_	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	
4	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE CIVIL ACTION NO. 03-02006 PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS, ET AL
6	WASHINGTON, D.C.
7	VERSUS THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2008
) R	villoso inologii, iniloi o, 2000
9	RINGLING BROTHERS AND BARNUM & 10:00 A.M. BAILEY CIRCUS, ET AL
10	
11	EVIDENTIARY HEARING
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN M. FACCIOLA
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14	
15	<u>APPEARANCES:</u>
16	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, ERIC R. GLITZENSTEIN, ESQ. HOWARD M. CRYSTAL, ESQ.
17	KIMBERLY D. OCKENE, ESQ. MEYER, GLITZENSTEIN &
18	CRYSTAL 1601 Connecticut Ave.,NW
19	Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20009
20	(202) 588-5206
21	MATTHEW F. STOWE, ESQ.
22	PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER, LLP
23	875 15th Street,NW Washington, DC 20005
24	(202) 551–1700
25	

```
FOR THE DEFENDANTS,
                                            JOHN M. SIMPSON, ESQ.
                                            LISA Z. JOINER, ESQ.
                                            GEORGE A. GASPER, ESQ.
                                            KARA PETTEWAY, ESQ.
                                            FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP
                                            801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
                                            Washington, D.C.
                                                               20004
                                            (202)662-4501
       REPORTED BY:
                                            WENDY C. RICARD, CCR, RPR
                                            OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
                                            333 Constitution Ave., NW
                                            #6718
                                            Washington, D.C.
                                                               20001
                                            (202)354-3111
       Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography.
10
       Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
11
12
13
                                INDEX
       WITNESSES:
                                                      PAGE:
14
           TRACY SILVERMAN
15
              BY MS. JOINER
                                                       8
16
17
              BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN
                                                        46
18
           MICHAEL MARKARIAN
              BY MR. GASPER
                                                       50
19
20
       EXHIBITS:
21
       PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT NO. 7 (Tab "C" documents) 47
22
       DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT NO. 23(Interrogatories/
                                                       49
                                   Documents)
       DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT NO.45
                                  (Declaration/
                                                       85
23
                                    Documents)
```

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Civil case # 03-02006, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals versus Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey Circus, et al.

For the plaintiff is Katherine Meyer, Kimberly
Ockene, Eric Glitzenstein. Representing the defendant is Lisa
Joiner, John Simpson, George Gasper, Kara Petteway.

This is an evidentiary hearing. Also present is Ms. Jane Lyons (Phonetic) from the United States Attorney's Office.

THE COURT: Ms. Lyons, would you come up please?

Ms. Lyons, as I've explained to you, a question arose pursuant to an obligation I had to review certain documents which had been redacted as your role in transmitting those documents to one or both of the parties in this case.

Ms. Lyons, would you be so kind as to tell them what you told me?

MS. LYONS: I'm afraid I don't recall with precision the conversations I had either with Mr. Gasper or with you, but I can state for the record that I settled the ASPCA versus Department of Agriculture, civil action 05-840, which was also pending before Judge Sullivan, with the intention of allowing the maximum amount of information to be released to the parties, but we released it through the ASPCA's lawyers for more — you could say enlightened redaction and application of FOIA exemptions and governmental privileges that we were

fighting about. And that was our intention when we released the documents to the ASPCA, that they would, with a better eye than someone at the USDA, with their black magic marker — with a better eye, they could redact the documents more appropriately and, hopefully, minimize the disputes in discovery in this case.

THE COURT: And what happened then?

MS. LYONS: Well, I received phone calls from Mr. Gasper twice; Ms. Ockene has called me a couple of times.

You've called me a couple of times.

THE COURT: Okay. But to back up a bit, the suit that was pending before Judge Sullivan was a suit by the ASPCA that sought under FOIA certain documents that were in the possession of the Department of Agriculture.

MS. LYONS: Yes. They were also sought under a subpoena, and we settled the matter purely under the subpoena.

THE COURT: And you made these documents available to -- when you made the documents available to the ASPCA, were there any redactions that had been done by the agency pursuant to the exceptions under FOIA?

MS. LYONS: They had received most of the documents previously in a redacted form, and we had filed -- indicies and assertions of governmental privilege with Judge Sullivan.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LYONS: And then to settle the lawsuit, we

provided the same documents, plus a few more that we had found during the settlement negotiations, in an unredacted form, but with the intention that the information in them would still be protected and used only in this litigation, and at the conclusion of this litigation either be destroyed or returned to the agency.

THE COURT: And I take it -- thank you, Ms. Lyons.

Does anybody have any questions of Ms. Lyons? Then to pick up
the thread, when the documents are given to the ASPCA, then
are any additional redactions made? Mister --

MS. OCKENE: Thank you, Your Honor. When we received the documents pursuant to our settlement agreement with the USDA, the only redactions we made in turning the materials over to the defendant, pursuant to our discovery obligations with the defendant in this case, we only sought to redact the names and specific identifying information like Social Security numbers and address of individuals who we believed were not yet known to the defendant, and who had lodged complaints or otherwise alerted the USDA to the mis-treatment of the animals by Ringling Brothers. So we were seeking to protect the legitimate privacy interest of third parties.

THE COURT: And those are documents which I in turn reviewed which are on the CD-rom.

MS. OCKENE: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Any questions for Ms. Lyons by anyone?

MR. GASPER: Your Honor, may we respond to Ms.

Ockene's -- it's more to address the Court than Ms. Lyons.

THE COURT: Well, if you need Ms. Lyons, she has

MR. GASPER: No, Your Honor.

other things to do. Do you need --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Ms. Lyons. You're excused. I appreciate your coming today.

MS. LYONS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You're welcome. Yes, sir.

MR. GASPER: Good morning, Your Honor. George
Gasper for the defendant. Just following up so that the
record is clear here that what's been redacted by plaintiffs,
we understand, is the names of individuals, as well as other
information. The other information is in our notes back at
the office, but, in terms of the names of the individuals,
this isn't necessarily a privacy matter. These are people who
would be potential witnesses in this case, and so it's the
identity of potential witnesses the plaintiffs have now been
given access to, but not the defendant.

And so -- there's a case back in 2007, Your Honor -- I do not have the citation with me -- but it's one of your cases in which you held that what one side has access to under Rule 45, the other side has equal access to.

THE COURT: Let me explain what I did. When I got the CD-rom, all right, I went back through them and looked at that the redactions, and they were redactions of identifying information of people who made complaints.

MR. GASPER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And why were those redactions improper?

I thought that's what Ms. Lyons just told us.

MR. GASPER: The redactions are improper in the sense that what's now been given to plaintiffs is the identity of people who could be witnesses in this case, either that could have been deposed by Feld already or could be called by either side, and so these are people who have — the underlying complaints here of the USDA involve the same allegations that are at issue in this lawsuit, and so these are people who have witnessed actions that are at issue in this lawsuit.

THE COURT: Let's proceed because we've got witnesses here. We'll have to put this to one side, and I'll put it down for separate hearing. Call your next witness.

MS. OCKENE: May I respond just briefly?

THE COURT: Well, we're going to -- I've got to go back over this myself. I'm going to have to look at them again and refresh my recollection as to what's going on here. But I wanted to make sure you both had a chance to hear what Ms. Lyons told me because, now, I understand what happened;

```
but now I've got to go back through them one by one and see
       what was deleted.
                 MS. OCKENE: For the record, Your Honor, we do not
       intend to call any of the witnesses, any of the individuals,
       whose names are redacted.
                 THE COURT: All right. As I say, we'll have to put
       it to one side. I'll have to pull out -- look at it again.
       Okay. Please call your next witness.
                 MS. JOINER: -- Tracy Silverman, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry?
10
11
                 MS. JOINER: Tracy Silverman.
12
                 THE COURT: Ms. Silverman, please. Once again, all
13
       other witnesses must step out.
                 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ms. Silverman has already been
14
15
       sworn.
16
                 THE COURT: Yes, she has. Ms. Silverman, I remind
17
       you you're under oath.
18
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
19
20
                 TRACY SILVERMAN, called as a witness herein, after
21
       having been duly sworn previously, testified as follows:
22
      BY MS. JOINER:
23
            Excuse me. Ms. Silverman, when we left off the other
24
       Q.
       day, you had identified approximately five conference calls in
```

which you had communications with the organizational plaintiffs regarding Mr. Rider's funding, correct?

- A. I don't recall, but I'll take your word for it.
- Q. Who participated in those five conference calls?
- A. And these are the conference calls again about funding?
- Q. That's correct.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. That would have been the organizational plaintiffs involved in the lawsuit.
- Q. And who from the organizational plaintiffs would have participated?
- A. Most likely it would have been Lisa Weisberg from the ASPCA; Nicole Paquette from the Animal Protection Institute, and that was when she was officially a plaintiff -- or I'm sorry -- when API had become a plaintiff; myself; Cathy Liss from AWI; and, I believe, John Lavorn and/or Ethan Eddy (Phonetic) for the Fund.
- Q. Did Ms. Meyer also participate from the Wildlife Advocacy Project?
- A. Not in those calls that we were talking specifically about contributions from the group, specific dollar amounts. I can't recall if she was on any of those phone calls. I know she's been on phone calls when we talked about media strategy, and if there happened to be a call where those things overlapped, she may have been on. But I do remember one call where she actually got off when we were talking about specific

funding.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

- Q. So you do remember at least one call where she was --
- A. I'm sorry?
- Q. You do remember at least one call where Ms. Meyer was on the phone?
- A. I don't ever recall her being on the phone when we talked specifically about dollars and funding.
- Q. Okay. Can you tell us, please, what the co-plaintiffs discussed with regard to funding?

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, this is same objection we've made. We have a pending motion, if you recall, from our hearing last week on exactly these conference calls. We're filing our brief tomorrow, and I think Your Honor ruled that, subject to your reviewing that motion, you would sustain an objection until you have a chance to review this, so this is getting back into the same issue.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. JOINER:

- Q. Did Mr. Rider ever participate in any of these calls?
- A. No.
- Q. Why was that?
- A. The fund -- whenever we talked about funding for the media campaign, there was really no reason for Mr. Rider to be on any of those calls.
 - Q. Who ultimately received the funding for the media

campaign?

- A. For the most part, the funding went through the Wildlife Advocacy Project.
- Q. And the Wildlife Advocacy Project gave it to whom?
- A. I don't know where all the money goes for the Wildlife Advocacy Project, but I do know that some funds that go towards the Wildlife Advocacy Project go towards our media campaign, and Tom Rider who is the one who is the sole actor in our media campaign.
- Q. Is there anybody else, to your knowledge, at the Wildlife
 Advocacy Project other than Mr. Rider who is conducting a
 media campaign?
- 13 A. Not that I know of.
- Q. Did you take any notes from these conference calls?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. And were there any follow-up communications that resulted from any of these conference calls?
- 18 A. There my have been follow-up calls.
- 19 Q. Approximately, how many?
- A. Very few. I couldn't give you a specific number. I'm sorry.
- Q. Okay. So I believe you testified that you started at the Animal Welfare Institute in February of 2005?
- 24 A. Five, yes.
- 25 Q. So the conference calls that you're referencing would

```
have been after you started; is that correct?
       Α.
            Those are the ones that I'm testifying to, yes.
            Okay. Do you know whether there were any conference
       calls prior to you starting?
       Α.
            I don't know.
       Q.
            Who at AW -- if I use AWI for Animal Welfare Institute,
       will you understand what I mean?
       Α.
            Yes.
            Can you tell us who at AWI knew about the payments that
       Q.
10
       were being made to or for Mr. Rider?
11
            Other than me, it would be Cathy Liss and Jill Umphlett.
       Α.
12
            I'm sorry. What was the last name?
13
            Umphlett. She would have known about some of them.
                 THE COURT: Why don't you spell that for the
14
15
       reporter, please?
16
                 THE WITNESS: I think her last name is spelled
17
       U-M-P-H-L-E-T-T.
      BY MS. JOINER:
18
                          Umphlett have a position at AWI?
19
       Q.
            And does Ms.
20
            I believe her title is administrative assistant.
       Α.
21
            To anybody in particular?
       Ο.
22
                 She's just our receptionist, and she'll handle
       checks that go out and bookkeeping, that kind of thing.
23
24
       Q.
            Okay. Did anybody at AWI have to approve the funding for
```

25

Rider?

