, without
6 mentioning the number one defense, which was he doesn't
7 have the documents. That could have gone a long way.
8 That could have shown maybe some good faith if you would
9 have done that.

10 Q. Mr. Aronberg, in connection with -- at the
11 time of the motion to dismiss, you had filed nothing,
12 your office had done no indication that you didn't have
13 the documents, did you, up to this point in time? Up to
14 this point in time. And this is only -- this is only
15 late 2019. You hadn't filed an answer. You hadn't filed
16 any motion.

17 A. In our motion to dismiss.

18 Q. You hadn't responded to any of our three
19 prior letters, and the first pleadings you filed
20 indicated that your objection was that we were improperly
21 seeking these materials under the Court's inherent
22 authority and supervisory powers over the grand jury for
23 public disclosure. That was the official position filed
24 by your lawyer, and I understand, you were taking a legal
25 position to dismiss the lawsuit.

1 A. Correct, but also I do want to challenge
2 one part of that. When you say that we -- we were silent
3 over and over again about responding to your public
4 records requests, I have spoken to -- I've spoken to the
5 public records person in my office who believes that she
6 did say that we didn't have the documents to everyone who
7 has requested them.

8 MR. BIDEAU: Your Honor, I'd move to strike
9 as hearsay.

10 THE COURT: Sustained.

11 BY MR. BIDEAU:

12 Q. And, after you filed this motion, the Palm
13 Beach Post filed an amended complaint, correct, and, in
14 that amended complaint, the Post asserted two causes of
15 action, right? One was a statutory claim, and one was a
16 declaratory judgment claim under the First Amendment and
17 the Court's inherent authority, correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. And the motion to dismiss and the arguments
20 in front of Judge Marx all went to the statutory claim,
21 not to the second claim, the declaratory judgment claim,
22 correct?

23 A. The Marx hearing was about Count 2.

24 Q. Count 2, the statutory claim, correct?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. And, so, when we look at -- I've got the
2 complaint here because I want to read it. The first
3 amended complaint, which is J9, and if you take a look at
4 J9 --

5 THE COURT: Let me stop you for one second.
6 So I'm flipping through these, but, like, for
7 example, right there, I can't -- I can't see that.

8 MR. BIDEAU: Right, I know.

9 THE COURT: But I saw that you were able to
10 blow up a portion of --

11 MR. BIDEAU: He is.

12 THE COURT: -- and I'm going to ask him to
13 do that, that way I don't have to --

14 MR. BIDEAU: I'm going to ask him to blow
15 it up so you can see it.

16 THE COURT: Thank you very much. I
17 appreciate it.

18 BY MR. BIDEAU:

19 Q. So let's take a look here at Count 1 for
20 declaratory relief.

21 MR. BIDEAU: Gerard, it's on page 19.

22 Okay, just blow up the Count 1 for declaratory
23 relief, please, that section.

24 BY MR. BIDEAU:

25 Q. Then, with respect to paragraph 7, do you

1 see that one of the allegations is that the Post
2 respectfully requests the Court declare that, pursuant to
3 Florida Statute 905.27(1), it is entitled to access to
4 the testimony, minutes and other evidence presented in
5 2019 -- 2006 to the grand jury because such disclosure
6 and access would be in furtherance of justice, and then
7 it cites to 905.27(1)06 (sic), correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And it says, because the Post is not
10 seeking these materials in connection with any civil or
11 criminal case, it seeks a declaration -- In other words,
12 it asks the Court, hey, construe this paragraph, construe
13 the statute to allow us to give this stuff to the public
14 because we recognize there's an interest of justice
15 provision in that statute, correct?

16 A. Well, it is what it says it is.

17 Q. Okay. And that's what it says, right, in
18 furtherance of justice? That's what the request was?

19 A. Again, it is what it is.

20 Q. Okay. And then paragraph 71, the Post
21 seeks a further declaration that disclosure of the
22 testimony, minutes and other evidence presented to the
23 grand jury is appropriate pursuant to the Court's
24 inherent authority over grand jury proceedings because of
25 the exceptional public interest in this case and

1 compelling circumstances supporting transparency. Do you
2 see that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay, and, with respect to paragraph 71, do
5 you know what the answer was --

6 A. No --

7 Q. -- that you filed?

8 A. -- not offhand.

9 MR. BIDEAU: Okay. Can we pull up the
10 answer to 71? That's J2, page 10, 71, 71.

11 BY MR. BIDEAU:

12 Q. As to 71, you admit that we seek a
13 declaration, but you deny the remainder of paragraph 71.
14 So, in fact, although we were asking in 71 that the Court
15 uses its inherent authority over grand jury proceedings,
16 because of the exceptional interest in this case and
17 compelling circumstances, that the Court declare that
18 we're allowed to use this testimony, your answer was,
19 well, that's your declaration, but we deny paragraph 71.
20 So you asked the Court to deny that relief?

21 A. It is what it is.

22 MR. BIDEAU: Okay. And then we'll go to
23 paragraph 72. I think you have a slide on that,
24 72.

25

1 BY MR. BIDEAU:

2 Q. And, in 72, we say, the Post has sought
3 from defendants, but defendants have refused to provide,
4 access to the testimony, minutes and evidence presented
5 in 2006 to the grand jury. Indeed, defendants have each
6 filed motions to dismiss the complaint and the reliefs
7 sought under 50 -- 905.27(1). Accordingly, a good faith
8 dispute exists between the parties. Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And you see in that case your office
11 admitted that, your lawyers admitted that at least,
12 admitting there was a good faith dispute between the
13 parties and admitting that the defendants had refused to
14 provide access to the testimony, minutes and evidence
15 presented, right? No qualification, you all just admit
16 that.

17 A. Again, it is what it is.

18 Q. Now, you said that this argument that
19 Ms. Whetstone made during her opening statement, that the
20 idea that you wouldn't object to disclosure, was
21 something new, that just popped up at this hearing, that
22 -- I think your phrase was, "you moved the goal posts,"
23 right --

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. -- at this hearing? But that's not true

1 either, right, because that issue had been raised with
2 you all the way back in June of 2020, right?

3 A. Are you saying this lawsuit was about that?
4 Is that what you're saying, or are you saying that it was
5 about possession?

6 Q. The issue -- The issue of your position
7 with respect to whether you would agree with -- I'm sorry
8 -- whether you would object to the request to have the
9 records released was an issue that had been raised by
10 Mr. Mendelsohn back in June of 2020, correct?

11 A. Can you restate the question, please?

12 Q. Sure. Let me -- Let me try to do it a
13 little more articulately because that was pretty
14 terrible. Let me get the letter out to make it easier
15 for all of us. J16, please.

16 You've seen this letter, right, Exhibit 16?

17 A. I'm not sure if I've seen this one.

18 Q. Okay, well, did you know that, when your
19 lawyer filed his 57.105 motion back in early June and
20 then had that two-page letter that he served it with,
21 right, and he laid out, we don't have the records, right?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. Which is the basis for your 57.105 --

24 A. Yeah, correct.

25 Q. -- we don't have it, leave me alone.

1 A. Well...

2 Q. Basically.

3 A. Yeah, no possession, custody or control.

4 Q. Okay, no possession, custody or control.

5 Mr. Mendelsohn, a couple weeks later, wrote
6 a letter back, right? Do you remember seeing that?

7 A. This is the letter you're referring to?

8 Q. That's the letter, and it's under tab 16 in
9 the binder.

10 A. Again, I don't remember seeing this letter.

11 Q. Can you flip to the second page?

12 A. This letter was written to my attorney --

13 Q. To your attorney, right.

14 A. -- back in June of 2020.

15 Q. June 23rd, 2020.

16 A. No, I don't remember reading this letter.

17 Q. Okay, well, let me see if I can help you
18 out then. Would you go to the middle of that paragraph
19 where it says, "The state attorney was named..." Can you
20 -- Go above that, where it says, "The state attorney was
21 named as a party, not simply" -- Do you see it? Okay.

22 Do you see Mr. Mendelsohn writes back, he
23 says, "Assuming the state attorney does not currently
24 have physical possession of the Epstein grand jury
25 materials" -- I mean, by the way, the Office of State

1 Attorney at some point would have had possession of the
2 materials that were going to be presented to the grand
3 jury, right? I mean, the office presented this stuff to
4 the grand jury. You would have had possession.

5 A. If you're talking about the transcripts,
6 no.

7 Q. No, but I'm talking about the other
8 materials, the investigative materials, the exhibits, the
9 minutes, the other things like that.

10 A. The minutes?

11 Q. Your office would have had those?

12 A. The minutes? I don't believe so. I guess
13 it depends. I don't know how they did it back in Barry
14 Krischer's administration, but the documents that you
15 asked for, I've never had. So that's the only question I
16 had.

17 Q. Well, hold on. You mean the transcripts,
18 because in the complaint, we actually ask for more than
19 transcripts.

20 A. Right, but those are documents I've never
21 had, and that's the whole thing.

22 Q. You personally never had them, but --

23 A. Right.

24 Q. -- you agree with me, the Office of State
25 Attorney would have, during the course of the

1 investigation, would have had those materials, it had to?

2 A. Again, I don't know what Barry Krischer's
3 administration had back then.

4 Q. Well, when you got the public records
5 request, did you have somebody go back and look and see
6 what they had?

7 A. Well, obviously, when we got public records
8 requests, we try to fulfill all of them.

9 Q. Right, and you don't know personally
10 sitting here today what was done to respond to any of
11 Mr. Mendelsohn or Mr. Grygiel, my partners' letters
12 asking for materials from back during the Barry Krischer
13 days, correct? Because there's been no response to those
14 letters even to today.

15 MR. WYLER: Objection, Your Honor, those
16 letters and the Chapter 119 request have nothing
17 do with this lawsuit. They're not referenced in
18 the lawsuit. They have no bearing on the
19 requested relief that plaintiff is requesting
20 here.

21 THE COURT: Overruled.

22 BY MR. BIDEAU:

23 Q. And so --

24 THE COURT: Can you repeat the question?

25 MR. BIDEAU: Sure, I'll repeat the

1 question.

2 BY MR. BIDEAU:

3 Q. You don't know what anybody in your office
4 did to respond to Mr. Mendelsohn or Mr. Grygiel's
5 letters, Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 37, correct? You don't
6 personally know?

7 A. It is my understanding, based on
8 conversations I had with the office, that every public
9 records request has been responded to and that people
10 were told, who requested Jeffrey Epstein grand jury
11 transcripts, that we did not have them.

12 Q. Mr. Mendelsohn and Mr. Grygiel, in those
13 letters, request a lot more than just transcripts, right?
14 They wanted evidence. They wanted exhibits. They wanted
15 that sort of material, correct? That was Exhibit 1 and
16 37, we looked at, right?

17 A. When I say "transcripts," I mean records, I
18 mean records, that anything we had, we put then out on
19 that portal that your client refused to acknowledge.

20 Q. Well, the portal was things you'd already
21 produced. That's what -- Your press release says this is
22 all the stuff we've already given out, right? That's
23 already been in the public, right?

24 A. Yeah.

25 Q. Okay, well, but you understand, we were

1 asking for stuff that you hadn't yet given out, and, as
2 best you know, you don't have any personal knowledge as
3 to whether or not -- what happened to those requests, to
4 Mr. Mendelsohn's request or Mr. Grygiel's request, right?
5 You personally don't know?

6 A. Well, again, you objected because of
7 hearsay before, but, in speaking to an individual who
8 does public records in my office, I've been told that
9 that person had said whether or not we've had those
10 documents, and so I believe that everyone who requested
11 documents were told truthfully whether we had those
12 documents or not. And we can use documents in a broad --
13 in a broad way.

14 Q. In a broad sense, right?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. But you don't have copies of any responses
17 or that went back to Mr. Mendelsohn or Mr. Grygiel in my
18 office when they requested documents, correct?

19 A. I would think that Mr. Wyler would have
20 everything that we produced.

21 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Mendelsohn, back in June
22 of 2020, in response to your first 57.105 letter, he
23 says, The state attorney was named as a party, not simply
24 as custodian of the grand jury -- the grand jury records.
25 The state attorney was named in his official capacity as

1 his office has, quote, as his primary interest,
2 protection of its grand jury system, and he cites to a
3 11th Circuit decision. Do you see that?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. And, in that case, the U.S. petition
6 -- he goes on to explain it. He goes on to explain that
7 the Broward County State Attorney was involved in this
8 case, and so Mr. Mendelsohn was indicating to you in that
9 case where you were named not only whether you had
10 custody; you were named in that case basically because
11 you're in charge of the grand jury process, you had the
12 right to object if the clerk wanted to give out those
13 records or not.

14 A. Where does it say that?

15 Q. It's in the -- The case indicates that,
16 when one seeks grand jury materials, the relevant state
17 attorney is a necessary party in order to protect the
18 grand jury system, and the Office of State Attorney
19 supervised it to make arguments if needed against release
20 of the grand jury materials. Do you see that?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So Mr. Mendelsohn was telling you, as
23 opposed to what you said a few minutes ago in here, that
24 the first time you saw these goal posts being moved,
25 Mr. Mendelsohn -- was today when Ms. Whetstone testified

1 -- I mean, when Ms. Whetstone talked. In fact, all the
2 way back to when the very first 57.105 motion was filed,
3 Mr. Mendelsohn told you that one of the reasons that the
4 Post sued you in this case was in order to address the
5 situation that you had the right, if you thought it was
6 appropriate, to object to the release of materials. Do
7 you see that?

8 A. Was that in the complaint?

9 Q. I'm asking about the -- I'm asking about
10 the --

11 A. Well, the letter you wrote after -- well
12 after the complaint, the letter you're showing me here
13 that was sent to Mr. Wyler is what it says it is.

14 Q. Correct.

15 A. That's on not in the complaint, right?

16 Q. But you told me that this idea of moving
17 the goal posts, that the Post was suddenly making that
18 argument, you told everybody in this courtroom a few
19 minutes ago that just happened today, I mean, they're
20 just moving the goal posts on me. Well, if the goal
21 posts are being moved, that was back on June 23rd of
22 2020, and you remember seeing this, right?

23 A. Again, I don't remember seeing this letter,
24 but, again, this was not part of the complaint. This is
25 an after-the-fact letter from Mr. Mendelsohn to my

1 lawyer.

2 Q. Correct, and so --

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. -- you -- neither you nor your lawyer ever
5 responded to this letter, right?

6 A. Well, you'll have to talk to my lawyer
7 about that. Obviously I don't personally respond to
8 letters written to my lawyer.

9 Q. Correct. But you told us you're familiar
10 with the pleadings, but you're not familiar with this
11 particular letter?

12 A. Again, I don't remember seeing this letter.

13 Q. Now, Mr. Mendelsohn indicates in the last
14 sentence, These are some of the same reasons why the
15 state attorney was named in this case. Do you see that?
16 Very last sentence of that paragraph.

17 A. Yes.

18 MR. BIDEAU: Can we take a look at

19 Exhibit 21? Do you have Exhibit 21 up?

20 Can you -- Can you blow up the part that's
21 highlighted, please, and I'll read it?

22 BY MR. BIDEAU:

23 Q. Now, Exhibit 21 is Defendant David
24 Aronberg's response to plaintiff's memorandum in
25 opposition to the 57.105 motion, the original one filed

1 back in June of 2020. And do you see in paragraph -- in
2 the first paragraph, you indicate, quote, Nonetheless,
3 the state attorney has no objection and never had any
4 objection to the Court releasing the records sought by
5 plaintiff as to the disclosure of the requested materials
6 sought herein lies within the province of the clerk
7 pursuant to the order of the Court. Do you see that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And this is the first time in any pleading
10 -- Strike that.

11 First of all, obviously you knew this was
12 an issue back in October of 2020, the fact that the Post
13 was arguing that one reason you needed to be in this case
14 was because you had the right to object, because you
15 address that issue in October of 2020, correct?

16 A. Here.

17 Q. Here, right, as of October 2020. So that
18 argument had been raised not for the first time today,
19 but back in 2020, right, Mr. Aronson?

20 A. Aronberg.

21 Q. Aronberg. I'm sorry.

22 A. This is what it says it is.

23 And, again, I felt that this sentence was
24 consistent with what our position always has been
25 because, when we were forced to do the motion to dismiss,

1 we were forced, because of a matter of law, to make the
2 legal argument as a legal matter that the Post is not
3 entitled to this, but as far as my belief of whether I
4 care whether these grand jury documents are released,
5 I've never cared one way or the other, but, because of
6 this, in my view, bad faith lawsuit, you forced us to do
7 a motion to dismiss that told you we don't have this
8 stuff, and, secondly, we had to do a response as a matter
9 of law.

10 Q. Okay, now let me get back to my question.
11 My question was: You told the Court earlier today that
12 this moving the goal posts, this idea that you had the
13 right to object and we wanted to make sure you weren't
14 going to object was something that came up for the first
15 time today, and that wasn't true, was it? That issue
16 came up back in June of 2020 at the -- at the latest when
17 Mr. Mendelsohn put it in his letter, and you saw it
18 necessary to address it in October of 2020, right?

19 A. So the letter that I said I don't remember
20 seeing is the letter that you say put me on notice that
21 this argument was being made?

22 Q. Well, that letter certainly put you on
23 notice if you didn't know it before that, sir, because it
24 says it clear as day.

25 A. But it doesn't make my statement

1 inconsistent. It said, again, that I was not aware of
2 your moving the goal posts, and, besides, it doesn't
3 matter because this whole thing is about possession,
4 custody and control, which you informed of that we didn't
5 have. Now you're saying, well, this whole thing was
6 about you wanted me to talk to the clerk, or you didn't
7 want me to talk to the clerk, and to me that's
8 disingenuous because that's not the subject of this
9 lawsuit.

10 You mentioned in a sentence that
11 Mr. Mendelsohn wrote to my lawyer much later than the
12 complaint, well after the complaint, in one sentence in a
13 letter to my lawyer, and you're saying, aha, we wanted
14 this the whole time.

15 Q. Well, certainly we wanted it the whole
16 time, and we wanted it at the, as Mr. Mendelsohn will
17 testify, and Mr. Mendelsohn wrote that when your lawyer
18 sent a 57.105, saying our case isn't frivolous, we think
19 your office might have possession of the records, at
20 least some of the records that we were seeking, and in
21 addition, your office has the right to object.

22 A. Did you put that in the complaint? You
23 didn't put that in the complaint.

24 Q. I know it's hard for a lawyer to not ask
25 questions, but --

1 A. Fair enough. Fair enough.

2 Q. And try not to argue because our court
3 reporter is going to kill us.

4 Okay, in any event, Mr. Aronberg, in the
5 October 14th, 2020, response, you indicate that the state
6 attorney has no objection, okay, to the clerk producing
7 these records if the clerk produces them, right?

8 A. Right.

9 Q. And you know, by the way, that the clerk
10 had already produced them without -- well, probably --
11 nobody could find a court order -- had given them to the
12 U.S. Attorney and the FBI years earlier, right?

13 A. I guess so. I mean, I wasn't there years
14 earlier, so if that's what happened, yes, sure.

15 Q. And, by the way, shortly after you filed
16 Exhibit 21 is when the Palm Beach Post dismissed the
17 case, right? It was within 14 days of that, correct?

18 We can do it up there. Maybe 17 days?

19 A. Whatever your timeline says.

20 Q. Right. All right, you indicated on the
21 20th is the first time you stated you had no objection to
22 production of the materials, okay, and then on
23 October 21st, now that you said you don't have them and
24 you don't object, the Post dropped you as a party seven
25 days later, see that?

1 A. Yeah.

2 Q. Right? Okay. And then 17 days later, you
3 file an amended motion which makes a host of arguments
4 not set forth in your original motion back in June
5 of 2020, correct?

6 A. Well, you have to ask Mr. Wyler about the
7 substance of that, but I know that the motion -- the
8 amended motion was filed after I was already dismissed
9 from the lawsuit and after your client failed to dismiss
10 me within the 21-day grace period.

11 Q. Well, that's the 21-day grace period for
12 the first motion that you filed, correct?

13 A. Correct, correct.

14 Q. But the motion we're here on today,
15 according to the Court order and the notice, is your
16 amended motion, which was never served prior to being
17 filed, correct?

18 A. Well, are you saying that the filing of the
19 second motion means that the first motion is now void, it
20 just goes away, it didn't exist?

21 Q. We're going to be arguing that to the
22 Judge, but the filing, under the law, the filing of a
23 second motion that raises new and different arguments
24 absolutely goes away, the first motion goes away.

25 A. But the whole purpose of the 21-day notice

1 is to give you a chance to dismiss me, and I was already
2 dismissed by that point, so --

3 Q. So let's take that to its logical -- Let's
4 assume you had gone ahead and served this back, say, back
5 here in October, okay, and then you filed that response
6 and we looked at it and said, oh, he's now admitting --
7 he's now saying he's not going to oppose it. If we had
8 dismissed you right then, you'd have no fee claim, right,
9 because under the rule, we're allowed to dismiss.

10 A. You get 21 days.

11 Q. We get 21 days, right. So if you had
12 served it all the way back here in October and if we had
13 gotten your response and dismissed, you'd have no fee
14 claim, right? We would have gotten your 57.105, and
15 within the grace period, we would have dismissed it,
16 right?

17 A. If the second one was filed before I was
18 dismissed, within the 21 days --

19 Q. Yes, sir.

20 A. -- and the case was still pending? Then,
21 yeah, you'd have a much better argument. But you don't
22 have an argument now because, under the first --

23 Q. We'll argue -- We'll argue that to the
24 Judge --

25 A. All right, fair enough.

1 Q. -- as to whether we have an argument now.

2 We think the Fourth is pretty clear on that one.

3 MR. BIDEAU: Would you bring up, please --

4 just last question -- Exhibit 25, paragraph 20?

5 BY MR. BIDEAU:

6 Q. And this is -- this is your amended motion,

7 and you say, The state attorney has no objection to the

8 clerk producing and disclosing the requested material

9 should the Court grant an order to that effect; however,

10 it is impossible for the state attorney to comply with

11 the relief, blah, blah, blah, because you'd made that

12 argument before.

13 That argument that you had no objection to

14 the clerk producing the requested materials was not set

15 forth in your original motion, your original 57.105

16 motion, correct?

17 A. I believe that's correct.

18 MR. BIDEAU: That's all I have, Judge.

19 THE COURT: Redirect?

20 MR. WYLER: Just real quick.

21 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. WYLER:

23 Q. Mr. Aronberg, you were just talking -- or,

24 just being asked questions about the public records

25 requests that were made of your office.

1 Did the plaintiff ever file a Chapter 119
2 lawsuit against your office for those records?

3 A. No.

4 MR. WYLER: No further questions.

5 THE COURT: Is Mr. Aronberg excused?

6 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 MR. WYLER: Yes, you're excused.

8 MS. WHETSTONE: Your Honor, may we take a
9 five-minute break?

10 THE COURT: We'll be back in a few. I'll
11 be in recess, we'll say 5 to 10 minutes.

12 (Off the record from 3:39 p.m. to
13 3:57 p.m.)

14 THE COURT: All right, please be seated.

15 MR. WYLER: Your Honor, before I rest, I
16 just wanted to say to the Court that plaintiff and
17 defense counsel, we've -- we've agreed on all
18 those exhibits, that joint exhibit book. We just
19 wanted to make sure that all exhibits, 1 through
20 37, are recognized by the Court.

21 THE COURT: All right, so Exhibits 1
22 through 37 of this joint binder have been
23 stipulated to and are in evidence, and that's the
24 an agreement of the parties.

25 MS. WHETSTONE: Yes, Your Honor.

1 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 (Joint Exhibits 1 through 37 were admitted
3 into evidence.)

4 Defense rests.

5 THE COURT: But not this timeline, correct?
6 This is not?

7 MS. WHETSTONE: That's correct. That's a
8 demonstrative. Thank you, Your Honor.

9 THE CLERK: Thank you.

10 MS. WHETSTONE: The plaintiff calls Stephen
11 Mendelsohn.

12 THE COURT: Before we do this, how long is
13 Mr. Mendelsohn going to testify today?

14 MS. WHETSTONE: We will make this as fast
15 as possible.

16 THE COURT: I'm not trying to rush you
17 through everything, but we're done at 5:00 today.

18 MS. WHETSTONE: Thirty minutes.

19 THE COURT: And after Mr. Mendelsohn, are
20 you done?

21 MS. WHETSTONE: Yes, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Okay. In the event that you're
23 going past 5 -- we're not going to go past 5, but
24 in the event you need to go past 5, I'll bring you
25 back in later in the week. It won't be tomorrow.

1 Tomorrow I have another matter that I have to hear
2 in the afternoon. But, in the event we need to go
3 past 5, even if it's for argument, probably
4 Thursday or Friday in the afternoon, I'll bring
5 you back.

6 If the testimony is going to conclude today
7 or mostly conclude today and the only thing left
8 are your arguments of law and your arguments as to
9 the findings of fact, then that might be something
10 that we end up doing on Thursday or Friday
11 afternoon, okay?

12 MR. WYLER: Yes, Your Honor. I think it
13 might be worthwhile to point out to the Court that
14 the reasonableness phase of this, if we get there,
15 we've already agreed that there would be no
16 experts, so I think that could dispense with that.

17 I am located up in Amelia Island, Florida,
18 so I am --

19 THE COURT: Fifteen minutes away.

20 MR. WYLER: Super close. So I don't know
21 if it would be possible, if we finished with the
22 testimony today, if maybe we could make written
23 closing arguments to the Court instead of coming
24 back?

25 THE COURT: How do you feel about writing?

1 MS. WHETSTONE: We would have no objection
2 to that if Your Honor would prefer. Whatever Your
3 Honor prefers, we will do.

4 THE COURT: If you guys don't mind writing.
5 I mean, I think people are better in writing.
6 People overestimate their oratory skills, but
7 okay.

8 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm
9 that the evidence you're about to give will be the
10 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 Thereupon,

13 STEPHEN MENDELSON, ESQ.,
14 having been duly sworn by the Clerk of the Court,
15 responded and testified as follows:

16 THE COURT: Whenever you're ready.

17 MS. WHETSTONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

20 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Mendelsohn.

21 A. Hello.

22 Q. Please introduce yourself to the Court.

23 A. Yes. I am Stephen Mendelsohn.

24 Let me just move a little closer.

25 Yes, I'm Stephen Mendelsohn, and I'm an

1 attorney at Greenberg Traurig in the Fort Lauderdale
2 office.

3 Q. Please let us know your educational
4 background.

5 A. I have a bachelor's degree from Colgate
6 University in Upstate New York, graduated in 1980 and --
7 in economics, and I have a J.D. degree from Hofstra
8 University School of Law from 1983.

9 Q. And what's your work experience going
10 backwards in time?

11 A. I've been at Greenberg Traurig as a
12 commercial litigator for approximately 20 years, and all
13 that time I've been a shareholder at Greenberg. As I
14 said, I work out of the Fort Lauderdale office at
15 present. Previous to that, I was in the Boca Raton
16 office of Greenberg Traurig, so going back 20 years.

17 Before that, I was an attorney with
18 Rutherford Mulhull & Wargo in Boca Raton, also commercial
19 litigation, and, prior to that, I was a named partner a
20 firm in Miami. That was Carolonga, Langen, Lorenza
21 (phonetic) & Mendelsohn, and before that, I was an
22 assistant attorney general for the State of New York.

23 Q. In what states are you licensed to practice
24 law?

25 A. New York and Florida.

1 Q. At Greenberg Traurig, what types of cases
2 do you practice?

3 A. A variety of commercial litigation,
4 copyright, trademark, securities, real estate disputes,
5 disputes over employment, contract, fraud. Also, not
6 just simply commercial, but I also do defamation defense,
7 First Amendment cases on defamation, and I do trial work
8 and appellate work.

9 Q. When you were at the New York State
10 Attorney General's Office, what types of cases did you
11 handle?

12 A. I was in the Litigation Bureau of Labor
13 Statistics, and that's civil litigation, primarily civil
14 rights and constitutional law cases involving 42 USC
15 Section 1983, where New York State and its officials were
16 sued in their official capacity. That included cases
17 under the Fourth Amendment, cases under the Seventh
18 Amendment occasionally, and the Eighth Amendment and
19 Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

20 Q. Are you AV rated?

21 A. Yes, AV rated as well.

22 Q. Have you ever been sanctioned or subject to
23 disciplinary action?

24 A. Never.

25 Q. Ever --

1 A. In any jurisdiction.

2 Q. Ever had 57.105 sanctions or Rule 11
3 sanctions awarded in any case that you've worked on?

4 A. This is the first motion ever under 57.105
5 or Rule 11 under the federal rules or any of that.

6 Q. So besides this case, no?

7 A. No.

8 Q. You've never had any motion raised?

9 A. No. No, ma'am.

10 Q. How did you first get involved with the
11 Jeffrey Epstein case on behalf of the Palm Beach Post?

12 A. I was contacted by Michael Grygiel from our
13 Albany office. He represents a number of media and
14 newspapers throughout the United States, and essentially
15 he heads the media group at Greenberg Traurig. And he
16 was looking for someone to help the Palm Beach Post in
17 obtaining documents from at that time the state
18 attorney's office here in Palm Beach County.

19 Q. When were you contacted by Mike Grygiel?

20 A. When approximately?

21 Q. (Nods head up and down.)

22 A. In the summer of 2019. It's Grygiel,
23 G-r-y-g-i-e-l.

24 Q. Thank you. So here, around -- on the
25 timeline, I'm indicating July 2019?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And what did the Post want to find out and
3 inform the public about with regard to Jeffrey Epstein?

4 A. Right, at that time, the Epstein matter was
5 back in the news. Mr. Epstein had been arrested by the
6 FBI, and he was being prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney's
7 Office in the Southern District of New York and was in
8 custody.

9 So the issues of the plea deal that had
10 been worked out by Mr. Krischer's office back in 2006 was
11 back in the news, and, in particular, President Trump's
12 Secretary of Labor, Alexander Acosta, at that time was
13 the U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of Florida who
14 also helped negotiate the plea and the non-prosecution
15 agreement, and there was a big firestorm as to whether or
16 not Mr. Acosta should or should not resign as Secretary
17 of Labor.

18 Q. What was the Post interested in finding out
19 with regard to the prior grand jury investigation by the
20 Palm Beach County State Attorney?

21 A. Well, because of the firestorm surrounding
22 Alex Acosta and the re-arrest, or new arrest, I should
23 say, of Jeffrey Epstein, the Post was interested in
24 looking back again as to what Barry Krischer's office as
25 state attorney did in terms of using or misusing the

1 grand jury process, in terms of the prosecution of
2 Jeffrey Epstein both in terms of the very light
3 non-prosecution agreement that they allowed him to enter
4 into, as well as the extremely lenient sentence that he
5 had.

6 Q. Were you involved in drafting letters to
7 the state attorney's office seeking documents relating to
8 the Epstein prosecution?

9 A. Yes.

10 MS. WHETSTONE: Would you please bring up
11 Exhibit 1?

12 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

13 Q. We're pulling up Exhibit 1 in the joint
14 exhibit binder. It's an August 27th letter.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Or, actually, Mr. Mendelsohn, please let me
17 know what this letter is.

18 A. Yes, this is Joint Exhibit 1. This is a
19 letter I wrote on August 27, 2019, to State Attorney Dave
20 Aronberg on behalf of the Post requesting specific
21 documents related to the grand jury investigation of
22 Jeffrey Epstein.

23 Q. What were you seeking in this letter?

24 A. Particularly, we were interested in items
25 stated on pages 2 and 3, some of what we were looking at.

1 We were very interested in finding out the conversations
2 between defense counsel, that's criminal defense counsel
3 for Mr. Epstein and, in particular, Alan Dershowitz and
4 Mr. Krischer's office.

5 We knew from investigation that
6 Mr. Dershowitz had provided Mr. Krischer with exhibits or
7 documents which went to injure the testimony -- the
8 credibility and the testimony of the young woman who
9 testified before the grand jury. I mean, we were looking
10 for those communications between Mr. Krischer's office
11 and defense counsel, in particular where Mr. Dershowitz
12 and others from the defense provided those materials to
13 damage the credibility of the grand jury witness.

14 We also wanted communications between
15 Mr. Krischer's office and the FBI and the U.S. Attorney's
16 Office because those issues were coming to the fore
17 because of Alex Acosta, and we did know that there were
18 such communications, and we wanted those documents to go
19 back to the Post for public disclosure.

20 Q. What was the state attorney's office's
21 response to this August 27th letter?

22 A. I never received a response to this letter.

23 Q. Were there other letters from Greenberg
24 Traurig to the state attorney's office following up?

25 A. Yes. Mr. Grygiel wrote a letter to the

1 state attorney's office as well. When I didn't receive a
2 response, I guess he felt whatever, but he did send that
3 next letter.

4 Q. Okay, so I'm pulling up Exhibit 37. Is
5 this -- Let me know what this is.

6 A. Yes, this is Mr. Grygiel, from our Albany
7 office, this is his letter to State Attorney Dave
8 Aronberg, October 9, 2019, reiterating some of the things
9 that we thought were in the possession of the state
10 attorney's office but had not been provided to the Palm
11 Beach Post.

12 Q. Did you get a response -- Was there a
13 response to this letter?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Did you review the documents that were
16 provided by the state attorney's office to the Post?

17 A. Yes. Before -- Sort of in the middle of
18 this, the Palm Beach Post, before I had written, had made
19 a public records request of the state attorney's office,
20 and some materials had been provided, and we did go
21 through that, those materials. They did not include
22 those that I mentioned in Joint Exhibit 1, which
23 particularly were missing the Dershowitz communications
24 and the communications with Mr. Krischer's office, the
25 FBI and the U.S. Attorney's Office.

1 Q. So what information -- what additional
2 information was needed that the Post was seeking?

3 A. We wanted to see why the grand jury was
4 used in such a way as to result in a very lenient charge
5 for Mr. Epstein, as well as the lenient sentence that was
6 part of the non-prosecution agreement.

