UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS,

. CA No. 03-2006

Plaintiff,

v.

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, March 11, 2009

FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,

2:47 p.m.

Defendant.

•

.

TRANSCRIPT OF BENCH TRIAL - AFTERNOON SESSION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs KATHERINE A. MEYER, ESQ.

TANYA SANERIB, ESQ. DELCIANNA WINDERS, ESQ.

Meyer, Glitzenstein & Crystal 1601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20009

202-364-4092

For the Defendants: LISA JOINER, ESQ.

KARA PETTEWAY, ESQ. JOHN SIMPSON, ESQ. MICHELLE PARDO, ESQ.

LANCE SHEA, ESQ.

Fulbright & Jaworski, LLP 801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202-662-4504

Court Reporter:

JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, RPR
Official Court Reporter
U.S. Courthouse, Room 6820
333 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-354-3187

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right, counsel. Over the weekend I went over the deposition testimony. I note that plaintiff did not offer page eleven, but page eleven of the relevant testimony seems to be important. The question, page eleven, let's see, line five, this is a copy of at least the first ten pages of defendant's pretrial statement, and if you turn to last page here, page ten, you'll see your name, and I assume the name is Mr. Sowalsky. It's the second name from the top, and under the subject of testimony, it says, quote: Relatorium legal history of FEI's elephants, including acquisition, permitting, and regulatory status, end quote, so does that comport with the answer you just gave me? You had given a more general answer that plaintiff cited for the Court's attention. His answer is at 15. It's a little more inclusive in terms of the history of the Feld elephants, but other than that, I think it comports with what I just said. And it goes on, is your knowledge of the history of Feld's elephants primarily through the records you were discussing just previously or is it also based on your history with the company?

And he says both. So it seems to me the plaintiff was on fair notice about the scope of why this man was being offered as an expert, but that's just one prong of it. That still doesn't provide a basis, an independent basis for the admissibility of these documents.

Defendants rely on Judge Friedman's opinion. I don't see how that case helps you at all. Why does that case help you? I mean, Judge Friedman recognized that information received from this other bank, to the subject bank was not reliable and didn't come in as a business record, so I don't think this case supports your argument at all.

MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, it was also United States versus Adefehinti.

THE COURT: I want to talk about Boca first. Unless

I'm misreading it, why does Judge Friedman's opinion help you?

MR. SIMPSON: The result doesn't, but I think he sets

THE COURT: Right. If you follow the framework, it

still doesn't provide a basis for the admissibility.

out the framework that's followed here.

MR. SIMPSON: Because the problem in that case -first of all, they were trying to prove up these documents with
a deposition, and the deponent really didn't know who wrote the
documents. The best the deponent could do was narrow down the
authors of the documents to three people, and he also didn't
know how the documents were used by the corporation, so I don't
know whether the government, whoever was trying to get it into
evidence, didn't have another witness, that's the best they
could do, and Judge Friedman said this is not a proper
predicate.

But what the D.C. Circuit ruled in the Adefehinti case

is basically what you have to do is lay the foundation on three 1 2 things: How did the corporation acquire it, how did they use 3 it, and how did they maintain it in terms of filing it? If you can demonstrate that you were the witness with personal 4 5 knowledge how those things take place and that the information 6 flow that comes through the corporation is trustworthy in the 7 sense --8 THE COURT: What's to show it's trustworthy, though? 9 MR. SIMPSON: Well, it is what it purports to be. 10 there any reason to doubt, for example, I can show the Court the 11 documents we're talking about because we're talking in the 12 abstract.

THE COURT: Throughout the trial, USDA documents, right?

MR. SIMPSON: But we haven't seen these yet. Could we pull up Defendant's Exhibit 71, for example?

THE COURT: All right.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MS. SANERIB: Your Honor, I'm willing to allow him to use this as a demonstrative, but we do object to this exhibit, just to get that on the record.

THE COURT: Go ahead. Pull it up, counsel.

MR. SIMPSON: This is an example of what we're talking about, your Honor. This is a letter that's written to Ms. Strauss, who's vice president, corporate counsel of Feld Entertainment, who is personally known to Mr. Sowalsky. She

works for him. If you scroll down a little further down the page, it's from W. Ron DeHaven, who's deputy administrator of the animal care division of AFIS, which is in the USDA, and this letter, as you go back to the first paragraph, reports on the status of an investigation of Ringling Brothers Barnum and Bailey Circus, initiated in January of 1999 has been closed administratively with no action, so all we're doing is offering this document as evidence that this is what was sent to the company about the status of this case. It speaks for itself.