Mr.

- A. Cathy Liss.
- Q. And are there any documents that are related to that approval?
- A. No.
- Q. Does AWI have a board of directors?
- A. Yes.

12

13

- Q. And were the Rider payments ever discussed at board meetings or with board members?
- 9 A. I don't believe so, but I've never attended a board
 10 meeting, unless it was just to drop by and say hello to board
 11 members. That would be something that Cathy Liss would know.
 - Q. And you previously identified for us that AWI has made payments directly to Mr. Rider by check and wire transfer, correct?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- Q. Were there any other type of payments that AWI made directly to Mr. Rider?
- 18 A. I don't believe so.
- Q. Can you explain for us what the process is for requesting a check at AWI?
- A. Generally, I would just ask Jill if she could write a check and send it over to the Wildlife Advocacy Project. I'm assuming you're talking about specific to the media campaign in this case.
- 25 Q. Yeah. I'm just asking the general business practice for

AWI to issue a check.

- A. Well, if I were the one that was asking for the check, I would have a communication with Cathy Liss about it. I would call her and say I'd like a check for such and such a purpose, and she would say "yes" or "no"; and if she said, yes, then I would ask Jill to please send a check to whoever I wanted it to go to.
- Q. And by "Jill", you mean Ms. Umphlett?
- A. Yes. I'm sorry, Jill Umphlett.
- 10 Q. Is there a check request form?
- 11 A. No.
- Q. And is there anybody other than Ms. Liss that approves
- checks?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. And who at AWI has check signing authority?
- 16 A. Cathy Liss.
- 17 Q. Is there anybody else?
- A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
- 19 Q. And so is there any accounting department at AWI?
- 20 A. No.
- Q. So Ms. Umphlett is the one who is responsible for physically preparing the check?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- Q. And how does Ms. Umphlett keep a record of the checks
- 25 that she writes?

- A. I believe she has a software program that she uses called QuickBooks.
- Q. Does she physically write out checks?
- A. You know, I'm not really sure. I ask her for the check, and she sends it out. I'm not sure specifically how the process goes.
- Q. So she doesn't give the check back to you, she sends it herself?
- A. She sends it herself, that's correct.
- 10 Q. And how does she know where to send it?
- 11 A. Well, if it's a check that I have requested, I'll tell
 12 her where to send it.
- Q. Do you provide her with the address?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And are you aware of any other kind of recordkeeping that
 AWI has besides the software program that you've mentioned?
- 17 A. I don't keep those records, so that is isn't something I would know. I'm sorry.
- Q. Okay. When you travel, do you have to do expense reports for reimbursements?
- 21 A. Yes.
- MS. JOINER: May I approach, Your Honor?

 THE COURT: Sure.
- 24 BY MS. JOINER:
- Q. What I'd like to direct your attention to is tab "C" here

- of plaintiffs' exhibits and, specifically, perhaps, maybe, 10 or 15 pages into it, if you can find AWI 8807 to 8808.
- A. Are you referring to the Bates stamps?
- Q. Yes, ma'am.
- A. Well, the tenth one that I have is 06504.
- Q. Okay. Keep going. You're almost there. A couple more pages.
 - A. Okay. I think I'm with you.
 - Q. Have you found it?
- 10 A. 08807; is that where you want me to start?
- Q. Yes, ma'am. And I believe it's a two-page document that continues on.
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you recognize this document?
- 15 A. Yes, I do.
- 16 Q. Okay. Can you explain for us what it is?
- 17 A. Sure. This appears to be my expense report from the
- 18 expenses I had at a press conference I participated in
- 19 Sacramento, California, back in September of 2005.
- Q. Did Mr. Rider attend that with you?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 O. Do these amounts in here reflect travel for Mr. Rider or
- just for you?
- 24 A. Travel just for me.
- Q. And what about the entry for the lodging; does that

```
reflect an expenditure just for you or Mr. Rider?
       Α.
            That reflects an expenditure just for me.
            Okay. Did Mr. Rider have any kind of an expense report
       Ο.
       like this for AWI?
       Α.
            No.
       Q.
            Does Mr. Rider do expense reports for AWI?
       Α.
            No.
            If you would turn now in that same tab to 10118, which is
       Q.
       towards the back -- I think it's actually the third from the
10
       back.
11
       Α.
            Okay.
12
       0.
           Found that?
13
       Α.
            Yes.
            Okay. Have you seen this document before?
14
       0.
15
       Α.
           Yes.
                   It is a January 3, 2008 check from the Animal
16
17
       Welfare Institute to Mr. Tom Rider; is that correct?
18
            It's a little bit difficult to read, but I believe that's
       Α.
19
       what this is, yes.
20
            The copy is a little dark. What is the amount of this
       Q.
21
       check?
```

- 22 A. \$750.
- Q. And whose signature is on the check?
- A. Cathy Liss.
- 25 Q. And what does the memo line for the check say?

- A. Elephant media.
- Q. So why did AWI pay Mr. Rider directly at this time?
- A. I don't remember specifically why we did on this particular occasion.
- Q. Did Mr. Rider ask for this particular amount?
- A. I don't recall.
- Q. How did you know where to send this check to?
- A. Mr. Rider would have told me where he was located and where to send the check for those checks that we sent directly to him.
- Q. And would you have needed to have written that information down at the time that he provided it?
- 13 A. Not necessarily.

- Q. The address, you would not have needed to have written down?
- A. No. Sometimes Jill would be in my office, and I would just tell her. I would be on the telephone with Mr. Rider, and I'd say, Jill, I need a check request. I need to send a check to Mr. Rider. And if she happened to be in my office this could have been a particular time when she was I would just tell her.
- Q. So would she write down the address as to where to send this to Mr. Rider?
- 24 A. Perhaps. But you'd have to ask her that question.
- 25 Q. Do you know how this was sent to Mr. Rider, what the

```
means were?
       Α.
            No, I don't recall.
            Does AWI have a set payment schedule for Mr.
       Α.
            No.
            How does it know when to make payments for Mr.
       Q.
            Well, we never have to make payments for Mr. Rider.
       These are grant contributions that we make to him for our
       media campaign, just so that we're clear about that. I talk
       to Mr. Rider regularly. I also talk to Kathy Meyer at the
10
       Wildlife Advocacy Project, so I am somewhat familiar with how
11
       much money there is for the media campaign, and when we feel
12
       that there is a time where the funds are low or we need money
13
       to do a certain media event, then that would be a time that we
       would send Mr. Rider a check or send money to the Wildlife
14
15
       Advocacy Project for that purpose.
16
            So you would have a phone conversation with either Mr.
17
       Rider or Ms. Meyer?
18
       Α.
            Exactly.
19
       Q.
            Do you know where Mr. Rider currently is right now?
20
       Α.
            I do.
21
            What's his current address right now?
       Ο.
22
       Α.
            I don't feel comfortable disclosing that.
23
                 THE COURT: Why is that relevant?
24
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I object to that, Your Honor.
```

He's doing this media campaign, and there's also an

outstanding request that the defendants have made that we're briefing right now on these Federal Express labels. We have given the information about the cities that Mr. Rider goes to. we have deleted the precise addresses precisely because, in all candor, we think that if they know where Mr. Rider is when he goes to the cities where he does his media campaign, that can be used to disrupt his campaign, follow him.

In the pending motions they've made, they've said they want to contact his friends and relatives. We're making an argument that you may ultimately accept or not accept — we're making an argument that this is interfering with his activities and interfering potentially with third parties in a way that we don't believe is appropriate, and I think that's basically in part what this is designed to accomplish.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MS. JOINER: Can I respond to that? We don't think there is any evidence to support the notion that we're following or doing whatever other nefarious deeds for Mr. Rider. Mr. Rider is a witness that sits in the midst of all of this. He should be subpoenaed, and he should be here to testify, and hiding his address is going to come up later when we come to the issue of whether or not his testimony can be used and how. So his actual address --

THE COURT: In this hearing or in the trial?

MS. JOINER: That is correct, for both.

THE COURT: Is he -- when you say you don't want to give his address, don't give his address, but he's somewhere in America? THE WITNESS: Yes, he is. THE COURT: Thank you. Move on. BY MS. JOINER: Does AWI have a process for sending a wire transfer? Q. Α. Not a formal process, no. Okay. So does -- is there any kind of an account that Q. AWI has, for example, at Western Union? I don't know. Α. Okay. So in those instances where AWI wired Mr. money, were you involved with that? Not specifically with the wire transfer, but I may have requested that funds be sent to Mr. Rider. Okay. And who did you ask to send those funds to Mr. Q. Rider? Well, when I have in the past, it's always been to Jill Α. Umphlett.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

- 18 19
 - Okay. And do you know how AWI actually arranges for those wire transfers?
- 22 No, I don't. When we were doing -- when we were producing materials for discovery and looking back at the wire 23 24 transfers that we had done, I had talked to Jill Umphlett 25 about it because I don't really know how Western Union works

because I don't do any of the wire transfers, and there was one wire transfer that she had done, and it was the first time that she had done it, so she just told me how she had done it.

- Q. How did she explain what she -- can you tell us what she did to make that wire transfer?
- A. Sure. She got a check -- I believe it was for \$600. We wanted to send \$500 to Mr. Rider for the media campaign, and there was a wire transfer fee of \$30 or \$35 or whatever it was. So she went and got a check, and she cashed it for \$600 and then she went -- I'm not sure where she went to do the wire transfer, but it ended up being 535 or \$36 with the fee.

And she went ahead and did the wire transfer, and then the rest of the money came back to AWI into petty cash. And I think prior to that the wire transfers that we had done had been done by credit card, if I recall.