7 We knew from the Post's investigation and
8 from other materials we had assembled that there were --
9 there was a grand jury that was empaneled. In fact,
10 there was two. The first one was canceled, and the
11 second one was conducted, and a witness, a victim did
12 testify. And we were on fairly certain ground that the
13 state attorney's office under Barry Krischer undermined
14 her credibility with materials provided to Mr. Krischer
15 by defense counsel --

16 Q. Did you --

17 A. -- and we did not get those materials back
18 from the state attorney's office.

19 Q. Did you review any other information to
20 reach the conclusions about the grand jury indictment?

21 A. Yes. I wanted to say that I was not the
22 only one working on this at Greenberg Traurig. In
23 addition to Mr. Grygiel, Nina Boyajian of our Los Angeles
24 office, who is a First Amendment expert, was also part of
25 our team. She is very well versed in First Amendment

1 issues, especially when it comes to representing the
2 media's interest under the First Amendment.

3 So we also had paralegals tasked with that
4 responsibility, too. We had assembled deposition
5 transcripts, affidavits that had been submitted in
6 various cases. I personally have spoken with the Town of
7 Palm Beach County -- the Town of Palm Beach Chief of
8 Police Reiter and discussed his testimony with him in
9 civil cases. I've obtained his deposition transcripts.

10 We spoke to only a few of the plaintiffs' lawyers in the
11 cases, but some of them did provide us with materials.

12 There was a voluminous amount of materials
13 we used. We also went back to the criminal case where
14 the materials were in the public domain and read through
15 those items as well.

16 Q. And, after this team at Greenberg reviewed
17 all this information and did due diligence, what was
18 decided next?

19 A. Ultimately, the team decided that it was
20 necessary to bring a lawsuit to obtain what we call grand
21 jury materials. It's not just simply the transcripts of
22 what occurred in front of the grand jury, but all of the
23 ancillary or corollary materials related to that. And
24 that, as we stated in Exhibit 1, included, but not
25 limited to, the communications where we believe

1 Mr. Dershowitz provided damaging information or
2 documentation to Mr. Krischer's office to destroy his own
3 witness in front of the grand jury, which honestly,
4 looking at all of the materials we had received and based
5 upon my personal discussions with the chief of police of
6 the Town of Palm Beach, we came to the conclusion
7 Mr. Krischer had abused his authority as state attorney.

8 Q. When did the due diligence process start
9 and when did it end as far as reviewing the facts?

10 A. Started in the summer of 2019, and it --
11 Well, the first phase resulted in the lawsuit, and that
12 contained hundreds of hours' worth of work, not only
13 legal work, but, as I said, factual investigatory work as
14 well. But it continued even after the lawsuit had been
15 filed as well. We didn't stop in case we found something
16 new, and ultimately we did find new things out in this
17 case, which I can add later, but there were new
18 revelations that had occurred.

19 Q. And the initial complaint was filed in...?

20 A. The end of November of 2019.

21 Q. What legal research was done before filing
22 the initial complaint? And that was for the statutory
23 count under 905.27.

24 A. Sure. The way we divided the work between
25 myself primarily and Ms. Boyajian was that we would

1 handle the First Amendment issues in the case. So the
2 U.S. Supreme Court cases involving the rights of the
3 media to be the public surrogate or be the public
4 mouthpiece and to obtain and participate in all facets of
5 criminal proceedings, she helped me and provided that --
6 I was aware of all of that, but she certainly had a
7 greater in-depth knowledge than I did. I was tasked with
8 the responsibility of fleshing out Section 905.27 of the
9 Florida statutes primarily.

10 Q. What did you personally research to flesh
11 out Florida Statute 905.27?

12 A. I read every word of Chapter 905. I looked
13 at Law Review articles. I remember one from Catholic
14 University, Valparaiso and others about the grand jury
15 process, grand jury secrecy, both federal cases and state
16 cases. I found every reported case under 905.27, which
17 particularly dealt with the issues that we were
18 discussing before and that Mr. Aronberg testified about,
19 and that went back to even the predecessor statute to
20 905.27, which is into the 1920s. And I tried to find
21 legislative history on the statute, but there wasn't any.

22 So I amassed 50, 60 cases under the statute
23 going back from the '20s, '30s, '40s, '50s, '60s, et
24 cetera, under 905.27. I read all of them.

25 Q. It sounds like a great deal of research,

1 but did you engage in any other research before filing
2 the initial complaint?

3 A. Well, federal as well, not only under the
4 state, but I wanted to see, you know, who to sue, to be
5 honest with you, in this case. We had a debate amongst
6 ourselves as to who the proper defendants were going to
7 be, and my principal responsibility was determining under
8 Florida law who that would be.

9 So I had extensive experience as an
10 assistant attorney general on suing, at least in
11 defending state officials in not only 1983 cases, but
12 many other type of cases where state officials are sued
13 in their official capacity. So this was certainly
14 nothing new to me.

15 I probably handled 3, 400 cases like that,
16 all on the defense side. So I was very familiar with
17 arguments of who was the proper party and the role of a
18 state official in litigation.

19 So what did I do? I went to see whether
20 there were other 905 cases, Chapter 905 cases where state
21 officials had been sued, and in particular I found two
22 cases. One was a state case and one was a federal case.
23 The state case was James vs. Wille and, coincidentally,
24 actually involved the predecessor to Barry Krischer, and
25 that case involved the beating of an inmate at the Palm

1 Beach County Jail out by Belle Glade, and that individual
2 sought grand jury testimony, and the state attorney was
3 named as a party in the case and, in fact, participated
4 in the case as to whether or not grand jury secrecy under
5 the statute -- you know, the extent of it and made legal
6 arguments opposing such.

7 Q. So we're talking about some of the cases
8 you relied upon --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. -- in determining that the state attorney
11 was a necessary party defendant, and I wanted to pull up
12 -- you mentioned James vs. -- Was it the James vs. Wille
13 case?

14 A. Yeah, James vs. Wille, correct.

15 Q. And that's Exhibit 36. Can you just let me
16 know if Exhibit 36 is the case you were talking about?

17 A. Yep, that's the case.

18 Q. And were there any other cases you relied
19 upon specifically with regard to the state attorney
20 necessarily being a party?

21 A. Yes. An 11th Circuit case called In re
22 Grand Jury. It's a Federal 11th Circuit Court of Appeals
23 case.

24 MS. WHETSTONE: And that's in Your Honor's
25 binder, the Authorities binder at tab 11. We'll

1 pull that up.

2 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

3 Q. Is that the In re Grand Jury case?

4 A. Yes, that's the case.

5 Q. So what were the three -- what were the
6 reasons the state attorney was named a defendant?

7 A. Well, this case particularly, the state
8 attorney was from Broward County named in this case.
9 It's a little complicated facts, but essentially there
10 was a federal grand jury that issued a subpoena to the
11 Broward County State Attorney seeking state attorney
12 grand jury materials for a particular investigation, and
13 the Broward County attorney, as you can see here,
14 participated in this case and objected to the release of
15 such under 905.27.

16 And I was particularly interested in the
17 language from this case which said that the state
18 attorney's role was an essential one because his or her
19 role was to protect the grand jury process, which
20 included grand jury secrecy.

21 So, based upon the James vs. Wille case and
22 this case and my background in defending state officials,
23 I felt that the state attorney here in his official
24 capacity was a necessary party because someone had to
25 advocate one way or the other for grand jury secrecy if

1 the state attorney decided that's what he wanted to do.
2 But, if we didn't name the state attorney, we were
3 denying that state official and that office the right to
4 object under secrecy laws.

5 So the purpose was to allow the state
6 attorney, if he chose to do so, to object to the
7 disclosure under 905.27 and to advocate for the state
8 secrecy interest, and that was a prime issue of why he
9 was named.

10 Q. Were there other reasons?

11 A. Well, we weren't sure what the state
12 attorney's office had. We knew that at one point the
13 state attorney's office had grand jury materials because
14 that's -- under Mr. Krischer that's what had occurred.
15 He presented this to the grand jury. So we weren't
16 completely sure who had what.

17 So we also believed, and I still believe,
18 that the statute does not prohibit the state attorney
19 from requesting the state attorney to look at grand jury
20 materials, not disclose it to the public, but merely to
21 disclose it to the state attorney if the state attorney
22 wanted to look at it.

23 So we were hopeful that, if the state
24 attorney was interested in looking at these materials,
25 that he would say that he had the right to look at them

1 under 905.27 and then, if so, ask the Court for an
2 in-camera review before release to the public.

3 So those are the three issues we were
4 concerned with.

5 Q. Did Greenberg Traurig conclude that the
6 state attorney was a necessary party to this case
7 regardless of whether it had possession of the grand jury
8 materials?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And was that conclusion a yes?

11 A. Yes, it was.

12 Q. So, after the complaint -- the initial
13 complaint was filed in November of 2019, were discussions
14 had with the state attorney's counsel and the counsel for
15 the clerk?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. What were those discussions?

18 A. Well, we had discussions about the case,
19 particularly where this is going, did they have
20 objections and, if so, under what basis did they have
21 objections.

22 Q. After the complaint -- the initial
23 complaint was filed, what position did the state attorney
24 take in the case?

25 A. Took two -- Took two positions. He filed

1 an answer, and that answer contained a motion to dismiss.

2 Q. Backing up. Sorry. After the initial
3 complaint was filed, what was the -- what was the
4 position taken by the state attorney to the initial
5 complaint, just the Count 2?

6 A. Okay.

7 Q. Sorry, just Count 1.

8 A. His position was that grand jury secrecy
9 was preeminent under 905.27, and that statute barred the
10 release of the materials. He also argued that the
11 statute was only operative where there was a pending
12 civil case and a pending criminal case, and since the
13 Epstein case was not pending civilly involving the Post,
14 or the criminal case, there was no criminal case in Palm
15 Beach County, we didn't have any position or standing
16 under the statute to seek the materials on behalf of the
17 Palm Beach Post.

18 Q. Did the state attorney file a motion to
19 dismiss the initial complaint?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. What was your reaction to that?

22 A. Well, I was hopeful that they wouldn't
23 object or seek to dismiss it, but I understood that they
24 had a statutory obligation to protect grand jury secrecy,
25 so I didn't take it personally or anything like that. I

1 understood the role that they were playing because that
2 was the role we gave them the opportunity to play in this
3 case. So I was neither surprised, nor upset that they
4 played that role, because that's the opportunity we gave
5 them.

6 Q. Did the clerk file a motion to dismiss the
7 initial complaint as well?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. After the state attorney filed his motion
10 to dismiss the initial complaint, what did the Post do in
11 response?

12 A. After the initial -- Well, we filed an
13 amendment to the -- to the complaint.

14 Q. Did you take a look at whether there were
15 other causes of action you could assert?

16 A. Yes. We decided to develop the First
17 Amendment issue in more depth and argue that the Post had
18 rights under the First Amendment, as well as the statute,
19 in conjunction with the statute to obtain the materials,
20 as well as an argument that I had developed which was
21 that the Court has inherent authority as the ultimate
22 supervisor of the grand jury system under the Florida
23 Constitution to prevent abuse of the grand jury system,
24 and we felt that the Court had such authority. That was
25 the Clayton case that I was relying on.

1 Q. We're going to pull up Exhibit 9, which is
2 the amended complaint in this matter.

3 Could you confirm to me that's the first
4 amended complaint?

5 A. Yes, I see that. That's on the board here.
6 Yes, it's in front of me as well.

7 Q. And we'll turn to it, but the state
8 attorney answered Count 1 of this amended complaint,
9 which was the count for declaratory judgment; is that
10 correct?

11 A. That is correct. They moved to -- Yes,
12 they moved to dismiss Count 2, the purely statutory
13 claim, and they answered the declaratory judgment which
14 was the mixture of First Amendment, statute, inherent
15 authority of the Court.

16 Q. What do you recall about reviewing the
17 answer to the first amended complaint for declaratory
18 relief?

19 A. Well, they continued to oppose the release
20 of the materials under 905.27 asserting grand jury
21 secrecy and asserting that we didn't have a claim under
22 the statute. I did note that they admitted in
23 paragraph 72 that the case was brought in good faith, and
24 that's particularly the declaratory judgment one. That
25 stood out to me.

1 Q. We'll pull that up. I think we've seen it
2 a couple times. We'll pull it up.

3 Please let me know if this comparison of
4 Exhibit 9 and Exhibit 10 is the paragraph you're talking
5 about.

6 A. Right, right, yes, that they refused to
7 provide access. That's through their objection to the
8 clerk to testimony, minutes and other evidence. Again,
9 this was not just simply transcripts. It was much
10 broader than that. And that a good faith dispute exists,
11 and they admitted all of that.

12 Q. Did Count 1 for declaratory relief seek to
13 force the state attorney to produce documents that he did
14 not have?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Did the state attorney's position that his
17 office did not have possession or custody of the grand
18 jury materials end the need for his office to be a party
19 to the declaratory relief claim?

20 A. No, and really the proof of that is what
21 actually occurred, which is they moved forward with their
22 motion to dismiss and ultimately a motion for summary
23 judgment.

24 So they opposed the release of the
25 materials, as was their right, under the statute

1 asserting grand jury secrecy. So it actually proved why
2 we put them in the case, which is to give them the
3 opportunity on behalf of the office officially to assert
4 grand jury secrecy, which is what they did. So, in
5 effect, it worked. They took advantage of the
6 opportunity and asserted that we were not entitled to it
7 under the statute's grand jury secrecy provisions.

8 Q. On June 8th, 2020, Judge Marx -- did Judge
9 Marx enter an order on the motion to dismiss Count 2
10 under Florida Statute 905.27?

11 A. She did.

12 Q. And what was -- what was the ruling?

13 A. She determined that the Post lacked --
14 well, that the statute did not create a private right of
15 action, that it was limited to those who were seeking the
16 materials in the pending civil case and a pending
17 criminal case, so she did it on a very narrow ground.

18 Q. That order -- sorry.

19 A. Go right ahead.

20 Q. Mr. Mendelsohn, go ahead.

21 Okay, that order did not address the
22 declaratory judgment claim in Count 1, did it?

23 A. No.

24 Q. When did the state attorney send its
25 initial what he calls place-marker 57.105 demand letter

1 and motion for fees?

2 A. Within hours of the order from Judge Marx
3 was issued, I believe, on June 8, 2020.

4 Q. And at that point why was the state
5 attorney kept in the case?

6 A. Well, they were still objecting to
7 disclosure under Count 2, under the declaratory judgment.
8 They were still asserting that grand jury secrecy and the
9 statute could not be overcome by the First Amendment or
10 by the Court's inherent authority, and that the Court's
11 inherent authority was limited by the statute, which we
12 obviously thought was sort of the other way, that the
13 statute or the legislature could not inhibit the Court's
14 inherent authority because the judiciary had its rights
15 and the legislature had its rights. So that issue still
16 remained.

17 Q. Did you write to the state attorney's
18 counsel and lay out the Post's reasons for continuing to
19 include the state attorney in the case?

20 A. Yes. That's my letter of June 23rd, 2020.

21 Q. And we'll go ahead and pull that up.

22 That's Exhibit 16.

23 Is that the letter that you're referring
24 to?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And your letter set forth the reasons why
2 the state attorney was named as a party in the case --

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. -- and continued to be named?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did the state attorney's office ever
7 address the second reason for keeping the state attorney
8 in the case in response to this letter?

9 A. I never received a written response to this
10 letter.

11 Q. And that second reason was that he was the
12 -- that the state attorney's office was an official
13 tasked with protecting grand jury secrecy?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And, in your letter, did you cite a case to
16 the state attorney?

17 A. Yes. I cited to In re Grand Jury
18 Proceedings, the 11th Circuit case.

19 Q. Did you have discussions with the state
20 attorney's counsel after this point, after writing this
21 letter?

22 A. Yes, with Mr. Wyler.

23 Q. And what were they?

24 A. What are we going to do about this case
25 essentially. Is the state attorney going to oppose us?

1 Is he continuing to oppose us? Because I never received
2 a response to my June 23rd letter, and I wanted it to be
3 understood that we honestly believed that the state
4 attorney had a necessary role to play in their official
5 capacity. We were hopeful that they would take a neutral
6 position, but they remained adamant that they had to
7 protect grand jury secrecy under the statute, which we
8 respected.

9 Q. And I don't want to know the substance of
10 settlement discussions, if there were any, but did
11 settlement discussions go on with the state attorney's
12 counsel after the June 23rd letter?

13 A. Yes. Yes, they did.

14 Q. And is that indicated on the timeline here
15 of June, June 8th, 2020, to October 15th, 2020?

16 A. Yes. With Mr. Wyler, yes.

17 Q. Mr. Wyler.

18 A. He was a very nice man on the phone. We
19 had very good conversations, very professional.

20 Q. The state attorney filed his motion for
21 fees on July 1st, 2020; is that correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And is this the state attorney's first
24 motion for fees that was filed on July 1st, 2020?

25 A. It is.

1 Q. Did the initial 57.105 motion as filed set
2 forth any of the grounds for the motion?

3 A. No, it didn't. It just said that they were
4 entitled to 57.105.

5 Q. So, after this point, did you -- did the
6 Post and Greenberg seek discovery from the clerk?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And this was in the litigation?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. What discovery did you seek from the clerk?

11 A. We wanted to know whether or not any --
12 well, first, whether the state attorney under
13 Mr. Krischer had asked for any of the materials that the
14 clerk had had, and, also, whether the FBI and U.S.
15 Attorney's Office had asked the clerk to provide such
16 materials. And the clerk indicated to us in response to
17 a request that the clerk's office had done so, though
18 they were vague as to why and when.

19 Q. And what -- did you serve
20 interrogatories --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- and document --

23 A. Requests, yes. We wanted to see a log of
24 the materials in the grand jury sealed -- that the clerk
25 had sealed. We hoped that there was a log indicating

1 what was in there, not really specifically what was in
2 there, but by category, whether it was a transcript,
3 whether there were exhibits and/or whether there were
4 affidavits or whether there were deposition transcripts.
5 Whatever there was in there, we wanted to understand.

6 The clerk had responded that they don't
7 keep a log, so they couldn't tell us unless the seal was
8 broken what was in there.

9 Q. In August of 2020, the state attorney's
10 office filed a motion for summary judgment, is that
11 correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And Exhibit 19, please. Is this the state
14 attorney's motion for summary judgment that's on the
15 screen?

16 A. Yes, it is. Yes.

17 Q. And, in support of this motion for summary
18 judgment, did Mr. Aronberg file an affidavit in support?

19 A. He did.

20 MS. WHETSTONE: If you could go to 18,
21 please.

22 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

23 Q. And is 18 the State Attorney Dave
24 Aronberg's affidavit in support?

25 A. It is.

1 Q. At this point, after the affidavit had been
2 filed, had the state attorney responded to another one of
3 the reasons that he had been named as a necessary party
4 to the action?

5 A. No. They focused exclusively on possession
6 rather than their position protecting the grand jury's
7 secrecy issue which they had advocated for.

8 Q. So did the state attorney's affidavit and
9 motion for summary judgment address In re Grand Jury
10 Proceedings or any of that -- any point in your letter
11 about his office being able to prevent the clerk from
12 releasing grand jury materials?

13 A. No, they never responded to that.

14 Q. Was there still a factual issue -- At this
15 time in August 2020, was there still a factual issue as
16 to whether the state attorney had physical possession of
17 copies of grand jury materials?

18 A. Well, we knew at one point Mr. Krischer
19 obviously had to have had such. We also had -- We were
20 of the belief that there were communications, on very
21 strong grounds, between Mr. Krischer's office and
22 Mr. Dershowitz and other defense counsel, as well as the
23 FBI and U.S. Attorney leading up to and including the
24 indictment, the non-prosecution agreement, as well as the
25 sentencing report.

1 We never received any such, and we knew
2 they were out there. Exactly who had them, where they
3 were, we weren't sure. We learned in hindsight that the
4 U.S. Attorney's Office had been provided with such by the
5 clerk's office. This is the Palm Beach County clerk's
6 office.

7 Q. So fast forwarding a bit to October 2nd,
8 2020, did Greenberg and the Post -- sorry -- did the Post
9 file a response to the state attorney's first
10 place-marker 57.105 motion?

11 A. We did.

12 Q. And if you could pull up Exhibit 20.

13 A. Which one is this exhibit?

14 Q. 20.

15 A. That's what I thought. Okay.

16 Q. Is this the Post's response, memorandum of
17 law of the plaintiff to the state attorney's --

18 A. That is correct.

19 Q. -- 57.105 sanction motion?

20 A. Yes. I drafted this, yes.

21 Q. On page 8 --

22 MS. WHETSTONE: Gerard, do you mind going
23 to page 8.

24 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

25 Q. Did you again raise the state attorney's

1 ability to object to release of grand jury records?

2 A. Yes. I cited to In re Grand Jury

3 Proceedings again.

4 Q. If you look at the screen, is that on page

5 8? Is that where you cited to?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. And at this point, the state attorney still

8 had not responded to this reason he was named as a party;

9 is that correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. So then on October 14th, 2020, did the

12 state attorney file a reply to this response?

13 A. Yes.

14 MS. WHETSTONE: If could you pull up

15 Exhibit 21.

16 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

17 Q. Is this the state attorney's reply in

18 support of the first place-marker motion for fees?

19 A. Yes, it's in response to their June 2020

20 motion for fees.

21 Q. So this is not a reply to the 57.105 motion

22 we're here on today, right?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. This is a reply to the original June

25 place-marker motion for fees, correct?

1 A. Correct. What happened is the state
2 attorney never noticed the first motion they filed for
3 fees for a hearing, and they still haven't done that. So
4 it's never been noticed for hearing.

5 There was a little dispute between myself
6 and Mr. Wyler as to whether or not the fee motion that he
7 had filed in June should be heard first or their motion
8 for summary judgment should be heard first, and there was
9 a case management conference before Judge Hafele, and
10 Judge Hafele decided that the state attorney could decide
11 the order of when that would occur. So not knowing when
12 -- what hearing would go first, I filed a response to
13 their fee motion that they filed back in June, and that
14 was Exhibit 20, and then he responded in Exhibit 21.

15 Q. And I'll call your attention to pages 1
16 through 2 of Exhibit 21 and the state attorney's reply --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- and where it's highlighted on the
19 screen.

20 A. Yep, I see that.

21 Q. It says, "Nonetheless, the state attorney
22 has no objection and never has had any objection to the
23 clerk releasing the records sought by the plaintiff."

24 Was this the first time the state attorney
25 -- the state attorney stated his office would not object

1 to the release of grand jury materials if ordered by the
2 Court?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. So, after your reply -- sorry -- after your
5 response on October 2nd, then on October 14th, the state
6 attorney for the first time stated in a filing that he
7 had no objection to the production of Epstein grand jury
8 materials by the clerk?

9 A. That's accurate, yes.

10 Q. Was this a change from the state attorney's
11 prior position about releasing grand jury materials?

12 A. Absolutely.

13 Q. How would you describe the change from the
14 initial -- from his initial response to the initial
15 complaint to this reply?

16 A. Initially they fulfilled why they were in
17 the case, which is they objected to the release of the
18 materials under 905.27, and now they were taking a
19 neutral position, and they were no longer advocating the
20 supremacy of 905.27 and its secrecy provisions as a bar
21 or prevention or preventive for the release of grand jury
22 materials. They were no longer taking that position.
23 They were no longer taking any position.

24 Q. What was your reaction to this change?

25 A. Well, I was pleased.

1 Q. Did you send a letter -- a settlement
2 letter on October 15th in response to this October 14th
3 position in the reply?

4 A. Yes. I did it pretty quickly after I saw
5 it.

6 Q. The next day?

7 A. The next day. Well, I started writing it
8 on the 14th, but, yes, we sent it on the next day.

9 Q. Okay, and I'll pull up Exhibit 22.
10 Is this your letter to Mr. Wyler with
11 regard to the reply?

12 A. Yes. Since they had changed to a neutral
13 position, I didn't see a point in discussing whether or
14 not they should remain in the case, and that's what the
15 purpose of this was.

16 Q. And in it you say you were pleased about
17 them changing --

18 A. Yes, yes. In the second paragraph, I said
19 I was pleased to read that they -- the state attorney's
20 clear and unequivocal statement in their response filed
21 yesterday that their office will not oppose the Post's
22 request for access to the Jeffrey Epstein grand jury
23 materials. I was pleased.

24 Q. Once the state attorney's office said that
25 it would no longer object to release of the grand jury

1 materials by the clerk, what was [REDACTED]s and
2 the Post's response?

3 A. We had a team meeting and ultimately
4 discussion with the Post as to whether or not the state
5 attorney should remain in the case. We had, for the
6 first time, Mr. Aronberg's affidavit. He had previously
7 stated that position, but for the first time in a
8 pleading or an affidavit filed in the case, he said he
9 clearly didn't have possession. And he's now taking a
10 neutral position. Because of the change in position that
11 this neutrality had now created, we had a very serious
12 discussion as to whether or not he should remain in the
13 case because, remember, one of the necessary party prongs
14 that I had mentioned previously was to give Mr. Aronberg
15 the opportunity as state attorney to voice either his
16 objection to the release or his neutrality or maybe his
17 support.

18 Now he decided to change from opposition to
19 neutrality, and, since that was the case, we determined
20 ultimately to drop him from the case, that there was no
21 -- he had exercised his option and made a decision, and
22 we were happy that he had done so.

23 Q. Was -- What date was the state attorney
24 dropped as a party to the action?

25 A. It was in October. Was it October 21st?

1 Q. We'll pull up Exhibit 23.

2 A. Okay, I've got it in front of me. It was
3 October 21st, 2020.

4 Q. And is this Exhibit 23 the notice of
5 dropping the state attorney as a party?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. After this, 19 days after this, did the
8 state attorney file an amended motion for fees under
9 57.105?

10 A. He did.

11 Q. Is that the motion we're here on today?

12 A. Correct. That's the only one that the
13 state attorney has noticed for hearing.

14 Q. We're pulling up Exhibit 25, and, once it's
15 up, I'd like you to confirm, is this the amended motion
16 for sanctions that we're here on today?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Was this amended motion ever served on you
19 or the Post anytime before it was filed?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Does the amended motion set forth new and
22 different BCs for the motion for sanctions than compared
23 to the first what they call place-marker motion?

24 A. Absolutely.

25 Q. What were some of those new arguments?

1 A. Well, ultimately the major new argument was
2 that he now had neutrality in the case. That was a
3 massive change in the position of the state attorney
4 which was not the situation back when they first made
5 their place-holder motion, and this is the words they
6 used back in June. This was a sea change as far as we
7 were concerned in the status of the case.

8 Q. And you told the state attorney that was
9 the basis for its joinder back in the beginning of the
10 case?

11 A. As a necessary party, yes. And, since they
12 were no longer advocating secrecy and now had adopted
13 neutrality, that's why we dropped them from the case.

14 Q. And I'll move to what I think is going to
15 be my last exhibit, the final judgment, which is
16 Exhibit 30.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Did the Post -- So did the Post file a
19 motion for summary judgment against the clerk --

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. -- as to the declaratory relief claim?

22 A. Yes. They were the remaining party in the
23 case.

24 Q. And Judge Hafele heard argument on that
25 motion for summary judgment?

1 A. He heard it for about two and a half hours,
2 yes.

3 Q. And was this the same declaratory judgment
4 count that had been asserted against the state attorney
5 that had been dismissed against him after he said he had
6 no objection to the clerk releasing documents?

7 A. It was Count 1. That was the same count
8 that we had against the state attorney and the clerk, and
9 that had been dropped against the state attorney at the
10 time I argued the motion for summary judgment in front of
11 Judge Hafele in September of 2020 or August of 2020.

12 Q. And Judge Hafele entered an order on a
13 motion for summary judgment which became this final
14 judgment; is that right?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. And going through it, on page 5, the Court
17 noted that the Post's position was -- Well, I'll ask you,
18 what was the Court's reaction in the final judgment to
19 the presentations given by the Post?

20 A. Ultimately Judge Hafele determined that his
21 hands were -- while he recognized that the Court had
22 inherent authority and that inherent authority covered
23 the supervision of prosecutorial abuse of the grand jury
24 process, he felt constrained by the statute, which was
25 905.27. So he felt ultimately that he could not exercise

1 inherent authority because of the limitations that he
2 thought 905.27 contained, though, without sounding too
3 egotistical, he was very effusive to the work that
4 Greenberg Traurig had done, as well as the work done by
5 the clerk's counsel.

6 Q. So I'll draw attention to page 7. It says,
7 "The newspaper makes strong arguments to advance its more
8 expansive construction of Section 905" --

9 A. Right.

10 Q. -- "27 as part of furthering justice." And
11 then page 11, it says, "The Court acknowledges the
12 newspaper's vibrant and sincere arguments."

13 Was that -- Was that comment with regard to
14 Count 1?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And that's the count we're here on today?

17 A. Correct. That matter is on appeal. The
18 final judgment is on appeal.

19 Q. Thank you. That was my next question.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. Okay. Okay, one last question -- sorry --
22 two.

23 Did you have any discussions with the
24 editorial side of the Post having anything to do with the
25 decision to sue the state attorney?

1 A. None. There was a firewall between the
2 legal arguments we were making here and whatever the Post
3 was writing both editorially and factually. I had
4 absolutely no conversations with the Post, nor did any
5 member of my team as to what they were going to write.
6 It's not my role to tell the paper what it wants to, or
7 not, write or not write, so the legal positions that we
8 adopted in this case were -- were the positions that we
9 as Greenberg Traurig and the paper came to the conclusion
10 of based upon the facts and the law.

11 As to what the Post may have wanted to
12 write or did write, I have zero input into that, nor did
13 Mr. Grygiel, nor did Ms. Boyajian. I didn't even know
14 what was going to be printed until I read it in the
15 paper, so I did not know one word they were going to put
16 in the paper.

17 Q. Last question. Did suing the state
18 attorney in this case have anything to do with a personal
19 vendetta against the state attorney?

20 A. Well, I voted for Mr. Aronberg. No.

21 Q. So no?

22 A. We have a mutual friend. So I have no
23 animus against him at all. I'm not happy he has me
24 sitting up here, to be honest with you, but, you know, I
25 understand why he has me up here. I get that. He's not

1 happy being associated with Mr. Epstein. The man was
2 reprobate. He was one of the lowest forms of humanity.
3 So even having my name in an article, even if I'm not
4 accused of something, I can understand why he's not happy
5 about it.

6 But I don't -- we didn't do this out of
7 animus or lack of preparation. This was a sober decision
8 against someone in their official capacity. I'm sorry
9 that he feels personally offended by this, but we took
10 great pains to make sure that there were no allegations
11 in the amended complaint and the complaint accusing him
12 of anything or of any wrongdoing of any kind because
13 that's just not the case that we have in front of us.

14 MS. WHETSTONE: Thank you, Mr. Mendelsohn.

15 Sorry, we went a little long.

16 THE COURT: No, it's okay.

17 Are you going to finish in the next 10
18 minutes?

19 MR. WYLER: No, Your Honor. That's
20 impossible for me.

21 THE COURT: So then we're not going to get
22 started.

23 MR. WYLER: I don't think it would be
24 worthwhile for me to start and then stop in 10
25 minutes. It's going to take me at least

1 30 minutes, probably more like 45.

2 THE COURT: Okay, so, you know, from Amelia
3 Island to here is five hours?

4 MR. WYLER: Yes, sir.

5 THE COURT: You're almost in Georgia.

6 MR. WYLER: Exactly. Your Honor, I will be
7 here whenever you need me to be here. I'll make
8 it happen.

9 THE COURT: Thursday or Friday?

10 MR. WYLER: Honestly --

11 THE COURT: How about Thursday?

12 MR. WYLER: -- how about Thursday? Yeah,
13 Thursday would be better.

14 THE COURT: Okay, all right, we'll come
15 back in Thursday.

16 MR. MENDELSON: In the afternoon, Your
17 Honor?

18 THE COURT: Come back Thursday, probably
19 1:00 p.m. Give me one minute.

20 (Brief interruption.)

21 THE COURT: All right, so the only thing
22 left is cross examination, redirect, and then are
23 the parties going to write closing arguments?

24 MS. WHETSTONE: If Your Honor would prefer
25 it, we'd be fine with that.

1 THE COURT: I prefer closing arguments that
2 are written. I think things are more coherent.
3 You know, I think the logic is tighter. If the
4 parties don't mind writing closing arguments, I
5 would prefer that.

6 Okay, do you want to bring your closing
7 argument? I mean, I can anticipate you probably
8 know what you're going to argue.

9 MS. WHETSTONE: If we could finish the
10 direct -- the redirect and just make sure we have
11 the testimony, that we will have the transcript
12 and add it into the closings or make sure that we
13 have -- What do you think?

14 MR. WYLER: Your Honor, it's going to be
15 really hard for me to drive back, and then hand
16 write it and then drive back down here again.

17 THE COURT: Why don't we do this: Cross
18 examination, redirect. You'll give me a closing
19 argument, and you can supplement your closing
20 arguments in writing. If I need to have an
21 additional hearing, we can do that via Zoom since
22 the evidence and presentation will have concluded.

23 MS. WHETSTONE: Sounds good.

24 THE COURT: Sound good?

25 MR. WYLER: Sounds good, yes.

1 THE COURT: All right, so we'll come back

2 Thursday, 1:00 p.m.

3 THE WITNESS: Am I excused, Your Honor,
4 from the stand?

5 THE COURT: Yes.

6 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

7 THE COURT: I know we have guests. You
8 know, the Wall Street Journal will write
9 reprobate. It's a big word. It's a big word.

10 All right, anything else?

11 Have a great day, everybody. We're in
12 recess.

13 (The hearing adjourned at 4:53 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 COURT CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF FLORIDA

4 COUNTY OF PALM BEACH

5

6

7 I, Lisa Begley, RPR, RMR, certify that I
8 was authorized to and did stenographically report
9 the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript
10 is a true and complete record of my stenographic
11 notes.

