EXHIBIT AAA

MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT BY DEFENDANTS KATHERINE MEYER, ERIC GLITZENSTEIN, AND MEYER GLITZENSTEIN & CRYSTAL

Civ. No. 07-1532 (EGS/JMF)

į		
l	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
2		X
3	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY	Docket No. 03-2006
4	TO ANIMALS, ET AL, Plaintiffs,	
5	∨.	Washington, D.C. February 12, 2009 2:40 p.m.
6	FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,	PM SESSION
7	Defend	
8	TRANSCRIPT OF BENCH TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
9		
10	APPEARANCES:	
11		A SANERIB, ESQUIRE
12	61	IANNA J. WINDERS, ESQUIRE r, Glitzenstein & Crystal
13	Suit	Connecticut Avenue, N.W. e 700
14	11	ington, D.C. 20009 588.5206
15	<u> </u>	M. SIMPSON, ESQUIRE
16	LANC	ZEILER JOINER, ESQUIRE E L. SHEA, ESQUIRE
17	MICH	L. PETTEWAY, ESQUIRE ELLE PARDO, ESQUIRE
18		right & Jaworski, LLP Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
19	11	e 500 ington, D.C. 20004
20	202.	724.6522
21	11 =	lina Kerr, RPR District Courthouse
22	Room	6716
		ington, D.C. 20001 354.3258
23	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript	
24	produced by computer.	
25		

1 MS. MEYER: Objection, Your Honor, that just completely misstates what Mr. Rider says in response to that. 2 3 THE COURT: Well, read it. Take a look at it. Read it carefully, Mr. Rider, and then if you want him to repeat 4 the question you can -- Ask the question again, Counsel. 5 6 What's your question? 7 (BY MR. SIMPSON) You objected in that first paragraph to the first sentence of this interrogatory, did you not, that I just read? 9 MS. MEYER: And objection, Your Honor, because the 10 rest of the response says that subject to a protective order 11 12 he would provide all of the information --13 THE COURT: He can answer it. He can testify. Read 14 the answer and then respond to his question. 15 THE WITNESS: Could you please just ask the question 16 again so I have it clear. 17 THE COURT: Counsel, the answer does speak for 18 itself. It's in the record. Ask him a question about his understanding of that. 19 (BY MR. SIMPSON) All right. Well, let me ask you this 20 21 question. As to the second part of your answer, you say 22 (reading) Subject to and without waiving the foregoing or 23 general objections to these interrogatories, Mr. Rider provides the following answer to the second sentence of this 24 interrogatory, colon, I have not received any such compensation.

1 Have I read that correctly? 2 Yes. 3 And the second sentence of this interrogatory states, (reading) If the money or items were given to you as 4 5 compensation for services rendered, describe the services 6 rendered and the amount of compensation. 7 Have I read that correctly? 8 Yes, sir. So you told us that you had not received such 9 compensation; isn't that right? 10 11 No, sir, I believe we gave you everything. 12 THE COURT: Let me ask you this: What did you 13 intend -- when you signed your name to that answer, what did 14 you intend by that response, "I have not received any such compensation," what did you mean by that? 15 16 THE WITNESS: Well, I believe it was for when he 17 talks about services rendered. I didn't look at it -- I never looked at it doing this as a job. I looked at it as doing a 18 service. I was speaking for the elephants. So that would be 19 20 the reason I'd say I had no such compensation because it -- it looks like I'm saying, "Oh, yes, I would do this." I wasn't 21 22 getting paid to do this, so that would be my answer to that. The first part --23 24 THE COURT: You weren't getting paid to do it. 25 the money was being paid to you for what purpose?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: To -- for all my expenses to go around and do my media, my public service, speaking to legislature and things like that. That part of it I did not consider a job; henceforth, I didn't think it -- I didn't consider it compensation. I may be -- I'm only a person. Maybe I don't understand that part of it, but that's why I would say I did not receive any compensation. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: As far as payment for doing it. (BY MR. SIMPSON) But at the time this interrogatory was answered in 2004, you had been paid money by PAWS, correct? I had been given grants by PAWS. They were in the form of money, were they not? Yes, it was. And you had received money from Meyer, Glitzenstein & Crystal, correct? Yes, sir. And you received money from the Wildlife Advocacy Project, correct? Yes, sir. At some point in this case, the judge overruled your objections to this interrogatory, didn't he? I don't know if he can answer that one. THE COURT: Maybe you should ask -- that calls for a legal conclusion.