- Q. And are there any kinds of records or receipts that are kept with petty cash?
- A. I don't know.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Do you know whether there is a cost involved with sending a wire transfer?
- 21 A. I believe there is a fee from my discussions with Ms.
 22 Umphlett.
- Q. And did Ms. Umphlett get a receipt for that wire transfer?
 - 5 A. I don't know.

```
0.
            So you don't know if AWI has a receipt for that or not?
            If we do have a receipt for it, we would have produced it
       Α.
       in discovery. I just -- I'm sorry. I can't recall.
            And at AWI does anybody have to approve money transfers?
            Again, that would be Cathy Liss.
       Α.
       Q.
            Okay. If you would flip back in the same tab, "C", a
       couple of pages, to AWI-10116. It's five from the end.
            Okay. I see it.
       Α.
            Find that?
       Ο.
10
       Α.
            Yes.
11
            Have you ever seen this document before?
       Ο.
12
       Α.
            Yes.
13
       Q.
            Okay. What is it?
            It appears to be a receipt from a Western Union money
14
15
       transfer.
16
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry. What's the number again; AWI
17
       10016?
18
                 MS. JOINER: I'm sorry; 10116.
                 THE COURT: 10116.
19
20
                 MS. JOINER: Yeah. It's five from the end.
21
                 THE COURT: Thank you. I see it. Ms. Silverman,
22
       what did you just say about this document?
23
                 THE WITNESS: I said that it appears to be
       receipt from a Western Union money transfer.
24
25
       BY MS. JOINER:
```

- Q. Who is -- at the top, it says: "Dear Suzan Milward(Phonetic)". Who is Susan Milward?
- A. Susan Milward is an employee of the Animal Welfare Institute.
- Q. And what is her title?
- A. I don't know her title.
 - Q. Did she make this money transfer?
- A. It appears so, yes.
- 9 Q. Was this particular transfer done over the Internet or by some other means?
- 11 A. I'm not sure by looking at the document, and I didn't do 12 it so I can't answer the question. I'm sorry.
- Q. Okay. If you look down underneath transaction details, it says: "Your money transfer control number is" and then it's redacted. Do you know what a money transfer control
- 16 number is?
- 17 A. No.
- Q. Okay. Do you know how Mr. Rider then goes to retrieve the wire funds?
- 20 A. No.
- Q. And how did Ms. Milward pay Western Union? Was this check, cash, or credit card transaction?
- 23 A. I believe it was a credit card.
- Q. And whose credit card was it?
- A. It's hard for me to tell by looking at the document, but

- I believe Ms. Milward has an AWI credit card.
- Q. If this would have been charged to a credit card, would
- Ms. Milward then be reimbursed?
- A. Not if it was an AWI credit card.
- Q. If it was an AWI credit card, then AWI would have paid the bill directly?
- A. To the credit card company?
- Q. Yes. I'm sorry.
- A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. Do you know where that credit card statement is?
- 11 A. If we have a copy of it, it would have been produced in discovery.
- Q. Do you know whether the money transfer control number changes with each wire transfer or not?
- 15 A. No, I don't.
- Q. Okay. Now, if you would turn three more pages towards the back, please, and look at AWI-10119.
- 18 Q. Have you found that?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Can you explain what this document is?
- 21 A. Yes. It's a check to the Wildlife Advocacy Project in
- the amount of \$4,500 for media.
- Q. Okay. And what's the date of the check?
- 24 A. January 11th, 2008.
- 25 Q. And who signed this particular check?

- A. Cathy Liss.
- Q. All right. So on January 11th, if you look back, that is the same date that money was also being wired directly to Mr.

Rider; is that correct?

- A. I'll have to look back at the other document.
- Q. Yeah. Just flip it a couple of pages earlier to the wire transfer.
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So who -- Ms. Milward did the wire transfer directly to Mr. Rider on that day, correct?
- 11 A. It appears so from the document, but I can't tell you for sure.
- Q. And how would Ms. Milward know where to send that to?
- A. Well, again, my communications whenever I've requested grant money for Mr. Rider has been through Jill Umphlett. If Jill Umphlett isn't available, she would contact Susan
- Milward. As far as an address to send it, that would either come from me or Ms. Umphlett.
- Q. And then if you look over to the check that's dated the same date, this was going to the Wildlife Advocacy Project, correct?
- 22 A. Correct.

10

Q. Is there any reason why payments were going out to the Wildlife Advocacy Project and to Mr. Rider directly on the same day?

MR. STOWE: Objection, Your Honor. What's the relevance of this to whether or not documents have been searched for and produced?

THE COURT: I'm hoping that will become clear. Answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't remember on this particular occasion why that occurred; however, there were times that we needed to get money to Mr. Rider for media for one reason or another in a short period of time, and I know that wire transfer is a pretty quick way of doing that. Sometimes when we contribute money into the Wildlife Advocacy Project, it takes time for money to get there, to be processed, and then the money to go out to Mr. Rider.

So on this particular occasion, I can only guess that was the situation, that we wanted to get money to Mr. Rider for a particular media event or travel or whatever it happened to be.

BY MS. JOINER:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Do you know who prepared this particular check on January 11th, 2008?
 - A. No, I don't. It was signed by Ms. Liss.
- Q. Do you know whether there would have been any documents related to the addressees for both of these payments?
 - A. In terms of a written document with an address?
 - Q. That's correct. Would there have been any kind of notes

written down as to where to send these two payments? Α. I don't know. It may have been written on a scrap piece of paper. I really don't know because I didn't do it. MS. JOINER: Can I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: Sure. MS. JOINER: This is the August order. Do you need (Speaking to Mr. Glitzenstein.) a copy? BY MS. JOINER: This is the August 23, 2007 discovery order. Have you Q. 10 had a chance to look at it? That's what it is. I haven't had a chance to read 11 Α. 12 through it, again, but, yes. 13 Q. Have you previously seen this document? 14 Α. Yes. 15 And read through it? Q. 16 Α. Yes. 17 Okay. Were you the person at AWI who was responsible for searching for documents that were called for by this order? 18 Yes. 19 Α. 20 If you would like to look at the language on pages Q. 21 six and seven that pertains to the productions for the 22 organizational plaintiffs; if you want to orient yourself. 23 Α. Which part? I'm sorry.

I would like to focus on the bullet point that begins on

the bottom of paragraph -- Page 6 and continues on.

24

```
Α.
            Okay.
            Ms. Silverman, did you have any understanding what that
       first bullet point meant?
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, I object on the same
       grounds that I think you sustained last week, which was that
       it unavoidably calls for an attorney/client communication to
       be divulged.
                 THE COURT: Well, I think it's a work product.
       me ask you this, Ms. Sullivan: You read the document?
10
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
11
                 THE COURT: And you had the responsibility of
12
       complying with it on behalf of your organization?
13
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: So without telling us how you arrived at
14
15
       it, you reached a certain conclusion as to what it meant?
16
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
17
                 THE COURT: Next question.
       BY . JOINER:
18
            What was your understanding of what needed to be produced
19
20
       in response to this paragraph?
21
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I object to the -- it calls for
22
       an attorney/client privilege --
23
                 THE COURT: Sustained. Work product. Go ahead.
24
                 MS. JOINER: May I approach, Your Honor?
                 THE COURT: Certainly.
```

```
BY MS. JOINER:
            I would like to turn to Defendants' Exhibit 64.
                 THE COURT: You got it, Ms. Silverman?
                 THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor.
       BY MS. JOINER:
            Do you recognize this document?
       Α.
            Yes.
           What is it?
       Q.
            This is an invitation to a benefit that we held in July
       Α.
10
       of 2005.
            Was it a fundraiser?
11
       0.
12
       Α.
            Yes.
13
            And what were the funds being raised for?
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, this also goes
14
15
       precisely to the motion which is being briefed. A fundraiser
16
       that was held by non-profit groups in which people are invited
17
       to attend for the purpose of promoting a group activity is, we
       submit, and we will be briefing tomorrow, a quintessential
18
       First Amendment activity, and we would at least ask Your Honor
19
20
       to hold off on any questioning related to this.
21
                 THE COURT: Well, it speaks for itself. Let's look
22
       at the second page, Ms. Silverman.
23
                 THE WITNESS:
                               Okay.
24
                 THE COURT: All right. We're asked to join Ed
       Begley and Valerie Harper at a benefit; that's right.
```

```
document speaks for itself; is that right?
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- called next, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: Okay.
       BY MS. JOINER:
            Was AWI a host of this event?
       Α.
           Yes.
           Was AWI involved in the planning of this event?
       Q.
          Yes.
       Α.
10
            Did AWI have any communications either orally or in
11
       writing that related to the organization and planning of this
12
       event?
13
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, again, this is --
                 MS. JOINER: It's a "yes" or "no" question right
14
15
       now.
16
                 THE COURT: Okay. I'll rule on the objections.
17
       Okay. State your question -- Madam Reporter, read the
       question back, would you?
18
                 (Whereupon, the court read the above question back
19
20
       at this time.)
21
                 THE COURT: "Yes" or "No", Ms.
                                                  Silverman?
22
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
23
                 THE COURT: Thank you.
24
       BY MS. JOINER:
25
            And who at AWI worked on planning this event?
```

Α. I did. Was there anybody else? It was primarily me. I had talks with Ms. Liss about Α. it, but I was the one that was responsible for it. Were there ever any e-mails that related to this organizing and planning of this fundraising event? Yes. Α. And were there ever any hard copy documents that related Q. to this fundraising event? 10 Hard copy documents other than the invitation and --Α. 11 Anything -- the only thing we have is the invitation. Ο. So 12 is there anything other than the invitation? 13 Α. Not that I can think of. Okay. Any kind of notes about planning, organizing? 14 Notes about the planning? 15 Α. 16 Were there any kind of notes or documents other Q. 17 than e-mails that were created during the process of organizing this event? 18 Sure. 19 Α. 20 Do you know what happened to the funds that were raised 0. 21 from this event? 22 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, once, again, I --THE COURT: Well, that's not appropriate. 23 24 question is: Are you aware of any information pursuant to

Judge Sullivan's order that suggests that the funds that were

```
raised by this event went to pay Tom Rider?
          THE WITNESS: They did not go to pay Tom Rider, no.
          THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MS JOINER:
     Would you please turn to Defendant's Exhibit 58?
you found that?
     Yes.
Α.
     If you would turn to the second page of this memo that
Q.
was produced by the Wildlife Advocacy Project, and if you
would look down at the fourth line which indicates an October
7th, 2005 deposit and the memo portion states: AWI, dash,
from fundraiser in L.A., and the right-hand column indicates
that the amount paid is $8,000; do you see that?
Α.
     Yes.
     Was there any fundraiser in L.A. that AWI did, apart from
Ο.
the one where we just looked for the invitation?
Α.
     No. Not that I'm aware of.
     And if you look two lines down on this same document, it
indicates that there was a deposit dated November 23, 2005,
and the memo says: Grant, dollar sign, from AWI, and in
parentheses, from fundraiser in California, and the amount
paid was $5,427.57; do you see that?
    Yes, I do.
Α.
```

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q. And, again, would this be the same fundraiser that we just looked at the invitation for?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Would you turn, please, to Defendant's Exhibit 75? And you have explained for us that some of the money that AWI pays to or for Mr. Rider is for van repairs; is that correct?
- A. That is correct. So that he can participate in the media campaign.
- Q. Have you found this Exhibit No. 75?
- A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. If you look at the last page -- this is the order,
 10 I believe, in which the documents were produced to us. The
- last page of this appears to actually be the first page of the fax cover sheet; do you see that?
- 13 A. Yes. Yes.
- Q. The "To Tracy," that's indicated on there, are you the "Tracy" that's referenced there?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Did you actually receive this document at AWI?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Do you still have a copy of this document?
- 20 A. If I did, I would have given it to my attorneys.
- 21 Q. Did AWI actually pay this invoice?
- 22 A. I believe so. Yes.
- 23 Q. And do you know how that payment was made?
- A. I can't recall.
- Q. So it could have been by check, by credit card, or by --

- is there any other option; check or credit card?
- A. I believe it would have been by either check or credit card.
- Q. Thank you. If we can go back, I'd like to look at tab "C", again. And, in particular, I'm looking for AWI-9946.
- A. I'm sorry; 9946 is what you said?
- Q. Yes, that's correct. Maybe about two-thirds of the way through.
- A. Okay.
- 10 Q. Okay. Is this the payment that you previously identified
- for us where the check was written to Ms. Umphlett and then
- cashed and then wired to Mr. Rider?
- A. I'm not sure. The amount is \$600.
- 14 Q. Right.
- A. But I'm not sure if this is the one.
- Q. Well, did this kind of -- did this kind of payment happen
- more than once?
- 18 A. What kind of payment?
- 19 Q. Where a check was written to Ms. Umphlett, she cashed
- it, and then wired the money to Mr. Rider?
- A. No. I don't believe so.
- 22 Q. Can you -- I cannot read on my copy the memo line. Can
- you read that for us?
- A. I think it says: Fix me. Tom Rider.
- 25 Q. And do you know whose handwriting is at the top?