12

13 Dated this 12th day of September, 2022.

14

15

16

Lisa Begley, RPR, RMR

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

<hr/> <p>(</p> <hr/> <p>(1) 13:23 19:21 28:3</p> <p>(1) (b) 19:23 20:15</p> <p>(2) 19:21</p> <p>(4) 's 26:14</p> <p>(a) 19:22</p> <hr/> <p>1</p> <hr/> <p>1 10:1 12:13 14:20 16:22 34:22,23 37:14 40:2,4 68:5,7,16,18 75:19,22 83:5,15 95:19,21 96:2 103:11,13,18 105:22 107:24 115:7 117:8 118:12 119:22 128:15 134:7 135:14</p> <p>10 10:23 33:1 47:14 77:10 95:11 118:4 137:17,24</p> <p>103 47:16</p> <p>11</p>	<p>11:5 29:13 51:9 101:2,5 111:25 135:11</p> <p>118 46:11</p> <p>119 82:16 95:1</p> <p>119.07 14:19</p> <p>11th 85:3 111:21, 22 121:18</p> <p>12 11:5,9 49:8 58:19</p> <p>120 15:18</p> <p>1353 9:9,13,20 12:12</p> <p>1374 12:12</p> <p>14 27:11 28:14, 16 29:11 91:17</p> <p>14th 31:4 38:5 45:1 91:5 127:11 129:5 130:2,8</p> <p>15th 48:2 55:14,25 122:15 130:2</p> <p>16 11:9 36:16 79:16 80:8 120:22</p>	<p>17 10:5 11:25 12:5 45:2 91:18 92:2</p> <p>17th 70:17</p> <p>18 9:25 10:17 31:22 124:20, 23</p> <p>19 10:5 26:2 75:21 124:13 132:7</p> <p>1920s 109:20</p> <p>193 8:1</p> <p>1980 99:6</p> <p>1983 99:8 100:15 110:11</p> <p>1:00 138:19 140:2</p> <p>1:42 4:2</p> <p>1st 122:21,24</p> <hr/> <p>2</p> <hr/> <p>2 5:7 22:5 25:7 37:13 39:25 40:1,21 74:23,24 103:25 115:5 117:12 119:9</p>	<p>120:7 128:16</p> <p>2.42 19:4</p> <p>20 30:1 38:1 94:4 99:12,16 126:12,14 128:14</p> <p>2005 33:22</p> <p>2006 23:21 29:1 33:6,24 35:15 54:14 55:20 72:7 76:5 78:5 102:10</p> <p>2006-CF-9454 19:10</p> <p>2012 44:2 50:3</p> <p>2013 15:19 50:2,4 55:15</p> <p>2016 8:2</p> <p>2019 5:25 6:5 26:10 34:6,16 45:1 68:18 69:19 70:13, 24,25 73:15 76:5 101:22, 25 103:19 105:8 108:10, 20 114:13</p> <p>2020 5:2,3 8:17 16:18,22,24, 25 25:25</p>
--	--	--	--

26:2,25 29:23 30:19 36:16 37:20 38:6 44:5 45:2 57:12 79:2,10 80:14,15 84:22 86:22 88:1,12,15, 17,19 89:16, 18 91:5 92:5 119:8 120:3, 20 122:15,21, 24 124:9 125:15 126:8 127:11,19 132:3 134:11	22 130:9 222 47:24 23 12:5 132:1,4 235 54:7 23rd 30:19 36:16, 20 38:4 80:15 86:21 120:20 122:2,12 24 (a) 14:20 25 28:14 29:8 30:5 94:4 132:14 26 26:8 268 5:24 6:4 27 68:18 103:19 135:10 276 26:9 27th 70:16 103:14 104:21 29 9:11 2nd 37:19 126:7 129:5	<hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 9:25 103:25 110:15 30 40:25 133:16 138:1 30s 109:23 30th 49:6,7 36 111:15,16 37 69:17,21 70:4,13 83:5, 16 95:20,22 96:2 105:4 38 39:1 3:39 95:12 3:57 95:13 3rd 8:17 51:19 53:13 <hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 9:25 10:8 400 110:15 40s 109:23 42	100:14 45 138:1 4:53 140:13 <hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 10:5 42:21 44:10,15 95:11 96:23, 24 97:3 134:16 50 78:7 109:22 50s 109:23 57 6:9 57.103 (a) 20:8 57.105 5:2,8,11,16 6:6,10,13 8:5 15:2,22,23 16:5,7,9,10, 13 17:6 21:16 22:7,8,11,21 23:3 25:3 26:13 27:1,8, 23 28:3,6,7 32:2,10 38:13 39:8 41:20 42:23,24,25 53:17,22 54:10,19 64:11 79:19, 23 84:22 86:2 87:25 90:18
--	--	---	---

93:14 94:15 101:2,4 119:25 123:1, 4 126:10,19 127:21 132:9 57.105(1) (a) 5:17 8:11 22:22 57.105(1) (b) 5:20 13:10 20:9 22:24 57.105(3) (a) 19:17,20 22:10 42:5 59 29:12 5:00 96:17 <hr/> 6 <hr/> 6 11:25 28:1 47:14 71:20 60 109:22 60s 109:23 <hr/> 7 <hr/> 7 75:25 135:6 71 76:20 77:4, 10,12,13,14, 19 72 77:23,24 78:2 117:23	73 15:19 762 5:24 6:4 <hr/> 8 <hr/> 8 10:8,11,17 120:3 126:21, 23 127:5 8th 5:3 26:25 54:1 119:8 122:15 <hr/> 9 <hr/> 9 32:24 44:4 105:8 117:1 118:4 90 58:9 905 109:12 110:20 135:8 905.17 14:13 905.17(1) 56:19 905.21(1) (c) 55:17 905.27 5:13 13:19 14:24 21:16 25:8 40:7 108:23 109:8, 11,16,20,24 112:15 113:7	114:1 115:9 117:20 119:10 129:18,20 134:25 135:2 905.27(1) 33:9 76:3 78:7 905.27(1) 06 76:7 987 26:9 997 8:1 9th 5:1 16:18,25 26:20 70:13 <hr/> A <hr/> ability 21:19 35:25 53:6 127:1 above-captioned 55:16 above-described 55:23 absolutely 9:8 11:18 31:19 66:9,10 92:24 129:12 132:24 136:4 abuse 116:23 134:23 abused 108:7 accepting 63:6 access 8:15 20:21	23:18 33:4 35:8 36:1 48:17 49:16 50:5 55:18 56:14,17 76:3,6 78:4, 14 118:7 130:22 accessed 49:23 accompanied 53:23 accompanying 55:2 accounts 56:11 accurate 60:15 129:9 accuse 66:22 accused 67:15 137:4 accusing 67:3 137:11 achieve 50:8 acknowledge 66:24 83:19 acknowledged 51:3,7 67:2 acknowledges 135:11 acolytes 58:23 Acosta 102:12,16,22 104:17
---	--	---	--

acted 33:17	82:3	131:6,8	120:21
action 5:10 6:22 10:25 22:5 38:22 40:23 44:8 46:1 47:21 48:5,9 53:4,14 55:23 56:24 74:15 100:23 116:15 119:15 125:4 131:24	administrations 50:1 admission 33:13 admit 62:3 77:12 78:15 admits 48:7 admitted 14:9 32:17,21 33:12 78:11 96:2 117:22 118:11 admittedly 21:4 admitting 37:14 78:12, 13 93:6 adopted 133:12 136:8 advance 135:7 advantage 119:5 advocate 112:25 113:7 advocated 125:7 advocating 129:19 133:12 affidavit 18:10,11 29:22 55:3,5, 7 57:3 124:18,24 125:1,8	affidavits 18:10 107:5 124:4 affirm 43:11 98:8 affirmative 39:18 afforded 14:2 after-the-fact 86:25 afternoon 4:7,13 43:22, 25 63:19 97:2,4,11 98:20 138:16 agenda 62:13,16 agenda-driven 62:24 agree 10:6 66:4 67:17 79:7 81:24 agreed 26:21 95:17 97:15 agreement 42:17 44:17 95:24 102:15 103:3 106:6 125:24 aha 90:13 ahead 9:21 93:4 119:19,20	aimed 27:19 Alan 104:3 Albany 101:13 105:6 Alex 102:22 104:17 Alexander 102:12 allegation 28:5 46:14 allegations 47:18,25 76:1 137:10 allege 10:14 45:24 allowed 77:18 93:9 103:3 allowing 55:18 aloud 55:9 alternative 18:3 amassed 109:22 Amelia 97:17 138:2 amended 4:4,25 15:10, 13,21 16:12, 14,16,24 17:18,24 18:7 25:21,25 26:12,18,22

27:9,16 28:9, 12 29:9,11, 15,18,24 30:1 31:8,11,14 32:25 43:4 44:4 45:1 46:8 57:5 74:13,14 75:3 92:3,8,16 94:6 117:2,4, 8,17 132:8, 15,18,21 137:11	4:6 anticipate 139:7 Antonacci 48:21 anytime 132:19 apologize 16:20,22 69:18 70:5 apparently 53:8 appeal 41:18 135:17, 18 Appeals 111:22 appearances 4:6 appears 60:9 appellate 100:8 applicable 28:4 application 5:21 7:4 22:25 applied 20:2,11,12 31:21 applies 14:14 20:8,19 apply 19:17 27:23 28:8 approach 4:21 23:7	68:8 appropriately 15:8 approximately 99:12 101:20 arguable 13:6 argue 21:6 27:14 33:14 47:3,5 72:24 73:1 91:2 93:23 116:17 139:8 argued 115:10 134:10 arguendo 11:25 arguing 88:13 92:21 argument 13:10,20 14:6 15:12,22 18:14 19:25 20:7,16,19 21:8 25:18 31:8 42:3 47:1,2 60:10, 12 78:18 86:18 88:18 89:2,21 93:21,22 94:1,12,13 97:3 116:20 133:1,24 139:7,19 arguments 14:25 18:6 22:17 27:9 28:10 29:16,	19 31:8 36:23 41:10 46:23 74:19 85:19 92:3,23 97:8, 23 110:17 111:6 132:25 135:7,12 136:2 138:23 139:1,4,20 Aronberg 4:15,16,17 7:17 9:17 10:15,20 13:3,8,15,17 15:3,9 16:19, 23 17:10,16 18:15,19 19:10 20:20 23:4 28:24 42:13 43:9, 17,22 44:1,20 46:13 47:19 48:1,4,11 49:15 51:8,25 52:9,20 54:9 55:13 63:19 65:16,20 66:12 68:12 73:10 88:20, 21 91:4 94:23 95:5 103:20 105:8 109:18 124:18 131:14 136:20 Aronberg's 4:25 8:12 13:11 22:7,10 29:22 87:24 124:24 131:6 Aronson 88:19
---	--	--	---

arose 42:19	assuming 11:25 80:23	50:1,2 55:14, 25 71:15	38:6 42:12 50:6 71:9,15
arrest 33:21 102:22	attached 54:5	80:12,13,19, 20,23 81:1,25	101:18 102:6 103:7 104:15,
arrested 102:5	attacked 58:19	84:23,25 85:7,17,18	20,24 105:1, 10,16,19,25
article 14:20 59:1,2 137:3	attacking 61:2	87:15 88:3 91:6,12 94:7,	106:13,18 112:18
articles 48:15,25 58:20 61:1,2, 3,25 62:2,4 73:4 109:13	attacks 58:24	10 99:1,17,22 100:10	113:12,13 114:14 118:16
articulately 79:13	attempt 26:25	102:13,20,25 103:19 105:7	120:17 121:6, 12,20 122:11,
asks 76:12	attention 65:2 128:15 135:6	108:7 110:10 111:2,10,19	23 123:15 124:9,14
assembled 106:8 107:4	attorney 4:16 6:21,24 7:24 10:6,9, 13,16,19,25	112:6,8,11, 13,23 113:1, 2,6,18,19,21,	125:8 126:4, 9,17,25
assert 54:13 116:15 119:3	11:13,16,24 12:9 19:14 23:21 24:20 25:22,24 26:17,23	24 114:6,23 115:4,18 116:9 117:8	127:17 128:16 129:10 130:19,24
asserted 5:9 74:14 119:6 134:4	27:14 28:25 29:4 30:2,6, 12,15,18,20,	118:13 119:24 120:5,19 121:2,7,16,25	attorneys 13:12,25 23:2 34:11,13 41:11 42:15
asserting 117:20,21 119:1 120:8	33:12 34:1 35:2,10,11, 13,19,21,23,	122:4,20 123:12 124:23 125:2,16,23 127:7,12	attorneys' 4:5 6:15 15:7,11,14 16:11,12,17,
assertion 47:13	25 36:7,8,10, 11,17,21,25 37:8,21	128:2,10,21, 24,25 129:6 131:5,15,23	22,25 17:21 18:2,5,8 38:24 39:12
assistant 99:22 110:10	38:10,12,16 39:11,15 40:10,13,18	132:5,8,13 133:3,8 134:4,8,9 135:25 136:18,19	44:4 53:25
associates 14:1	41:5 42:18 43:17 44:2 48:2 49:15	attorney's 5:1 6:18 24:5,9,19,25 29:21 33:2	August 29:23 68:18 69:19 103:14, 19 104:21
assume 54:4 69:7 93:4		34:20 35:2,5, 15 36:18 37:4	124:9 125:15 134:11 Authorities 26:7 39:1 111:25

authority 7:23 10:22 18:17 24:15 55:18 56:6, 13,20 72:9 73:22 74:17 76:24 77:15 108:7 116:21, 24 117:15 120:10,11,14 134:22 135:1	10,19 80:6, 14,22 81:13 82:3,5,12 84:17,21 86:2,21 88:1, 12,19 89:10, 16 92:4 93:4, 12 95:10 96:25 97:5,24 99:16 102:5, 10,11,24 104:19 106:17 107:13 109:19,23 128:13 133:4, 6,9 138:15,18 139:15,16 140:1	82:2,12 102:24 106:13 110:24 based 8:6 17:5 83:7 108:4 112:21 136:10 basically 80:2 85:10 basis 5:11 13:6 31:19 39:21 42:24 54:15 64:2 79:23 114:20 133:9 Bates 9:5,9,16,17 46:10 47:16, 24 54:7 battles 58:17 BCS 132:22 Beach 4:11 23:20 33:2,6,22 46:15 48:7,16 49:15 50:2, 15,23 51:1 55:15,20 58:7,16,18,21 59:4,8,16 60:5,6 62:11 65:22 68:23 72:7 74:13 91:16 101:11, 16,18 102:20 105:11,18 107:7 108:6 111:1 115:15,	17 126:5 bearing 82:18 beating 110:25 began 4:2 33:22 beginning 13:13 46:21 58:6 59:22 60:24 61:12 133:9 behalf 4:10,14 101:11 103:20 115:16 119:3 belief 89:3 125:20 believed 58:23 113:17 122:3 believes 74:5 Belle 111:1 Bideau 4:8 51:24 52:8,18 58:1 60:17 62:17, 25 63:10,16, 18 68:1,5,7, 11 69:21 70:1,5,12 71:25 72:4 74:8,11 75:8, 11,14,18,21, 24 77:9,11,22 78:1 82:22,25 83:2 87:18,22
authorized 22:15 authorizing 6:14 AV 100:20,21 award 6:14,17 8:4 awarded 6:11 19:22 42:5 101:3 awarding 42:20 aware 51:18 57:14, 15 90:1 109:6 <hr/> B <hr/> B-A-I-L-Y-N-S- O-N 6:4 bachelor's 99:5 back 21:11 58:14 59:17,19 63:23 64:18 65:21 79:2,	background 36:4 99:4 112:22 backing 33:20 115:2 backwards 99:10 bad 89:6 Bailynson 5:23 6:4 32:6 ball 53:7,17 Bankunited 38:25 bar 129:20 barred 115:9 Barry 48:23 81:13		

94:3,5,18	bottom		11,15 20:11,
big	72:2	C	12 25:15
19:13 61:16	box	CA	26:3,6,9,10
69:18 70:6	34:15	4:10 9:17	27:5,6 28:1,2
102:15 140:9	Boyajian	call	31:21 32:4,7
binder	106:23 108:25	107:20 128:15	36:6,9,10
8:23 23:11	136:13	132:23	37:10,22
26:8 27:12	break	called	38:4,25 41:9
28:1 39:2	95:9	62:5 111:21	42:1,2,17,18
40:25 42:21	bright	calling	46:2 49:25
67:23 68:9,13	8:16	43:8	56:15 62:6
69:18 71:20	bring	calls	65:8,10,13,
80:9 95:22	34:18 94:3	26:23 48:18	15,18,19,23,
103:14 111:25	96:24 97:4	96:10 119:25	24 66:1,13
binders	103:10 107:20	canceled	67:1,11,18
70:6	139:6	106:10	76:11,25
bit	broad	capacity	77:16 78:10
33:20 70:3	84:12,13,14	71:6,7,16	85:5,8,9,10,
126:7	broader	84:25 100:16	15 86:4 87:15
blah	118:10	110:13 112:24	88:13 90:18
94:11	broken	122:5 137:8	91:17 93:20
block	124:8	care	101:3,6,11
12:7 73:5	brought	71:21 89:4	107:13
blow	34:8 65:23,	cared	108:15,17
75:10,14,22	24,25 117:23	89:5	109:1,16
87:20	Broward	Carolonga	110:5,22,23,
board	48:22 59:3	99:20	25 111:3,4,
117:5	85:7 112:8,	case	13,16,17,21,
Boca	11,13	5:7,23,24 6:5	23 112:3,4,7,
99:15,18	Buitrago	7:12,16,25	8,14,17,21,22
Bock	4:9	8:2,3 10:12	114:6,18,24
48:6	burden	13:24,25	115:12,13,14
boil	32:10,13	14:4,11 15:4,	116:3,25
11:10	41:22	10,16,19,20	117:23 119:2,
book	Bureau	16:4,6,15,16,	16,17 120:5,
95:18	100:12	19,23 17:5,	19 121:2,8,
botch	business	10,16,22,23,	15,18,24
32:6	65:3	25 18:2,15	128:9 129:17
		19:5,6,8,9,	130:14 131:5,
			8,13,19,20
			133:2,7,10,
			13,23 136:8,

18 137:13	5:13 13:19	claim	36:1,13 37:1,
cases	14:13,19,24	5:12,18,21	9 40:18 41:4,
39:19 100:1,	82:16 95:1	6:21,25 7:3	6,17 43:11,18
7,10,14,16,17	109:12 110:20	8:11 15:14	48:6 56:14,
107:6,9,11	charge	19:24 20:13	20,22 57:15,
109:2,15,16,	85:11 106:4	21:7 22:3,8,	17 61:11 62:8
22 110:11,12,	chat	22 25:4,5,7,	85:12 88:6
15,20,22	65:13	10 32:14,16,	90:6,7 91:6,
111:7,18	chief	18,22 33:14,	7,9 94:8,14
catch	107:7 108:5	19 35:12	96:9 98:8,14
58:11	chose	37:7,16 41:2,	114:15 116:6
category	113:6	3,12,15,23	118:8 123:6,
124:2	Circuit	42:2,9 56:24	10,14,15,16,
Catholic	48:2 55:14,25	74:15,16,20,	24 124:6
109:13	85:3 111:21,	21,24 93:8,14	125:11 128:23
center	22 121:18	117:13,21	129:8 131:1
58:12	circumstance	118:19 119:22	133:19 134:6,
central	64:13	133:21	8
6:5	circumstances	claims	clerk's
century	6:10 77:1,17	20:9 22:11	37:23 38:8
23:24	cite	34:18 59:3	53:6 56:17
cetera	6:1 26:9	clarification	61:6 123:17
109:24	121:15	53:24	126:5 135:5
challenge	cited	Clayton	client
74:1	31:9 121:17	116:25	65:5 73:4
chance	127:2,5	clear	83:19 92:9
93:1	cites	14:15 19:2	close
change	76:7 85:2	26:3 56:5	31:7 37:2
17:4,8,13,17	citizens	58:6 61:12,13	43:2 97:20
53:3 62:6,12	60:6	65:1 66:17	closer
129:10,13,24	civil	89:24 94:2	98:24
131:10,18	6:22 10:25	130:20	closing
133:3,6	13:23 14:4,10	clerk	42:25 97:23
changed	76:10 100:13	10:9,24	138:23 139:1,
130:12	107:9 115:12	11:12,15,24	4,6,18,19
changing	119:16	12:8 14:8,21	closings
39:16 130:17	civilly	18:16 21:23	139:12
chapter	115:13	22:13 24:3,16	closure
		29:6 30:3,8,	50:8
		13 35:9,21	

cocaine 59:11,13	32:25 33:8 44:25 45:2,24 46:8,14 60:4 61:21,24 66:15,17 74:13,14 75:2,3 78:6 81:18 86:8, 12,15,24 90:12,22,23 108:19,22 110:2 114:12, 13,22,23 115:3,5,19 116:7,10,13 117:2,4,8,17 129:15 137:11	concluded 56:15 139:22	constrained 134:24
coherent 139:2		conclusion 36:6 108:6 114:10 136:9	construction 135:8
coincidentally 110:23		conclusions 106:20	construe 76:12
Colgate 99:5		condensed 9:3	construed 27:4
commended 41:13		conduct 43:1,2	contacted 101:12,19
comment 135:13		conducted 24:12 35:14 106:11	contacting 34:19
commercial 99:12,18 100:3,6		conference 128:9	contained 108:12 115:1 135:2
common 27:3	completely 29:3 32:15 41:25 113:16	confidential 11:23 14:18	contentions 56:12
communications 104:10,14,18 105:23,24 107:25 125:20	complicated 112:9	confirm 117:3 132:15	contingency 42:16 44:16
community 58:16	complied 31:11	conjunction 5:2 116:19	contingency-fee 64:2
compare 28:13	comply 15:15,25 27:8,12,17 94:10	connection 73:10 76:10	continue 50:7 58:25 62:1 70:11
compared 132:22	compromise 38:20	consideration 25:17	continued 58:24 62:4 108:14 117:19 121:4
comparison 32:20,24 118:3	comptroller 48:6	considered 26:22	continuing 120:18 122:1
compelling 77:1,17	concern 23:25 41:10	consistent 88:24	contract 100:5
competent 8:6	concerned 67:11,12 114:4 133:7	Constitution 14:20 100:19 116:23	contractual 38:24
competitor 50:22	conclude 97:6,7 114:5	constitutional 25:10 34:11 40:6 42:8 100:14	contrary 22:17 39:13 47:18 48:1
complaint 10:14 23:18			

control 7:20 8:15 10:3 20:22 29:1 35:18,20 40:11,15,17 45:15,17,18 46:3,5,25 47:19 48:3,14 52:5 53:1,5, 11 56:1 59:23 60:25 62:10 63:8 67:21 80:3,4 90:4	69:4,10 70:20 71:1,2,6,8, 13,16 74:1, 13,17,18,22, 24,25 76:7,15 79:10,22,24 82:13 83:5,15 84:15,18 86:14 87:2,9 88:15 91:17 92:5,12,13,17 94:16,17 96:5,7 111:14 117:10,11 121:14 122:21 124:11 126:18 127:6,9,23,25 128:1 132:6, 12 134:15 135:17	7 117:8,9,12 118:12 119:9, 22 120:7 134:4,7 135:14,16 country 50:17 counts 53:16 County 33:6,22 48:7 49:15 50:2 55:15,20 60:6 85:7 101:18 102:20 107:7 111:1 112:8, 11,13 115:15 126:5 County's 23:21 couple 57:19 63:21 80:5 118:2 court 4:3,18,22,24 6:1,17,23 7:1 8:3,7,21,25 9:6,10,14,19, 21 11:21 12:11,14,21, 24 13:5,22 14:3,23 17:19,23,25 19:23,25 21:3,7,18,22 22:12,16 23:5,8,12,16, 17 24:1,3 25:20 26:3,11 28:3 30:4	31:16,23 36:13 38:7 39:3,6 41:15 42:20 43:4,7, 10,18,24 44:18,22 46:9 47:14,23 49:12 51:21 52:1,11,14,21 54:4 55:10 56:22 57:15 58:5 60:19 62:19 63:2, 13,15 68:6,10 69:20 70:2,7 74:10 75:5,9, 12,16 76:2,12 77:14,17,20 82:21,24 88:4,7 89:11 91:2,11 92:15 94:9,19 95:5, 10,14,16,20, 21 96:5,12, 16,19,22 97:13,19,23, 25 98:4,14, 16,22 109:2 111:22 114:1 116:21,24 117:15 129:2 134:16,21 135:11 137:16,21 138:2,5,9,11, 14,18,21 139:1,17,24 140:1,5,7 court's 6:16 8:5 39:20 55:18
conversations 83:8 104:1 122:19 136:4			
copies 37:1 84:16 125:17			
copy 23:10 26:18 44:11 53:19, 22 54:10 55:5,6 57:7 68:2	correspondence 56:9 counsel 5:5 28:5 64:5,7,10 95:17 104:2, 11 106:15 114:14 120:18 121:20 122:12 125:22 135:5		
copyright 100:4			
corner 9:16			
corollary 107:23	counsel's 24:19		
correct 20:10 44:5,6 53:19 54:16 55:1,4 57:6,9 60:10,12,16 64:14 65:13 66:18,20,24 67:6,8,19,21 68:19,20,23	count 5:7,10 21:1 22:5 25:7 32:25 37:13, 14 39:25 40:1,2,4,21 74:23,24 75:19,22 108:23 115:5,		

72:9 73:21 74:17 76:23 120:10,13 134:18 courtroom 86:18 courts 6:9 cover 59:9,12 coverage 50:21,22 covered 62:20 63:13 134:22 covering 48:23 crack 59:11,13 create 22:2,4 49:2 119:14 created 131:11 creates 49:16 creation 22:1 credibility 104:8,13 106:14 criminal 14:4,11 34:12 37:2 56:15 59:2 76:11 104:2 107:13 109:5 115:12, 14 119:17	cross 63:15,17 138:22 139:17 cudgel 47:10 cumulative 63:10 curiously 50:23 custodian 48:8 84:24 custody 7:20 8:15 10:3 20:21 24:4,20,21,23 28:25 36:22 37:5 40:11, 14,15,17 45:14,16 46:3,5,25 47:19 48:3,14 52:5 53:1,4, 10 56:1 59:23 60:24 62:10 63:8 67:21 80:3,4 85:10 90:4 102:8 118:17 cut 66:23 <hr/> D <hr/> damage 104:13 damaging 108:1 database 50:16	date 57:10 131:23 dated 36:19 69:19 dates 49:5 Dave 4:16 10:19 44:1 49:15 55:13 103:19 105:7 124:23 David 4:15 10:15 43:17 44:1 55:13 87:23 Davis 5:23 6:3 32:6 day 5:5 51:2,5 89:24 130:6, 7,8 140:11 days 26:2,16 38:9 54:2 82:13 91:17,18,25 92:2 93:10, 11,18 132:7 DCA 5:24 6:5 8:2 15:19 26:10 28:2 36:6 deal 15:12 23:23 33:25 64:23 66:23 102:9 109:25 dealt 109:17	debate 110:5 decide 128:10 decided 107:18,19 113:1 116:16 128:10 131:18 decision 17:15 41:18 49:2 85:3 131:21 135:25 137:7 declaration 76:11,21 77:13,19 declaratory 5:10,12,18,20 21:2,6 22:3, 9,21 25:4,9 32:25 37:7 40:2,5 41:3, 12,16 42:3,9 55:16,24 56:3,25 67:7 74:16,21 75:20,22 117:9,13,17, 24 118:12,19 119:22 120:7 133:21 134:3 declare 39:10 67:7 76:2 77:17 defamation 100:6,7 defects 25:19 31:18 defend
--	---	---	--

10:25 11:6 44:8 defendant 4:15 18:19 28:24 38:18, 19 47:18 48:1,4,5 55:15 59:2 87:23 111:11 112:6 defendant's 5:7 defendants 10:10 24:2 33:3,4,7 35:9 78:3,5,13 110:6 defending 110:11 112:22 defense 6:21,25 7:3 14:3 19:16,24 20:8,17,18, 23,25 22:9 72:22 73:6 95:17 96:4 100:6 104:2, 11,12 106:15 110:16 125:22 Defense's 12:12 defer 6:11 degree 99:5,7 deliberation 33:18 deliver 56:6	demand 5:2,4,9 15:2 16:5,10 17:14 22:7,8,21 53:22 54:11, 14 56:13 119:25 demands 17:5 demonstrative 96:8 denial 25:16 denied 31:14 43:3 46:15 60:5 deny 43:4 46:19 77:13,19,20 denying 113:3 depends 81:13 deposed 65:10 deposition 59:4,6 107:4, 9 124:4 depth 116:17 derogation 27:2 Dershowitz 104:3,6,11 105:23 108:1 125:22 describe 129:13	deserve 50:9 Design 15:17,18 destroy 108:2 deter 6:7 39:8 determination 11:21 determined 119:13 131:19 134:20 determines 19:23 determining 8:4 34:14 110:7 111:10 develop 116:16 developed 116:20 devoid 32:14 41:24 difference 18:7 19:13 61:16 diligence 7:9 34:17 107:17 108:8 direct 9:24 43:20 47:12 53:14 98:18 139:10 directly 64:25 disagree 41:17	disciplinary 100:23 disclose 113:20,21 disclosed 13:18,24 21:20 46:17 disclosing 30:3 94:8 disclosure 7:21 13:22 14:12 19:4 57:23 72:8 73:23 76:5,21 78:20 88:5 104:19 113:7 120:7 discourage 39:9 discovery 123:6,10 discussed 107:8 discussing 109:18 130:13 discussion 131:4,12 discussions 108:5 114:13, 17,18 121:19 122:10,11 135:23 disingenuous 90:8 dislike 58:15 dismiss 5:7 8:18 25:7
---	---	---	---

33:8 37:12 39:25 40:1 46:23 47:2, 13,22 51:19 62:4 71:19 72:24,25 73:11,17,25 74:19 78:6 88:25 89:7 92:9 93:1,9 115:1,19,23 116:6,10 117:12 118:22 119:9 dismissal 26:5 27:18 38:11,21 dismissed 22:5 25:22 26:1 27:15 31:2,6 38:9 39:15 41:5 53:16 57:4, 13,14 91:16 92:8 93:2,8, 13,15,18 134:5 dismisses 38:18 dismissing 40:21 dispense 12:20 97:16 dispositive 25:15 dispute 32:22 33:10 37:15 64:21 78:8,12 118:10 128:5	disputes 100:4,5 distracted 65:15 District 102:7,13 divert 65:2 divided 108:24 document 38:2 49:3 51:3 123:22 documentation 108:2 documents 24:13,17,21, 22 29:20 34:3,25 40:14,16 45:6,10,12, 13,15,17,18, 21 46:1,3,5, 22,25 47:4 48:8,18,24 50:25 53:2,7, 10 59:23 61:7,13 62:10 69:9 72:23 73:3,7,13 74:6 81:14,20 84:10,11,12, 18 89:4 101:17 103:7, 21 104:7,18 105:15 118:13 134:6 domain 107:14	Douglas 4:14 drafted 66:21 126:20 drafting 103:6 draw 135:6 drawn 8:16 drive 139:15,16 drop 54:21,22 131:20 dropped 15:3,9 16:18, 23 17:10,16, 20 21:24 52:6 54:17,24 57:8 60:15 91:24 131:24 133:13 134:9 dropping 132:5 due 7:9 34:17 107:17 108:8 duly 43:18 98:14 duty 23:22 <hr/> E <hr/> earlier 60:3 89:11 91:12,14	early 36:19 79:19 easier 9:12 69:23 79:14 easy 70:10 economics 99:7 editorial 135:24 editorially 136:3 educational 99:3 effect 15:5 30:5 94:9 119:5 effusive 135:3 egotistical 135:3 egregious 43:1 Eighth 100:18 elected 44:2 50:3 email 53:23 54:10 embarrass 65:25 embarrassing 62:2 empaneled 106:9 emphasize
--	--	---	---

47:24	Epstein	97:2	14:19
employees	19:9 31:5	eventually	exercise
14:1	33:23 34:4,8	54:21 57:15	134:25
employment	45:5 49:4,16,	evidence	exercised
100:5	21,25 50:5	8:6 12:16,17	131:21
enclosure	58:10 59:16	15:6 22:18	exhibit
28:17,22	60:25 66:4,5,	30:11 31:9,18	9:10,11 12:13
encouraging	6,8,15,23	33:5,16,21	28:16 29:8,11
27:19	68:25 69:1,5,	40:9,12 43:12	32:24 33:1
end	10 80:24	55:19 76:4,22	34:22,23
16:6 18:6	83:10 101:11	78:4,14 83:14	36:16 38:1,2
37:6 53:25	102:3,4,5,23	95:23 96:3	40:25 42:21
97:10 108:9,	103:2,8,22	98:9 118:8	44:10,15 49:8
20 118:18	104:3 106:5	139:22	51:9 67:23
engage	115:13 129:7	evident	68:5,7,9,15,
44:7 110:1	130:22 137:1	14:14 56:8	16,18 69:20,
engagement	Epstein's	ex-wife's	21 70:13
44:11,16	23:19 33:21	59:4,5	71:20 79:16
enter	50:8	exact	83:5,15
12:11 103:3	equal	32:8	87:19,23
119:9	6:19	exaggerated	91:16 94:4
entered	ESQ	59:1	95:18 103:11,
5:6 40:20	98:13	examination	13,14,18
41:1 134:12	essential	13:3 43:20	105:4,22
entire	112:18	63:15,17	107:24
55:11	essentially	94:21 98:18	111:15,16
entirety	101:14 112:9	138:22 139:18	117:1 118:4
43:5	121:25	exceptional	120:22 124:13
entities	establish	76:25 77:16	126:12,13
11:6	5:19 7:3	exceptions	127:15
entitled	20:11 22:24	5:14	128:14,16
39:11 72:15	established	exclusively	130:9 132:1,
73:3 76:3	49:14	125:5	4,14 133:15,
89:3 119:6	establishment	excuse	16
123:4	8:9 20:2 21:9	56:2	exhibits
entity	estate	excused	12:15,21
18:16 22:14	100:4	95:5,7 140:3	28:13,14
71:14	event	exempt	29:13 81:8
	91:4 96:22,24		83:14 95:18,
			19,21 96:2
			104:6 124:3

exist 31:9 92:20	15 42:4	23:1 25:18	96:14 126:7
existed 51:7	extensive 110:9	32:15 39:12	favor 14:7 41:16
existing 7:4 20:1 21:9,13	extent 111:5	41:25 56:7	57:16
exists 32:22 33:10 37:15 43:2 78:8 118:10	extra 68:1	59:5 108:9 112:9 136:10	FBI 91:12 102:6 104:15 105:25 123:14 125:23
expanded 6:10	extraordinary 49:1	factual 20:16,19 108:13 125:14,15	federal 36:6 101:5 109:15 110:3,
expansive 135:8	extreme 58:15	factually 136:3	22 111:22 112:10
expect 12:3	extremely 103:4	failed 17:11 18:25 20:7 29:3 31:13 92:9	feds 66:24
expectation 20:3	<hr/> F <hr/>	fails 20:25 22:10, 22	fee 6:18 42:19 44:16 93:8,13 128:6,13
experience 99:9 110:9	F-E-R-E-R-E 27:25	fair 64:6 91:1 93:25	feel 97:25
experienced 34:10	Facebook 48:19 50:20 51:4,17	fairly 106:12	feels 137:9
expert 18:12 106:24	facets 109:4	faith 19:25 20:17, 18 21:8 32:22 33:10,17 37:15 42:3 58:3 73:8 78:7,12 89:6 117:23 118:10	fees 4:5 5:1 6:11, 15 15:7,11,14 16:11,12,17, 22,25 17:21 18:2,5,8,9,11 25:25 26:15, 24 27:16 28:21 29:15 36:18 37:25 38:24 39:12 42:11,20,22 44:4 53:25 59:20 120:1 122:21,24 127:18,20,25 128:3 132:8
experts 97:16	fact 5:11 8:9,16, 17 10:14 12:8 13:6 41:23 47:4 48:5 54:15 58:9 61:4 62:12 63:7 64:19,22 66:17 69:16 77:14 86:1 88:12 97:9 106:9 111:3	familiar 44:21,24 46:13 51:19 87:9,10 110:16	
explain 19:18 52:21 60:21 85:6	facts 5:19,22 7:2, 5,12 16:2 20:3,11 22:23	family 62:23	
explained 36:9		fast	
explaining 49:10			
exposed 23:2			
extension 19:25 21:12,			

felt 23:22 88:23 105:2 112:23 116:24 134:24,25	79:19 86:2 87:25 91:15 92:8,12,17 93:5,17 108:15,19 114:13,23,25 115:3 116:9, 12 122:20,24 123:1 124:10 125:2 128:2, 7,12,13 130:20 131:8 132:19	108:16 109:20 finding 39:21 102:18 104:1 findings 8:5 97:9 finds 6:23 fine 60:13 62:21 138:25 finish 137:17 139:9 finished 97:21 firestorm 102:15,21 firewall 136:1 firm 44:7 67:22 99:20 firm's 18:9 44:11,16 five-minute 95:9 flesh 109:10 fleshing 109:8 flip 23:9 70:4 80:11 flipping 75:6 Florida 4:11 5:13 6:6 14:13 19:8	25:8,11 32:2 33:9 40:7 42:7,16,17 48:7 55:15,17 56:19 76:3 97:17 99:25 102:13 109:9, 11 110:8 116:22 119:10 focus 65:3 focused 125:5 focusing 7:8 follow 18:25 19:3 force 118:13 forced 88:25 89:1,6 fore 104:16 forms 137:2 Fort 99:1,14 forward 50:7 118:21 forwarding 126:7 found 5:24 8:1 12:12 15:18 108:15 109:16 110:21 Fourteenth 100:19
Ferere 27:25 Ferlanti 8:1 Fifteen 97:19 fight 59:20,21 file 19:2,4 54:25 92:3 95:1 115:18 116:6 124:18 126:9 127:12 132:8 133:18 filed 5:1 7:11 8:10 11:14 15:8, 11,14 16:11, 14,16,20,21, 24 17:21,24 23:18 25:21, 24 26:16 27:8 29:22 33:7 35:8 44:4,25 45:2 54:1 56:25 57:2 62:3,15 63:22 64:17 65:4 66:13,25 67:11 70:25 71:5 72:21 73:11,15,19, 23 74:12,13 77:7 78:6	files 15:20 filing 17:19 18:7 19:14 26:19 27:15 31:13 37:12,14,20 38:7 92:18,22 108:21 110:1 129:6 filings 6:7,12 40:15 44:21 48:11 final 14:7 18:9,20, 21 19:1 40:24 41:1,8 133:15 134:13,18 135:18 finally 12:5 38:6 42:10 54:22 find 8:22 9:4 17:23 18:3 46:7,10 59:12 91:11 102:2		

Fourth 5:24 6:5 8:2 15:19 28:2 36:5 94:2 100:17	furthering 135:10	78:22 85:24 86:17,20 89:12 90:2	60:6,25 61:9 62:10 63:8 67:4,6,14,19 69:10 72:7,10 73:22 76:5, 23,24 77:15 78:5 80:24 81:2,4 83:10 84:24 85:2, 11,16,18,20 89:4 102:19 103:1,21 104:9,13 106:3,9,20 107:20,22 108:3 109:14, 15 111:2,4,22 112:3,10,12, 19,20,25 113:13,15,19 114:7 115:8, 24 116:22,23 117:20 118:17 119:1,4,7 120:8 121:13, 17 122:7 123:24 125:6, 9,12,17 127:1,2 129:1,7,11,21 130:22,25 134:23
frankly 11:21	G	good 4:7,13 19:25 20:17,18 21:8 32:22 33:10, 17 37:15 42:3 43:22,25 58:3 63:19 64:12 73:8 78:7,12 98:20 117:23 118:10 122:19 139:23,24,25	
fraud 100:5	G-R-Y-G-I-E-L 101:23	govern 7:21 governs 5:13	
Friday 97:4,10 138:9	game 53:7	grace 92:10,11 93:15	
friend 136:22	gave 116:2,4	graduated 99:6	
friends 62:23	general 99:22 110:10	grand 5:14 7:22 10:21 14:2, 17,22 21:20 22:15 23:19 24:4,7,16 25:1 29:1,6 30:14,23,24 31:5 33:6 35:8,14,18 36:12,24 37:5 38:3 39:17 40:19 41:7 45:6,15 46:16 48:23 50:5 54:14 55:20 56:14,17	
frivolous 32:14,17 33:19 36:3 41:15,24 59:21 62:3 64:23 65:3 72:25 90:18	General's 100:10		
front 59:1 67:23 74:20 107:22 108:3 117:6 132:2 134:10 137:13	generally 52:14		
front-page 59:2	genuine 23:25 41:10		
fulfill 82:8	Georgia 138:5		
fulfilled 129:16	Gerard 4:9 29:25 31:25 32:19 71:25 75:21 126:22		
full 9:4,11	give 6:1 9:5 11:3, 8 23:12 43:12 45:9,10 72:16 76:13 85:12 93:1 98:9 119:2 131:14 138:19 139:18		
furtherance 76:6,18	Glade 111:1		
	goal 39:13 53:3 59:24 60:2,22		
			grant 7:23 30:4 56:14 94:9
			granted 57:15
			granting 5:6
			great 49:7 109:25

137:10 140:11			
greater	H	hate	hero
109:7		70:5	58:11
Greenberg	Hafele	head	hey
4:10 30:15	19:1 41:1,8	4:22 101:21	76:12
33:17 34:8	128:9,10	heads	hid
99:1,11,13,16	133:24	101:15	67:6
100:1 101:15	134:11,12,20	hear	hiding
104:23 106:22	Hafele's	11:15 18:14	67:4,15
107:16 114:5	14:7 18:20,21	25:23 30:14,	high
123:6 126:8	40:24	19 34:10,18,	32:5,10 41:22
131:1 135:4	half	24 35:1,3,6	higher
136:9	134:1	36:5,15 37:11	38:14
ground	hand	39:14 97:1	highlight
106:12 119:17	35:24 68:13	heard	71:25
grounds	139:15	24:18 25:5	highlighted
123:2 125:21	handle	39:23 40:11	87:21 128:18
group	100:11 109:1	61:8 128:7,8	hindsight
101:15	handled	133:24 134:1	126:3
Grygiel	110:15	hearing	hired
70:14 82:11	hands	8:18 12:11	59:9
83:12 84:17	134:21	40:9 44:22	history
101:12,19,22	happen	51:19 60:9	109:21
104:25 105:6	16:15 138:8	74:23 78:21,	Hofstra
106:23 136:13	happened	25 128:3,4,12	99:7
Grygiel's	33:24 66:14,	132:13 139:21	hold
83:4 84:4	24 84:3 86:19	140:13	81:17
guess	91:14 128:1	hearings	Holdings
64:15 81:12	happy	65:8	4:11
91:13 105:2	131:22 136:23	hearsay	honest
guests	137:1,4	74:9 84:7	110:5 136:24
140:7	harass	held	honestly
guide	36:2	15:20 43:24	108:3 122:3
8:3	harbor	helped	138:10
guys	27:13,17	102:14 109:5	Honor
72:21 98:4	hard	helps	4:7,13,17,20,
	41:14 69:18	18:20	23 9:8,22
	90:24 139:15	Herald	13:1 16:21
		58:9 66:1	17:2,13 18:3

23:6,7,10 24:18 25:14 26:8 29:9 31:16 32:1,23 39:19 42:25 43:6 44:15 46:7 47:11,15 51:24 52:8,18 53:21 54:6,7 58:1,4 60:17 62:17 68:7,8 69:21 74:8 82:15 95:6,8, 15,25 96:1,8, 21 97:12 98:2,3,17 137:19 138:6, 17,24 139:14 140:3	137:2 hundreds 108:12 I idea 29:10 65:20 78:20 86:16 89:12 impacted 62:23 important 24:24 25:2 38:11 40:4 importantly 24:14 27:5 29:24 35:17 41:19 imposed 42:11 impossibility 8:14 11:1 impossible 7:18 11:17 17:17 20:20 52:21,24 56:4 94:10 137:20 impression 41:9 42:2 improper 7:17 19:11 improperly 17:24 72:2,7 73:20 in-camera 114:2 in-depth 109:7	inch 11:19 Incidentally 67:22 include 55:2 105:21 120:19 included 18:8 37:10 39:2 57:3 100:16 107:24 112:20 includes 7:6 including 6:18 26:6 34:9 50:22 125:23 inconsistent 90:1 independently 15:25 27:12 31:11 indicating 29:23 31:24 85:8 101:25 123:25 indication 73:12 indictment 106:20 125:24 individual 84:7 111:1 inform 23:22 34:1 102:3 information 106:1,2,19	107:17 108:1 informed 7:15 46:21 90:4 informing 55:22 inherent 55:18 72:9 73:21 74:17 76:24 77:15 116:21 117:14 120:10,11,14 134:22 135:1 inhibit 120:13 initial 27:7 48:11 108:19,22 110:2 114:12, 22 115:2,4,19 116:7,10,12 119:25 123:1 129:14 initially 6:25 19:24 129:16 initiative 6:16 injure 104:7 inmate 110:25 input 136:12 inquiry 8:7 insisted 59:18
--	---	--	---

instance 56:18	investigation 23:20 24:6,12	issues 25:16 40:5	James 110:23
instructed 18:22	33:23 34:7	41:10 102:9	111:12,14
intentionally 62:14	35:14 49:21	104:16 107:1	112:21
interest 6:18 23:25 66:7 76:14,25 77:16 85:1 107:2 113:8	66:5,8,11 82:1 102:19 103:21 104:5 106:7 112:12	109:1,17 114:3	January 45:2 49:6,7 70:24
interested 19:6 102:18, 23 103:24 104:1 112:16 113:24	investigations 50:7	items 103:24 107:15	Jeanne 44:12
interesting 17:22 18:13 20:24	investigative 81:8	<hr/> J <hr/>	Jeffrey 19:9 23:19 45:5 49:3,16, 21,25 58:10 59:16 60:25 66:8 68:25 69:1,5 83:10 101:11 102:3, 23 103:2,22 130:22
Internet 49:4	investigatory 108:13	J.D. 99:7	
interpret 21:18 32:9	involved 25:10 65:6 66:14,17,18 67:23 85:7 101:10 103:6 110:24,25	J10 47:12,23	
interpretation 21:4,8,21	involves 40:5	J13 9:2	
interpretations 21:14	involving 41:9 100:14 109:2 115:13	J14 53:21	
interprets 32:4	irrelevant 51:25 58:2	J16 79:15	Jennifer 4:9
interrogatories 123:20	Island 97:17 138:3	J18 55:6	joinder 133:9
interruption 138:20	issue 41:2 42:7,9 59:8 79:1,6,9 88:12,15 89:15 113:8 116:17 120:15 125:7,14,15	J2 77:10	joint 8:23 12:15,21 28:14 29:11 42:21 44:10, 15 49:8 51:9 95:18,22 96:2 103:13,18 105:22
intervening 61:17	issued 54:11 112:10 120:3	J23 57:7	
introduce 43:23 98:22		J29 9:4,14,15 12:12	
		J6 47:12,16 71:19	Journal 140:8
		J9 46:8 75:3,4	Judge 5:6 8:17 10:1 14:7 18:20,21 19:1 22:6 25:6 39:24 40:9,20,24 41:1,8 51:20
		Jacobs 44:7	
		Jail 111:1	

52:3 53:12,15 57:23 61:13 62:25 63:10, 16 74:20 92:22 93:24 94:18 119:8 120:2 128:9, 10 133:24 134:11,12,20	79:2,10,19 80:14,15 84:21 86:21 88:1 89:16 92:4 119:8 120:3,20 122:2,12,15 127:19,24 128:7,13 133:6	83:10 84:24 85:2,11,16, 18,20 89:4 102:19 103:1, 21 104:9,13 106:3,9,20 107:21,22 108:3 109:14, 15 111:2,4,22 112:3,10,12, 19,20,25 113:13,15,19 114:7 115:8, 24 116:22,23 117:20 118:18 119:1,4,7 120:8 121:13, 17 122:7 123:24 125:9, 12,17 127:1,2 129:1,7,11,21 130:22,25 134:23	53:5 61:5 121:7 Kelly 38:25 key 7:7 kill 91:3 kind 137:12 knew 6:24 7:8 8:8 22:19 45:22 52:4,10,25 53:9 59:22 88:11 104:5 106:7 113:12 125:18 126:1 knowing 128:11 knowledge 84:2 109:7 Krischer 48:23 82:12 104:6 106:13, 14 108:7 110:24 113:14 123:13 125:18 Krischer's 81:14 82:2 102:10,24 104:4,10,15 105:24 108:2 125:21 L Labor 100:12 102:12,17
judgment 10:19 11:2, 12,20 12:2 14:7 18:20,21 19:1 29:21 40:25 41:1,8 54:25 57:1,3, 16 74:16,21 117:9,13,24 118:23 119:22 120:7 124:10, 14,18 125:9 128:8 133:15, 19,25 134:3, 10,13,14,18 135:18	jurisdiction 25:20 26:4,12 101:1 jurisdictional 25:16,19 31:7,18 jury 5:14,15 7:22 10:21 14:2, 17,22 21:20 22:15 23:19 24:4,8,16 25:1 29:1,6 30:14,23,24 31:5 33:7 35:9,14,18 36:12,24 37:5 38:3 39:17 40:19 41:7 45:6,15 46:16 48:23 50:5 52:15 54:14 55:20 56:14, 17 60:6,25 61:9 62:10 63:9 67:4,6, 14,19 69:10 72:8,10 73:22 76:5,23,24 77:15 78:5 80:24 81:3,4	jury's 125:6 justice 50:8 76:6,14, 18 135:10 justified 13:6 <hr/> K <hr/> K-A-M 15:17 K-A-M-E 15:18 Kame 15:16,17 27:6 keeping	
judicial 19:3 39:9 48:2 55:14,25 judiciary 120:14 July 16:22 34:16 101:25 122:21,24 June 5:3 8:17 26:25 30:19 36:16,19,20 38:4 51:19 53:13 54:1			

lack 137:7	40:6 41:25 42:4,8 44:7 47:2,3,5,6	lay 120:18	38:4 44:12,16 53:18,20,22
lacked 119:13	54:15 72:24 73:1,2 89:1,9	leader 58:21	54:5,13 68:18 69:3,6,8,14,
lacks 25:20 26:11 48:13	92:22 97:8 99:8,24 100:14 109:13	leading 60:18 125:23	16,19 70:13, 16,17 79:14, 16,20 80:6,7,
Lago 15:16,17 16:4,8 17:22 27:6,11	110:8 126:17 136:10	learned 126:3	8,10,12,16 84:22 86:11,
laid 79:21	laws 113:4	leave 12:25 79:25	12,23,25 87:5,11,12
Langen 99:20	lawsuit 7:11 11:7 29:5 35:8 52:7 53:4	left 9:16 35:7 97:7 138:22	89:17,19,20, 22 90:13 103:14,17,19,
language 6:14 19:19 20:6 21:11 112:17	54:18 57:8,25 58:7 59:21 60:23 62:3,15 64:23 65:3,6 67:7 71:1,5 72:21,25 73:25 79:3 82:17,18 89:6 90:9 92:9 95:2 107:20 108:11,14	legal 7:13 14:1,25 20:16 34:17 56:6 59:20 63:7 67:13, 14,17 73:1,24 89:2 108:13, 21 111:5 136:2,7	23 104:21,22, 25 105:3,7,13 119:25 120:20,23 121:1,8,10, 15,21 122:2, 12 125:10 130:1,2,10
large 46:16 49:19	lawsuits 50:6	legislative 109:21	letters 70:20 71:4,5 73:19 82:11, 14,16 83:5,13 87:8 103:6 104:23
late 15:4 73:15	lawyer 63:22 65:13 70:14 72:5 73:24 79:19 87:1,4,6,8 90:11,13,17, 24	legislature 120:13,15	licensed 99:23
latest 89:16	lawyers 15:1 22:18 48:13 78:11 107:10	legitimate 66:7	lies 88:6
Lauderdale 99:1,14		leniency 23:24 34:5	light 34:4 103:2
Lauren 4:8		lenient 103:4 106:4,5	Likewise 30:6
law 5:11,21 7:4, 10 13:7 20:1, 2,10,12 21:9, 10,13 22:1,2, 25 25:10,11, 12 26:3,6 27:3,5,6 31:21 32:15 34:12 36:6,9		letter 5:4,9,16 15:3 16:10,13 17:14 28:18, 22 30:20 34:24 36:16, 19 37:3,18	limitations 135:1 limited 34:3 40:21

107:25 119:15 120:11 lines 9:25 10:5 28:23 link 49:24 litigation 6:15 27:20 38:21 39:10 99:19 100:3, 12,13 110:18 123:8 litigator 99:12 LLC 8:1 15:18 located 97:17 log 123:23,25 124:7 logic 139:3 logical 93:3 long 43:24 54:22 61:2 73:7 96:12 137:15 longer 27:16 129:19, 22,23 130:25 133:12 looked 83:16 93:6 109:12 Lorenza	99:20 Los 106:23 lose 33:13 losing 6:20,23 8:8 lost 48:25 lot 7:6 39:23 83:13 lower 9:16 lowest 137:2 luck 34:3 <hr/> M <hr/> made 5:3 8:18 14:14 17:9,15 20:9 28:10 34:2 49:2 51:20 56:7 58:12 61:13 78:19 89:21 94:11,25 105:18 111:5 131:21 133:4 main 29:4 major 133:1 make 8:7 18:14 19:16 36:23	38:12,19 47:1,13 50:11 59:25 65:5 79:14 85:19 89:1,13,25 95:19 96:14 97:22 137:10 138:7 139:10, 12 makes 19:1 29:18 66:17 92:3 135:7 making 20:16 27:9 59:3 86:17 136:2 man 122:18 137:1 management 128:9 mark 4:8 12:18 Marx 5:6 8:17 10:2 22:6 25:6 39:24 40:9,20 51:20 52:3 57:23 61:13 74:20,23 119:8,9 120:2 Marx's 53:13,15 Mary 15:17 massive 133:3 material 5:19,22 7:2,5	20:3 22:23 23:1 83:15 94:8 materials 5:15 13:9 14:17 20:21 23:19 29:1 30:4,14,24 31:5 35:9 36:12,24 37:5,23 41:7 46:16,20 55:21 56:2,4, 7,15,17,21 72:8 73:21 76:10 80:25 81:2,8 82:1, 12 85:16,20 86:6 88:5 91:22 94:14 104:12 105:20,21 106:8,14,17 107:11,12,14, 21,23 108:4 112:12 113:13,20,24 114:8 115:10, 16 116:19 117:20 118:18,25 119:16 123:13,16,24 125:12,17 129:1,8,11, 18,22 130:23 131:1 matter 23:25 47:3,4, 5 55:16 56:9 59:15 66:4,5,
--	--	---	---

6,7 68:25 69:1,5,10 72:24 73:1 89:1,2,8 90:3 97:1 102:4 117:2 135:17	99:21 103:16 119:20 137:14 138:16	minute 138:19	Mortgage 7:25
means 33:19 92:19	Mendelsohn's 35:4 37:18 70:16 84:4	minutes 33:5 55:19 63:21 64:16 76:4,22 78:4, 14 81:9,10,12 85:23 86:19 95:11 96:18 97:19 118:8 137:18,25 138:1	motion 4:5,19,25 5:7,8 6:16 8:17 15:7,10, 13,21,23,24 16:11,12,14, 16,17,21,25 17:18,20,24 18:1,4,8 19:4,15 25:3, 6,17,21,25 26:4,5,12,13, 15,18,22,24 27:7,9,16 28:6,10,11, 12,13,16,17, 19 29:3,9,10, 11,13,14,15, 18,19,21,24 30:2 31:8,10, 11,14 33:13 36:18 37:12, 25 39:24 40:1 42:23 43:3,5 44:4 46:23 47:2,22 51:19 53:25 54:25 56:25 57:2,5 63:22 64:11, 17 71:18 72:23 73:11, 16,17 74:12, 19 79:19 86:2 87:25 88:25 89:7 92:3,4, 7,8,12,14,16, 19,23,24 94:6,15,16 101:4,8
mechanism 7:13	mentioned 26:20 90:10 105:22 111:12 131:14	misleading 17:12 58:19 59:2 61:3,8	
media 50:16,21 56:11 101:13, 15 109:3	mentioning 73:6	missing 34:20 105:23	
media's 107:2	merit 32:14 33:15 41:24	misspoke 64:24	
meeting 131:3	meritless 6:7,12	misuse 39:8	
member 136:5	merits 25:13	misusing 102:25	
memorandum 87:24 126:16	message 48:19	mixture 117:14	
Mendelsohn 13:3 30:15, 17,20 34:9, 19,24 35:1,6 36:5,8,15,20 37:3 38:3 39:14 53:23 54:10 68:19 69:4,8 79:10 80:5,22 82:11 83:4,12 84:17,21 85:8,22,25 86:3,25 87:13 89:17 90:11, 16,17 96:11, 13,19 98:13, 20,23,25	met 32:9 41:22 Miami 58:9 66:1 99:20 Michael 101:12 middle 80:18 105:17 Mike 70:14 101:19 miles 58:9 mind 17:9 59:21 98:4 126:22 139:4	modification 20:1 21:12 modified 21:17 monetary 19:21 money 59:19 63:23 64:1,4,11,14, 18,24,25 65:2 months 34:13 37:17 51:6 64:23	

115:1,18 116:6,9 118:22 119:9 120:1 122:20, 24 123:1,2 124:10,14,17 125:9 126:10, 19 127:18,20, 21,25 128:2, 6,7,13 132:8, 11,15,18,21, 22,23 133:5, 19,25 134:10, 13 motions 33:7 47:13 78:6 mouthpiece 109:4 move 50:7 59:24 69:18 74:8 98:24 133:14 moved 60:22 78:22 85:24 86:21 117:11,12 118:21 moving 53:3 60:2 86:16,20 89:12 90:2 Mulhull 99:18 multiple 7:16 50:1 mutual 136:22	<hr/> N <hr/> name's 4:14 named 24:2,10,11 30:21 35:19 36:21 71:6 80:19,21 84:23,25 85:9,10 87:15 99:19 111:3 112:6,8 113:9 121:2,4 125:3 127:8 naming 10:12 35:9 narrative 58:12 narrow 119:17 national 50:21 navigate 70:10 necessarily 111:20 needed 19:12 36:9,10 37:20,21 39:16 62:7 85:19 88:13 106:2 needless 39:9 negotiate 102:14 neutral	122:5 129:19 130:12 131:10 neutrality 38:9 131:11, 16,19 133:2, 13 news 102:5,11 newspaper 8:12 13:12,21 45:4 46:19,22 48:13 52:4,10 53:9 54:17 57:22 58:9 59:22 67:9 135:7 newspaper's 44:25 46:14 135:12 newspapers 59:17 65:4 101:14 nice 122:18 nickel 64:5,7 Nina 106:23 nods 4:22 101:21 non-prosecution 102:14 103:3 106:6 125:24 noncurable 25:15 Nonetheless 7:15 88:2 128:21	notably 7:6 note 32:5 38:11 40:4 47:17 117:22 noted 24:1 41:8 134:17 notes 14:16,17 notice 8:19 26:14 27:10,22 28:7,21 31:1 53:18 57:7 89:20,23 92:15,25 132:4 noticed 128:2,4 132:13 notify 48:12 50:11 noting 42:10 Notwithstanding 19:21 November 5:1 16:18,25 25:25 26:19 34:16 44:4 45:1 70:25 108:20 114:13 number 9:16,19,24 19:9 24:2,4 25:20 26:11 32:17 34:2
--	--	---	---

35:13,16,24 36:22,24 40:8 49:19 58:8,14 68:6,22 69:9 73:6 101:13	88:3,4 91:6, 21 94:7,13 98:1 118:7 128:22 129:7 131:16 134:6	89:18 91:5,23 93:5,12 105:8 122:15 126:7 127:11 129:5 130:2 131:25 132:3	16,19,24,25 106:13,18,24 108:2 113:3, 12,13 118:17, 18 119:3 121:6,12 123:15,17 124:10 125:11,21 126:4,5,6 128:25 130:21,24
numbers 9:5,18	objections 52:15 114:20, 21	offended 137:9	office's 104:20
numerous 58:17	obligation 7:10 17:18 115:24	offhand 77:8	official 35:17 71:6,16 73:23 84:25 100:16 110:13,18 112:23 113:3 121:12 122:4 137:8
<hr/> O <hr/>	obligations 42:19	office 19:10 24:3,5, 7,9,12,15,25 28:25 34:20 35:2,5,15,20 37:4,6 38:6 39:18 42:12 44:12 45:25 46:4 48:1,13 49:3,9,13,19 50:6 55:24 56:5,10,16,18 59:10,12,13 64:19,22 65:14 66:11 68:22 69:4,13 70:15 71:3, 10,15 73:12 74:5 78:10 80:25 81:3, 11,24 83:3,8 84:8,18 85:1, 18 90:19,21 94:25 95:2 99:2,14,16 100:10 101:13,18 102:7,10,24 103:7 104:4, 10,15,16,24 105:1,7,10,	officially 119:3
object 29:6 30:24 31:1 35:21 36:12 37:8,22 38:7 39:19 40:18 53:6 60:13 61:6 78:20 79:8 85:12 86:6 88:14 89:13, 14 90:21 91:24 113:4,6 115:23 127:1 128:25 130:25	obstruct 61:3 73:5		officials 100:15 110:11,12,21 112:22
	obtain 45:5,7 56:6 107:20 109:4 116:19		Olympus 26:6
	obtained 107:9		one-sided 58:18
	obtaining 7:14 101:17		ongoing 59:7,14
	obvious 28:9		online 49:20
objected 84:6 112:14 129:17	occasionally 100:18		open 19:15
objecting 61:16,22 72:14 120:6	occur 128:11		opening
objection 12:14 30:3,7, 12,13 31:4 41:6 51:24 52:8,11 58:1 60:17 62:17, 21,25 63:10 73:20 82:15	occurred 49:25 107:22 108:18 113:14 118:21		
	October 16:19,24 26:2 31:4,6 37:19 38:5 57:12 70:13,16 88:12,15,17		

24:19 26:21 28:24 78:19 operative 115:11 opportunity 17:3,7 116:2, 4 119:3,6 131:15 oppose 37:11 93:7 117:19 121:25 122:1 130:21 opposed 85:23 118:24 opposing 111:6 opposite 41:14 opposition 39:17 87:25 131:18 option 35:7 131:21 oratory 98:6 order 5:6 14:23 22:16 30:5 40:20,22 42:20 53:13, 15 56:22 64:17 85:17 86:4 88:7 91:11 92:15 94:9 119:9, 18,21 120:2 128:11 134:12 ordered 13:22 36:13	38:8 129:1 original 15:23 16:7, 17,21 18:4 44:25 71:18 87:25 92:4 94:15 127:24 originally- filed 18:1 outlet 50:16 outright 31:15 outset 42:19 overcome 31:17 58:8 120:9 overestimate 98:6 overruled 58:5 82:21 owe 64:5 <hr/> <div>P</div> <hr/> p.m. 4:2 95:12,13 138:19 140:2, 13 pages 28:18,19 29:12,13 103:25 128:15 paid 6:19 42:12 64:7	pains 137:10 palatable 41:13 Palm 4:11 23:20 33:2,6,22 46:15 48:6,16 49:15 50:2, 15,23 51:1 55:14,20 58:7,16,18,21 59:4,8,16 60:5,6 62:11 65:22 68:23 72:6 74:12 91:16 101:11, 16,18 102:20 105:10,18 107:7 108:6 110:25 115:14,17 126:5 paper 50:23,24 136:6,9,15,16 paragraph 19:23 30:1,5 72:3 75:25 76:12,20 77:4,13,19,23 80:18 87:16 88:1,2 94:4 117:23 118:4 130:18 paralegal 4:9 paralegals 107:3	part 14:16 17:22 21:25 22:7 74:2 86:24 87:20 106:6, 24 135:10 participate 109:4 participated 111:3 112:14 parties 13:24 19:5 27:19 32:23 33:11 78:8,13 95:24 138:23 139:4 partner 99:19 partners' 82:11 party 6:17,19,20,23 7:17 8:8 15:20 16:4 18:15,19 19:11 24:10, 11 25:22 26:2 29:5 30:22 32:12 35:12 36:7,21 37:7 38:13,15,16, 17,19,22,23 39:11 41:5,20 47:21 48:5 57:8 80:21 84:23 85:17 91:24 110:17 111:3,11,20 112:24 114:6 118:18 121:2
--	---	--	---

125:3 127:8 131:13,24 132:5 133:11, 22 party's 6:20,24 past 51:6 58:18 62:5 67:3 96:23,24 97:3 pay 59:20 pending 93:20 115:11, 12,13 119:16 people 48:18 83:9 98:5,6 perception 60:22 perform 12:4 performance 11:1,17 period 62:5 92:10,11 93:15 person 12:19 16:7 18:16 65:6 74:5 84:9 personal 58:20 71:7 84:2 108:5 136:18 personally 42:13 66:14, 16 71:11 81:22 82:9	83:6 84:5 87:7 107:6 109:10 115:25 137:9 persons 14:2 persuasive 41:13 pertinent 14:16 Peter 48:21 petition 85:5 phase 97:14 108:11 phone 122:18 phonetic 99:21 phrase 78:22 physical 80:24 125:16 picked 18:1 pinned 50:18 51:6 place 22:3 place-holder 133:5 place-marker 26:24 27:7 28:11,12,16 29:19 31:10 36:18 37:25 119:25 126:10	127:18,25 132:23 plaintiff 7:9,15 8:19 14:9,15 15:1, 3,12 17:7 18:14,22 20:5 21:5 22:18 23:2 30:9 38:18,20 44:5 50:12 54:11 55:16,18 56:4,8,12 60:10 72:1,6 82:19 88:5 95:1,16 96:10 126:17 128:23 plaintiff's 5:5,9 22:17 28:4 47:18,25 55:23 56:24 62:24 63:5 87:24 plaintiffs 5:3,17 13:12 plaintiffs' 107:10 play 116:2 122:4 played 116:4 playing 116:1 plea 66:23 102:9, 14 pleading 67:5 88:9 131:8	pleadings 44:21 56:9 66:13,21,25 67:10 73:19 87:10 pleased 129:25 130:16,19,23 plenty 65:17 point 24:24 35:15 53:24 57:4 59:12 64:12 70:19 72:13 73:13,14 81:1 93:2 97:13 113:12 120:4 121:20 123:5 125:1,10,18 127:7 130:13 points 18:24 police 107:8 108:5 popped 78:21 portal 49:2,14,16 50:24 51:5 83:19,20 portion 75:10 position 8:12 13:11 17:4,8,14,17 30:11,16 38:9 43:24 47:5 54:14 58:22
--	--	---	---