- A. No, I don't.
- Q. Has AWI taken steps to preserve documents related to this case?
- A. When you say "preserve documents", could you be a little bit more specific in what you mean by that?
- Q. To save documents related to this case?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. What has AWI done to do that?
- A. We don't have a formal process by which we preserve documents, but we do save things when we have them. We don't throw things away in the case. If we receive documents by the mail or we receive clippings or anything of that sort, we'll hold onto them.
- Q. Are there any e-mails?
- 15 A. Other than the ones that are on our computers?
- 16 Q. Any e-mails that relate to this case that AWI has?
- 17 A. I'm sorry, you had said hard copies so I thought that was a followup. Sure, we have e-mails.
- Q. Okay. And has AWI saved all of its e-mails regarding this case?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. If you would turn please to Defendants' Exhibit 74; do you recognize this document?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Is this an e-mail that you sent?

- A. Yes. It appears to be an e-mail that I sent.
- Q. Okay. And the recipients of this e-mail are indicated in the two-line --
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Has AWI saved this particular e-mail?
- A. I'm sure that we did. We try to save all of our e-mails.
- Q. Are there other e-mails regarding this litigation that are of this nature?

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, foundation. It's not clear that the e-mail regards this litigation at all, regards an interview that Mr. Rider did as part of the media campaign.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say your question, again, please.

15 BY MS. JOINER:

- Q. I'll back up. There is a reference in here that says he felt really good about the interview; do you see that?
- 18 A. I do.

10

11

- Q. Okay. So to be more specific, are there other e-mails that reflect communications that you have had with Mr. Rider?
- 21 A. Other e-mails?
- 22 O. Yes.
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And have you saved all of them?
- 25 A. I've tried to.

```
0.
            I need to get you the correct binder for the particular
       discovery document I want to look at.
                 MS. JOINER: Your Honor, may I approach?
                 THE COURT: Yeah.
       BY . JOINER:
            I would like to direct your attention to Exhibit No. 23,
       Defense Exhibit No. 23.
                 THE COURT: Defendants' 23?
                 MS. JOINER: Yes, sir.
10
       BY MS. JOINER:
11
       Ο.
           Have you found that?
12
       Α.
            Yes.
13
           Do you recognize this document?
14
       Α.
           Yes.
15
            Okay. Why was it prepared?
       Q.
16
            It was prepared because we were asked for supplemental
       Α.
17
       discovery responses.
18
            Was it also prepared pursuant to the Court's August 23,
       Q.
       2007 order?
19
20
       Α.
            Yes.
21
            Okay. And if you look at the next to last page, 14, this
22
       document is dated September 24, 2007; is that correct?
23
       Α.
            Yes.
24
            And if you look at the very last page on the
       verification, is that your signature?
```

```
Α.
            Yes.
            So were you the person at AWI who was responsible for
       preparing these responses?
            Yes, I was.
            If you would turn please to number 19; have you found
       Q.
       that?
       Α.
            Yes.
            Okay. There are no conference calls identified in there
       Q.
       with regard to the organizational plaintiffs and the funding;
10
       is that correct?
11
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
                                                             Sorry to
12
       interrupt, but, as with other witnesses, can we have the
13
       witness read the question that she was supposedly responding
       to before she provides answers --
14
15
                 THE COURT: Take your time, Ms. Silverman.
                                                               Read it
16
       carefully.
17
                 THE WITNESS: Okay, Your Honor. Thank you. Would
       you like me to read it aloud or to myself?
18
19
                 THE COURT: To yourself.
20
       BY . JOINER:
21
            Okay. Are there conference calls in there?
       Ο.
22
       Α.
            No.
                   If you would look next, please, and go ahead and
23
24
       read Interrogatory Number 21. I want to focus on the first
25
       paragraph, but please read the whole thing.
```

```
Α.
     (Witness complies.)
    My question with regard to this interrogatory response is
the second sentence to this particular supplemental response
that states -- it's on Page 11: AWI states that although it
did not originally view this information as responsive to this
interrogatory, it is providing the information in compliance
with the Court's order and because defendant has stated that
it views this information as responsive to this interrogatory.
So my question, first, is when it references, "this
information, " what is that referring to?
     I believe it's referring to the grants that were provided
for the media campaign.
    The funding for Mr. Rider?
    Correct. And the media campaign.
    All right. And when did AWI begin to view this
information as responsive?
          MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, I object on both
attorney/client and, also, work product.
          THE COURT: It also goes to foundation. Now, your
functioning in this capacity is general counsel of this
organization, right?
          THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Did you write that statement or was that
```

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The statement in its form -- it was

statement written by somebody else?

THE WITNESS:

```
written by my attorneys.
                 THE COURT: But you reviewed it?
                 THE WITNESS: I did.
                 THE COURT: Okay. And you didn't disagree with its
       contents?
                 THE WITNESS: I did not.
                 THE COURT: Did there ever come a time in this -- in
       the preparation of your answer where you discussed what your
       answer would be with counsel? Answer "yes" or "no".
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
10
11
                 THE COURT: And did he give you guidance as to that?
12
                 THE WITNESS: As to my answer, no.
13
                 THE COURT: Who drafted the answer, you or your
14
       attorney?
15
                 THE WITNESS: The answer that's here was drafted by
16
      my attorneys.
17
                 THE COURT: And you say you reviewed it?
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
18
      BY MS. JOINER:
19
20
            Well, certainly, by no later than January 31st, 2007, AWI
21
       regarded the funding payments to Mr. Rider as responsive to
22
       this interrogatory; is that correct?
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, foundation. Where
23
24
       did the date January 31, 2007 come from?
25
                 THE COURT: Well, are the days -- isn't that the
```

```
date of the answer?
                 MS. JOINER: The particular one we're looking at is
       the September 24, '07 answer.
                 THE COURT: Okay.
       BY MS. JOINER:
           So my question now is: If originally AWI did not view
       this as responsive, certainly, no later than January 31st,
       2007, it did?
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, again --
                 THE COURT: That's argumentative, but --
10
11
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- we haven't looked at January
12
       31st, 2007. That was before Judge Sullivan's September 2007
13
       order which these responses --
                 MS. JOINER: I object to the speaking objections.
14
15
                 THE COURT: Yeah. I think it's appropriate. Please
16
       explain, if you would, to the witness why January is
17
       significant.
       BY MS. JOINER:
18
19
       Q.
           Absolutely. If you would turn back one exhibit to Number
20
       22 -- do you have that?
21
            I do.
       Α.
22
            Okay. And this is AWI's supplemental responses to
       interrogatories that is dated -- if you look at the next to
23
24
       the last page -- January 31st, 2007; is that correct?
25
       Α.
            Yes.
```

- Q. Okay. And who signed as to the objections on this one; Exhibit 22?
- A. My signature is on the verification page.
- Q. But my question before was who signed as to the objections on Page 17?
- A. It looks to be Kathy Meyer.
- Q. Your counsel, correct?
- A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And then the next page, which you were referencing, Page 10 18, the verification on behalf of AWI came from you; is that correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Now, if we turn back to the supplemental response in Exhibit 22 at Number 21, it begins on Page 15, continues through Page 16.
- 16 A. Would you like me to read that?
- 17 Q. Yes. Please go ahead.
- 18 A. (Witness complies.) Okay.
- Q. Okay. And I just want to read on Page 16, the next to
 the last paragraph states: AWI has made contributions to the
 Wildlife Advocacy Project for advocacy work for public
 education on the issue of the treatment of elephants held in
 captivity. Documents reflecting these contributions have been
 produced by AWI and are hereby incorporated by reference, AWI06494 through 06506; do you see that?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And that was part of AWI's answer that you read and signed, too; is that correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Now, if we turn quickly back to the black binder, tab "C", it's the very first pages.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So the response in Exhibit 22, Number 19, references the documents that are located at the very beginning of tab "C", which is AWI-6494 through 6506.
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. Okay. And that particular group of documents, 6494
- through 6506, are checks that AWI wrote to fund Mr. Rider; is
- 14 that correct?
- 15 A. To fund the media campaign, yes.
- 16 Q. Okay. If we could turn now to Exhibit 41, defense
- 17 Exhibit 41, please; have you found that?
- 18 A. Yes, I have.
- 19 Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 20 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. What is this document?
- 22 A. This is my declaration.
- Q. And that was submitted in response to the August 23, 2007
- order that we looked at?
- 25 A. That's correct.

- Q. Paragraph one references that you are submitting this on behalf of AWI based on your personal knowledge; do you see that? Did you do anything other than your own personal knowledge in order to prepare this declaration? Did you speak to anybody else at AWI?
- A. Yes, I did.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And who did you speak with at AWI?
- A. I believe I spoke with Cathy Liss and, also, with Jill Umphlett.
- Q. And in paragraph two, the first sentence states: AWI has not intentionally -- excuse me -- destroyed, discarded or disposed of any records that are responsive to defendants' document production request and that are required by this court's August 23, 2007 order.

Were there any documents unintentionally discarded, destroyed or disposed of or otherwise not produced in this case?

- A. Not that I know of. If there was an e-mail that wasn't saved or something of that nature, it wasn't -- there was nothing that I can remember. Not every single e-mail always makes it into the saved folder, but I do the best I can.
- Q. And is paragraph two also the result of you talking to anybody at AWI?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And who did you speak with in order to prepare paragraph

```
two of this declaration?
            I spoke with Cathy Liss and Jill Umphlett.
                 MS. JOINER: Thank you, Ms. Silverman. I have
       nothing further at this time.
                 THE COURT: Cross-examine, please.
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: If Your Honor is inclined to take
       a break, I could use a couple of minutes. If not, I'll --
                 THE COURT: All right. We'll take five minutes;
       11:15 everybody.
10
                 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
11
                 THE COURT: Ms. Silverman, you're under oath.
12
       Please don't discuss your testimony with anybody.
13
                 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
                 (Whereupon, there was a brief recess at this time;
14
       thereafter, court resumed.)
15
16
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
17
       EXAMINATION BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:
18
            Ms.
                 Silverman, good morning.
       Q.
           Good morning.
19
       Α.
20
            If you could turn to the documents that are behind tab
       Q.
21
       "C", this is in the black volume two of plaintiffs' exhibits,
       tab "C".
22
23
       Α.
           (Witness complies.)
24
       Q.
            Are you generally familiar with what these documents are?
25
       Α.
            Yes.
```

- Q. What are they?
- A. They are documents that I produced in discovery on behalf of the Animal Welfare Institute.

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, could I move this entire set into evidence at this time? They were referred to by defense counsel, but just for matter of completeness.

THE COURT: Sure. No objection.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ GLITZENSTEIN: And I think we are up to Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 7.

THE COURT: All right. No objection. Tab "C" will be admitted as Plaintiffs' 7 without objection.