73:2,23,25 79:6 88:24 114:23 115:4, 8,15 118:16 122:6 125:6 129:11,19,22, 23 130:3,13 131:7,10 133:3 134:17 positions 29:25 114:25 136:7,8 possess 46:24 possessed 50:6 67:4 possession 7:20 22:13 24:13,21 37:5 45:14,16,25 46:3,5 48:8, 14 51:1 52:5 53:5 56:1,20 60:24 63:7 67:21 79:5 80:3,4,24 81:1,4 90:3, 19 105:9 114:7 118:17 125:5,16 131:9 post 4:12 23:18,22 24:2 26:1 30:16 33:3, 16,22 34:2,8, 13 35:3,6,7,8 39:15 43:3 46:15 48:17 50:15,23	51:1,10 58:8, 16,18,21 59:4,8,16 60:5 62:11 65:23 68:23 72:7,14 74:13,14 76:1,9,20 78:2 86:4,17 88:12 89:2 91:16,24 101:11,16 102:2,18,23 103:20 104:19 105:11,16,18 106:2 115:13, 17 116:10,17 119:13 123:6 126:8 131:4 132:19 133:18 134:19 135:24 136:2,4,11 Post's 41:11,16 106:7 120:18 126:16 130:21 131:2 134:17 post-1999 6:9 post-trial 28:6 posted 51:3 posting 49:20 posts 53:3 59:24 60:3,22 78:22 85:24 86:17, 20,21 89:12	90:2 posturing 10:12 power 7:23 24:15 35:21 36:23 45:19,21 powers 72:10 73:22 practice 99:23 100:2 precluded 13:15 predator 23:23 predecessor 48:21 66:11, 18 109:19 110:24 predecessors 66:6 preeminent 115:9 prefer 98:2 138:24 139:1,5 prefers 98:3 prejudgment 6:18 prejudice 5:8 22:6 preparation 137:7 present 6:15 99:15 presentation 139:22	presentations 134:19 presented 6:25 13:4,20 15:1 19:24 21:7 33:6 55:19 76:4,22 78:4,15 81:2, 3 113:15 President 102:11 press 49:9,13 50:10,14,17 51:12 56:10 67:12,15 83:21 pretty 79:13 94:2 130:4 prevail 28:20 prevailing 6:19 32:11 38:12,14,16, 17,19,23 39:11 41:20 prevent 24:16 48:17 61:10,20 116:23 125:11 prevented 63:6 prevention 129:21 preventive 129:21 previous 17:20 99:15
--	--	--	--

previously 37:11 49:22 51:21 131:6, 14	103:1 108:8 109:15 112:19 134:24	59:13	providing 13:15 16:13 29:6
primarily 100:13 108:25 109:9	produce 7:19 45:8,9 54:14 56:5 118:13	prosecuted 59:11 102:6	province 88:6
primary 85:1	produced 83:21 84:20 91:10	prosecution 14:4 33:24 37:2 49:21 103:1,8	provision 15:5,16 16:1 17:2,12 26:14 27:19 54:18 76:15
prime 113:8	produces 91:7	prosecutorial 134:23	provisions 14:19 119:7 129:20
principal 110:7	producing 24:16 30:3,13 35:22 37:9 91:6 94:8,14	protect 85:17 112:19 115:24 122:7	public 13:18 14:12 23:22,25 24:3,7,12,15 34:1,2,21 35:17,20 41:10 46:16 48:17 49:16, 20,23 55:22 56:8,10 57:23 66:7 68:22 72:8,16 73:23 74:3,5 76:13, 25 82:4,7 83:8,23 84:8 94:24 102:3 104:19 105:19 107:14 109:3 113:20 114:2
printed 136:14	production 31:5 38:8 61:7 62:9 91:22 129:7	protecting 24:7 121:13 125:6	
prior 17:19 26:23 27:15 59:10 68:21 73:19 92:16 99:19 102:19 129:11	professional 122:19	protection 24:25 30:22 85:2	
private 40:22 119:14	profit 65:5	prove 41:23	
problem 72:21	prohibit 113:18	proved 119:1	
procedural 10:12	prohibits 36:25	provide 13:8,17 17:3, 11 18:17 20:20 33:4 45:8 47:7 52:22,24 78:3,14 107:11 118:7 123:15	
procedure 6:8 18:25	prongs 131:13		
proceeding 6:22	proof 118:20	provided 36:8 54:19 56:19 104:6, 12 105:10,16, 20 106:14 108:1 109:5 126:4	publish 45:13
proceedings 4:2 76:24 77:15 109:5 121:18 125:10 127:3	proper 7:13 10:9 18:15,19 47:20 48:5 110:6,17		publisher 4:11
process 8:9 85:11	prosecute		pull 28:11 29:8 30:1 32:19 34:22 68:3

77:9 111:11 112:1 117:1 118:1,2 120:21 126:12 127:14 130:9 132:1 pulling 103:13 105:4 132:14 purely 117:12 purpose 6:6,11 14:5 39:8 55:21 72:8 92:25 113:5 130:15 purposes 38:23 pursuant 5:11 13:23 14:23 22:16 38:24 49:22 54:1 55:17 56:22 72:9 76:2,23 88:7 pursued 61:14 put 8:19 21:6 47:5 49:4,13 50:17,20 83:18 89:17, 20,22 90:22, 23 119:2 136:15 putting 50:14 puzzled 10:11 11:15	<hr/> Q <hr/> qualification 78:15 question 63:12 64:3 79:11 81:15 82:24 83:1 89:10,11 94:4 135:19,21 136:17 questions 57:19 63:14 69:1 90:25 94:24 95:4 quick 94:20 quicker 68:12 quickly 35:13 130:4 quote 21:8 26:24 30:12 45:25 46:15 85:1 88:2 <hr/> R <hr/> raise 126:25 raised 15:23 31:8 79:1,9 88:18 101:8 raises 15:22 29:24 38:3 92:23	ran 24:6 35:14 Randy 58:21 rated 100:20,21 Raton 99:15,18 re-arrest 102:22 reach 106:20 reached 48:22 reaction 115:21 129:24 134:18 read 8:22 9:13 19:19 26:9 32:3,7 47:15, 23 49:12 51:21 55:9 67:9 69:11 75:2 87:21 107:14 109:12,24 130:19 136:14 reading 25:5 80:16 ready 23:16 98:16 real 18:7 65:3 94:20 100:4 reason 29:4 57:25 58:2 60:14 88:13 121:7,	11 127:8 reasonable 6:17 18:10,11 20:3 reasonableness 97:14 reasons 11:13 36:20 65:23 86:3 87:14 112:6 113:10 120:18 121:1 125:3 recall 21:1 41:4 60:4,7 117:16 receive 105:1 received 34:4 50:21 68:22 69:4 70:20 104:22 108:4 121:9 122:1 126:1 recess 95:11 140:12 recognize 20:8 44:11 49:8 51:9 54:9 55:6 57:7 76:14 recognized 95:20 134:21 recollection 49:5 record 8:22 22:17 26:9 31:3,9 40:12 47:16 51:20 61:13
--	--	---	--

95:12	referenced	11:19 22:15	41:3,12,17
records	53:13 82:17	30:24 36:12,	42:3,9 55:17,
7:14,19,22	references	23 37:12,21,	24 56:3,25
8:15 10:4,7,	29:20 57:21	23 39:17	67:7 75:20,23
16 11:18,20,	referencing	45:19,21	77:20 82:19
22,23 12:1	51:10	49:2,9,13	94:11 117:18
13:16,17	referring	50:11,15,17	118:12,19
14:10,18	80:7 120:23	51:13 53:6	133:21
18:17,23	refresh	56:10 61:16,	reliefs
19:12,14	49:5	17,18,23 63:8	78:6
21:20 22:14,	refused	83:21 85:19	rely
16 24:4 29:7	33:4 37:18	86:6 112:14	26:23 47:3
30:8 34:2,15,	78:3,13 83:19	114:2 115:10	relying
21 35:4,16,22	118:6	117:19 118:24	116:25
36:1 37:9	refuted	127:1 129:1,	remain
39:17 40:11,	35:23	17,21 130:25	130:14 131:5,
19 47:20	regard	131:16	12
48:3,14	39:23,25	released	remainder
49:17,20,22,	102:3,19	14:21 49:9,22	77:13
23 50:12	111:19 130:11	56:21 59:6	remained
52:6,22,23	135:13	60:14 79:9	41:3 120:16
54:15 57:22	regular	89:4	122:6
60:6,14	38:15	releasing	remaining
61:18,19 63:9	Reiter	30:8 40:19	5:10 21:1
68:22 69:9	107:8	41:7 50:25	133:22
74:4,5 79:9,	reiterate	88:4 125:12	remarks
21 82:4,7	22:12	128:23 129:11	51:23,25 52:3
83:9,17,18	reiterating	134:6	remember
84:8,24 85:13	105:8	relevance	25:2 80:6,10,
88:4 90:19,20	related	62:18 63:1,2	16 86:22,23
91:7 94:24	103:21 107:23	relevant	87:12 89:19
95:2 105:19	relating	85:16	109:13 131:13
127:1 128:23	25:3,6 49:3	relied	reminded
redirect	103:7	111:8,18	37:19
94:19,21	relationship	relief	reminder
138:22	63:6	5:12,18,20	42:6
139:10,18	release	21:2,7 22:3,	remotely
reevaluate	5:14 10:21	9,21 23:4	43:2
17:4,8		25:4,10 33:1,	
reference		8 37:7 40:3,5	
66:16			

removed 58:22	14:10 22:14 30:4 45:15 46:20 48:14	reserved 42:25	responses 70:20 71:4 84:16
repeat 82:24,25	55:20 56:2,7, 21 63:8 72:7	resign 48:20 102:16	responsibility 35:18 107:4 109:8 110:7
repeatedly 53:11 56:7	74:7 82:19 83:10 84:10, 18 88:5 94:8, 14	respect 66:23 69:9 75:25 77:4 79:7	rest 95:15
reply 37:24 127:12, 17,21,24 128:16 129:4, 15 130:3,11	requesting 34:20 37:1 60:7 82:19 103:20 113:19	respected 122:8	restate 79:11
report 50:24,25 125:25	requests 23:4 34:3,21, 25 43:4 49:19,23	respectfully 40:8 41:17 43:4 76:2	rests 96:4
reported 109:16	68:23 69:9 74:4 76:2 82:8 84:3 94:25 123:23	respond 37:19 82:10 83:4 87:7	result 26:21 38:22 50:21 106:4
reporter 59:9,12 91:3	require 25:16	responded 43:19 69:14 72:6 73:18 83:9 87:5 98:15 124:6 125:2,13 127:8 128:14	resulted 108:11
reporting 62:24	required 27:10,16 56:1	responding 74:3	revelations 108:18
represent 36:11	requirement 27:1 31:12	response 33:11 36:17 37:24 49:19 82:13 84:22 87:24 89:8 91:5 93:5,13 104:21,22 105:2,12,13 116:11 121:8, 9 122:2 123:16 126:9, 16 127:12,19 128:12 129:5, 14 130:2,20 131:2	reversal 20:1 21:13
representing 107:1	requirements 32:10		reversed 21:18
represents 42:15 101:13	requires 26:15		review 105:15 106:19 109:13 114:2
reprobate 137:2 140:9	research 8:14 13:14 34:16,17 36:4 108:21 109:10,25 110:1		reviewed 44:20 107:16
request 14:22 35:4 36:1,14 67:6 68:21 76:18 79:8 82:5,16 83:9,13 84:4 105:19 123:17 130:22	researching 34:14		reviewing 108:9 117:16
requested 7:19 13:8			rights 100:14 109:2 116:18 120:14,15
			road 11:7,11
			role 110:17

112:18,19 116:1,2,4 122:4 136:6 rolling 53:17 room 11:19 rooted 5:12 rule 18:4 19:4 41:16 93:9 101:2,5 rules 19:3 101:5 ruling 119:12 rulings 39:20 run 10:17 23:20 rush 96:16 Rutherford 99:18 <hr/> S <hr/> safe 27:13,17 safe-harbor 15:5,15,25 17:2,12 26:14 27:1,10,18 28:7 31:12 54:18 sanction 126:19	sanctioned 100:22 sanctions 8:4 13:5 15:21,24 19:22 23:3 25:3,21 26:4, 19 31:19 32:2 33:14 38:13 39:21 41:23 42:5,11,24 43:5 53:17 61:14 101:2,3 132:16,22 SAO 55:25 56:6, 13,14 scenario 20:15 Scholz 44:8 School 99:8 Schultz 58:21 scooped 58:10 66:1 screen 68:4 69:22,25 70:3 124:15 127:4 128:19 sea 133:6 seal 124:7 sealed 123:24,25 seated 4:3 95:14	secrecy 24:8 109:15 111:4 112:20, 25 113:4,8 115:8,24 117:21 119:1, 4,7 120:8 121:13 122:7 125:7 129:20 133:12 secret 58:16 59:9 Secretary 102:12,16 section 8:5 14:20 15:22,23 33:9 56:19 75:23 100:15 109:8 135:8 securities 100:4 seek 53:16 77:12 115:16,23 118:12 123:6, 10 seeking 7:14 14:9 18:24 19:4 23:18 35:8 50:13 55:16 72:7 73:21 76:10 90:20 103:7,23 106:2 112:11 119:15 seeks 56:4 76:11,21 85:16	sell 59:17 65:4 send 53:18 105:2 119:24 130:1 sending 50:15 sense 19:18 84:14 sentence 72:17 87:14, 16 88:23 90:10,12 103:4 106:5 sentencing 125:25 September 70:17 134:11 series 61:1,2 serve 16:10 17:18 19:5 31:13 123:19 served 16:5,7,8,9 22:20 26:15, 18,25 79:20 92:16 93:4,12 132:18 serving 16:8 set 36:20 92:4 94:14 121:1 123:1 132:21 settlement 122:10,11 130:1
--	--	---	---

Seventh 100:17	Sidlosca 26:6	social 56:10	34:13 64:22 65:17,18
sexual 23:23	signed 44:12	sole 5:9 56:20	spoke 107:10
shareholder 99:13	significant 17:1 47:17,24	solely 11:20	spoken 74:4 107:6
Sharon 48:6	silent 62:7 74:2	solemnly 43:11 98:8	stamp 9:5,9,18 46:10 47:16, 24 54:7
shed 34:4	simply 11:5,14 33:12 80:21 84:23 100:6 107:21 118:9	sort 83:15 105:17 120:12	stand 140:4
Shore 27:25	sincere 41:12 135:12	sought 29:1 30:8 33:3,8 46:16 47:20 48:3 56:3 78:2,7 88:4,6 111:2 128:23	standard 31:21 32:1,5, 8,12 38:14, 15,16 41:19, 21
short 52:16	sir 6:3 9:2 70:24 89:23 93:19 138:4	Sound 139:24	standing 115:15
shortly 70:25 91:15	sitting 82:10 136:24	sounding 135:2	start 9:9 53:17 108:8 137:24
show 15:7 18:18 22:18 31:18 33:21 44:10 49:8 51:8 53:19 55:5 57:6	situation 27:24 86:5 133:4	sounds 109:25 139:23,25	started 48:18 50:4 108:10 130:7 137:22
showing 32:13 86:12	skills 98:6	Southern 102:7,13	starting 25:13
shown 73:8	slash 9:17	speaking 61:20 84:7	starts 72:1
shows 13:5 33:16	slide 77:23	specific 34:25 35:4 103:20	state 4:16 7:23 10:6,9,12,15, 19,25 11:12, 16,24 12:9 14:20 19:8,14 21:5 23:21 24:5,9,18,20, 24 25:22,24
sic 20:8 70:16 76:7	slow 70:2	specifically 5:16 111:19 124:1	
side 67:12,13,14, 15,17 110:16 135:24	So.3d 5:24 6:4 8:1 15:18 26:9	speculation 52:12	
sidelines 53:5 61:5	sober 137:7	spent	

26:17,22 27:14 28:25 29:4,20 30:2, 6,11,18,20,21 31:13,17 33:1,11,25 34:19 35:2,5, 10,11,13,15, 19,20,23,25 36:7,8,10,11, 17,18,21,25 37:4,7,21 38:6,10,12,16 39:10,15 40:10,13,18 41:4 42:12, 15,16,17,18 43:17 44:2 48:2 49:15 50:1,2,5 55:14,25 71:9,14,15 80:19,20,23, 25 81:24 84:23,25 85:7,16,18 87:15 88:3 91:5 94:7,10 99:22 100:9, 15 101:17 102:20,25 103:7,19 104:20,24 105:1,7,9,16, 19 106:13,18 108:7 109:15 110:4,11,12, 18,20,22,23 111:2,10,19 112:6,7,11, 17,22,23 113:1,2,3,5,	7,11,13,18, 19,21,23 114:6,14,23 115:4,18 116:9 117:7 118:13,16 119:24 120:4, 17,19 121:2, 6,7,12,16,19, 25 122:3,11, 20,23 123:12 124:9,13,23 125:2,8,16 126:9,17,25 127:7,12,17 128:1,10,16, 21,24,25 129:5,10 130:19,24 131:4,15,23 132:5,8,13 133:3,8 134:4,8,9 135:25 136:17,19 stated 38:7 91:21 103:25 107:24 128:25 129:6 131:7 statement 39:18 49:18 78:19 89:25 130:20 statements 8:18 13:2 40:12 51:20 60:4 states 13:19 99:23 101:14	Statistics 100:13 status 133:7 statute 5:13 6:6,13 7:6 13:19 14:15 15:4,6, 8 18:18 20:6 21:12,25 25:8 27:2 31:20 32:2,3 33:9 40:7,23 42:7 54:2,19 55:17 76:3,13,15 109:11,19,21, 22 111:5 113:18 115:9, 11,16 116:18, 19 117:14,22 118:25 119:10,14 120:9,11,13 122:7 134:24 statute's 119:7 statutes 7:21 13:7,14 14:13 20:14 56:20 109:9 statutorily 22:15 statutory 19:19 21:11 22:4 25:4,7, 12 37:13 42:7 74:15,20,24 108:22 115:24 117:12	stay 62:7 stayed 16:6 stems 58:20 59:15 step 49:1 Stephen 30:15 34:9 96:10 98:13, 23,25 steps 48:12 50:11 stipulated 12:22 95:23 stonewalling 48:16 stood 117:25 stop 75:5 108:15 137:24 story 58:10 59:17 streamline 6:8 Street 140:8 strict 31:12 strictly 27:3 strike 74:8 88:10 strong 41:12 125:21 135:7
---	--	---	---

stuff 29:14 67:3 76:13 81:3 83:22 84:1 89:8	5 46:4 59:5 61:19 67:14 71:10 86:4 100:16 110:12,21	supervisory 72:10 73:22	35:19 39:9 85:2,18 116:22,23
stymied 10:13	sufficient 27:7	support 20:13 39:21 41:11 124:17, 18,24 127:18 131:17	<hr/> T <hr/>
subject 46:1 48:9 90:8 100:22	suggested 66:12	supported 7:2,4	tab 26:7,8 27:11 28:1 31:22 39:1 69:17 80:8 111:25
submitted 8:23 44:22 107:5	suing 11:24 19:13 57:22 58:13 61:22 110:10 136:17	supporting 36:6 77:1	tabulation 18:9
subpoena 112:10	suit 8:10 20:7	supposed 10:20	taking 73:24 129:18, 22,23 131:9
subsection 13:23 26:14 28:3	summary 29:21 54:25 57:1,2,15,16 118:22 124:10,14,17 125:9 128:8 133:19,25 134:10,13	supremacy 129:20	talk 12:8 60:2 87:6 90:6,7
subsections 19:21		Supreme 109:2	talked 60:3 71:18 86:1
subsequent 15:21,24		surprised 116:3	talking 31:23 65:16 67:10 70:8 81:5,7 94:23 111:7,16 118:4
substance 92:7 122:9	summer 34:6 101:22 108:10	surrogate 109:3	
substantial 8:6		surrounding 102:21	
substantive 56:24	summons 44:25	sustain 62:20	talks 21:25
success 20:4	Sun-sentinel 50:22	Sustained 52:1,12 60:19 63:2 74:10	targeting 62:14
suddenly 86:17	Super 97:20	swear 43:11 98:8	task 24:25
sue 19:12 45:7 61:20 71:9,14 110:4 135:25	supervised 85:19	sweetheart 33:25	tasked 24:3,7 30:22 107:3 109:7 121:13
sued 13:9,16 45:4,	supervision 134:23	sworn 43:18 98:14	taxpayer
	supervisor 116:22	system 25:1 30:23	

64:24	50:19 51:12	70:19 71:11	83:10 84:8,11
taxpayers	58:13 59:14	73:11,13,14	86:3,16,18
42:13 59:19	61:9 62:1,9	85:24 88:9,18	87:9 89:7,11
63:22,25	65:12 67:18	89:15 90:14,	133:8
64:4,13,18	81:21 90:3,5	16 91:21	tomorrow
65:2	97:7 138:21	99:10,13	96:25 97:1
team	things	101:17 102:4,	top
34:8 106:25	14:8 59:15	12 125:15	14:8 57:10,11
107:16,19	71:10 81:9	128:24 129:6	total
131:3 136:5	83:20 105:8	131:6,7	28:19
telling	108:16 139:2	134:10	totally
59:24 85:22	thinking	timeline	16:2 21:21
terms	59:11	23:10 34:7	Town
102:25 103:1,	thinks	37:17 91:19	107:6,7 108:6
2	51:25	96:5 101:25	trademark
terrible	Thirty	122:14	100:4
79:14	96:18	times	transcript
testified	Thomson	7:16 15:2	9:3,23,25
43:19 64:16	4:10	118:2	12:12 25:5
65:7 85:25	thought	timing	39:24 124:2
98:15 104:9	9:12 57:24	15:13	139:11
109:18	65:22 86:5	today	transcriptions
testify	105:9 120:12	4:25 10:24	14:18
90:17 96:13	126:15 135:2	15:7 25:3	transcripts
106:12	thoughtful	34:10 40:2	50:5 58:13
testimony	33:18	44:3 58:25	60:25 61:9
10:21 14:2	Thursday	60:10 61:4	67:4,6,15,20
15:6 33:5	39:5 97:4,10	64:5,8 65:1	81:5,17,19
55:19 67:19	138:9,11,12,	67:18 82:10,	83:11,13,17
76:4,22 77:18	13,15,18	14 85:25	107:5,9,21
78:4,14 97:6,	140:2	86:19 88:18	118:9 124:4
22 104:7,8	tighter	89:11,15	transparency
107:8 111:2	139:3	92:14 96:13,	77:1
118:8 139:11	time	17 97:6,7,22	Traurig
texts	6:2,21 7:1	127:22	4:10 30:15
48:18	22:19,20	132:11,16	33:17 34:9
thing	24:14 26:19	135:16	99:1,11,16
10:23 17:1	31:10 54:22	told	100:1 101:15
18:13 20:24	65:17,18	5:16 48:24	104:24 106:22
		52:24 53:11	

114:5 135:4 136:9 Traurig's 131:1 trial 7:1 8:5,7 100:7 true 29:17 30:10 69:7 78:25 89:15 Trump's 102:11 Trust 7:25 truth 43:13,14 98:10 truthfully 84:11 turn 31:20 67:8 68:14 117:7 tweet 51:6 twist 20:5 Twitter 50:17,19 51:4,10 two-page 79:20 twofer 58:7 type 110:12 types 100:1,10	<hr/> U <hr/> U.S. 85:5 91:12 100:19 102:6, 13 104:15 105:25 109:2 123:14 125:23 126:4 Uh-huh 63:24 ultimate 7:12 63:7 116:21 ultimately 14:6 41:15 107:19 108:16 118:22 131:3, 20 133:1 134:20,25 unambiguously 7:22 unanswered 35:5 unchanged 20:23 underlying 14:10 19:5,8 25:17 57:25 undermined 106:13 understand 67:11 73:24 83:25 124:5 136:25 137:4 understanding 83:7 understood	115:23 116:1 122:3 undisputed 26:17 unequivocal 130:20 United 101:14 University 99:6,8 109:14 unquote 26:24 unsupported 5:18,21 22:23,25 untenable 32:16 41:25 upcoming 13:2 upset 116:3 Upstate 99:6 USC 100:14 utilized 14:6 <hr/> V <hr/> vague 123:18 Valparaiso 109:14 variety 100:3 vendetta 58:20 136:19	versed 106:25 version 6:9 9:3,4,12 versus 19:14 vibrant 135:12 victim 106:11 victims 50:8 view 89:6 violated 26:13 voice 131:15 void 92:19 voluminous 107:12 voluntarily 38:18 voluntary 26:5 voted 136:20 <hr/> W <hr/> wait 54:2 Wall 140:8 wanted 12:18 14:11 45:9,11,13
--	--	---	--

48:22 58:11 62:1 65:25 83:14 85:12 89:13 90:6, 13,15,16 95:16,19 104:14,18 106:3,21 110:4 111:11 113:1,22 122:2 123:11, 23 124:5 136:11 Wargo 99:18 ways 11:22,23 20:6 Web 49:2,14,16 50:24 51:3,5 week 96:25 weeks 80:5 whatsoever 10:22 14:5 Whetstone 4:7,8 12:15 23:7,9,15,17 31:24 39:4,7 68:3,8 69:22 78:19 85:25 86:1 95:8,25 96:7,10,14, 18,21 98:1, 17,19 103:10, 12 111:24 112:2 124:20, 22 126:22,24 127:14,16	137:14 138:24 139:9,23 whim 36:2 wiggle 11:19 Wille 110:23 111:12,14 112:21 win 10:18 11:2,7, 11 wins 64:11 withdraw 17:5 27:21 28:5 withdrawn 27:23 withdrew 16:5 witnesses 43:7 woman 104:8 won 32:11 word 109:12 136:15 140:9 wording 60:3 words 7:7 76:11 133:5 work 21:10 41:14	99:9,14 100:7,8 108:12,13,24 135:3,4 worked 101:3 102:10 119:5 working 106:22 worth 42:10 108:12 worthwhile 97:13 137:24 write 35:2 62:1 120:17 136:5, 7,12 138:23 139:16 140:8 writes 80:22 writing 59:5 70:3 97:25 98:4,5 121:20 130:7 136:3 139:4, 20 written 13:7 48:25 58:19 80:12 87:8 97:22 105:18 121:9 139:2 wrong 34:1 60:12 64:18,20 66:22 wrongdoing 137:12	wrote 30:20 61:1,2, 25 73:4 80:5 86:11 90:11, 17 103:19 104:25 Wylar 4:13,14,20,23 6:3 9:2,8,11, 15,20,22 12:17,23,25 23:6 26:20 28:23 29:15 32:3,7 39:7 42:15 43:9,21 44:8,15,19 46:7,10,12 47:11,15 48:10 52:2, 13,19 53:21 54:6,8 58:3 60:1,20 62:22 63:3,4,14 82:15 84:19 86:13 92:6 94:20,22 95:4,7,15 96:1 97:12,20 121:22 122:16,17 128:6 130:10 137:19,23 138:4,6,10,12 139:14,25 <hr/> y <hr/> years 34:7 50:1 58:17,19 59:7 91:12,13
---	--	--	--

99:12,16

yesterday

130:21

York

99:6,22,25

100:9,15

102:7

young

104:8

Z

Zoom

139:21

NOT A CERTIFIED COPY

CA Florida Holdings, L.L.C.

vs.

Dave Aronberg

Hearing Before:

Judge Luis Delgado

September 08, 2022

PHIPPS REPORTING

Raising the Bar!

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 15TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA
CASE NO. 50-2019-CA-014681-XXXX-MB AG

CA FLORIDA HOLDINGS, LLC,
Publisher of the PALM BEACH POST,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DAVE ARONBERG, as State Attorney
of Palm Beach County, Florida;
SHARON R. BOCK, as Clerk and
Comptroller of Palm Beach County,
Florida,

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF CONTINUATION OF
HEARING PROCEEDINGS

RE: Defendant Dave Aronberg's Amended Motion for
Attorneys' Fees

DATE TAKEN: Thursday, September 8, 2022
TIME: 1:06 p.m. - 2:42 p.m.
PLACE: PALM BEACH COUNTY COURTHOUSE
205 North Dixie Highway
Courtroom 10D
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
BEFORE: LUIS DELGADO, JR., Circuit Judge

Stenographically reported by:
Lisa Begley, RPR, RMR

271843

1 APPEARANCES:

2 On behalf of the Plaintiff:

GREENBERG TRAURIG

3 777 South Flagler Drive

Suite 300 East

4 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

561-650-6420

5 BY: LAUREN R. WHETSTONE, ESQ.

whetstonel@gtlaw.com

6 MARK F. BIDEAU, ESQ.

bideaum@gtlaw.com

7 GERARD BUITRAGO, ESQ.

buitragog@gtlaw.com

8

On behalf of Defendant, Dave Aronberg:

9 JACOB, SCHOLZ & WYLER, LLC

961687 Gateway Boulevard

10 Suite 2011

Fernandina Beach, Florida 32034

11 904-261-3693

BY: DOUGLAS A. WYLER, ESQ.

12 doug@jswflorida.com

13 Also present: Dave Aronberg, State Attorney
Defendant

14

Leigh Miller, Public Records Coordinator
Office of the State Attorney PBC

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	I N D E X	Page 144
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3	STEPHEN MENDELSON, ESQ.	
4	Cross Examination by Mr. Wyler	146
5	Redirect Examination by Ms. Whetstone	187
6		
7	Non-movant rests	204
8		
9	Certificate of Reporter	210
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Thereupon,

2 the following proceedings began at 1:06 p.m.:

3 THE COURT: All right, please be seated.

4 All right, announce your presence.

5 MS. WHETSTONE: Good afternoon, Your Honor,
6 Lauren Whetstone, and with me, Mark Bideau, Gerard
7 Buitrago and paralegal, Jennifer Thomson, on
8 behalf of Greenberg Traurig, on behalf of CA
9 Florida Holdings, the publisher of the Palm Beach
10 Post, the plaintiff, and our witness, Stephen
11 Mendelsohn.

12 MR. WYLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor,
13 Douglas Wyler with the law firm Jacobs, Scholz &
14 Wyler here on behalf of the State Attorney, Dave
15 Aronberg, defendant.

16 THE COURT: All right, so we left off with
17 cross examination? Is that where we are?

18 MS. WHETSTONE: Yes, Your Honor.

19 MR. WYLER: Yes, sir.

20 THE COURT: Madam Clerk, please swear in
21 the witness.

22 Sir?

23 THE WITNESS: Oh, I've been sworn in
24 before.

25 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm

1 that the evidence that you're about to give will
2 be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the
3 truth?

4 THE WITNESS: I do.

5 Thereupon,

6 STEPHEN MENDELSON, ESQ.,
7 having been duly sworn by the Clerk of the Court,
8 responded and testified as follows:

9 CROSS EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. WYLER:

11 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Mendelsohn.

12 A. Good afternoon, Mr. Wyler.

13 Q. So I'm going to start off with this: Isn't
14 it true that part of the exhibits that we've all agreed
15 on that are here and part of evidence are some of the
16 portions of our settlement negotiations?

17 A. There is one letter, yes.

18 Q. Okay. And isn't it true you and I talked
19 several times regarding settlement?

20 A. Sure.

21 Q. And isn't it also true that, during the
22 pendency of our settlement negotiations, Mr. Aronberg was
23 contacted by the same reporter that the SAO had
24 previously prosecuted for illegal substances?

25 MS. WHETSTONE: Objection, Your Honor, no

1 foundation.

2 MR. WYLER: That's fine.

3 THE COURT: All right.

4 BY MR. WYLER:

5 Q. Isn't it true, though, that Mr. Aronberg
6 and Mike Edmondson contacted you to complain about an
7 article that was being written about him?

8 A. No, no. I've never spoken to Edmondson
9 that I remember.

10 Q. Well, okay. That's fine. But you did
11 speak with Mr. Aronberg, right?

12 A. No. I don't recall speaking to anyone on
13 this matter, unless he was on the phone with you. Other
14 than that, no.

15 Q. Okay, well, then part of when we spoke, and
16 maybe you didn't know, Mr. Aronberg and Mike Edmondson
17 were on the phone with us, but isn't it true that there
18 was a time, when you and I spoke in settlement
19 negotiations, that you offered to hold an article pending
20 our settlement negotiations?

21 MS. WHETSTONE: Objection, Your Honor,
22 settlement discussion.

23 MR. WYLER: They opened the door to
24 settlement negotiations by putting it into
25 evidence.

1 THE COURT: What exhibit are you talking
2 about?

3 MR. WYLER: I don't actually have an
4 exhibit that is part of evidence, but I do have an
5 exhibit that is not part of evidence that I will
6 offer to the Court.

7 THE COURT: That is good then. Objection
8 is sustained.

9 A. That is absolutely untrue.

10 BY MR. WYLER:

11 Q. So you're saying that never happened?

12 A. No. Mr. Aronberg, through you, suggested
13 that in the settlement, that the paper would write a
14 favorable article about him if we were able to settle.
15 You suggested that. I didn't make a comment one way or
16 the other, but I absolutely advised my client of it.

17 I don't make editorial decisions for the
18 paper, so I have no authority to make such.

19 Q. So you're saying there was never a
20 conversation between you and I where we discussed
21 Mr. Aronberg creating a comment to go into the newspaper
22 as part of those settlement negotiations where you wanted
23 us to drop our 57.105 demand and you offered to get an
24 article held while we determined whether we would do
25 that?

1 MS. WHETSTONE: Objection, Your Honor,
2 compound, compound.

3 THE COURT: Sustained as compound.

4 BY MR. WYLER:

5 Q. All right, I'll move on.

6 So, in your direct examination the other
7 day, isn't it true that you stated that you devoted
8 hundreds of hours to the research and development of
9 bringing this lawsuit?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. And so, in all of that research, you
12 extensively put time into looking into Chapter 905.27
13 before you brought this action?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. And, prior to Judge Marx's June 8th order
16 on the motion to dismiss Count 2 -- Let me scratch that.

17 Isn't it also true that your client's
18 complaint alleged against -- that my client was in
19 possession or control of the documents that are in this
20 action, the subject of this action?

21 A. I'm sorry, can --

22 Q. I'll repeat it. Isn't it true that your
23 client's complaints alleged that my client and/or his
24 office is in, quote, possession and/or control of the
25 documents that are subject of this action?

1 A. Are you reading from the amended complaint?

2 Q. That is found at page 117, Bates stamp
3 number 117, paragraph 3 of the first amended complaint.
4 I'll be happy to show it to you.

5 A. Well, if you'll just let me know where in
6 the amended complaint it is, what paragraph.

7 Q. Paragraph 3.

8 THE COURT: What's the Bates stamp?

9 MR. WYLER: 117, Your Honor.

10 A. Yes, sir, that's part of what I said in
11 paragraph 3.

12 BY MR. WYLER:

13 Q. But there was an allegation that my client
14 is in possession and/or control of the documents?

15 A. In his official capacity as his office is
16 in possession and/or control of documents that are the
17 subject of this action. And in the prior sentence, I
18 quoted Florida Statute 27.03 which provides for the
19 attorney -- excuse me -- the state attorney to have
20 authority over grand jury proceedings in the state of
21 Florida.

22 Q. Okay. Isn't it also true in the first
23 amended complaint that your client admitted that it is
24 not -- it is not seeking these materials in connection
25 with either a civil or criminal case and, therefore,

1 sought unlimited access to the requested materials under
2 905.27?

3 A. Again, that's a compound question. I'm not
4 sure which one goes first.

5 Q. Isn't it -- If you would look at Bates
6 stamp page 135.

7 A. I don't have the Bates stamps in front of
8 me. All I have is the exhibits, sir.

9 Q. Okay. They should be on there, in the
10 bottom left corner.

11 A. Which one is it?

12 Q. 135.

13 A. Okay. I'm sorry, what is your question,
14 sir?

15 Q. Didn't you admit on that page that you are
16 not seeking these requested materials in connection with
17 either a civil or criminal case?

18 A. A pending -- Right, that is correct.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. The Post was not seeking these documents in
21 a pending criminal or civil case involving the Post.

22 That is correct.

23 Q. Thank you. And did you also seek unlimited
24 access to those requested materials for that reason?

25 A. No, that's not accurate.

1 Q. If you look -- Would you look at Bates --
2 at that Bates stamp I just provided you?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. I believe it's on here.

5 A. Are you looking at 135 --

6 Q. Uh-huh.

7 A. -- on Exhibit 9? Yes, I'm looking at that,
8 sir.

9 Q. Okay, and if you would look at
10 paragraph 70.

11 A. Sure.

12 Q. And then, do you see -- one, two, three --
13 the fourth line down, in the sentence that starts with,
14 "Because..."

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Okay. It says, "Because the Palm Beach
17 Post is not seeking these materials in connection with
18 either a civil or criminal case, it seeks a declaration
19 that the scope of its use of the disclosed materials is
20 not limited."

21 A. Right, not limited to a civil or criminal
22 case, but that the Post had the right under section (c)
23 of 905.27 in furtherance of justice. We were always
24 seeking an in-camera inspection of the documents by the
25 Court prior to any release to the Post.

1 Q. Did that argument succeed in your claim
2 against the clerk?

3 A. Which one?

4 Q. That you had no connection with the civil
5 or criminal case and to get unlimited -- to get unlimited
6 access.

7 A. Well, again, we weren't seeking unlimited
8 access. As I just mentioned, we were always seeking an
9 in-camera inspection by the Court prior to release to us.
10 So we were not seeking unlimited access, nor immediate
11 access to the documents.

12 Q. You weren't -- All right, we're going to
13 move on.

14 Isn't it true that the other day you
15 testified that you sued my client because you needed him
16 not to object to your request for these materials?

17 A. I needed him not to object? No. I gave
18 him the opportunity to do actually three things. One is
19 to support our request; two, they could have taken a
20 neutral position; or, three, they could have objected.

21 Initially, the state attorney's office took
22 the position to object, and as I think I testified, they
23 eventually changed the position in October of 2020 to
24 neutrality.

25 Q. And you believe that's a proper basis for

1 **filing this lawsuit against my client?**

2 A. That they adopted a neutrality position?

3 I'm not clear what you're asking me.

4 Q. Oh, no, that you needed him not to object.

5 A. That I needed him not to object? No --

6 Q. Unless you wanted --

7 A. I'm sorry, did I step on you, sir?

8 Q. No, you're fine.

9 A. No. That I needed him not to object? No,
10 I gave the state attorney's office the option to make, in
11 their discretion, to make the decision as to what they
12 wanted to do vis-à-vis grand jury secrecy. And as I
13 stated -- You know, if you look at the paragraph you
14 quoted before, that's paragraph 3 of the first amended
15 complaint, I cite to Florida Statute 27.03, which gives
16 the state attorney the authority over grand juries, and
17 if you look at the cases cited under 27.03, there are a
18 number of them which say that the state attorney has
19 very, very broad powers in the conduct of a grand jury,
20 so --

21 Q. Thank you, Mr. Mendelsohn. Let's move on.

22 A. Okay.

23 Q. In your long practice as an attorney, is it
24 your understanding that clear, unambiguous statutory
25 language has to be enforced as written?

1 A. Well, there are circumstances where the
2 courts have implied causes of action. That's the famous
3 United States Supreme Court case of Cort v. Ash where the
4 Court said that, even if Congress did not specifically
5 authorize a cause of action, that, in certain
6 circumstances, if Congress did not bar such, you could
7 have an implied cause of action. That comes also for
8 Section 10(b)(5) of the securities laws.

9 Q. Okay, but --

10 A. And Florida has that, too.

11 Q. All right. But, in your research, you
12 stated that you went through 905.27, right?

13 A. Exactly, yes.

14 Q. Okay. And you came across this language,
15 right? I'm going to read this to you: "When such
16 disclosure is ordered by a Court pursuant to
17 subsection (1) for use in a civil case, it may be
18 disclosed to all parties to the case and to their
19 attorneys and by the latter to their legal associates and
20 employees; however, the grand jury testimony afforded
21 such persons by the Court can only be used in the defense
22 or prosecution of the civil or criminal case and for no
23 other purpose whatsoever."

24 You came across that language when you were
25 doing the research, right?

1 A. Absolutely.

2 Q. And do you recall my client asserting that
3 as a defense from the beginning, from our first
4 interaction, first legal filing in this?

5 A. Yes, you made a motion to dismiss arguing
6 that the Post did not --

7 Q. We'll take a yes. It was a yes or no.

8 A. Well, you asked me if your client did that,
9 and I was answering it. So the answer --

10 Q. I'll take it as a yes or no.

11 A. May I finish my answer without
12 interruption?

13 The answer is, yes, you made a motion to
14 dismiss under 905.27 and asserted that the materials
15 could only be used in a civil or criminal case. Of
16 course, we disputed that because of (c), which is the
17 furtherance of justice language.

18 Q. And did that -- did that argument -- was
19 this argument successful in your action against the
20 clerk?

21 A. It was never addressed by the Court.

22 Q. So you're telling me that Judge Hafele
23 never brought up 57 -- or, 905.27 in his final judgment?

24 A. No. I'm suggesting the way you
25 characterize it was not the way Judge Hafele decided.

1 Judge Hafele, in his final judgment, said that he felt
2 constrained by the statute vis-à-vis his inherent
3 authority as a judge.

4 While he wanted as a judge to exercise his
5 inherent authority to allow for disclosure, he felt that
6 the statute constrained him in doing so because it did
7 not expressly so state that it could be used outside of
8 the civil or criminal case. That's what I believe Judge
9 Hafele said.

10 Q. Do you have a copy of the final judgment in
11 front of you?

12 A. Yes. What exhibit is it?

13 Q. It's tab 30.

14 A. Okay. Okay.

15 Q. All right, tab -- or, Bates 1477.

16 A. Sure. The newspaper makes strong arguments
17 to advance --

18 Q. No. No, sir. No, sir.

19 A. I'm sorry.

20 Q. No, sir. Let me redirect -- Let me direct
21 you to the first paragraph here under Emphasis Added? Do
22 you see it says, "Reading subsection (1)(c)...?"

23 A. Right.

24 Q. Could you read that until the cite for the
25 amended complaint, please?

1 A. Right. "Reading subsection (1)(c),
2 furthering justice," which is in quotes and parentheses,
3 "in tandem with section (2), it is evident that the
4 phrase, quote, furthering justice, end quote, is to be
5 interpreted in the context of seeking disclosure of the
6 grand jury materials for use in a pending criminal or
7 civil case."

8 Q. Keep going.

9 A. Yep. "The newspaper acknowledges that it
10 is not seeking the disclosure of such materials for such
11 purpose. Instead" --

12 Q. That's it. Thank you, Mr. Mendelsohn.

13 A. But it's not the --

14 Q. Mr. Mendelsohn --

15 THE STENOGRAPHER: I'm sorry, I can't take
16 this.

17 THE COURT: Gentleman, gentleman, we're
18 here for trial, and you're being cross-examined --

19 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, maybe, for the
20 rule of completeness, I would like to be able to
21 read the entire sentence.

22 THE COURT: So right now you're testifying.
23 It's your witness. What's your next
24 inquiry?

25 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor. May I

1 continue with this final judgment, Your Honor?

2 BY MR. WYLER:

3 Q. I would like you, Mr. Mendelsohn, to flip
4 to page 1479 of that same final judgment. At the very
5 top of that page, could you read that first sentence for
6 me, too -- for me?

7 A. "Subsection (2) clearly limits
8 Section 925.27's (sic) scope as to the instances in which
9 grand jury testimony or materials need to be disclosed
10 for use in a criminal or civil case."

11 Q. And then -- You can keep going.

12 A. "Section (2) provides that, once grand jury
13 testimony is disclosed in the course of a court
14 proceeding, it is then open to unlimited dissemination.
15 Before that occurs, the Court must determine that one of
16 the three needs prescribed in section (1) is present in a
17 criminal or civil case that requires disclosure. There's
18 nothing in Section 905.27 that gives the Court carte
19 blanche," which he has italics, "authority to release
20 grand jury materials in any situation that might bear
21 some relationship to, quote, furthering justice, end
22 quote, in its broadest sense."

23 Q. Thank you. All right, so moving on from
24 905.27, in your extensive research of this case, did you
25 also come across Chapter 905.17?

1 A. Sure.

2 Q. Okay, and let me provide that to you, sir.

3 MR. WYLER: This is tab 32 of the -- or, 33
4 of the Authorities, Your Honor, tab 33.

5 BY MR. WYLER:

6 Q. Do you have it, Mr. Mendelsohn, or would
7 you like me to provide it?

8 A. It's the amended and supplemental affidavit
9 of attorneys' fees and costs?

10 Q. You don't have the Authorities binder?

11 A. No, I don't have the Authorities binder.

12 MR. WYLER: May I approach?

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 BY MR. WYLER:

15 Q. Here's a copy of 905.17.

16 A. Yes, I'm familiar with this provision.

17 Q. Great, okay. And then the very last
18 sentence of that first paragraph, it starts with, "The
19 notes, records and transcriptions..." Would you please
20 read that for the Court?

21 A. I'm not sure where you're directing me,
22 sir.

23 Q. Let me approach again and show you here.

24 I'm sorry, I didn't have this highlighted for you.

25 Right here, very last sentence of that

1 first paragraph starts with, "The notes..."

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Will you please read that for the Court?

4 A. Sure. "The notes, records and
5 transcriptions are confidential and exempt from the
6 provisions of Section 119.07 subdivision (1) and
7 Section 24(a), Article 1 of the State Constitution, and
8 shall be released by the clerk only upon request by a
9 grand jury for use by the grand jury or on order of the
10 Court pursuant to 905.27."

11 Q. Thank you, Mr. Mendelsohn. And do you
12 recall my client asserting this as a defense to your
13 claim as well?

14 A. Yes, yes.

15 Q. And isn't it true that your client and your
16 firm and you yourself have been made aware several times
17 that Mr. Aronberg and his office have no ability to
18 comply with your declaratory relief claim because they
19 have no possession, custody or control of those requested
20 grand jury materials?

21 A. I'm aware that's your argument.

22 Q. You're aware that we've made that argument
23 to you several times, are you?

24 A. Yes, you made a motion to dismiss and a
25 motion for summary judgment.

1 Q. And did we also put that argument in our
2 57.105 demand?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. And isn't it true that you and your
5 client have admitted that the clerk is the only one in
6 possession and control of those requested grand jury
7 materials?

8 A. I don't believe so.

9 Q. All right. If I could direct the Court and
10 you, Mr. Mendelsohn, to tab 20, and it's Bates stamped
11 262.

12 A. 262? Yes, sir.

13 Q. And then the second paragraph starts with,
14 "Also..." Can you just read -- Can you just read that
15 first sentence for me? Or I'll just read it here. It
16 says, Also, the clerk, who admittedly has both possession
17 and control of the Epstein grand jury materials, has not
18 followed the state attorney's lead in seeking sanction of
19 the Palm Beach Post.

20 It says that in there, correct?

21 A. Well, you didn't read it verbatim, but
22 essentially that's what it says, yes.

23 It also says the clerk's decision --

24 Q. I didn't ask you what else it says.

25 A. I know, because it doesn't help you.

1 Q. But I didn't ask you that.

2 THE COURT: Gentleman, so this is the
3 second time, okay?

4 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Let's maintain a little
6 civility.

7 BY MR. WYLER:

8 Q. Mr. Mendelsohn, in your extensive
9 involvement in this case, how did you contribute to the
10 June 3rd, 2020, motion to dismiss hearing?

11 A. How did I?

12 Q. Yeah, or did you?

13 A. I didn't argue the motion, but certainly,
14 as part of the group, we had discussions as to how we
15 thought it should be argued, the potential arguments from
16 the state attorney's office and what we thought would
17 occur.

18 Q. Did you attend via Zoom or --

19 A. Yes --

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. -- I did.

22 Q. And have you ever read the transcript of
23 it?

24 A. Some time ago, yes.

25 Q. Okay, so then you were aware of Judge

1 Marx's statements, the ones that I read onto the record
2 in my opening statement regarding the impossibility of
3 performance for the records that you requested?

4 A. I know she said that, yes.

5 Q. Okay. Did you agree with Judge Marx's
6 statements as to an impossibility of Mr. Aronberg being
7 able to comply?

8 A. I took her statements as complete dicta
9 since they were not before her as a question on the
10 motion to dismiss. I did not know what personal
11 knowledge she had of what the state attorney's possession
12 or nonpossession was. So I did not credit it as being
13 anything but a dicta statement from her.

14 Q. So you or your firm, no one objected to
15 those statements then, correct?

16 A. There wasn't -- I'm not sure what you're
17 referring to.

18 Q. Was there any objections made to any of
19 those statements made -- objections or appeals made as to
20 those statements made on the record in that hearing?

21 A. I don't follow, because you don't make
22 objections to a judge's comments.

23 Q. Well, through an appeal, you would. Did
24 you file an appeal as to that motion to dismiss?

25 A. No. It wasn't necessary.

1 Q. Okay. Would you please flip to our Joint
2 Exhibit Number 14?

3 A. Sure.

4 Q. It's also found at Bates stamp 232.

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. Okay, do you -- do you recognize this as a
7 copy of my client's 57.105 demand letter and a copy of
8 the email when it was sent to you?

9 A. Yes, I do.

10 Q. And what day was it sent to you?

11 A. June 8th --

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. -- of 2020.

14 Q. Thank you. And then, if you flip to the --
15 past the letter, that's Bates stamp 235.

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. Do you -- Do you recognize this as the
18 motion for attorneys' fees that was sent along with that
19 motion to -- or, with that 57.105 demand?

20 A. Well, it wasn't a motion. It was an
21 unsigned proposed motion that you were suggesting would
22 be filed if we did not act within the 21-day safe harbor
23 under 57.105.

24 Q. That's right. And that -- Do you know when
25 this motion for attorneys' fees was actually filed?

1 A. July, the beginning of July of 2020, I
2 believe.

3 Q. If I told you July 1, 2020, does that sound
4 correct to you?

5 A. Yes, it does.

6 Q. Okay. And is that more than 21 days after
7 June 8th, 2020?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. It's 23 days beyond, my math.

10 A. I have no reason to doubt that.

11 Q. If you look at -- I quoted in our -- In the
12 57.105 demand, you'll see a quote of the Chapter 57.105
13 subsection (1).

14 A. What are you referring to now?

15 Q. Do you see in my -- the 57.105 demand
16 letter, still Exhibit 14?

17 A. The demand letter that's Exhibit 16?

18 Q. No, no, no. Still on 14.

19 A. 14.

20 Q. Bates stamp 233.

21 A. 233? Yes.

22 Q. Okay. Do you see where the 57.105
23 statute's quoted there in the middle of the page?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Can you tell me anywhere in there there's a

1 **good faith element?**

2 A. No, because you didn't quote the good faith
3 element of the statute.

4 Q. In subsection (1), is there a good faith
5 element?

6 A. I believe there is a good faith element
7 that wraps around the entire proceeding of 57.105.

8 Q. Okay, but in subsection 1 itself, is there
9 a good faith element in that subsection?

10 A. No, but there's an additional good faith
11 provision in 57.105 that you didn't cite to in this
12 letter.

13 Q. Okay. Now, are you referring to 57.105
14 subsection 4? I can show you the statute.

15 A. Let me just check here. I'm looking at my
16 letter of June 23rd. 57.105(3)(a), that's what I was
17 referring to.

18 Q. Okay. All right. And, now, we talked
19 about this before. Can you -- 57.105(3)(a), can you read
20 subsection (a) for the Court?

21 A. I don't have 57.105. I have my letter
22 which --

23 Q. I can hand it to you.

24 A. Sure.

25 Q. Yeah, absolutely.

1 A. Thank you.

2 **Q. You're welcome. 3(a) is right there.**

3 A. "Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2),
4 monetary sanctions may not be awarded; (a), under
5 paragraph (1)(b) if the Court determines that the claim
6 or defense was initially presented to the Court as a good
7 faith argument for the extension, modification or
8 reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law
9 as it is applied -- as it applied to the material facts
10 for the reasonable expectation of success; (b), under
11 section" -- excuse me -- "under paragraph (1)(a) or
12 paragraph (1)(b) against a losing party's attorney, if he
13 or she has acted in good faith based upon the
14 representations of his or her client as to the existence
15 of material facts; (c), under" --

16 **Q. I just -- I just needed you to read (a).**
17 **Thank you.**

18 A. Oh, I wasn't sure.

19 **Q. So under (3)(a), does that apply to**
20 **subsection (1)(a) of the statute, or does it only say**
21 **(1)(b) there?**

22 A. No, if you look at (3)(a) -- if you look at
23 (3)(b), it says, under paragraph (1)(a) or
24 paragraph (1)(b) against a losing party's attorney if he
25 or she has acted in good faith.

1 You're seeking fees against myself and --

2 **Q. No, no.**

3 A. -- and Greenberg attorneys, so I read that
4 as being applicable.

5 **Q. Mr. Mendelsohn, you're skipping down to --**
6 **That's not what I asked you. 57.105(3)(a), does that**
7 **apply to 57.105(1)(a)? Does it say it in the statute?**

8 MS. WHETSTONE: Objection, calls for a
9 legal conclusion.

10 MR. WYLER: No, I'm just asking him to read
11 it.

12 A. It doesn't say (1)(a) under (3)(a), but I
13 don't remember the case law as to whether or not, when
14 you're suing both the client and the lawyer under 57.105,
15 that both of them can't make the argument of good faith.
16 BY MR. WYLER:

17 **Q. But correct me if I'm wrong, it did say,**
18 **under paragraph (1)(b), if the Court determines that the**
19 **claim or defense was initially presented to the Court as**
20 **a good faith argument?**

21 A. (1)(b) has good faith in it as well, yes.

22 **Q. It doesn't say (1)(a) in there, does it?**

23 A. I'm confused now as to what you're asking
24 me. No offense.

25 **Q. Mr. Mendelsohn, that's okay. I'll move on**

1 from that. I believe the Court understands what I'm
2 saying.

3 So back to that 57.105 demand letter.

4 Isn't it true in that demand letter that we asserted that
5 your client's declaratory relief claim is not supported
6 by the material facts to establish it?

7 A. That's what you say, yes.

8 Q. Okay, we made that assertion, yes?

9 A. That's what the state attorney asserted.

10 Q. Yes, sir, okay. And, in making that
11 assertion, didn't he say that neither him or his office
12 has custody or control of those records and that's it's
13 impossible for him to provide them? He made that known
14 to you in that letter?

15 A. That's what he said, yes.

16 Q. Okay. Didn't that letter also say that
17 your client's declaratory relief claim is unsupported by
18 the application of the law to those facts?

19 A. Well, in a conclusory way, yes, but not in
20 any specifics as to why we were wrong.

21 Q. Well, then maybe you should keep looking at
22 that because, if you flip to the second page of that
23 57.105 demand letter, do you see Section 905.27(2) quoted
24 as the reason for that assertion?

25 A. Yes, but if you recall, there was more --

1 Q. Thank you.

2 A. -- there was more than one argument you
3 were making and more than one argument we were making.

4 Q. A review of this letter makes crystal clear
5 -- I'm sorry. All right. Okay, let's go to tab number
6 16.

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Do you recognize this as the letter where
9 you rejected our 57.105 demand?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Can I direct you to the very last paragraph
12 of that letter?

13 A. "For these reasons, we decline" --

14 Q. No, sir. No, sir. I'll point you. The
15 very last paragraph of this letter, it starts with, "Also
16 assuming..."

17 A. That's actually --

18 Q. Oh, no, I'm sorry, on the second page. I
19 didn't need that one.

20 A. That's actually the penultimate --

21 Q. Then we'll start with the penultimate
22 paragraph on 245 --

23 A. Right, I see that, yes. It starts, "Also
24 assuming..."

25 Q. First sentence, please.

1 A. "Also assuming the state attorney does not
2 have physical possession of the grand jury materials,
3 there is nothing in Florida law that prohibits the state
4 attorney from requesting the clerk provide copies to the
5 state attorney."

6 Do you want me to keep reading?

7 Q. No, sir. Thank you. But I would like to
8 redirect your attention, again, back to 905.17 and that
9 statement that you read earlier. It says, "The notes,
10 records and transcriptions are confidential and exempt
11 from the provisions of Section 119.07(1) and
12 Section 24(a) Article 1 of the State Constitution and
13 shall be released by the clerk only on request by a grand
14 jury for use by the grand jury or on order of the Court
15 pursuant to Section 905.27."

16 A. Right, I'm familiar with that.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. And that section refers to the clerk, not
19 to the state attorney.

20 Q. Thank you. Exactly. Thank you.

21 A. So there's nothing to prohibit the state
22 attorney in this statute from asking the clerk for these
23 materials.

24 Q. All right, isn't there a big difference
25 between getting access from the clerk for materials and

1 disclosing the materials? Isn't there a difference
2 between that?

3 A. I don't understand what you're asking.

4 Q. I'll ask you again. Isn't there a
5 difference between accessing the materials and being able
6 to disclose the materials?

7 A. Once the clerk provides --

8 Q. No, no, no. It's a yes or no question.

9 A. Then I don't understand what you're asking
10 me, to be honest with you.

11 Q. Is there -- Is there a difference between
12 saying, Hey, may I please have these records, versus
13 saying, Here you go, here's these records, Newspaper?

14 A. Well, what you're -- what you're asking me
15 is a twofold question.

16 Q. I asked you one question. Is there a
17 difference between access and disclosure?

18 A. No. Once you access something, it's
19 disclosed. I don't understand what you're asking me,
20 sir, I honestly don't.

21 Q. Mr. Mendelsohn, I'm sorry, and I do not
22 want to have -- I do not want to make the Court angry,
23 but we've got to stop talking over each other. I'm
24 asking you a simple question.

25 You stated here that Mr. Aronberg could get

1 access to these records through the Court -- through the
2 clerk, correct?

3 A. He could ask the clerk for them, and I
4 didn't -- and I argued that there was nothing in the
5 statute prohibiting him from asking the clerk for the
6 clerk to give his office these documents, yes, sir.

7 Q. Okay, sure. Okay, thank you. And so let's
8 just say that happened.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. The clerk gives -- Mr. Aronberg asks the
11 clerk for the records and the clerk gives them to him.

12 A. Okay.

13 Q. That's not what you asked for in your
14 lawsuit, is it?

15 A. Yes, of course it is.

16 Q. Mr. Mendelsohn, did you not -- does not
17 your complaint request the complete -- the disclosure of
18 these records from my client?

19 A. But --

20 Q. You asked -- Did you ask in your lawsuit
21 for my client to hand these records over?

22 A. No, no.

23 Q. No? Okay.

24 A. No, because we had asked for the records to
25 be examined by the Court in camera before they were ever

1 to be disclosed to the public. In fact, we stated in the
2 amended complaint that the Court should review such
3 documents and redact anything that would identify
4 witnesses or potential witnesses or those who were not
5 charged with a crime.

6 So it's inaccurate for you to suggest that
7 the paper just wanted it handed to them. That was never
8 the case.

9 Q. Okay. Let's look back at your complaint.
10 It's tab number 9. We're going to look at Bates stamp
11 136, and we're going to look at your wherefore clause.

12 A. Tab 9, you say?

13 Q. Yes.

14 A. 136?

15 Q. Yes.

16 A. I see it.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. "Wherefore, the Post -- the Palm Beach Post
19 respectfully requests that the Court determine the rights
20 and obligations of the parties by declaring that,
21 pursuant to Florida Statute Section 905.27(1)(c) and the
22 Court's inherent authority, the Palm Beach Post may gain
23 access to the testimony, minutes and other evidence
24 presented in 2006 to the Palm Beach County grand jury and
25 use those materials for the purpose of informing the

1 public."

2 Q. Okay, thank you. And so in there it says
3 that you're asking for the Palm Beach Post to gain access
4 to the testimony; is that correct?

5 A. Yes, after the Court examined them in
6 camera.

7 Q. How else would you gain access to testimony
8 unless it was disclosed to you?

9 A. I'm --

10 Q. You would not.

11 A. I'm not following what you're asking me,
12 I'm really not.

13 Q. Would you please look at tab J17.

14 A. Dave Aronberg's motion for attorneys' fees?

15 Q. Uh-huh.

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. It's at Bates stamp 247.

18 A. Right. This is the one you made on July 1,
19 2020.

20 Q. Correct. And we went through that.

21 Before, you said that was filed at least 21 days after
22 you received the 57.105 demand, correct?

23 A. Well, you said it was 23, and I agreed with
24 you.

25 Q. And I said at least 21 days.

1 A. Right.

2 Q. Thank you. So, if I give you this -- Let
3 me give you this 57.105 statute again and ask you to look
4 at subsection (4) for me.

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. And if could you read that to the Court.
7 Thank you.

8 A. "A motion by a party seeking sanctions
9 under this section must be served but may not be filed
10 with or presented to the Court unless, within 21 days
11 after service of the motion, the challenged paper, claim,
12 defense, contention, allegation or denial is not
13 withdrawn or appropriately corrected."

14 Q. Thank you. And you and your client did not
15 withdraw the claim for declaratory relief within that
16 21 days after being served, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. All right. And then let me have you look
19 at tab number -- or, our Exhibit Number 23.

20 A. Plaintiff -- Yes, the notice of dropping
21 State Attorney Dave Aronberg on October 21st, 2020, that
22 is the one you want me to look at?

23 Q. Yes, that's right. Yep. And that's the
24 date it was filed, October 21, 2020; is that what you
25 said?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Okay. And is that filing date more than
3 21 days beyond when you were served with the 57.105?

4 A. You're confusing a lot of things there.

5 Q. No, I'm not. I asked you a question.

6 A. I cannot answer that question, I can't --

7 Q. Okay.

8 A. -- because it's making a number of
9 assumptions that are inaccurate.

10 Q. No, no, no. That was one simple question.
11 When were you served with the 57.105 demand?

12 A. Which one?

13 Q. No, no, no. You were only served with one
14 57.105 demand.

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. Okay. I'm just asking which one.

17 A. Right. I wanted you to pin down what you
18 did.

19 Q. Okay, you were served with one 57.105
20 demand.

21 A. Right.

22 Q. What day was that?

23 A. The letter was June 8th, 2020.

24 Q. Okay. And this -- And that gave you

25 21 days from that date to change your position; is that

1 correct?

2 A. The statute gave me that, yes.

3 Q. Okay. And then when did you actually
4 change your position and drop Mr. Aronberg?

5 A. We dropped Mr. Aronberg -- When you say
6 changed position, I don't know what you're referring to.
7 We dropped Mr. Aronberg as a defendant in this case on
8 October 21, 2020.

9 Q. Okay, and October 21, 2020, is more than
10 21 days after June 8th, 2020, right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. So then that fits with the statutory
13 language then, correct, of what that 21-day -- it gives
14 you 21 days to withdraw, and you didn't withdraw within
15 21 days, correct? The statute, 57.105 subsection (4),
16 gives you 21 days to withdraw the alleged --

17 A. You are confusing a number of things that
18 are happening, so I cannot answer that question. You're
19 assuming certain things that are not accurate, so I
20 cannot answer your question in the manner you put it to
21 me.

22 Q. Mr. Mendelsohn, it's very simple. I'm just
23 trying to establish that that -- that you filed your drop
24 cure -- you dropped the claim against Mr. Aronberg
25 outside of the 21-day safe-harbor period, correct?

1 A. But you never moved -- you never filed a
2 motion on the first motion you made for fees.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. That's not before us. So you're confusing
5 a safe-harbor for something you've never moved on versus
6 dropping your client as a defendant after something else
7 happened.

8 Q. Okay, so --

9 A. So you're mixing two things together.

10 Q. I'm not. I believe you are. Okay, so is
11 it your position then that, after you dropped Dave
12 Aronberg as a client, that --

13 A. He's not a client.

14 Q. After -- Is it your position that, after
15 you dropped Dave Aronberg as a party from this lawsuit,
16 it's your position that, after you dropped him, that
17 another 57.105 demand letter should have been sent to
18 you?

19 A. You didn't give us --

20 Q. Just answer my question. After you dropped
21 Mr. Aronberg from this lawsuit, is it your position that
22 you should have been served with another 57.105 demand
23 letter?

24 A. Yes. You didn't comply with 57.105 for
25 your amended motion for 57.105. You did not comply with

1 it. Yes, that is the position.

2 Q. Can you tell me, after dropping
3 Mr. Aronberg from the lawsuit, how your position -- how
4 your client's position could have changed if they were
5 served with another letter being that he was already out
6 of the lawsuit?

7 A. Well, that's the problem you have because
8 you served this motion without giving us the safe-harbor,
9 the amended motion I'm referring to, as well as the fact
10 that you served it after we dropped him. For
11 jurisdictional purposes, you can't do that.

12 Q. How could I provide you a safe-harbor if
13 you had already dropped him from the lawsuit?

14 A. Mr. Wyler, with all due respect, you're
15 actually making my argument, which is that 57.105 is not
16 applicable when your client is no longer part of the
17 case.

18 Q. Well, then I guess we just have differing
19 views on how to interpret that statute, Mr. Mendelsohn.

20 All right, I just have a few more questions
21 for you.

22 A. Sure.

23 Q. I'd like to go -- I think I'd like to go
24 back to that final judgment. That was tab 30.

25 A. Okay.

1 **Q. All right, all right, I'm on Bates stamp**
2 **1473, and I'm at the top of that page, that first**
3 **sentence.**

4 A. The clerk's position? Is that what you're
5 reading from?

6 **Q. Yes, yes. That's correct.**

7 A. "The clerk's position is that he is merely
8 a custodian of the materials, and, as such, he has no
9 real interest in the issues before the Court as
10 identified. The clerk only needs direction from the
11 Court on whether or not he should produce or disclose the
12 materials. Nonetheless, the clerk has zealously
13 advocated the position against disclosure based upon
14 grand jury secrecy and confidentiality because
15 Rule 2.420(d)(1)(B)(xvii) of the Florida Rules of General
16 Practice and Judicial Administration, the clerk is
17 required to maintain the confidentiality of grand jury
18 records."

19 **Q. Yes, will you read the next paragraph, too,**
20 **please?**

21 A. "The clerk is correct that his role as
22 custodian of the materials is only to follow the Court's
23 direction once confidentiality is determined. The
24 clerk's role in this proceeding has been complicated or
25 expanded because the newspaper filed this action as a

1 civil declaratory judgment action and has moved for
2 summary judgment under Florida Rule of Civil Procedure
3 1.510. However, the proper procedure for obtaining
4 disclosure of confidential Court records is set forth in
5 Florida Rule of General Practice and Judicial
6 Administration 2.420(j) which only requires the filing of
7 a, quote, motion, end quote, seeking disclosure, Florida
8 Rule of General Practice and Judicial Administration
9 2.420(j) (2) ."

10 Want me to keep going?

11 Q. Yeah, just to the very end of that next
12 sentence, please.

13 A. "Accordingly, the Court will treat the
14 newspaper's complaint and motion for summary judgment as
15 a motion for disclosure under Rule 2.42" -- excuse me --
16 "2.420(j). As a result, the Court need not determine as
17 a matter of law whether the clerk of the Court is a
18 proper defendant to the declaratory judgment for the
19 release of the grand jury materials."

20 Q. Thank you. All right.

21 A. I'm sorry, was there a question?

22 Q. No. There's going to be. Just one second.
23 When you filed this lawsuit, were you
24 familiar with Rule 2.420 of the Rules of Judicial
25 Administration?

1 A. Absolutely.

2 Q. Then why didn't you just file a motion like
3 the rule says -- says you're supposed to if you want
4 confidential Court records and sued my client instead?

5 A. First off, the rule doesn't actually say
6 that. It says you may file a motion in a pending
7 criminal or civil procedure. Since there wasn't a
8 pending criminal or civil proceeding, we didn't view that
9 motion as being necessary to be made.

10 Now, this issue is before the Fourth DCA at
11 the present time, and the clerk's taken the position in
12 its answer brief that Rule 4 -- 2.420 is ambiguous and
13 the actual procedure that needs to be followed is
14 uncertain. And, in fact, the clerk's position is now
15 that the Supreme Court must reassess how one would seek
16 grand jury materials.

17 That was in their answer brief, which I'd
18 be happy to provide to the Court along with our initial
19 brief and reply brief, which extensively discusses
20 Rule 2.420, but also argue that the clerk has now adopted
21 a position of neutrality when it comes to the release of
22 the grand jury materials. In its answer brief, it says
23 it no longer opposes release of the materials.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. It is now neutral on that issue.

1 Q. Thank you, Mr. Mendelsohn.

2 In the Court's final judgment, however, it
3 does say, which you just read to the Court, the proper
4 procedure for obtaining disclosure of confidential
5 records is set forth in Florida Rule of General Practice
6 and Judicial Administration 2.420(j), which only requires
7 the filing of a motion seeking disclosure; is that
8 correct?

9 A. Yes, but at this time, the state attorney
10 was not a party, and, in fact, the state attorney has
11 never made any argument under Rule 2.420 in this case.
12 It has never made such an argument.

13 Q. But you were aware of that rule before you
14 filed this lawsuit?

15 A. Right, and the clerk made this argument
16 after we dropped the state attorney from this case. That
17 was the first time the clerk had made such. The clerk
18 made this argument that the rule was applicable in
19 opposition to our motion for summary judgment which
20 occurred after the state attorney had been dropped from
21 the case.

22 So this was not an issue in the case either
23 because your client did not raise it, the clerk did not
24 raise it, and it was not before the Court until after
25 your client was no longer a party. So it was not an

1 issue that either you addressed or we addressed as part
2 of your demand that we withdraw the case.

3 Q. But you still knew about it before you
4 filed the lawsuit, right? You knew about that rule?

5 A. Of course. Of course.

6 Q. All right, last question for you: Isn't it
7 true that your client's goal in obtaining these records
8 from my client was for public disclosure? Was that your
9 end goal?

10 A. After the Court examined them in camera and
11 removed witness identification or people who hadn't been
12 indicted, that was actually discussed very much
13 extensively in the oral argument before Judge Hafele,
14 and, in fact, he asked us particularly if I were -- and
15 using Judge Hafele's words -- inclined to release these
16 materials to the newspaper and the public -- it wasn't
17 just the paper; it was simultaneously to the public --
18 how would I go about redacting them? Would I need to
19 have someone else, a master, possibly review them? How
20 would I go about doing it?