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

- Q. Ms. Silverman, do you believe that these documents reflect all payments that AWI has been able to uncover that have gone to Mr. Rider either directly or indirectly?
- A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

- Q. And do you have a high level of confidence that that's the case?
 - A. I do. We searched high and low, so --
- Q. And so you believe you did a thorough search for documents that would reflect any payments to Mr. Rider?
 - A. I do.
- 24 Q. And did you carry that search out in good faith?
 - 5 A. Yes, I did.

```
Ο.
     Did you carry it out in a conscientious way that would be
designed to search all files and locations where such funding
might be located?
Α.
     Yes, I did.
     With respect to the fundraiser that we were discussing
before, are you aware that documents relating to the
fundraiser have in fact been withheld on media strategy
grounds?
     Yes.
Α.
          Silverman, if I could ask you to take a look at
Defendants' Exhibit 23 --
          MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, this one was referred
to. I don't believe it was formally moved into evidence.
Since there has been testimony about it, it might make sense
to do that. I'd be happy to have it marked as Plaintiffs'
Exhibit 8 or if the defendants want to have it introduced as
Defendants' Exhibit No. 23?
          MS. JOINER: I'm sorry. What number is that?
          MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Twenty-three.
          MS. JOINER: Let's just use it as the same number,
Your Honor.
          THE COURT: So, therefore, it's coming in as
Defendants' Exhibit No. 23. All right. Defendants' Exhibit
Number 23 is admitted.
```

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. GLITZENSTEIN:

0. And looking over it, Interrogatory Number 21, which defense counsel asked you about, if you could just take a moment to not read again, but just glance through again to make sure you're familiar with the interrogatory answer that I'm asking about. Do you believe that is a complete and accurate response to the interrogatory? Α. Yes, I do. And is it your understanding that in response to Judge Sullivan's September 27th -- excuse me -- August 23rd, 2007 order, AWI did in fact undertake an effort to uncover all information that would be included in this interrogatory? Α. Yes. MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I have nothing further, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Silverman, you may step down. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: You may call your next witness, please. MR. GASPER: Michael Markarian. MICHAEL MARKARIAN, called as a witness herein, after having been duly sworn by the deputy clerk, testified as follows:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GASPER:

- Q. Good morning, Mr. Markarian.
- A. Good morning.
- Q. Could you please state your name for the record?
- A. Michael Markarian.
 - Q. And please spell the last name?
 - A. M-A-R-K-A-R-I-A-N.
- Q. Thank you. Mr. Markarian, are you employed?
- A. Yes.
- Q. By whom?
- 11 A. By the Humane Society of the United States.
- 12 Q. And what is your title?
- 13 A. Executive Vice President for External Affairs.
- Q. When did you assume that title?
- 15 A. January of 2005.
- 16 Q. Is that January 2005, is that when you began to work for
- the Humane Society?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Do you currently hold any position on behalf of the Fund
- for Animals?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. What is that position?
- 23 A. The president of the Fund for Animals.
- Q. Who pays your salary, Mr. Markarian?
- 25 A. The Humane Society of the United States.

- Q. Does the Fund for Animals provide you with any compensation?
- A. Not directly.
- Q. Any indirectly compensation?
- A. The Fund for Animals reimburses the Humane Society of the United States for time that I spend working on Fund for Animals' projects.
- Q. Does the Fund for Animals reimburse the Humane Society for any time you've spent discussing payments to Mr. Rider?
- 10 A. I'm not aware of that.
- Q. Sir, how many hours per week do you spend working on Fund for Animals' matters?
- 13 A. It varies.

- Q. On average, over the course of the last year, how many per week?
- 16 A. Maybe one hour per week.
- 17 Q. What office do you work out of?
- 18 A. I principally work out of the Humane Society of the
 19 United States office in Gaithersburg, Maryland.
 - Q. Who pays the lease for that space?
 - A. The Humane Society of the United States.
- Q. Did there come a time, sir, when the Humane Society
- 23 purchased assets from the Fund for Animals?
- A. There was a time when the Fund for Animals and the Humane Society of the United States entered into a corporate

combination agreement, and there was a transfer of assets between the two groups.

- Q. So the Humane Society purchased the assets of Fund for Animals; is that right?
- A. It was an asset acquisition agreement.
- Q. When did that take place?
- A. January of 2005.
- Q. And as a result of that acquisition, the Humane Society purchased most of the Fund for Animals assets; isn't that right?
- A. I'm not sure whether "purchased" is the correct term or whether "most" would be correct. The Fund for Animals maintained several assets in real property, and other assets were transferred to the Humane Society of the United States.
- Q. Are you aware of what assets the Fund for Animals retained?
- 17 A. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 18 Q. What were they?
- A. The Fund for Animals maintained property at our Black
 Beauty Ranch Animal Sanctuary in Texas and property in Ramona,
 California, which is used to operate the Fund for Animals
 Wildlife Rehabilitation Center.
- 23 Q. Anything else that the Fund for Animals retained?
- A. I'm not entirely sure. There may have been some other assets that were maintained for the Fund for Animals. Those

```
are the two properties that I'm certain of.
                 MR. GASPER: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
                 THE COURT: Certainly.
                 MR. GASPER: Your Honor, we have a copy of this for
       the Court, as well.
                 THE COURT: Thank you.
       BY MR. GASPER:
       Q.
            Mr.
                 Markarian, do you recognize this document?
           Yes, I do.
       Α.
10
           And what is this document?
       Ο.
11
            This is the asset acquisition agreement entered into by
12
       the Fund for Animals and the Humane Society of the United
13
       States.
                   Sir, on Paragraph 1.1 on Page 1, am I correct that
14
15
       this says the Humane Society will purchase, acquire, and
16
       accept from the Fund all assets except those identified in
17
       section 1.2?
            Yes. I believe that's correct.
18
       Α.
            And if you flip forward, sir, to Page 3, Section 1.2,
19
20
       defines excluded assets to include, "A", cash in the amount of
21
       $250,000; "B", books and records relating to its
22
       incorporation; "C" -- and I am paraphrasing here -- records
       relating to preparation and certification of financial
23
24
       statements; "D", rights under this agreement; "E", personal
       property of officers, directors; "F", the right to receive
25
```

- mail; and "G", is the title that you described earlier on the real estate; is that correct?
- A. Yes. That's correct.
- Q. Other than these assets right here, the Humane Society purchased everything owned by the Fund for Animals effective January 1st, 2005; isn't that right?
- A. Other than these assets listed, other assets were transferred to the Humane Society of the United States.
- 9 Q. So effective January 1st, 2005, sir, all the equipment in
 10 Fund for Animals offices were transferred to the Humane
 11 Society; isn't that right?
 - A. The Fund for Animals does continue to lease office space, but any owned assets other than what has been included here would have been transferred to the Humane Society.
- Q. So the equipment in the offices, that was transferred to the Humane Society; is that right?
 - A. That's my understanding, yes.
- Q. And the filing cabinets, those were transferred to the Humane Society; is that right?
- 20 A. Yes.

13

14

- Q. And the computers, those were transferred to the Humane Society; isn't that right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you use a computer for your work as president of Fund for Animals?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Who owns that computer?
- A. The Humane Society of the United States.
- Q. Do you have a Humane Society e-mail address?
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Do you use that e-mail address for your work as Fund for Animals' president?
- A. Yes, sometimes I do.
- Q. And do you have a Fund for Animals' e-mail address?
- 10 A. I do, yes.
- 11 Q. How often do you use that?
- 12 A. Infrequently.
- 13 Q. You have conducted Fund for Animals business using your
- 14 HSUS e-mail address; is that correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. You mentioned office space that Fund for Animals still
- has. Prior to the combination with HSUS, how many offices did
- 18 Fund for Animals have?
- 19 A. The Fund for Animals had about a half dozen offices
- around the country.
- Q. How many does it have now?
- 22 A. It has one office in New York City and the animal
- 23 sanctuaries that I mentioned previously.
- Q. Who pays for the office space in New York City?
- 25 A. The Fund for Animals.

- Q. They pay the lease on that?
- A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q. Do any Humane Society employees work out of that office?
- A. There are a couple of Humane Society employees who are based in the New York City area who do spend some time in that office, but they're not full time in that office.
- Q. Sir, pursuant to the agreement that we have looked at here between HSUS and Fund for Animals, the Humane Society was required to offer employment to every Fund for Animals' employee; isn't that right?
- A. The HSUS was required to offer employment to every Fund for Animals employee at that time pursuant to the normal hiring process, including background checks and applications.
- Q. How many employees, sir, prior to this agreement did Fund for Animals have?
- 16 A. About 50.

11

12

13

- Q. How many employees does Fund for Animals currently have?
- 18 A. The Fund for Animals has no paid staff of its own.
- 19 Q. Who pays people who work on behalf of the Fund for 20 Animals?
- A. They are employed by the Humane Society of the United States, and the Fund for Animals reimburses the HSUS for time that those employees spend working on Fund for Animals' programs.
- Q. Whose time is reimbursed by Fund for Animals?

- A. Several staff members who work on Fund for Animals' programs.
- Q. Anyone who works on this case?
- A. Myself; attorneys who represent the Fund for Animals in this case, their time would also be paid for by the Fund for Animals.
- Q. Who are those attorneys?
- A. Jonathan Lovvorn and Ethan Eddy.
- Q. What about Roger Kinler (Phonetic)?
- 10 A. I believe that Roger's time that he spends on Fund for
- Animals' matters would also be reimbursed by the Fund for
- 12 Animals.
- Q. So who is Roger Kinler?
- 14 A. He's the general counsel and chief legal officer for the
- 15 Humane Society of the United States.
- Q. And who is Ethan Eddy?
- A. Ethan works in the animal protection litigation section of the Humane Society of the United States.
- 19 Q. And by whom is Jonathan Lovvorn employed?
- A. Jonathan Lovvorn is employed by the Humane Society of the United States.
- Q. Sir, since January of 2005, the Fund for Animals has not operated its own fundraising department; isn't that right?
- A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. And it has not operated its own public relations

```
department; isn't that right?
       Α.
            Yes, that's correct.
            And it has relied upon the Humane Society employees to
       provide those services; isn't that right?
            That's correct.
       Α.
       Q.
            Same thing with the litigation department, correct, that
       Fund for Animals has not operated its own litigation
       department since January 1, 2005?
            That's correct.
       Α.
10
            And it's relied upon the individuals you mentioned
       Ο.
11
       earlier for litigation services; isn't that right?
12
       Α.
            Yes.
13
       Q.
            All of whom are Humane Society employees?
14
       Α.
           Yes.
15
            Sir, prior to January 1st, 2005, this combination with
16
       Humane Society, describe the ways in which you personally have
17
       been involved in this lawsuit.
            Could you restate that, please?
18
       Α.
            Sure. Prior to the combination with the Humane Society,
19
       Q.
20
       describe the ways in which you have been involved in this
21
       lawsuit.
```

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, we are going to object to the extent that it may call for attorney/client privileged information or work product.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. But let me see if I

understand the question: Have you had any involvement in this lawsuit in any way, Mr. Markarian? THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: What has the nature of your involvement been? THE WITNESS: As the president of the Fund for Animals, I had decision-making authority, consulted with our staff about the nature of the lawsuit, consulted with our attorneys about legal strategy, what evidence we may choose to rely on, and, also, had discussions with other co-plaintiffs. THE COURT: Thank you. BY MR. GASPER: Did anyone else acting on behalf of the Fund for Animals have any involvement in this lawsuit prior to January 2005? Yes, I believe so. Α. Who were they? Q. Previous staff members of the Fund for Animals, named D.J. Schubert (Phonetic) and Christine Wolf (Phonetic) had some involvement in the lawsuit, as well. D.J. Schubert, is that a former Meyer, Glitzenstein and Crystal associate? I believe he was employed at one time by Meyer and Glitzenstein. I don't know what his position was there.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Crystal?

Ethan Eddy, was he employed by Meyer, Glitzenstein and

- A. My understanding is that he was at one time.
- Q. Jonathan Lovvorn was, as well; isn't that right?
- A. That's my understanding.
- Q. Now, sir, since January 1st, 2005, the manner in which you have participated in this lawsuit, has it changed in any way?
- A. I have still been as the president of the Fund for Animals the main point of contact regarding the lawsuit for the Fund for Animals. Mr. Lovvorn and Mr. Eddy have also had some involvement as counsel for the Fund for Animals.
- Q. Anyone other than Mr. Lovvorn, yourself, and Mr. Eddy been involved in this lawsuit on behalf of the Fund for Animals since January 2005?
- 14 A. Not that I'm aware of.

- 15 Q. Has Mr. Kinler worked at all on this litigation?
- A. Mr. Kinler is involved in the corporate governance of
 the organization, has been involved in responding to subpoena
 requests. I'm not aware that he has been involved in the
 offensive litigation matters in this case.
- Q. You don't know, sir, if he has ever spoken to the board of directors about this litigation?
 - A. I'm not aware of it.
- Q. Okay. Sir, do you recall being deposed in this case in June of 2005?
- 25 A. Yes, I do.