21 And we had about a half hour's worth of
22 discussion as to how to accomplish that if he were
23 inclined to grant disclosure. So that absolutely was an
24 issue before Judge Hafele.

25 Q. Great. So then the final goal was -- Was

1 the final goal to have these requested grand jury
2 materials be able to be disclosed to the public?

3 A. Absolutely.

4 Q. Okay. And that was without any connection
5 to any underlying civil or criminal case, correct?

6 A. If you're asking me whether or not the Post
7 was part of a civil or criminal case pending at the time,
8 no, it was not.

9 Q. You did not -- Did you request these
10 records as part of a pending civil or criminal case?

11 A. Involving the Post? No --

12 MR. WYLER: Thank you. No further
13 questions.

14 A. -- other than this lawsuit.

15 THE COURT: Thank you.

16 Redirect examination.

17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

18 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

19 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Mendelsohn.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Mr. Wyler asked you to read a sentence in
22 the amended complaint --

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. -- and I'd like to draw your attention to
25 that, and it's Exhibit 9. I'm going to look at

1 **paragraph 3.**

2 A. Yes, I have that in front of me.

3 Q. **Can you read the entire paragraph 3,**
4 **please?**

5 A. Yes, I'd be happy to.

6 "Defendant Dave Aronberg is the duly
7 elected State Attorney for the 15th Judicial District in
8 and for Palm Beach County, Florida, pursuant to Florida
9 Statute Section 27.01 and has authority in grand jury
10 proceedings pursuant to Florida Statute Section 27.03.
11 He is sued in his official capacity as his office is in
12 possession and/or control of documents that are the
13 subject of this action."

14 Q. **So, and I'm actually going to compare --**

15 MS. WHETSTONE: And it's on the screen for
16 Your Honor, too, if that's easier to see.

17 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

18 Q. **But we're going to look at paragraph 4 next**
19 **because paragraph 4 names the clerk; is that correct?**

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. **Could you read paragraph 4, please?**

22 A. Yes. "Defendant Sharon R. Bock is the duly
23 elected clerk and comptroller of Palm Beach County,
24 Florida. She is sued here in her official capacity as
25 her office is in possession and/or control of documents

1 that are the subject of this action."

2 Q. So comparing those two paragraphs, was the
3 clerk named in a different capacity as the state attorney
4 in paragraph 3?

5 A. Yes, because, in paragraph 3, I cited to
6 Florida Statute 27.03, which is the broad grant of
7 authority to state attorneys to supervise and conduct
8 grand jury investigations, and that's really what the
9 situation involved in this case.

10 Q. So you set forth in the amended complaint
11 that the state attorney was named as having authority
12 over grand jury proceedings; is that correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Was the same language in the first
15 complaint that was filed in November 2019?

16 A. I don't recall.

17 Q. Let's go ahead and pull that up.

18 MS. WHETSTONE: And, Gerard, if you don't
19 mind, it's Exhibit 4.

20 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

21 Q. And, while you're turning to that, was the
22 clerk only named in its official capacity as having
23 possession?

24 A. Yes, that is correct. I'm looking at
25 paragraph 3 of the original complaint dated 11/14/2019,

1 and it appears that paragraph 3 appears the same.

2 Q. And let's go ahead and blow that up just so
3 we can close the loop on this.

4 Paragraph 3 of the original complaint is
5 the same as the amended complaint; is that correct?

6 A. Yes. Both of them cite to Section 27.03
7 Florida Statutes creating jurisdiction by the state
8 attorney over all grand juries within their particular
9 judicial district.

10 Q. So the state attorney was named -- never
11 named solely because he might have possession, custody --
12 or custody of the grand jury records from the Epstein
13 grand jury investigation; is that correct?

14 A. That is correct. The primary reason was
15 because the state attorney has such authority over the
16 grand jury process in this judicial district.

17 Now, granted, Mr. Aronberg was not the one
18 who conducted the Jeffrey Epstein grand jury proceeding.
19 Nevertheless, we didn't sue Mr. Aronberg in his
20 individual capacity, only in his official capacity
21 because he's the successor to State Attorney Krischer.

22 Q. Was there any case law cited in the amended
23 complaint -- We'll go back to Exhibit 9, please -- any
24 case law cited in the amended complaint dealing with the
25 state attorney's official capacity as the protector of

1 **the grand jury system?**

2 A. You mean paragraph 3?

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. No, I didn't cite to it because it was
5 clear to anyone who looked at Florida Statute 27.03, they
6 would see a litany of cases describing the authority of
7 the state attorney over the grand juries in their
8 judicial district. So it was obvious that -- what we
9 were getting at.

10 Q. You cited the statute that gives the state
11 attorney power over the grand jury?

12 A. Correct, yes. In fact, there are cases
13 that say that, under this statute, that the grand jury is
14 essentially the arm of the -- of the state attorney.

15 Q. And now that we're back on the amended
16 complaint, I'll direct your attention to paragraph 21 --
17 sorry -- page 21, wherein there is the wherefore clause.

18 Mr. Wyler had you read from one of the
19 wherefore clauses, but I wanted to ask about the
20 wherefore clause on page 21 --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- and you had said that you had requested
23 an in-camera inspection. Actually, could I just ask you
24 to read this wherefore clause?

25 A. Sure. "The Palm Beach Post respectfully

1 requests that this Court, pursuant to Florida Statute
2 Section 905.27(1) and the Court's inherent authority,
3 order the state attorney and clerk of the Court to file
4 with this Court files of testimony, minutes and other
5 evidence presented in 2006 to the Palm Beach County grand
6 jury during the first Jeffrey Epstein sex abuse
7 investigation so that, following an in-camera inspection,
8 it can be made available to the Palm Beach Post and the
9 public on an expedited basis, and grant such other and
10 further equitable or legal relief the Court deems just
11 and proper."

12 Q. So, in the amended complaint, did you
13 request an in-camera inspection?

14 A. In fact, in our motion for summary judgment
15 that we made before Judge Hafele, there's a whole section
16 on that.

17 Q. And Mr. Wyler asked you about the
18 transcript -- the hearing before Judge Marx and that
19 transcript, and during that hearing, Judge Marx made
20 comments about possession and custody of the grand jury
21 records by the state attorney.

22 I wanted to ask you about the order on that
23 motion to dismiss. The order was Exhibit 15.

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And did Judge Marx's order address those

1 **comments that Mr. Wyler read?**

2 A. No, she did not. That's why I believe that
3 they were dicta.

4 **Q. And what did Judge Marx's order rule?**

5 A. She ruled on a very narrow area, which --
6 and I respect Judge Marx. She's a very, very seasoned
7 and reasoned jurist.

8 She determined that, under 905.27, that
9 there was not a private cause of action, and that,
10 because it was not a private cause of action, we could
11 not utilize that statute to seek the grand jury
12 materials. We disagreed with that, and that is the
13 subject of the appeal.

14 **Q. So turning to the final judgment that was**
15 **entered by Judge Hafele, which is --**

16 A. 30.

17 **Q. -- Exhibit 30, yes --**

18 A. Yes.

19 **Q. -- Mr. Wyler asked you to read from page 7,**
20 **that was Bates number ending 1477.**

21 A. Yes.

22 **Q. And I'm going to ask you to go ahead and**
23 **finish that paragraph, or read the whole paragraph if you**
24 **would like.**

25 A. Right. "The newspaper makes strong

1 arguments to advance its more expansive construction of
2 Section 905.27 as part of, quote, furthering justice,
3 unquote. Unquestionably, the established matters
4 surrounding Mr. Epstein's conduct, the circumstances of
5 his resolution of the 2006 state charges and potential
6 federal charges and his 2008 guilty plea and
7 incarceration are matters of public interest, and
8 disclosure of the materials may arguably fall within the
9 concept of, quote, furthering justice, end quote, in the
10 broadest social sense of the phrase."

11 Should I keep going, or not?

12 Q. I think that's fine for now.

13 Were there other portions of the final
14 judgment that you wanted to discuss and needed to finish?
15 Did the --

16 A. Well --

17 Q. Go ahead, sorry.

18 A. I take issue with the state attorney's
19 assertion that this was only about possession and
20 custody. We were asserting that the Court has inherent
21 authority over the grand jury process and that inherent
22 authority superseded or was preeminent over the statute,
23 905.27. That is why we gave the state attorney the
24 opportunity to participate in this case, because we felt
25 it was only fair to, not only the state attorney, but to

1 the public to hear a voice for grand jury secrecy. And
2 the state attorney availed himself of that opportunity.

3 Now, on appeal, we are of the belief that
4 the Court has such inherent authority and that the
5 Court's inherent authority is, as I say, superior to the
6 statute. There are federal cases which say that, and
7 there are state cases which say that. And, in fact, the
8 Florida Supreme Court's case -- actually it's a Fifth DCA
9 case in Clayton says that, where a state attorney may
10 have abused his authority with the grand jury -- It's not
11 Mr. Krischer, and it's not Mr. Aronberg, so I'm not
12 suggesting they are -- but, in that case, it was the
13 Fifth DCA who said that, I don't care what the statute
14 says, the Court has authority to control abuses of the
15 grand jury process, and ultimately that's why we're here.

16 We believe that we've laid out a very
17 detailed factual and legal reason why we think the prior
18 state attorney abused his authority. How did he do so?
19 By obtaining materials from the defense team that
20 undermined the credibility of the witness and the victim
21 before the grand jury. We assert that in paragraph 22 of
22 the amended complaint. It states that in there. And, if
23 you look at the exhibits, you'll see that.

24 We now know, based upon the Department of
25 Justice, the U.S. Department of Justice's report, that

1 the clerk's office in Palm Beach County shared these
2 reported secret grand jury materials with the federal
3 government without a court order, without notice
4 apparently to Mr. Aronberg's office or to the public.

5 Now, why they did that, under what
6 authority they did that, I don't know. Now, whether they
7 asked Mr. Krischer or whether he consented during the
8 time of the U.S. Attorney's interactions with the state
9 attorney, Mr. Krischer's office, we don't know that
10 either. But we do know that they have been disclosed.

11 Q. And you're trying to get those materials
12 and --

13 A. We want the public to have those materials.

14 Q. Right.

15 A. Not me.

16 Q. The public.

17 A. The public. The Post is only a conduit for
18 the public. That's what the media is under the First
19 Amendment. Without the media acting as the conduit for
20 the public, the public does not have the authority, the
21 time or the resources to inform the public of what's
22 going to happen.

23 Imagine if Joe Public or Jane Public came
24 and brought this lawsuit. Would it have gone anywhere?
25 No. Thank God for the First Amendment that the Post has

1 the right constitutionally to seek these materials.

2 I know I'm going off on a tangent, but it's
3 important.

4 THE COURT: You are. So let's move on.

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6 BY MS. WHETSTONE:

7 Q. Thank you, Mr. Mendelsohn. Now let's go
8 back to the demand, the first motion for sanctions that
9 was that one-page motion, and that was served on
10 June 8th, 2020.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And the demand was Exhibit 14.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And Mr. Wyler had asked you some questions
15 about the letter that was enclosed with that motion and
16 was the basis for the sanctions motion that was attached
17 dealing with possession or custody of the grand jury
18 materials by the state attorney's office.

19 A. I'm sorry, I don't understand your
20 question.

21 Q. Sure. He had asked you whether there was a
22 basis for the first motion for fees, and the basis is set
23 forth in this enclosure letter; is that correct?

24 A. Right. Their position was that the
25 Statute, 905.27, and -- yes, 905.27 did not provide a

1 private right of action, yes.

2 Q. So 905.27, that statute is not the claim
3 that we're here on today, correct?

4 A. That is correct. Count 1 was broader than
5 that.

6 Q. And, when it comes to -- Mr. Wyler said
7 something about possession or custody of the state
8 attorney. He referenced that the state attorney does not
9 have possession or custody in this letter, correct?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. But the reason for naming the state
12 attorney in the complaint, the initial complaint and the
13 amended complaint, was broader than his own possession or
14 custody?

15 A. Correct. As the entity charged by Florida
16 law with the supervision of the grand jury proceeding,
17 that included as well the protection of grand jury
18 secrecy, and we named him in his official capacity, if he
19 so chose, to protect grand jury secrecy, which he did in
20 a motion to dismiss and the motion for summary judgment
21 he filed opposing the release of the materials to the
22 public.

23 Q. So that first motion for fees was filed
24 July 1st, 2020; is that correct?

25 A. The first motion, yes.

1 Q. Yes. And did the state attorney ever set
2 that motion, original motion for fees for hearing?

3 A. Never.

4 Q. And we are not here on that first motion;
5 is that correct?

6 A. Correct. They never set it for a hearing.

7 Q. So we're here on the amended motion for
8 sanctions which was filed November 9th, 2020; is that
9 correct?

10 A. Correct. And, in fact, the amended motion
11 and the notice of hearing does not mention the first one
12 from July of 2020.

13 Q. So you never got a notice of hearing that
14 set the original first -- July 1st, 2020, motion for fees
15 for hearing; is that correct?

16 A. That is correct, yes.

17 Q. And you never got a copy via mail or fax or
18 hard copy of the amended motion for fees filed
19 November 9th prior to the time it was filed, correct?

20 A. That is correct. We weren't given the
21 21-day safe harbor.

22 Q. Why did you -- Why did the Post decide to
23 drop the state attorney when it did?

24 A. The state attorney's position changed from
25 one of opposition to the release of the grand jury

1 materials to one of neutrality. Once the grand jury --
2 Once the state attorney changed the position, then the
3 Post re-evaluated whether or not he should remain in the
4 case, and we determined that he should be dropped from
5 the case.

6 Q. At that point, had the Post accomplished
7 everything that it needed from the state attorney in the
8 amended complaint?

9 A. Yes. We had given him the opportunity to
10 voice objection or non-objection. He originally voiced
11 objection, then he changed it to neutrality. That was
12 his decision, and there was nothing further that needed
13 to be stated.

14 Q. And, at that point, when the Post decided
15 to dismiss the state attorney on October 21st, 2020, had
16 the Post accomplished everything that was set forth in
17 your June 23rd, 2020, letter, those three reasons?

18 A. Yes. We had given the state attorney his
19 opportunity to be heard, and he took it and then decided
20 he no longer needed it.

21 Q. And, finally, the -- you mentioned that the
22 final judgment on Count 1 regarding declaratory relief is
23 currently on appeal.

24 A. Yes, Count 1 is, yes.

25 Q. And does the state attorney need to be

1 **named in that appeal?**

2 A. No.

3 **Q. Why not?**

4 A. Well, the appeal was taken on Count 1 as
5 you say. Count 1 had a number of elements associated
6 with it. That's the declaratory judgment provision. It
7 asserted that, under the First Amendment, both the U.S.
8 Constitution and the Florida Constitution that the Post
9 had standing or the right to seek these grand jury
10 materials, and the statute was complementary to that
11 First Amendment right by the language in the statute,
12 905.27, of it being in furtherance of justice.

13 We also asserted that the Court had
14 inherent authority over and above 905.27. If the
15 appellate court were to determine that 905.27 was in
16 conflict with the Court's authority, that the Court's
17 authority was superior to 905.27. So if it's unclear --
18 So there were a number of elements, a constitutional
19 element, the Court's constitutional inherent authority as
20 described by the Florida Supreme Court and that we
21 believe that the reading of the statute that read out in
22 furtherance of justice or tied it exclusively to a
23 pending civil or criminal case was too narrow a reading
24 of the statute.

25 **Q. So the state attorney has stated his**

1 affirmative non-objection to the clerk releasing the
2 grand jury materials from the Jeffrey Epstein case if
3 ordered by the Court?

4 A. Yes. That was why we dropped the state
5 attorney.

6 Q. On October 14th --

7 A. Correct, yes.

8 Q. -- that was the first time he filed that
9 affirmative statement --

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. -- that he didn't object?

12 A. That's absolutely right, yes.

13 Q. And the clerk no longer objects to the
14 release of the grand jury materials if ordered by the
15 Court in the Fourth DCA appeal?

16 A. Yes. In their answer brief, the clerk took
17 the position that it had no opposition at all to the
18 release of the materials, which was contrary to the
19 position they took against our motion for summary
20 judgment.

21 MS. WHETSTONE: No further questions.

22 THE COURT: Is this witness excused?

23 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

24 MS. WHETSTONE: Yes.

25 THE COURT: All right, thank you, sir.

1 MS. WHETSTONE: If I may approach, I'll
2 take the exhibit binder.

3 THE WITNESS: These are for Mr. Wyler.
4 Thank you.

5 THE COURT: Next witness.

6 MR. WYLER: May we call a rebuttal witness?

7 MS. WHETSTONE: Your Honor, there's no
8 rebuttal witness listed on the --

9 MR. WYLER: Well, as to the statements that
10 Mr. Mendelsohn said at the beginning denying the
11 conversation where he, you know, put it on us to
12 -- you know, he said that he would hold the filing
13 of an article while settlement negotiations were
14 pending.

15 MS. WHETSTONE: And, Your Honor, those
16 settlement discussions were never entered into
17 evidence, never even attempted to enter into
18 evidence, and we object to those being entered
19 into evidence now.

20 THE COURT: Settlement negotiations are
21 excluded by statute. All right, so no.

22 MR. WYLER: Okay.

23 MS. WHETSTONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Is there anything else?

25 MR. WYLER: Other than -- No, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Then, I guess, both
2 parties have rested at this point?

3 MS. WHETSTONE: I was going to ask if Your
4 Honor wanted copies of the appeal brief and the
5 reply that had been filed in the Fourth DCA?

6 THE COURT: It's not in evidence, no.

7 MS. WHETSTONE: Then the non-movant rests.

8 THE COURT: All right. So everybody's
9 rested. I have your joint --

10 MS. MILLER: Can we have just a moment,
11 please?

12 THE COURT: I'll take a moment. I'll be
13 back in five minutes.

14 (Off the record from 2:20 p.m. to 2:35
15 p.m.)

16 THE COURT: Please be seated.

17 Everyone get a chance to confer with who
18 they need to confer with?

19 MR. WYLER: Your Honor, thank you. We'd
20 ask if you might reconsider the rebuttal witness.
21 It's not based on settlement. It's really based
22 on the direct testimony yesterday of
23 Mr. Mendelsohn saying that there was a firewall
24 between the legal team and the news team, and our
25 witness can directly contradict that.

1 MS. WHETSTONE: Your Honor, we object to
2 this as not on the witness list, which we have
3 agreed, and having no issue that needs to be
4 raised. You could have asked Mr. Mendelsohn about
5 -- and you could have asked Mr. Aronberg about his
6 own recollection of that instance.

7 MR. WYLER: I could call Mr. Aronberg then
8 as a rebuttal.

9 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

10 MS. WHETSTONE: Objection, it's not
11 relevant to the motion at all.

12 THE COURT: I agree. All right, I will not
13 reconsider.

14 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Closing arguments. All right,
16 now, I think what we discussed last time we were
17 here was that you would give me your closing
18 arguments, and, if you needed to supplement, I'll
19 give you time to supplement in writing.

20 Is that what you all want to do, or do you
21 want to conclude today?

22 MR. WYLER: I would prefer to provide you a
23 written closing argument if possible.

24 THE COURT: Instead of --

25 MR. WYLER: Yeah, I absolutely would. I

1 think that there's a lot of -- there's a lot going
2 on here, and I think it might be beneficial to the
3 Court if you would -- if you would allow us. I
4 will give you -- I'd be happy to give you a
5 written closing argument. I think it could help
6 you in formulating your final judgment, whichever
7 way you go.

8 MS. WHETSTONE: Your Honor, I prepared a
9 closing argument, but -- and I can also write one.
10 I was planning on doing a supplemental one anyway.

11 THE COURT: Well, I'm asking you, you know.

12 MS. WHETSTONE: I think it would probably
13 be more -- if you were going to do one or the
14 other, I think written closing arguments, we could
15 really lay out, you know --

16 THE COURT: Yeah, I joked about it earlier,
17 I think people are better in writing. A lot of
18 people, when they try to go off the cuff or deal
19 with the changes they experienced during a trial,
20 they miss things. I do think people are better in
21 writing.

22 How much time do you need to prepare a
23 written argument?

24 MR. WYLER: If you could give us a week,
25 that would be great.

1 THE COURT: Okay, I'm going to give you
2 some guidance because there's something I do want
3 to hear from you.

4 I do want you to address Lago. And,
5 Ms. Whetstone, when I read In re Grand Jury
6 Proceedings, in those cases the state attorney was
7 subpoenaed, they were not a party to the case, and
8 I want you to address that as well.

9 How much time do you need to prepare your
10 closings?

11 MR. WYLER: If you could give us a week,
12 Your Honor, that would be terrific.

13 THE COURT: I'll give you a week.

14 Ms. Whetstone, is a week sufficient?

15 MS. WHETSTONE: Yes, Your Honor, a week is
16 sufficient.

17 THE COURT: I'll give you 10 days. I would
18 also like a copy of the transcript attached.

19 MR. WYLER: Then we might need a little
20 more time to get it.

21 MS. WHETSTONE: Your Honor, could we ask
22 for 20 days?

23 THE COURT: I'll give you three weeks.

24 I'll give you three weeks. Give me your -- your
25 written closings and proposed orders.

1 Give me one more minute. There might be
2 something else I want you guys to address.

3 In the event that I agree with
4 Mr. Aronberg, the amounts have been stipulated to,
5 correct?

6 MS. WHETSTONE: No, Your Honor, they have
7 not been stipulated to. We submitted a bench memo
8 that objects to the majority of the fees.

9 THE COURT: I saw that. Travel time.

10 MS. WHETSTONE: Yes, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. BIDEAU: But the rates have been
13 agreed. We're not contesting the rate. They
14 didn't need to bring an expert to talk about the
15 rate. Our argument was on legally whether some of
16 these -- some of these fees were -- were
17 recoverable.

18 THE COURT: You can be seated. Give me a
19 second.

20 MS. WHETSTONE: Oh, okay.

21 THE COURT: I want you to address
22 Weatherby. One of the cases submitted, Weatherby.

23 MR. WYLER: Weatherby? Yes, sir.

24 And, Ms. Whetstone, I want you to address
25 In re Grand Jury on that issue regarding --

1 because there is a difference, Mr. Aronberg in his
2 official capacity as a named party, and In re
3 Grand Jury, I think in that case, I think the
4 state attorney's was subpoenaed.

5 And I also want you -- well, both parties
6 to address the Horowitz case where it says that
7 the judge can extend the law because it's an
8 obligation of legislative authority.

9 All right, so you'll give me your arguments
10 and proposed orders within 21 days.

11 Do I need to bring you back in for a
12 hearing?

13 MS. WHETSTONE: No, Your Honor.

14 MR. WYLER: No, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Okay. All right, then we'll be
16 in recess. Thank you very much, everybody.

17 MR. WYLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 MS. WHETSTONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Have a great day.

20 (The hearing concluded at 2:42 p.m.)
21
22
23
24
25

COURT CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF PALM BEACH

I, Lisa Begley, RPR, RMR, certify that I

was authorized to and did stenographically report
the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript
is a true and complete record of my stenographic
notes.

Dated this 13th day of September, 2022.

Lisa Begley

Lisa Begley, RPR, RMR

<p>(</p> <p>(1)</p> <p>155:17 159:16</p> <p>161:6 166:13</p> <p>167:4 168:3</p> <p>(1) (a)</p> <p>168:11,20,23</p> <p>169:12,22</p> <p>(1) (b)</p> <p>168:5,12,21,</p> <p>24 169:18,21</p> <p>(1) (c)</p> <p>157:22 158:1</p> <p>(2)</p> <p>158:3 159:7,</p> <p>12 168:3</p> <p>(3) (a)</p> <p>168:19,22</p> <p>169:12</p> <p>(3) (b)</p> <p>168:23</p> <p>(4)</p> <p>177:4 179:15</p> <p>(a)</p> <p>167:20 168:4,</p> <p>16</p> <p>(b)</p> <p>168:10</p> <p>(c)</p> <p>152:22 156:16</p> <p>168:15</p> <p>1</p> <p>161:7 166:3</p> <p>167:8 172:12</p> <p>176:18 198:4</p>	<p>200:22,24</p> <p>201:4,5</p> <p>1.510</p> <p>183:3</p> <p>10</p> <p>207:17</p> <p>10(b) (5)</p> <p>155:8</p> <p>11/14/2019</p> <p>189:25</p> <p>117</p> <p>150:2,3,9</p> <p>119.07</p> <p>161:6</p> <p>119.07 (1)</p> <p>172:11</p> <p>135</p> <p>151:6,12</p> <p>152:5</p> <p>136</p> <p>175:11,14</p> <p>14</p> <p>165:2 166:16,</p> <p>18,19 197:12</p> <p>1473</p> <p>182:2</p> <p>1477</p> <p>157:15 193:20</p> <p>1479</p> <p>159:4</p> <p>14th</p> <p>202:6</p> <p>15</p> <p>192:23</p> <p>15th</p> <p>188:7</p> <p>16</p>	<p>166:17 171:6</p> <p>1:06</p> <p>145:2</p> <p>1st</p> <p>198:24 199:14</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>149:16</p> <p>2.42</p> <p>183:15</p> <p>2.420</p> <p>183:24</p> <p>184:12,20</p> <p>185:11</p> <p>2.420(d) (1) (b) (</p> <p>xvii)</p> <p>182:15</p> <p>2.420(j)</p> <p>183:6,16</p> <p>185:6</p> <p>2.420(j) (2)</p> <p>183:9</p> <p>20</p> <p>162:10 207:22</p> <p>2006</p> <p>175:24 192:5</p> <p>194:5</p> <p>2008</p> <p>194:6</p> <p>2019</p> <p>189:15</p> <p>2020</p> <p>153:23 163:10</p> <p>165:13 166:1,</p> <p>3,7 176:19</p> <p>177:21,24</p> <p>178:23 179:8,</p>	<p>9,10 197:10</p> <p>198:24 199:8,</p> <p>12,14 200:15,</p> <p>17</p> <p>21</p> <p>166:6 176:21,</p> <p>25 177:10,16,</p> <p>24 178:3,25</p> <p>179:8,9,10,</p> <p>14,15,16</p> <p>191:16,17,20</p> <p>209:10</p> <p>21-day</p> <p>165:22</p> <p>179:13,25</p> <p>199:21</p> <p>21st</p> <p>177:21 200:15</p> <p>22</p> <p>195:21</p> <p>23</p> <p>166:9 176:23</p> <p>177:19</p> <p>232</p> <p>165:4</p> <p>233</p> <p>166:20,21</p> <p>235</p> <p>165:15</p> <p>23rd</p> <p>167:16 200:17</p> <p>24(a)</p> <p>161:7 172:12</p> <p>245</p> <p>171:22</p> <p>247</p> <p>176:17</p> <p>262</p>
---	--	--	--

162:11,12	189:19		205:25
27.01		9	abuse
188:9	5	9	192:6
27.03	57	152:7 175:10,	abused
150:18	156:23	12 187:25	195:10,18
154:15,17	57.105	190:23	abuses
188:10 189:6	148:23 162:2	905.17	195:14
190:6 191:5	165:7,19,23	159:25 160:15	access
2:20	166:12,15,22	172:8	151:1,24
204:14	167:7,11,13,	905.27	153:6,8,10,11
2:35	21 169:14	149:12 151:2	172:25
204:14	170:3,23	152:23 155:12	173:17,18
2:42	171:9 176:22	156:14,23	174:1 175:23
209:20	177:3 178:3,	159:18,24	176:3,7
	11,14,19	161:10 172:15	accessing
3	179:15	193:8 194:2,	173:5
	180:17,22,24,	23 197:25	accomplish
	25 181:15	198:2 201:12,	186:22
3	57.105 (1) (a)	14,15,17	accomplished
150:3,7,11	169:7	905.27 (1)	200:6,16
154:14 188:1,	57.105 (3) (a)	192:2	accurate
3 189:4,5,25	167:16,19	905.27 (1) (c)	151:25 179:19
190:1,4 191:2	169:6	175:21	acknowledges
3 (a)		905.27 (2)	158:9
168:2	7	170:23	act
30	193:19	925.27's	165:22
157:13 181:24	70	159:8	acted
193:16,17	152:10	9th	168:13,25
32			acting
160:3	8	A	196:19
33	8th	ability	action
160:3,4	149:15 165:11	161:17	149:13,20,25
3rd	166:7 178:23	absolutely	150:17 155:2,
163:10	179:10 197:10	148:9,16	5,7 156:19
4		156:1 167:25	182:25 183:1
		184:1 186:23	188:13 189:1
4		187:3 202:12	193:9,10
167:14 184:12			198:1
188:18,19,21			

actual 184:13	afternoon 145:5,12 146:11,12 187:19	188:12,25	arguably 194:8
Added 157:21		angry 173:22	argue 163:13 184:20
additional 167:10	agree 164:5 205:12 208:3	announce 145:4	argued 163:15 174:4
address 192:25 207:4, 8 208:2,21,24 209:6	agreed 146:14 176:23 205:3 208:13	answering 156:9	arguing 156:5
addressed 156:21 186:1	ahead 189:17 190:2 193:22 194:17	apparently 196:4	argument 153:1 156:18, 19 161:21,22 162:1 168:7 169:15,20 171:2,3 181:15 185:11,12,15, 18 186:13 205:23 206:5, 9,23 208:15
Administration 182:16 183:6, 8,25 185:6	allegation 150:13 177:12	appeal 164:23,24 193:13 195:3 200:23 201:1, 4 202:15 204:4	arguments 157:16 163:15 194:1 205:15, 18 206:14 209:9
admit 151:15	alleged 149:18,23 179:16	appeals 164:19	arm 191:14
admitted 150:23 162:5	ambiguous 184:12	appears 190:1	Aronberg 145:15 146:22 147:5,11,16 148:12,21 161:17 164:6 173:25 174:10 177:21 179:4, 5,7,24 180:12,15,21 181:3 188:6 190:17,19 195:11 205:5, 7 208:4 209:1
admittedly 162:16	amended 150:1,3,6,23 154:14 157:25 160:8 175:2 180:25 181:9 187:22 189:10 190:5,22,24 191:15 192:12 195:22 198:13 199:7,10,18 200:8	appellate 201:15	
adopted 154:2 184:20		applicable 169:4 181:16 185:18	
advance 157:17 194:1		application 170:18	
advised 148:16		applied 168:9	
advocated 182:13		apply 168:19 169:7	
affidavit 160:8	Amendment 196:19,25 201:7,11	approach 160:12,23 203:1	
affirm 145:25		appropriately 177:13	
affirmative 202:1,9	amounts 208:4	area 193:5	
afforded 155:20	and/or 149:23,24 150:14,16		

Aronberg's 176:14 196:4	attorney 145:14 150:19 154:16,18,23 168:12,24 170:9 172:1, 4,5,19,22 177:21 185:9, 10,16,20 188:7 189:3, 11 190:8,10, 15,21 191:7, 11,14 192:3, 21 194:23,25 195:2,9,18 196:9 198:8, 12 199:1,23 200:2,7,15, 18,25 201:25 202:5 207:6	190:15 191:6 192:2 194:21, 22 195:4,5, 10,14,18 196:6,20 201:14,16,17, 19 209:8	176:17 182:1 193:20
article 147:7,19 148:14,24 161:7 172:12 203:13		authorize 155:5	Beach 145:9 152:16 162:19 175:18,22,24 176:3 188:8, 23 191:25 192:5,8 196:1
Ash 155:3		availed 195:2	bear 159:20
asks 174:10		awarded 168:4	began 145:2
assert 195:21		aware 161:16,21,22 163:25 185:13	beginning 156:3 166:1 203:10
asserted 156:14 170:4, 9 201:7,13		B	behalf 145:8,14
asserting 156:2 161:12 194:20	attorney's 153:21 154:10 162:18 163:16 164:11 190:25 194:18 196:8 197:18 199:24 209:4	back 170:3 172:8 175:9 181:24 190:23 191:15 197:8 204:13 209:11	belief 195:3
assertion 170:8,11,24 194:19	attorneys 155:19 169:3 189:7	bar 155:6	bench 208:7
associates 155:19	attorneys' 160:9 165:18, 25 176:14	based 168:13 182:13 195:24 204:21	beneficial 206:2
assuming 171:16,24 172:1 179:19	Authorities 160:4,10,11	basis 153:25 192:9 197:16,22	Bideau 145:6 208:12
assumptions 178:9	authority 148:18 150:20 154:16 157:3, 5 159:19 175:22 188:9 189:7,11	Bates 150:2,8 151:5,7 152:1,2 157:15 162:10 165:4,15 166:20 175:10	big 172:24
attached 197:16 207:18			binder 160:10,11 203:2
attempted 203:17			blanche 159:19
attend 163:18			blow 190:2
attention 172:8 187:24 191:16			Bock 188:22

bottom 151:10	case 150:25 151:17,21 152:18,22 153:5 155:3, 17,18,22 156:15 157:8 158:7 159:10, 17,24 163:9 169:13 175:8 179:7 181:17 185:11,16,21, 22 186:2 187:5,7,10 189:9 190:22, 24 194:24 195:8,9,12 200:4,5 201:23 202:2 207:7 209:3,6	charged 175:5 198:15	175:11 191:17,20,24
bring 208:14 209:11		charges 194:5,6	clauses 191:19
bringing 149:9		check 167:15	Clayton 195:9
broad 154:19 189:6		chose 198:19	clear 154:3,24 171:4 191:5
broaden 198:4,13		circumstances 155:1,6 194:4	clerk 145:20,25 146:7 153:2 156:20 161:8 162:5,16 172:4,13,18, 22,25 173:7 174:2,3,5,6, 10,11 182:10, 12,16,21 183:17 184:20 185:15,17,23 188:19,23 189:3,22 192:3 202:1, 13,16
broadest 159:22 194:10		cite 154:15 157:24 167:11 190:6 191:4	
brought 149:13 156:23 196:24		cited 154:17 189:5 190:22,24 191:10	
Buitrago 145:7		civil 150:25 151:17,21 152:18,21 153:4 155:17, 22 156:15 157:8 158:7 159:10,17 183:1,2 184:7,8 187:5,7,10 201:23	clerk's 162:23 182:4, 7,24 184:11, 14 196:1
<hr/> C <hr/>	cases 154:17 191:6, 12 195:6,7 207:6 208:22		client 148:16 149:18,23 150:13,23 153:15 154:1 156:2,8 161:12,15 162:5 168:14 169:14 174:18,21 177:14 180:6,
CA 145:8	challenged 177:11		
call 203:6 205:7	chance 204:17		
calls 169:8	change 178:25 179:4		
camera 174:25 176:6 186:10	changed 153:23 179:6 181:4 199:24 200:2,11	civility 163:6	
capacity 150:15 188:11,24 189:3,22 190:20,25 198:18 209:2	Chapter 149:12 159:25 166:12	claim 153:1 161:13, 18 168:5 169:19 170:5, 17 177:11,15 179:24 198:2	
care 195:13	characterize 156:25	clause	
carte 159:18			