- Q. Did you talk to Mr. Kinler to prepare for that testimony?
- A. I believe so.
- Q. Okay. Who is Ms. Heidi Prescott(Phonetic)?
- A. She is the senior vice president of campaigns for the Humane Society of the United States.
- Q. Has she been involved in this lawsuit in any manner?
- A. In her previous role as national director of the Fund for animals, she had some knowledge of the lawsuit, but was not very directly involved.
- Q. Did she have knowledge of any payments being made to or for Mr. Tom Rider?
- 13 A. I'm not sure whether she would have had knowledge of any payments.
- 15 Q. Is she still employed by the Humane Society?
- 16 A. Yes, she is.

23

24

- Q. And you don't know whether or not she has knowledge of these payments; is that right?
- 19 A. I don't believe that she does. We have -- we queried her
 20 in response to these interrogatories and subpoena requests,
 21 and she did not have any knowledge or documents in her
 22 possession about payments to Mr. Rider.
 - Q. Sir, are you aware that this Court issued an order on August 23rd, 2007 ordering the Fund for Animals to produce documents and information concerning payments to Tom Rider?

- A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you read that order?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. How many times?
- A. I don't recall.
 - Q. When did you first read the order?
 - A. I read the order when it was issued in August of 2007.
 - Q. And when did you last read the order?
- A. I re-read the order in preparing for today's testimony.
- 10 Q. Are you also aware, sir, that the Court issued an order
- in December of 2007 requiring the Humane Society to produce
- documents in this case?
- 13 A. Yes, I am.
- 14 Q. Have you read that order?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. When did you first read it?
- 17 A. I read the order when it was issued in December of 2007.
- 18 Q. Sir, you signed all of the Fund for Animals interrogatory
- responses in this case; is that right?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And in doing so, you verified that they were true and
- accurate and complete; is that right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And you were the deponent on behalf of Fund for Animals
- back in December of 2005; isn't that right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And you submitted a declaration on behalf of the Fund for Animals in response to the Court's August order; isn't that right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And you submitted a declaration on behalf of the Humane Society in response to the December order; isn't that right?
- A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Sir, were you responsible for locating responsive documents on behalf of the Fund for Animals?
- 11 A. Yes, I was.
- Q. Are you familiar with how Fund for Animals looked for such documents?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. And were you responsible for the Humane Society's search for documents?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. Are you familiar with what HSUS did to comply with the order?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Markarian, is it your understanding that Fund for
 Animals has produced all of the documents in its or HSUS'
 files that concern payments to or for Tom Rider?
- 24 A. Yes, it is.
- 25 Q. Has FFA produced all the documents in its or HSUS' files

that concern communications regarding the subject matter of this lawsuit?

- A. Excuse me. Yes, it has.
- Q. Has Fund for Animals identified in its interrogatory responses all the internal communications it has had concerning payments to Tom Rider?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Has Fund for Animals identified in its interrogatory responses all the communications it has had with HSUS concerning payments to Tom Rider?
- 11 A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q. Has Fund for Animals identified in its interrogatory responses all of the communications it had with other organizations concerning payments for Tom Rider?
- 15 A. Yes.

- Q. Sir, is it your understanding that the Humane Society has produced all of the documents in its or its employees' files that pertain to the payments HSUS has made to the Wildlife Advocacy Project?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. All of the documents in its files that pertain to these payments; is that correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Is it your understanding that the Humane Society has produced all of the documents in its or its employees' files

that refer, reflect, or relate to Tom Rider? Α. Yes. Has HSUS produced all of the documents in its or its employees files that pertain to WAP, the Wildlife Advocacy Project, and pertain to payments to Tom Rider? Α. Yes. And, sir, has the Humane Society produced all of the Q. documents in its or its employees' files that discuss this litigation? Α. Yes. All of the documents that discuss this litigation; is that correct? Yes, I believe so.

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, just for clarity's sake, we haven't gotten anything from Mr. Markarian as to what his understanding of those terms are. Obviously, pertaining to most litigation, it involves attorney/client communications and other things that the parties agreed did not have to be produced. So I just want to make sure Mr. Markarian knows what he's being asked and is not being led down a path that is not going to serve anybody's purposes.

THE COURT: Okay. So be it. Go ahead, proceed.

MR. GASPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. GASPER:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Mr. Markarian, the Fund for Animals paid Tom Rider a

thousand dollars in 2004; isn't that right?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And the Fund for Animals paid Meyer, Glitzenstein and Crystal approximately \$4,500 that was given to Mr. Rider over the course of three years; isn't that right?
- A. That's correct.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. And the Humane Society has paid the Wildlife Advocacy
 Project \$11,500 over the course of three years that was given
 to Mr. Rider; isn't that right?
- A. The amount that was paid to the Wildlife Advocacy Project was to be used for a media campaign regarding circus issues.

 We do understand that some of the money was used to support

 Mr. Rider's travel expenses and his activities to discuss circus issues with the public and with the media, but we don't have the expectation that that's the only thing the money was used for.
 - Q. But the amount of the payments total \$11,500; isn't that right?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. So the Fund for Animals has paid Tom Rider a thousand dollars. The Fund for Animals has paid Meyer, Glitzenstein and Crystal almost \$4,500, and the Humane Society has paid the Wildlife Advocacy Project \$11,500; is that correct?
- A. The Humane Society has not paid the Wildlife Advocacy
 Project that money. That was the Fund for Animals' payment to

the Wildlife Advocacy Project which was processed by the accounting department of the Humane Society.

- Q. Why wasn't that processed by the Fund for Animals?
- A. The Fund for Animals relies on the administrative functions of the Humane Society of the United States when processing checks, making payments, etcetera.
- Q. Which individuals requested that the payments be made?
- A. I believe that I approved the payments. The requests would have come either from myself or from John Lovvorn.
- Q. Any other FFA employees that know about the payments to Tom Rider other than yourself and Mr. Lovvorn?
 - A. Not to my knowledge.

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Nobody else knows about these payments; is that your testimony?
 - A. Can you rephrase the question again? I'm sorry.
 - Q. Are there any other Fund for Animals' employees that know about these payments other than yourself and Mr. Lovvorn?
 - A. Well, there are no Fund for Animal employees. I'm an officer of the organization. Mr. Lovvorn is counsel for the organization. He and I had direct involvement in donations to the Wildlife Advocacy Project to support media and campaign efforts. I had direct knowledge of the payments to Mr. Rider that were made in 2004 which you referenced, which were used by him to repair his van and be able to travel.
 - Q. Okay. Let's talk about them in two parts, then. Prior

to the 2005 -- so these are payments made by the Fund for Animals. Who knew about those other than yourself? Marian Probst(Phonetic) who was the chair of our board of the Fund for Animals and worked in the New York City office had also had knowledge of those payments. Q. Did you talk to her about those payments? Α. Yes. Q. Did you talk to anyone else on behalf of Fund for Animals about those payments? I don't recall at that time. Α. Did anyone else on behalf of Fund for Animals know about Ο. the payments other than yourself and Ms. Probst, and this is, again, all prior to January 2005? They may have. I don't recall who on staff I would have talked to about that. Okay. Now, after 2005, the payments by the Humane Society, are there any FFA officers or directors that know about those payments other than yourself? MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Objection, Your Honor. Again, I think the witness has already stated these weren't from the Humane Society. THE COURT: Yeah. Well, I'm a little confused.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

made allegedly, I guess, perhaps, on behalf of FFA, but they

MR. GASPER: Yeah. Your Honor, these are payments

After 2005, you want to know about FFA?

are on Humane Society paperwork, Humane Society checks, etcetera. So when I refer to the Humane Society payments, I'm referring to the payments made out of the HSUS accounts to Wildlife Advocacy Project, as you say, Mr. Markarian, on behalf of Fund for --

THE COURT: Are you aware of such a procedure?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. The nature of the combination between the two organizations is --

THE COURT: I understand. Thank you. Counsel.

- Q. Who else on behalf of the Humane Society knows about these payments being made?
- A. Our accounting department which would have processed the payments to the Wildlife Advocacy Project. They would clearly know that those payments exist.
- Q. Any other HSUS employees other than Mr. Lovvorn, yourself, and the accounting department?
- 18 A. I'm not aware of others.

BY MR. GASPER:

- Q. Were they ever discussed at the Humane Society board meetings?
- 21 A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Do you attend those board meetings?
- 23 A. I do, yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Q. Were they ever discussed at the Fund for Animals' board meetings?

- A. At the Fund for Animals' board meetings, we have discussed this litigation in general. We have not to my recollection discussed donations that were made to the Wildlife Advocacy Project to support media and campaign efforts on the circus issue.
- Q. How many times has the Fund for Animals' board discussed this litigation?
- A. I really can't recall.
- Q. More than three?
- 10 A. Possibly.
- 11 Q. As many as 10?
- 12 A. I would doubt it.
- Q. Sir, do you recall whether the Fund for Animals made a supplemental document production in January of 2007 in this case?
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Are you aware of how the Fund for Animals searched for documents in connection with that production?
- 19 A. Yes.

- 20 Q. Whose files were searched?
- A. My personal files were searched; the Fund for Animals'
 organizational files were searched; files at our Black Beauty
 Ranch Sanctuary in Texas were searched; files in our New York
 City office were also searched.
 - Q. Were there any specific employees' files that were

searched other than your own?

- A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q. Who was that?
- A. I believe we identified several staff members who had possibly worked on Fund for Animals' projects, including staff members of the Black Beauty Ranch, and as well as the attorneys in our litigation section who work on this case.
- Q. And which attorneys specifically are you referring to?
- A. John Lovvorn and Ethan Eddy.
- Q. They are the only attorneys whose files were searched in January of 2007?
- 12 A. I believe that's correct.
- Q. Did you review the board meeting minutes in January of 2007?
- 15 A. I'm sorry?
- Q. Did you review the Fund for Animals board minutes to see whether or not they were responsive?
- 18 A. Yes, I believe I did.
- 19 Q. When you searched -- let's say we've got yourself, Mr.
- 20 Lovvorn and Mr. Eddy, did the Fund for Animals review these
- individuals' HSUS e-mail accounts for responsive documents?
- 22 A. Yes, we did.
- Q. Did you produce any?
- A. I don't recall the exact documents that we produced at that particular time, but we did search the electronic files,

e-mail files, as well as paper files.

- Q. So it's your testimony, sir, that you've searched all of your Humane Society e-mails for any documents containing payments to Tom Rider?
- A. And you produced all of those; is that your testimony?
- A. I don't recall finding any documents electronically that related to payments to Tom Rider.
- Q. Do you recall Fund for Animals conducting a search in September of 2007 for documents in this case?
- 10 A. Yes, I do.

13

14

18

19

20

21

- Q. Were any other individuals' files searched other than the ones you've already mentioned in January 2007?
 - A. We generally searched the same files that we had searched previously which I've mentioned.
- Q. Now, with respect to Mr. Lovvorn, either in January or September, what specific files did Fund for Animals review of his?
 - A. We reviewed files that were related to this case and any files that were likely to contain information that was responsive to the request.
 - Q. Did you review all of the files in his possession that might contain information relating to payments to Mr. Rider?
- A. I did not personally review every file or every document.

 I made recommendations on which staff and which files should
- be reviewed, and our attorneys compiled the information for

our responses.

12

18

19

- Q. So you don't know, sir, whether or not all of Mr.

 Lovvorn's files concerning payments were searched by Fund for

 Animals?
- A. I believe that all of his files were searched if we felt they were like likely to contain any information that might be responsive.
- Q. Sir, the individuals whose files were searched in September of 2007, how did they know what to look for?
- 10 A. They were instructed by our attorneys on what to look
 11 for.
 - Q. And which attorneys were those?
- 13 A. They were -- if you'll excuse me for one second, which
 14 document request are we --
- Q. We're talking about the September 2007 production that the Fund for Animals made in response to the Court's August 2007 order.
 - A. I believe they would have been instructed by our counsel at Meyer and Glitzenstein, as well as our counsel within the organization and our general counsel's office, as well.
- Q. And "our general counsel's office", is that Fund for Animals or Humane Society's?
- 23 A. The Humane Society's general counsel's office.
- Q. Okay. So, sir, the people who were looking for documents, did they rely on these instructions by your outside

```
and inside counsel?
       Α.
            Yes, I'm sure they did.
            Were these instructions reduced to writing?
       Ο.
            I don't recall.
       Α.
            Have you ever seen a document purporting to summarize the
       Q.
       requirements of the Court's August 2007 order?
            I don't recall.
       Α.
            Sir, you read the August 2007 order; is that correct?
           Yes.
       Α.
10
            Was your understanding of that order influenced by
       Ο.
11
       anything lawyers have told you?
12
            We, obviously, consulted with our attorneys on how to
13
       interpret the order.
            And did you discuss with them the scope of the order?
14
15
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, I object on attorney/
16
       client grounds.
                 THE COURT: Sustained.
17
       BY MR. GASPER:
18
            Sir, were you responsible for providing the interrogatory
19
20
       responses on behalf of Fund for Animals in this case?
21
            Yes.
       Α.
22
            Did anyone who works for Fund for Animals or Humane
23
       Society provide information for those responses concerning
```

Can -- could you rephrase the question, please?

communications with Mr. Rider?

24

25

Α.

0. Sure. Did anyone who works for the Fund for Animals or the Humane Society provide information for those interrogatory responses that concerned payments to Tom rider? Well, our attorneys compiled the information. queried other staff who may have had some contact with Mr. They compiled the documents which were found, and, obviously, worked with me to compile the responses to the interrogatories. Q. Specifically who was queried? THE COURT: Who was queried by whom? MR. GASPER: I'm sorry. Mr. Markarian just testified that individuals were queried by lawyers to prepare this information. So my question, sir, is who were you referring to when you said individuals were queried? THE WITNESS: At this time, they queried any staff who may have worked on Fund for Animals' programs, and, as I indicated earlier, those included staff at the Black Beauty Ranch, myself, and my own personal files and the files of our counsel who had worked on this litigation, as well as the files in our New York city office. BY MR. GASPER: Was anyone else asked to provide information about

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Was anyone else asked to provide information about payments to Mr. Rider?
- A. At this time, this is the -- this is the September 2007 response?

- Q. My question was: Throughout either the '04 or '07 responses. I believe the "at-this-time" phrase was something you mentioned, but my question pertains to at any time.
- A. Okay. The -- several former staff of the Fund for Animals, including Heidi Prescott, were queried about any interactions she may have had with Tom Rider, any documents that may be in her possession; Richard Farnotto(Phonetic) who is the director of the Fund for Animals Black Beauty Ranch was also queried multiple times, and documents in his possession were searched multiple times.
- Q. Was Mr. Lovvorn queried about his communication with other organizations concerning payments to Tom Rider?
- A. I believe so, yes.
- O. You believe he was asked about that?
- 15 A. Yes.

11

12

13

18

- Q. Are you aware, sir, whether or not those communications are disclosed in the interrogatory responses?
 - A. I don't believe that there were any documents that were responsive to that request.
- Q. I'm sorry, sir. The question was: The communications
 that Mr. Lovvorn had with other organizations that concerned
 payments to Tom Rider, is it your understanding that those
 communications are identified in the Fund for Animals'
 interrogatory responses?
- MR. STOWE: Objection. Foundation. Assumes facts

not in evidence. THE COURT: Have you seen the responses that he's referring to? BY MR. GASPER: You've seen the responses, haven't you? Α. Yes, I have. And you verified them all to be true and accurate; isn't Q. that right? Yes, that's correct. Α. 10 Is it your understanding that these discussions are 11 reflected in those interrogatory responses? 12 THE COURT: What discussions? MR. GASPER: The discussions that Mr. Lovvorn had 13 with other organizations concerning payments to Tom Rider. 14 15 THE WITNESS: It's my understanding by -- from 16 reading the Court order and in consultation with our counsel 17 that we were not obligated to provide any documents which related to the media campaign by the organization. So those 18 would not have been included in the interrogatory responses. 19

BY MR. GASPER:

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Sir, is it your understanding that documents concerning payments to Tom Rider have not been produced on the basis that they are media strategy documents?
- A. No, that's not my understanding.
- Q. I'm sorry. I misunderstood your point, then.

MR. STOWE: Your Honor, I think that we talked about communications, and now we're talking about documents, I think the witness --

THE COURT: I think he can figure it out. Go ahead,
Mr. Markarian. Why don't you -- what are you having?

THE WITNESS: We have produced every document that relates to any payments to Tom Rider. We have not produced documents which were excluded from the scope of the order which related to the media and campaign strategy by the organizations.

BY MR. GASPER:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. The documents you're referring to that you excluded on that grounds, the documents and the information, does that include the communications about the payments that Mr. Lovvorn had with the other organizations?
- A. I'm not aware that it did.
- Q. I'm sorry. So we have to take a step. The question,
 sir, was whether or not your understanding is that
 communications Mr. Lovvorn has had concerning payments to Tom
 Rider were identified in Fund for Animals interrogatory
 responses? Is it your understanding that those communications
 are described in the interrogatory responses?
 - A. Yes.
- 24 Q. You think they're in there; is that your testimony?
 - A. We have produced every document that related to payments

to Tom Rider. We queried staff about conversations that they have had and included any responsive statements in the interrogatories.

- Q. Sir, HSUS received a subpoena in this case; isn't that right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How did you learn about it?
- A. I learned about it through our counsel.
- Q. Were you involved in searching for responsive documents?
- 10 A. Yes, I was.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Specifically whose files were searched when Humane Society looked for documents?
- A. We identified several staff members of the Humane Society of the United States who had previously searched their files because they were searched during the Fund for Animals' responses, and they were researched, rechecked, and we also identified a broader scope of Humane Society of the United States' employees who had not worked on Fund for Animals programs, but we felt may have had some contact with Mr. Rider, may have worked on circus-related issues, and, therefore, we identified several people in our regional offices, several people in our wildlife section, thinking that we would cast the net widely and search files and talk to staff members who may have had some interaction with Mr. Rider.

- Q. Was Mr. Lovvorn among those people?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Were all of his files searched?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Even his files that relate to Fund for Animals' payments?
- A. I believe so, yes.
 - Q. Do you know for sure?
- A. I can't say for sure.
- Q. What about Ethan Eddy, were all of his files searched?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Even his files that relate to Fund for Animals' payments
- for Mr. Rider?
- 13 A. I'm not aware that he has files related to any Fund for
- Animals' payments to Mr. Rider.
- 15 Q. Were Mr. Lovvorn and Mr. Eddy asked if they had any
- e-mails about payments to Mr. Rider?
- 17 A. Yes, they were.
- 18 Q. Did they have any?
- 19 A. I can't recall if there were any that were responsive to
- the request.
- 21 Q. Were Mr. Kinler, Roger Kinler's files searched in
- response to this subpoena?
- A. I don't recall.
- Q. Were Mr. Wayne Pachelli's (Phonetic) files searched?
- 25 A. Yes.

- O. All of his files?
- A. I believe so.
- Q. Including any files he had related to a July 2005 fundraiser that raised money for Mr. Rider.
- A. Yes. I believe that all his files were searched.
- Q. Anyone else on behalf of the Humane Society that was involved in that 2005 fundraiser?
- MR. STOWE: Your Honor, he hasn't asked the witness any questions about whether or not HSUS or Fund for Animals had any involvement in the fundraiser.

THE COURT: Did you? That's the one in Los Angeles?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The Humane Society of the United

States did provide some support for that fundraiser and helped

promote it to some of our donors, but was not very involved in

organizing it or collecting donations or anything at that

level.

BY MR. GASPER:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Setting aside whether it was very involved or not very involved, who on behalf of HSUS was involved?
- A. Mr. Pachelli attended the event and spoke at the event as he frequently does at other events for local humane societies and animal protection organizations around the country. I had some knowledge of the fundraiser, and I believe that some of our staff in our major gifts' section may have sent some invitations to Humane Society donors in that

```
area.
            Specifically who? What individual employees?
            I don't recall. When -- that was in 2005. I don't
       recall which staff worked on that.
            Sir, I believe there is a white binder in front of you.
       Can you please turn to tab 45? These are Defendants' Exhibit
       45.
            Forty-five? I believe this goes to --
       Α.
            I may need to get you a different volume.
       Q.
       Α.
            This goes to 32.
10
11
                 MR. GASPER: I'm sorry. Your Honor, may I approach?
12
                 THE COURT: Of course. It's your declaration,
13
       right, Exhibit 45?
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. I'm sorry.
14
15
                 THE COURT: Sure. Just a moment. Let the reporter
       do what she has to do.
16
17
                 (Whereupon, the court reoprter changed steno paper
       at this time.)
18
       BY MR. GASPER:
19
20
           Mr. Markarian, do you recognize this document, Exhibit
       Q.
21
       45?
22
       Α.
           Yes, I do.
            And what is this document?
23
       Ο.
24
            It is my declaration on behalf of the Humane Society of
25
       the United States.
```

- Q. Okay. And so that the record is clear, if you flip ahead after yours it is within Exhibit 45, but after the first few pages there is a second declaration attached as Exhibit 45 and I just want to make sure the record is clear; do you recognize the second document there?
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. What is this?
- A. It's the declaration of Mary Katherine Bergee (Phonetic), the controller of the Humane Society of the United States.
- Q. And both of these declarations are on behalf of the Humane Society of the United States; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. And they're in connection with the Court's December 2007 order; is that right?
- 15 A. That's right.
- Q. Sir, if I can direct your attention to paragraph two. You state: That HSUS, quote, conducted a thorough inquiry in December 2007 to find relevant documents in its possession, control or custody, that -- and you go on to list "A" through "D"; do you see that?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. What did you mean when you said "relevant documents"?
- 23 A. By "relevant documents" I mean documents that were
 24 responsive to the Court's request and that we -- I believe if
 25 I remember correctly -- we had about one week to respond to

the order, and we created a search process that we felt was most likely to produce responsive documents.

- Q. Were there any documents withheld on the basis that they were not relevant?
- A. I believe that there was a very small set of documents that was withheld because it had already been produced by the Fund for Animals.
- Q. Sir, were there any documents that you did not look for because you did not deem them relevant?

A. Well, as I said, we had about a week to comply. We -
THE COURT: Excuse me, counsel. Approach the bench.

(The Court spoke to the deputy clerk at this time.) Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: As I said, we had about a week to comply. We created a search process that we felt would be most likely to produce relevant documents. We did not search every corner of every building. We did not search the files of departments that were not likely at all to have any documents that were related to Tom Rider or related to this litigation.