12,13 181:16 184:4 185:23, 25 186:8 client's 149:17,23 165:7 170:5, 17 181:4 186:7 close 190:3 closing 205:15,17,23 206:5,9,14 closings 207:10,25 comment 148:15,21 comments 164:22 192:20 193:1 compare 188:14 comparing 189:2 complain 147:6 complaint 149:18 150:1, 3,6,23 154:15 157:25 174:17 175:2,9 183:14 187:22 189:10,15,25 190:4,5,23,24 191:16 192:12 195:22 198:12,13 200:8	complaints 149:23 complementary 201:10 complete 164:8 174:17 completeness 158:20 complicated 182:24 comply 161:18 164:7 180:24,25 compound 149:2,3 151:3 comptroller 188:23 concept 194:9 conclude 205:21 concluded 209:20 conclusion 169:9 conclusory 170:19 conduct 154:19 189:7 194:4 conducted 190:18 conduit 196:17,19 confer 204:17,18 confidential	161:5 172:10 183:4 184:4 185:4 confidentiality 182:14,17,23 conflict 201:16 confused 169:23 confusing 178:4 179:17 180:4 Congress 155:4,6 connection 150:24 151:16 152:17 153:4 187:4 consented 196:7 Constitution 161:7 172:12 201:8 constitutional 201:18,19 constitutionall y 197:1 constrained 157:2,6 construction 194:1 contacted 146:23 147:6 contention 177:12 contesting 208:13	context 158:5 continue 159:1 contradict 204:25 contrary 202:18 contribute 163:9 control 149:19,24 150:14,16 161:19 162:6, 17 170:12 188:12,25 195:14 conversation 148:20 203:11 copies 172:4 204:4 copy 157:10 160:15 165:7 199:17, 18 207:18 corner 151:10 correct 151:18,22 162:20 164:15 166:4 169:17 174:2 176:4, 20,22 177:16 178:15 179:1, 13,15,25 182:6,21 185:8 187:5 188:19 189:12,24
---	---	---	--

190:5,13,14 191:12 197:23 198:3,4,9,10, 15,24 199:5, 6,9,10,15,16, 19,20 202:7 208:5 corrected 177:13 Cort 155:3 costs 160:9 Count 149:16 198:4 200:22,24 201:4,5 County 175:24 188:8, 23 192:5 196:1 court 145:3,16,20 146:7 147:3 148:1,6,7 149:3 150:8 152:25 153:9 155:3,4,16,21 156:21 158:17,22 159:13,15,18 160:13,20 161:3,10 162:9 163:2,5 167:20 168:5, 6 169:18,19 170:1 172:14 173:22 174:1, 25 175:2,19 176:5 177:6,	10 182:9,11 183:4,13,16, 17 184:4,15, 18 185:3,24 186:10 187:15 192:1,3,4,10 194:20 195:4, 14 196:3 197:4 201:13, 15,20 202:3, 15,22,25 203:5,20,24 204:1,6,8,12, 16 205:9,12, 15,24 206:3, 11,16 207:1, 13,17,23 208:9,11,18, 21 209:15,19 Court's 175:22 182:22 185:2 192:2 195:5,8 201:16,19 courts 155:2 creating 148:21 190:7 credibility 195:20 credit 164:12 crime 175:5 criminal 150:25 151:17,21 152:18,21 153:5 155:22 156:15 157:8	158:6 159:10, 17 184:7,8 187:5,7,10 201:23 cross 145:17 146:9 cross-examined 158:18 crystal 171:4 cuff 206:18 cure 179:24 custodian 182:8,22 custody 161:19 170:12 190:11,12 192:20 194:20 197:17 198:7, 9,14 <hr/> D <hr/> date 177:24 178:2, 25 dated 189:25 Dave 145:14 176:14 177:21 180:11,15 188:6 day 149:7 153:14 165:10 178:22 209:19	days 166:6,9 176:21,25 177:10,16 178:3,25 179:10,14,15, 16 207:17,22 209:10 DCA 184:10 195:8, 13 202:15 204:5 deal 206:18 dealing 190:24 197:17 decide 199:22 decided 156:25 200:14,19 decision 154:11 162:23 200:12 decisions 148:17 declaration 152:18 declaratory 161:18 170:5, 17 177:15 183:1,18 200:22 201:6 declaring 175:20 decline 171:13 deems 192:10
--	---	---	--

defendant 145:15 179:7 180:6 183:18 188:6,22	devoted 149:7	186:8,23 194:8	doubt 166:10
defense 155:21 156:3 161:12 168:6 169:19 177:12 195:19	dicta 164:8,13 193:3	discretion 154:11	Douglas 145:13
demand 148:23 162:2 165:7,19 166:12,15,17 170:3,4,23 171:9 176:22 178:11,14,20 180:17,22 186:2 197:8, 12	difference 172:24 173:1, 5,11,17 209:1	discuss 194:14	draw 187:24
denial 177:12	differing 181:18	discussed 148:20 186:12 205:16	drop 148:23 179:4, 23 199:23
denying 203:10	direct 149:6 157:20 162:9 171:11 191:16 204:22	discusses 184:19	dropped 179:5,7,24 180:11,15,16, 20 181:10,13 185:16,20 200:4 202:4
Department 195:24,25	directing 160:21	discussion 147:22 186:22	dropping 177:20 180:6 181:2
describing 191:6	direction 182:10,23	discussions 163:14 203:16	due 181:14
detailed 195:17	directly 204:25	dismiss 149:16 156:5, 14 161:24 163:10 164:10,24 192:23 198:20 200:15	duly 146:7 188:6, 22
determine 159:15 175:19 183:16 201:15	disagreed 193:12	disputed 156:16	<hr/> E <hr/>
determined 148:24 182:23 193:8 200:4	disclose 173:6 182:11	dissemination 159:14	earlier 172:9 206:16
determines 168:5 169:18	disclosed 152:19 155:18 159:9,13 173:19 175:1 176:8 187:2 196:10	district 188:7 190:9, 16 191:8	easier 188:16
development 149:8	disclosing 173:1	documents 149:19,25 150:14,16 151:20 152:24 153:11 174:6 175:3 188:12, 25	editorial 148:17
	disclosure 155:16 157:5 158:5,10 159:17 173:17 174:17 182:13 183:4,7,15 185:4,7	door 147:23	Edmondson 147:6,8,16
			elected 188:7,23
			element 167:1,3,5,6,9 201:19

elements 201:5,18	ESQ 146:6	excused 202:22	extension 168:7
email 165:8	essentially 162:22 191:14	exempt 161:5 172:10	extensive 159:24 163:8
Emphasis 157:21	establish 170:6 179:23	exercise 157:4	extensively 149:12 184:19
employees 155:20	established 194:3	exhibit 148:1,4,5	186:13
enclosed 197:15	establishment 168:8	152:7 157:12	<hr/> F <hr/>
enclosure 197:23	event 208:3	165:2 166:16, 17 177:19	fact 175:1 181:9
end 158:4 159:21 183:7,11 186:9 194:9	eventually 153:23	187:25 189:19 190:23 192:23 193:17 197:12 203:2	184:14 185:10 186:14 191:12 192:14 195:7 199:10
ending 193:20	everybody's 204:8	exhibits 146:14 151:8	facts 168:9,15 170:6,18
enforced 154:25	evidence 146:1,15 147:25 148:4, 5 175:23 192:5 203:17, 18,19 204:6	existence 168:14	factual 195:17
enter 203:17	evident 158:3	existing 168:8	fair 194:25
entered 193:15 203:16,18	examination 145:17 146:9 149:6 187:16, 17	expanded 182:25	faith 167:1,2,4,6, 9,10 168:7, 13,25 169:15, 20,21
entire 158:21 167:7 188:3	examined 174:25 176:5 186:10	expectation 168:10	fall 194:8
entity 198:15	excluded 203:21	expedited 192:9	familiar 160:16 172:16 183:24
Epstein 162:17 190:12,18 192:6 202:2	exclusively 201:22	experienced 206:19	famous 155:2
Epstein's 194:4	excuse 150:19 168:11 183:15	expert 208:14	favorable 148:14
equitable 192:10		expressly 157:7	fax 199:17
		extend 209:7	

federal 194:6 195:6 196:2 fees 160:9 165:18, 25 169:1 176:14 180:2 197:22 198:23 199:2,14,18 208:8,16 felt 157:1,5 194:24 file 164:24 184:2, 6 192:3 filed 165:22,25 176:21 177:9, 24 179:23 180:1 182:25 183:23 185:14 186:4 189:15 198:21,23 199:8,18,19 202:8 204:5 files 192:4 filing 154:1 156:4 178:2 183:6 185:7 203:12 final 156:23 157:1, 10 159:1,4 181:24 185:2 186:25 187:1 193:14 194:13 200:22 206:6	finally 200:21 fine 147:2,10 154:8 194:12 finish 156:11 193:23 194:14 firewall 204:23 firm 145:13 161:16 164:14 fits 179:12 flip 159:3 165:1, 14 170:22 Florida 145:9 150:18, 21 154:15 155:10 172:3 175:21 182:15 183:2,5,7 185:5 188:8, 10,24 189:6 190:7 191:5 192:1 195:8 198:15 201:8, 20 follow 164:21 182:22 formulating 206:6 found 150:2 165:4 foundation 147:1	fourth 152:13 184:10 202:15 204:5 front 151:7 157:11 188:2 furtherance 152:23 156:17 201:12,22 furthering 158:2,4 159:21 194:2, 9 <hr/> G <hr/> gain 175:22 176:3, 7 gave 153:17 154:10 178:24 179:2 194:23 General 182:15 183:5, 8 185:5 gentleman 158:17 163:2 Gerard 145:6 189:18 give 146:1 174:6 177:2,3 180:19 205:17,19 206:4,24 207:1,11,13, 17,23,24 208:1,18 209:9	giving 181:8 goal 186:7,9,25 187:1 God 196:25 good 145:5,12 146:11,12 148:7 167:1, 2,4,6,9,10 168:6,13,25 169:15,20,21 187:19 government 196:3 grand 150:20 154:12,16,19 155:20 158:6 159:9,12,20 161:9,20 162:6,17 172:2,13,14 175:24 182:14,17 183:19 184:16,22 187:1 188:9 189:8,12 190:8,12,13, 16,18 191:1, 7,11,13 192:5,20 193:11 194:21 195:1,10,15, 21 196:2 197:17 198:16,17,19
--	---	--	--

199:25 200:1 201:9 202:2, 14 207:5 208:25 209:3 grant 186:23 189:6 192:9 granted 190:17 great 160:17 186:25 206:25 209:19 Greenberg 145:8 169:3 group 163:14 guess 181:18 204:1 guidance 207:2 guilty 194:6 guys 208:2 <hr/> H <hr/> Hafele 156:22,25 157:1,9 186:13,24 192:15 193:15 Hafele's 186:15 half 186:21 hand 167:23 174:21	handed 175:7 happen 196:22 happened 148:11 174:8 180:7 happening 179:18 happy 150:4 184:18 188:5 206:4 harbor 165:22 199:21 hard 199:18 hear 195:1 207:3 heard 200:19 hearing 163:10 164:20 192:18,19 199:2,6,11, 13,15 209:12, 20 held 148:24 Hey 173:12 highlighted 160:24 hold 147:19 203:12 Holdings 145:9 honest 173:10	honestly 173:20 Honor 145:5,12,18 146:25 147:21 149:1 150:9 158:19,25 159:1 160:4 163:4 188:16 203:7,15,23, 25 204:4,19 205:1,14 206:8 207:12, 15,21 208:6, 10 209:13,14, 17,18 Horowitz 209:6 hour's 186:21 hours 149:8 hundreds 149:8 <hr/> I <hr/> identification 186:11 identified 182:10 identify 175:3 illegal 146:24 Imagine 196:23 implied 155:2,7	important 197:3 impossibility 164:2,6 impossible 170:13 in-camera 152:24 153:9 191:23 192:7, 13 inaccurate 175:6 178:9 incarceration 194:7 inclined 186:15,23 included 198:17 indicted 186:12 individual 190:20 inform 196:21 informing 175:25 inherent 157:2,5 175:22 192:2 194:20,21 195:4,5 201:14,19 initial 184:18 198:12 initially 153:21 168:6 169:19
--	---	--	---

inquiry 158:24	issues 182:9	183:1,2,14,18 185:2,19 192:14 193:14 194:14 198:20 200:22 201:6 202:20 206:6	183:19 184:16,22 187:1 188:9 189:8,12 190:12,13,16, 18 191:1,11, 13 192:6,20 193:11 194:21 195:1,10,15, 21 196:2 197:17 198:16,17,19 199:25 200:1 201:9 202:2, 14 207:5 208:25 209:3
inspection 152:24 153:9 191:23 192:7, 13	italics 159:19		
instance 205:6	J	judicial 182:16 183:5, 8,24 185:6 188:7 190:9, 16 191:8	
instances 159:8	J17 176:13	July 166:1,3 176:18 198:24 199:12,14	
interaction 156:4	Jacobs 145:13	June 149:15 163:10 165:11 166:7 167:16 178:23 179:10 197:10 200:17	justice 152:23 156:17 158:2,4 159:21 194:2, 9 195:25 201:12,22
interactions 196:8	Jane 196:23		Justice's 195:25
interest 182:9 194:7	Jeffrey 190:18 192:6 202:2	juries 154:16 190:8 191:7	
interpret 181:19	Jennifer 145:7	jurisdiction 190:7	K
interpreted 158:5	Joe 196:23	jurisdictional 181:11	knew 186:3,4
interruption 156:12	joint 165:1 204:9	jurist 193:7	knowledge 164:11
investigation 190:13 192:7	joked 206:16	jury 150:20 154:12,19 155:20 158:6 159:9,12,20 161:9,20 162:6,17 172:2,14 175:24 182:14,17	Krischer 190:21 195:11 196:7
investigations 189:8	judge 149:15 156:22,25 157:1,3,4,8 163:25 164:5 186:13,15,24 192:15,18,19, 25 193:4,6,15 209:7		Krischer's 196:9
involved 189:9	judge's 164:22		L
involvement 163:9	judgment 156:23 157:1, 10 159:1,4 161:25 181:24		Lago 207:4
involving 151:21 187:11			
issue 184:10,25 185:22 186:1, 24 194:18 205:3 208:25			

laid 195:16	legislative 209:8	<hr/> M <hr/>	149:15 164:1, 5 192:25 193:4
language 154:25 155:14,24 156:17 179:13 189:14 201:11	letter 146:17 165:7, 15 166:16,17 167:12,16,21 170:3,4,14, 16,23 171:4, 8,12,15 178:23 180:17,23 181:5 197:15, 23 198:9 200:17	Madam 145:20	master 186:19
Lauren 145:6		made 156:5,13 161:16,22,24 164:18,19,20 170:8,13 176:18 180:2 184:9 185:11, 12,15,17,18 192:8,15,19	material 168:9,15 170:6
law 145:13 168:8 169:13 170:18 172:3 183:17 190:22,24 198:16 209:7	limited 152:20,21	mail 199:17	materials 150:24 151:1, 16,24 152:17, 19 153:16 156:14 158:6, 10 159:9,20 161:20 162:7, 17 172:2,23, 25 173:1,5,6 175:25 182:8, 12,22 183:19 184:16,22,23 186:16 187:2 193:12 194:8 195:19 196:2, 11,13 197:1, 18 198:21 200:1 201:10 202:2,14,18
laws 155:8	limits 159:7	maintain 163:5 182:17	
lawsuit 149:9 154:1 174:14,20 180:15,21 181:3,6,13 183:23 185:14 186:4 187:14 196:24	list 205:2	majority 208:8	
lawyer 169:14	listed 203:8	make 148:15,17,18 154:10,11 164:21 169:15 173:22	
lay 206:15	litany 191:6	makes 157:16 171:4 193:25	math 166:9
lead 162:18	long 154:23	making 170:10 171:3 178:8 181:15	matter 147:13 183:17
left 145:16 151:10	longer 181:16 184:23 185:25 200:20 202:13	manner 179:20	matters 194:3,7
legal 155:19 156:4 169:9 192:10 195:17 204:24	looked 191:5	Mark 145:6	media 196:18,19
legally 208:15	loop 190:3	Marx 192:18,19 193:6	memo 208:7
	losing 168:12,24	Marx's	Mendelsohn 145:11 146:6,
	lot 178:4 206:1, 17		

11 154:21 158:12,14 159:3 160:6 161:11 162:10 163:8 169:5, 25 173:21 174:16 179:22 181:19 185:1 187:19 197:7 203:10 204:23 205:4	13 161:24,25 163:10,13 164:10,24 165:18,19,20, 21,25 176:14 177:8,11 180:2,25 181:8,9 183:7,14,15 184:2,6,9 185:7,19 192:14,23 197:8,9,15, 16,22 198:20, 23,25 199:2, 4,7,10,14,18 202:19 205:11	needed 153:15,17 154:4,5,9 168:16 194:14 200:7,12,20 205:18	199:11,13 Notwithstanding 168:3 November 189:15 199:8, 19
mention 199:11 mentioned 153:8 200:21 middle 166:23 Mike 147:6,16 MILLER 204:10 mind 189:19 minute 208:1 minutes 175:23 192:4 204:13 mixing 180:9 modification 168:7 moment 204:10,12 monetary 168:4 motion 149:16 156:5,	move 149:5 153:13 154:21 169:25 197:4 moved 180:1,5 183:1 moving 159:23	negotiations 146:16,22 147:19,20,24 148:22 203:13,20 neutral 153:20 184:25 neutrality 153:24 154:2 184:21 200:1, 11 news 204:24 newspaper 148:21 157:16 158:9 173:13 182:25 186:16 193:25 newspaper's 183:14 non-movant 204:7 non-objection 200:10 202:1 Nonetheless 182:12 nonpossession 164:12 notes 160:19 161:1, 4 172:9 notice 177:20 196:3	number 150:3 154:18 165:2 171:5 175:10 177:19 178:8 179:17 193:20 201:5, 18 <hr/> O <hr/> object 153:16,17,22 154:4,5,9 202:11 203:18 205:1 objected 153:20 164:14 objection 146:25 147:21 148:7 149:1 169:8 200:10, 11 205:10 objections 164:18,19,22 objects 202:13 208:8 obligation 209:8 obligations 175:20 obtaining 183:3 185:4 186:7 195:19
	N		
	named 189:3,11,22 190:10,11 198:18 201:1 209:2 names 188:19 naming 198:11 narrow 193:5 201:23		

<p>obvious 191:8</p> <p>occur 163:17</p> <p>occurred 185:20</p> <p>occurs 159:15</p> <p>October 153:23 177:21,24 179:8,9 200:15 202:6</p> <p>offense 169:24</p> <p>offer 148:6</p> <p>offered 147:19 148:23</p> <p>office 149:24 150:15 153:21 154:10 161:17 163:16 170:11 174:6 188:11,25 196:1,4,9 197:18</p> <p>official 150:15 188:11,24 189:22 190:20,25 198:18 209:2</p> <p>one-page 197:9</p> <p>open 159:14</p> <p>opened 147:23</p>	<p>opening 164:2</p> <p>opportunity 153:18 194:24 195:2 200:9, 19</p> <p>opposes 184:23</p> <p>opposing 198:21</p> <p>opposition 185:19 199:25 202:17</p> <p>option 154:10</p> <p>oral 186:13</p> <p>order 149:15 161:9 172:14 192:3, 22,23,25 193:4 196:3</p> <p>ordered 155:16 202:3, 14</p> <p>orders 207:25 209:10</p> <p>original 189:25 190:4 199:2,14</p> <p>originally 200:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <hr/> <p>p.m. 145:2 204:14, 15 209:20</p>	<p>Palm 145:9 152:16 162:19 175:18,22,24 176:3 188:8, 23 191:25 192:5,8 196:1</p> <p>paper 148:13,18 175:7 177:11 186:17</p> <p>paragraph 150:3,6,7,11 152:10 154:13,14 157:21 160:18 161:1 162:13 168:5,11,12, 23,24 169:18 171:11,15,22 182:19 188:1, 3,18,19,21 189:4,5,25 190:1,4 191:2,16 193:23 195:21</p> <p>paragraphs 189:2</p> <p>paralegal 145:7</p> <p>parentheses 158:2</p> <p>part 146:14,15 147:15 148:4, 5,22 150:10 163:14 181:16 186:1 187:7, 10 194:2</p>	<p>participate 194:24</p> <p>parties 155:18 175:20 204:2 209:5</p> <p>party 177:8 180:15 185:10,25 207:7 209:2</p> <p>party's 168:12,24</p> <p>past 165:15</p> <p>pendency 146:22</p> <p>pending 147:19 151:18,21 158:6 184:6,8 187:7,10 201:23 203:14</p> <p>penultimate 171:20,21</p> <p>people 186:11 206:17,18,20</p> <p>performance 164:3</p> <p>period 179:25</p> <p>personal 164:10</p> <p>persons 155:21</p> <p>phone 147:13,17</p> <p>phrase 158:4 194:10</p>
---	--	---	---

physical 172:2	145:10 151:20,21	previously 146:24	18 185:3 192:11
pin 178:17	152:17,22,25 156:6 162:19	primary 190:14	proposed 165:21 207:25 209:10
plaintiff 145:10 177:20	175:18,22 176:3 187:6, 11 191:25	prior 149:15 150:17 152:25 153:9 195:17 199:19	prosecuted 146:24
planning 206:10	192:8 196:17, 25 199:22	private 193:9,10 198:1	prosecution 155:22
plea 194:6	200:3,6,14,16 201:8	problem 181:7	protect 198:19
point 171:14 200:6, 14 204:2	potential 163:15 175:4 194:5	procedure 183:2,3 184:7,13 185:4	protection 198:17
portions 146:16 194:13	power 191:11	proceeding 159:14 167:7 182:24 184:8 190:18 198:16	protector 190:25
position 153:20,22,23 154:2 178:25 179:4,6 180:11,14,16, 21 181:1,3,4 182:4,7,13 184:11,14,21 197:24 199:24 200:2 202:17, 19	powers 154:19	proceedings 145:2 150:20 188:10 189:12 207:6	provide 160:2,7 170:13 172:4 181:12 184:18 197:25 205:22
possession 149:19,24 150:14,16 161:19 162:6, 16 164:11 172:2 188:12, 25 189:23 190:11 192:20 194:19 197:17 198:7,9,13	practice 154:23 182:16 183:5,8 185:5	process 190:16 194:21 195:15	provided 152:2
possibly 186:19	preeminent 194:22	produce 182:11	provision 160:16 167:11 201:6
Post	prefer 205:22	prohibit 172:21	provisions 161:6 172:11
	prepare 206:22 207:9	prohibiting 174:5	public 175:1 176:1 186:8,16,17 187:2 192:9 194:7 195:1 196:4,13,16, 17,18,20,21, 23 198:22
	prepared 206:8	prohibits 172:3	publisher 145:9
	prescribed 159:16	proper 153:25 183:3,	pull
	presence 145:4		
	present 159:16 184:11		
	presented 168:6 169:19 175:24 177:10 192:5		

189:17	quotes	reasonable	192:21
purpose	158:2	168:10	recoverable
155:23 158:11		reasoned	208:17
175:25	<hr/>	193:7	redact
purposes	R	reasons	175:3
181:11	raise	171:13 200:17	redacting
pursuant	185:23,24	reassess	186:18
155:16 161:10	raised	184:15	redirect
172:15 175:21	205:4	rebuttal	157:20 172:8
188:8,10	rate	203:6,8	187:16,17
192:1	208:13,15	204:20 205:8	referenced
put	rates	recall	198:8
149:12 162:1	208:12	147:12 156:2	referring
179:20 203:11	re-evaluated	161:12 170:25	164:17 166:14
putting	200:3	189:16	167:13,17
147:24	read	received	179:6 181:9
	155:15 157:24	176:22	refers
<hr/>	158:21 159:5	recess	172:18
Q	160:20 161:3	209:16	rejected
<hr/>	162:14,15,21	recognize	171:9
question	163:22 164:1	165:6,17	relationship
151:3,13	167:19 168:16	171:8	159:21
164:9 173:8,	169:3,10	recollection	release
15,16,24	172:9 177:6	205:6	152:25 153:9
178:5,6,10	182:19 185:3	reconsider	159:19 183:19
179:18,20	187:21 188:3,	204:20 205:13	184:21,23
180:20 183:21	21 191:18,24	record	186:15 198:21
186:6 197:20	193:1,19,23	164:1,20	199:25
questions	201:21 207:5	204:14	202:14,18
181:20 187:13	reading	records	released
197:14 202:21	150:1 157:22	160:19 161:4	161:8 172:13
quote	158:1 172:6	164:3 170:12	releasing
149:24 158:4	182:5 201:21,	172:10	202:1
159:21,22	23	173:12,13	relevant
166:12 167:2	real	174:1,11,18,	205:11
183:7 194:2,9	182:9	21,24 182:18	relief
quoted	reason	183:4 184:4	161:18 170:5,
150:18 154:14	151:24 166:10	185:5 186:7	17 177:15
166:11,23	170:24 190:14	187:10 190:12	
170:23	195:17 198:11		

192:10 200:22	research	Rules	158:3 159:8,
remain	149:8,11	182:15 183:24	12,16,18
200:3	155:11,25		161:6,7
remember	159:24	s	168:11 170:23
147:9 169:13	resolution		172:11,12,15,
removed	194:5	safe	18 175:21
186:11	resources	165:22 199:21	177:9 188:9,
repeat	196:21	safe-harbor	10 190:6
149:22	respect	179:25 180:5	192:2,15
reply	181:14 193:6	181:8,12	194:2
184:19 204:5	respectfully	sanction	securities
report	175:19 191:25	162:18	155:8
195:25	responded	sanctions	seek
reported	146:8	168:4 177:8	151:23 184:15
196:2	rested	197:8,16	193:11 197:1
reporter	204:2,9	199:8	201:9
146:23	rests	SAO	seeking
representations	204:7	146:23	150:24
168:14	result	Scholz	151:16,20
request	183:16	145:13	152:17,24
153:16,19	reversal	scope	153:7,8,10
161:8 172:13	168:8	152:19 159:8	158:5,10
174:17 187:9	review	scratch	162:18 169:1
192:13	171:4 175:2	149:16	177:8 183:7
requested	186:19	screen	185:7
151:1,16,24	rights	188:15	seeks
161:19 162:6	175:19	seasoned	152:18
164:3 187:1	role	193:6	sense
191:22	182:21,24	seated	159:22 194:10
requesting	rule	145:3 204:16	sentence
172:4	158:20 182:15	208:18	150:17 152:13
requests	183:2,5,8,15,	secrecy	158:21 159:5
175:19 192:1	24 184:3,5,	154:12 182:14	160:18,25
required	12,20 185:5,	195:1 198:18,	162:15 171:25
182:17	11,13,18	19	182:3 183:12
requires	186:4 193:4	secret	187:21
159:17 183:6	ruled	196:2	served
185:6	193:5	section	177:9,16
		152:22 155:8	178:3,11,13,
			19 180:22

181:5,8,10	160:2,22	182:1	155:12 173:25
197:9	162:12 165:5,	stamped	175:1 200:13
service	16 170:10	162:10	201:25
177:11	171:14 172:7	stamps	statement
set	173:20 174:6	151:7	164:2,13
183:4 185:5	202:23,25	standing	172:9 202:9
189:10 197:22	208:23	201:9	statements
199:1,6,14	situation	start	164:1,6,8,15,
200:16	159:20 189:9	146:13 171:21	19,20 203:9
settle	skipping	starts	states
148:14	169:5	152:13 160:18	155:3 195:22
settlement	social	161:1 162:13	statute
146:16,19,22	194:10	171:15,23	150:18 154:15
147:18,20,22,	solely	state	157:2,6
24 148:13,22	190:11	145:14	167:3,14
203:13,16,20	solemnly	150:19,20	168:20 169:7
204:21	145:25	153:21	172:22 174:5
sex	sought	154:10,16,18	175:21 177:3
192:6	151:1	157:7 161:7	179:2,15
shared	sound	162:18 163:16	181:19 188:9,
196:1	166:3	164:11 170:9	10 189:6
Sharon	speak	172:1,3,5,12,	191:5,10,13
188:22	147:11	19,21 177:21	192:1 193:11
show	speaking	185:9,10,16,	194:22 195:6,
150:4 160:23	147:12	20 188:7	13 197:25
167:14	specifically	189:3,7,11	198:2 201:10,
sic	155:4	190:7,10,15,	11,21,24
159:8	specifics	21,25 191:7,	203:21
simple	170:20	10,14 192:3,	statute's
173:24 178:10	spoke	21 194:5,18,	166:23
179:22	147:15,18	23,25 195:2,	Statutes
simultaneously	spoken	7,9,18 196:8	190:7
186:17	147:8	197:18 198:7,	statutory
sir	stamp	8,11 199:1,	154:24 179:12
145:19,22	150:2,8 151:6	23,24 200:2,	STENOGRAPHER
149:14 150:10	152:2 165:4,	7,15,18,25	158:15
151:8,14	15 166:20	201:25 202:4	step
152:8 154:7	175:10 176:17	207:6 209:4	154:7
157:18,20		stated	Stephen
		149:7 154:13	

145:10 146:6 stipulated 208:4,7 stop 173:23 strong 157:16 193:25 subdivision 161:6 subject 149:20,25 150:17 188:13 189:1 193:13 submitted 208:7,22 subpoenaed 207:7 209:4 subsection 155:17 157:22 158:1 159:7 166:13 167:4, 8,9,14,20 168:20 177:4 179:15 subsections 168:3 substances 146:24 succeed 153:1 success 168:10 successful 156:19 successor 190:21 sue 190:19	sued 153:15 184:4 188:11,24 sufficient 207:14,16 suggest 175:6 suggested 148:12,15 suggesting 156:24 165:21 195:12 suing 169:14 summary 161:25 183:2, 14 185:19 192:14 198:20 202:19 superior 195:5 201:17 superseded 194:22 supervise 189:7 supervision 198:16 supplement 205:18,19 supplemental 160:8 206:10 support 153:19 supported 170:5 supposed 184:3	Supreme 155:3 184:15 195:8 201:20 surrounding 194:4 sustained 148:8 149:3 swear 145:20,25 sworn 145:23 146:7 system 191:1 <hr/> T <hr/> tab 157:13,15 160:3,4 162:10 171:5 175:10,12 176:13 177:19 181:24 talk 208:14 talked 146:18 167:18 talking 148:1 173:23 tandem 158:3 tangent 197:2 team 195:19 204:24 telling 156:22 terrific 207:12	testified 146:8 153:15, 22 testifying 158:22 testimony 155:20 159:9, 13 175:23 176:4,7 192:4 204:22 things 153:18 178:4 179:17,19 180:9 206:20 Thomson 145:7 thought 163:15,16 tied 201:22 time 147:18 149:12 163:3,24 184:11 185:9, 17 187:7 196:8,21 199:19 202:8 205:16,19 206:22 207:9, 20 208:9 times 146:19 161:16,23 today 198:3 205:21 told 166:3 top 159:5 182:2
---	--	---	---

transcript 163:22 192:18,19 207:18	unambiguous 154:24	<hr/> V <hr/>	175:11,18 191:17,19,20, 24
transcriptions 160:19 161:5 172:10	uncertain 184:14	verbatim 162:21	Whetstone 145:5,6,18 146:25 147:21 149:1 169:8
Traurig 145:8	unclear 201:17	versus 173:12 180:5	187:18 188:15,17 189:18,20
Travel 208:9	underlying 187:5	victim 195:20	197:6 202:21, 24 203:1,7, 15,23 204:3,7 205:1,10 206:8,12 207:5,14,15, 21 208:6,10, 20,24 209:13, 18
treat 183:13	undermined 195:20	view 184:8	whichever 206:6
trial 158:18 206:19	understand 173:3,9,19 197:19	views 181:19	withdraw 177:15 179:14,16 186:2
true 146:14,18,21 147:5,17 149:7,17,22 150:22 153:14 161:15 162:4 170:4 186:7	understanding 154:24	vis-à-vis 154:12 157:2	withdrawn 177:13
truth 146:2,3	understands 170:1	voice 195:1 200:10	witnesses 175:4
turning 189:21 193:14	United 155:3	voiced 200:10	words 186:15
twofold 173:15	unlimited 151:1,23 153:5,7,10 159:14	<hr/> W <hr/>	worth 186:21
<hr/> U <hr/>	Unquestionably 194:3	wanted 148:22 154:6, 12 157:4 175:7 178:17 191:19 192:22 194:14 204:4	wraps 167:7
U.S. 195:25 196:8 201:7	unquote 194:3	Weatherby 208:22,23	write 148:13 206:9
Uh-huh 152:6 176:15	unsigned 165:21	week 206:24 207:11,13,14, 15	writing 205:19
ultimately 195:15	unsupported 170:17	weeks 207:23,24	
	untrue 148:9	whatsoever 155:23	
	utilize 193:11	wherefore	

206:17,21	Zoom	
written	163:18	
147:7 154:25		
205:23 206:5,		
14,23 207:25		
wrong		
169:17 170:20		
Wylar		
145:12,13,14,		
19 146:10,12		
147:2,4,23		
148:3,10		
149:4 150:9,		
12 158:25		
159:2 160:3,		
5,12,14		
163:4,7		
169:10,16		
181:14		
187:12,21		
191:18 192:17		
193:1,19		
197:14 198:6		
203:3,6,9,22,		
25 204:19		
205:7,14,22,		
25 206:24		
207:11,19		
208:23		
209:14,17		
<hr/>		
y		
<hr/>		
yesterday		
204:22		
<hr/>		
z		
<hr/>		
zealously		
182:12		