MR. GASPER: Sir, in paragraph number four, you state that the individuals identified had no documents that, quote, were not solely related to media or legislative strategies --

THE COURT: You can't refer to this as evidence. Are you offering it into evidence?

```
MR. GASPER: Yes, Your Honor. We can move this into
       evidence.
                 THE COURT: All right. What number is it, then?
                 MR. GASPER: It's 45, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: All right. Defendants' 45 is admitted.
       BY MR. GASPER:
            Do you see paragraph four, Mr. Markarian?
       Q.
       Α.
            Yes.
            You said none of the employees interviewed had in their
       0.
10
       possession documents that were, quote, solely related to media
11
       or legislative strategies; do you see that?
12
            Yes, I do.
            For purposes of this declaration, how did you define
13
       media or legislative strategies?
14
15
            We defined that as any strategy that was related to our
16
       media campaign to inform the public about circus issues, about
17
       the abuse of elephants in circuses, and we also included press
       releases, any documents that were publicly available on our
18
19
       web site, such as a press release which simply stated the
20
       organization's position on circus issues.
21
            So your testimony, sir, is you withheld documents on the
22
       basis it was publicly available; is that right?
                 MR. STOWE: Objection, Your Honor. This line of
23
       questioning is going to get into attorney/client privilege
24
```

matters.

```
THE COURT: Well, when it gets there, we'll stop it.
       Go ahead. Keep going.
       BY MR. GASPER:
            Did you exclude anything that was publicly available?
                                                                    Do
       you have a web site, by the way?
       Α.
            Yes.
            Was there anything on the web site that pertained to the
       Q.
       judge's order but that you kept back because it was publicly
       available?
10
            There were press releases available on the web site which
11
       we kept back because we felt they were exclusively related to
12
       the media campaign of the organization.
13
                 THE COURT: But they were on the web site?
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
14
15
       BY MR. GASPER:
16
            Sir, was your definition of, quote, media or legislative
17
       strategies influenced by anything your lawyers told you?
                  In consultation with our attorneys, we did discuss
18
       Α.
            Yes.
       the scope of media and legislative strategies.
19
20
            What kind of documents did the Humane Society withhold on
       0.
21
       the basis that they were media or legislative strategies?.
22
                 MR. STOWE: Your Honor, that sounds like attorney/
23
       client --
24
                 THE COURT: Well, let's see if we can cross that.
                                                                     Ιt
       wouldn't be fair, it wouldn't be right to draw a deduction
```

from Mr. Markarian's testimony as to the advice he was given, but let me see if I can do it this way. Answer this "yes" or Did you discuss what the words "media and legislative strategy" meant with your lawyers? THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: And you got guidance from them? THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: All right. And you talked with them about that? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: And was that the principle you then used 12 to exclude things that you felt were within media and 13 legislative strategy? THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. It seems to me "A" to be an 15 16 attorney/client privilege. It also seems to be work product 17 because it exposes the workings of a lawyer's mind as to the meaning of the term. 18 19 MR. GASPER: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 BY MR. GASPER: 21 Markarian, the employees whose files were searched 22 in response to this subpoena, did they have any documents that 23 pertained to payments either to Tom Rider or the Wildlife 24 Advocacy Project? 25 The accounting department of the Humane Society of the Α.

United States did produce documents related to payments by the Fund for Animals to the Wildlife Advocacy Project.

- Q. Did anyone else other than the accounting department produce such documents?
- A. I'm not aware that anyone other than the accounting department had documents related to those payments.
- Q. Did you ask anyone other than the accounting department if they had such documents?
- A. Yes, we did.

10

20

21

22

- Q. Who did you ask?
- 11 As I mentioned earlier, we asked several staff members of Α. 12 regional offices for the Humane Society. Staff members of the 13 wildlife department searched my own files, searched the files of people whose files had been previously searched multiple 14 times in response to the Fund for Animals interrogatories. 15 16 But we cast the net more widely in response to the HSUS 17 subpoena to try and capture any staff member who might have had contact with Tom Rider, might have had documents in their 18 19 possession, and none of these people did.
 - Q. Is it your testimony, sir, that Jonathan Lovvorn has no files in his possession that concern payments to Tom Rider?
 - A. That's my understanding.
- Q. And is it your understanding that Mr. Lovvorn had no e-mails concerning payments to Tom Rider?
 - A. That's my understanding.

- Q. Is it your understanding that he has no e-mails referring or reflecting or relating to Mr. Rider?
- A. That's my understanding.
- Q. What about yourself, sir, have you ever received or sent an e-mail concerning payments to Tom Rider?
- A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Sir, also in paragraph four of Exhibit 45, you state that none of the employees interviewed had any documents, quote, that had not already been searched and produced to defendant by Fund for Animals; do you see that?
- A. Yes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. What did you mean by that phrase "not already been searched and produced"?
- MR. STOWE: We're going to object again on the same attorney/client grounds.

THE COURT: Well, let's see what Mr. Markarian says.

THE WITNESS: The several files that had been searched during the Fund for Animals' responses to its interrogatories were in fact searched again. Many of these staff members' files were checked and then rechecked and checked again, both in terms of the Fund for Animals' searches and then later the Humane Society of the United States' searches.

BY MR. GASPER:

Q. So it is your testimony that any file that was searched

previously by the Fund for Animals was searched again by the Humane Society in December of 2007?

- A. I'm not aware that every single file that had been searched initially was then searched again, but there was a great deal of overlap. Many of these files were searched multiple times.
- Q. Sir, also, on paragraph four, if you flip over, it's Page 3 of the declaration -- you state that none of the employees interviewed had documents, including electronic documents, that referred to, reflected, related to Tom Rider or to any payments made to Tom Rider by the HSUS; do you see that?

Α.

Yes.

- Q. Did any of these people have documents that related to payments made by the Humane Society to the Wildlife Advocacy Project?
- A. The accounting department had some records of donations from the Humane Society of the United States to the Wildlife Advocacy Project that preceded this matter. I believe they were related to manatee protection campaigns, and, then as I indicated, the accounting department also had records of payments that were made to the Wildlife Advocacy Project on behalf of the Fund for Animals which related to the media and campaign effort regarding circus elephants.
- Q. Did anyone else other than the accounting department have any such documents?

- A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. Did you ask every single person whether or not they had such documents?
- A. We asked every single person that we queried as part of the search. We asked the staff members who we felt were remotely likely to have had any contact with Mr. Rider or with this litigation or even with elephant related issues, and they did not have any documents that were responsive to this request. Some of them had never even heard of Mr. Rider or knew anything about this litigation.
- Q. Sir, in paragraph five of your declaration, you state that attorneys for the HSUS and employees of the HSUS accounting department conducted a search of HSUS accounting records to find records of and documents relating to any payments by the HSUS to Tom Rider and to the Wildlife Advocacy Project; do you see that?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Did you look anywhere else other than the accounting department for documents relating to the payments to the Wildlife Advocacy Project?
- A. As I said, we've queried several members of the program staff who had worked at some level on circus-related issues, and we asked them to search their files, and there were no documents that related to Mr. Rider or to the Wildlife Advocacy Project.

```
0.
            Nobody had any documents except for the accounting
       department relating to these payments; is that your testimony?
            That's correct.
       Α.
            There were no e-mails reflecting or referring or relating
       to Mr. Rider?
           Not to my knowledge.
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gasper, how much more do
       you have because we're going to stop? All right. Here's the
       situation we confront. It is now 12:20. We certainly cannot
10
       continue this afternoon because, as I've advised you, I'm
11
       duty judge and I have all the criminal matters beginning at
12
       1:30.
13
                 So, accordingly, where do we stand and where do we
       go from here? How many more witnesses do you have? How much
14
15
      more evidence?
16
                 MR. GASPER: I can speak to this witness, Your
17
       Honor, but I may defer to Mr. Simpson for the --
18
                 THE COURT: How much more time do you have with him?
                 MR. GASPER: With this witness, Your Honor, I'd like
19
20
       to say 30 to 40 minutes, maybe a little more.
21
                 THE COURT: After him, what do you have, Mr.
22
       Simpson?
23
                 MR. SIMPSON: After Mr. Markarian, Your Honor, we
24
      have Cathy Liss. We have Mr. Glitzenstein, Ms. Meyer.
25
       assuming Tom Rider is not going to be here. We would
```

designate his deposition in the manner that the Court wants it designated, either by having it read from the stand or provided in paper.

THE COURT: So you have five more witnesses?

MR. SIMPSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Well, what are we going to do about that? We've got to find another date to do them. Are all the -- the five who remain are all D.C. people, Ms. Liss; nobody is coming from out of state?

MR. SIMPSON: I believe that's true.

THE COURT: All right. Well, then you're going to have to sit down and work with counsel on getting a date to continue this. Bear in mind that you'll have to work with Ms. Podger(Phonetic), as well, because, as I've told you, I'm the judge in criminal matters for the rest of the month, and then we go into April. It looks like I'm going to be on trial almost all of April.

So let's stop there and work it out.

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: May I address you briefly, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, if you're going to object to his going any further, Mr. Glitzenstein, I would -- it's hard for me to hear you now because we have got to be back in 40 minutes to start a criminal calendar. These people have to eat and do some other things.

```
You can stand down, Mr. Markarian.
         MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I understand. Very quickly on
Mr. Markarian. As Your Honor may recall, last week was
supposed to be the only day, that's what we were told. Today
was scheduled only so that Mr. Markarian could make it.
appreciate if there is anyway we can finish Mr. Markarian up,
and then you will have heard from every organizational --
         THE COURT: Mr. Markarian, where do you live?
         THE WITNESS: I live in Washington, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay. How could we do that?
         MR. GLITZENSTEIN: How can we -- excuse me?
         THE COURT: He said he's got another 40 minutes.
         MR. GLITZENSTEIN:
                            I defer to the Court.
he's gone for an hour or so.
         THE COURT: No. You don't defer to the Court, you
defer to the clock. There's only 24 hours today.
         MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, could I just --
either now or at some point, counsel of record are three of
the witnesses. As you know, we have a pending motion.
         THE COURT: I know. All right. I'll have to look at
that.
         MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Can I suggest a course of action
on that --
         THE COURT: Sure.
                           Why not?
         MR. GLITZENSTEIN: -- which I think especially given
```

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the time dimension. If they are continuing to insist, which we don't think is necessary and we think is contrary to Judge Sullivan's ruling on him not wanting counsel of record to become witnesses in these proceedings, if after the close of the other testimony or even after today, they submit a brief statement or memorandum as to why they think they've satisfied what they acknowledge as a high standard for calling counsel of record, give us a short period of time to respond to that, and explain why we believe they have not satisfied those legal standards, we can keep those to 10 pages or so, and then Your Honor will have a basis on which to --THE COURT: But you already have a motion pending I thought you said. MR. GLITZENSTEIN: We made an oral motion. Honor may recall, we were not permitted to file a motion before last week's hearing. THE COURT: Why don't we do this, I'll let you file

that motion. How much time do you need to get it in?

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Your Honor, I think if we had a week, that would be fine.

THE COURT: All right. Take 10 days.

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Ten days.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Ten days to respond, Mr. Simpson?

MR. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. GLITZENSTEIN: If we could have a brief here for

```
reply because they'll articulate why they need counsel. So if
       we could have a week after their response to reply?
                 THE COURT: That's fine. Okay. But I still want
       you to work with Ms. Podger and at least set some tentative
       dates so you can lock me in. Whatever happens, you'll have
       some time. We can't do any more today. I have five detention
      hearings this afternoon. You'd sit around all afternoon
       listening to me do that.
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: I understand, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: And we just couldn't get it done.
10
                                                                Then
11
       I have a settlement conference at three o'clock.
12
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Right. I appreciate that, Your
13
       Honor.
                     GASPER: Your Honor, for the record, Mr.
14
15
      Markarian --
16
                 THE COURT: Mr. Markarian, you'll have to come back
17
       at the date we set. Is that okay with you?
                 THE WITNESS: I would prefer not to, but I --
18
19
                 THE COURT: Well, yeah, and I'd prefer water was
20
       wine, but, you know, life goes on, Mr. Markarian. Don't
21
       discuss your testimony. You're under oath.
22
                 THE WITNESS: I understand.
23
                 THE COURT: Thank you.
                 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
                      [End of proceedings]
```

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u> I, Wendy C. Ricard, Official United States Court Reporter in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand at the time and place aforesaid, transcribed under my personal direction and supervision, and that the preceding pages represent a true and correct transcription, to the best of my ability and 10 understanding. 11 12 13 14 15 Wendy C. Ricard, CCR, RPR 16 Official U.S. Court Reporter 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25