2.2

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I think, though, and it gets back to a point I made before we took the luncheon recess, I don't think the plaintiffs are alleging that Feld was on notice that these were takes by the USDA or any other agency, and I don't think they've offered any evidence, so I don't think you're prejudiced. I don't want to spend two days going through ——

MR. SIMPSON: We're not going to spend two days.

THE COURT: Oh, I know that. Or two hours going --

MR. SIMPSON: We're not even going to go to two hours.

THE COURT: If we're down to two minutes I may allow it then over objection, but wait a minute. I don't think you're prejudiced. I don't think they haven't offered any evidence that says you were on notice that Fish and Wildlife Service took this position factually.

MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, that's --

THE COURT: Wait a minute.

2.2

And it may well be that I can allow the witness to testify that, yes, you know, we never got any notice --

MR. SIMPSON: Well --

THE COURT: Wait.

-- that the USDA was contemplating any action. That makes your case as well. This is rank hearsay, though, and I don't think that Circuit opinion supports the admissibility of a USDA record for this purpose under these circumstances. I don't think so, but again, I don't think you're prejudiced. In fact, it seems to me that the parties may well be able to stipulate that the government never provided you with notice or provided Feld with notice that the actions complained of were indeed takes, and that's your concern, isn't it, that you weren't given any notice, that's one of them?

MR. SIMPSON: That's part of it.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SIMPSON: But the other part of this is, assuming that the Court agrees that the taking prohibition applies to this case, then we have a regulation that says that it's not a take if what you're doing is a generally accepted husbandry practice that complies with the Animal Welfare Act. That's in the regulatory -- the Fish and Wildlife definition of harassment, and we think this evidence goes to that question, because what's going on in these investigations are complaints

about how the bullhook is being used and the tethering of these elephants. Those are husbandry practices. Those are practices used to handle large animals.

THE COURT: The bottom line, though, is I assume Feld was never sanctioned for the use of the bullhooks by USDA, I assume.

MR. SIMPSON: That's correct.

THE COURT: And no one disputes that?

MR. SIMPSON: Well, I don't think they do.

THE COURT: Do they?

2.2

MR. SIMPSON: No, because what they want you to do is say this is all political, this isn't binding, you should ignore it. What you should pay attention to, your Honor, is affidavits and the low-level communications of the investigators themselves, like, for example, in the Benjamin case, that's one of their favorite exhibits, the Report of Investigation where a fellow named Green made comments about how he thought Benjamin died. They want you to read that, that's in evidence, but they don't want you to look at the letter that we got.

THE COURT: The fact of the matter is, the record is what the record says, and these records from USDA that I'm sure the plaintiffs have combed over from your files give credence to your argument that indeed there was no Notice of Infraction by USDA. That's your point that you're trying to make, right?

MR. SIMPSON: That's not in the record yet. That's

the problem.

2.2

THE COURT: Wait a minute. What I'm saying, you don't dispute that, do you, that these records don't show Notice of Violations?

MS. SANERIB: Yes, we agree with that.

MR. SIMPSON: But the problem is the loop's not been closed because they put in several --

THE COURT: I understand that. That's different. That's something completely different.

MR. SIMPSON: But they put in several documents that were part of this process at a lower level in the agency.

THE COURT: They had a basis for doing so too. Those records were certified.

MR. SIMPSON: We've also stipulated that anything generated by the USDA is authentic. We have a stipulation to that, so the only real question is whether it's a business record of the corporation.

THE COURT: I don't think it's a business record of the corporation.

Getting back, I don't think you're prejudiced at all because they're not claiming that you were put on notice by USDA or Fish and Wildlife Service either that these types of actions were indeed takes under the applicable law. I understand what the other evidence shows. I understand that, and it's already in the evidentiary record that there was indeed an independent

2.2

evidentiary basis for them to become part of the record.

Insofar as these records are concerned, first of all, they aren't business records maintained by Feld, and secondly, more importantly, I think, from your point of view, is they don't show anything. They don't show notice, and they aren't claiming that they do show notice.

MR. SIMPSON: It's not notice, your Honor, and they're variously worded. This one closes the case with no action.

Other of these letters say there's insufficient evidence of a violation.

Now, I think that's significant because you spent, I don't know, an hour listening to a police officer from California go over photographs and a videotape and all kinds of stuff about elephants in 1999 and then an incident with another elephant in 2001. All of that got submitted to USDA, all of that got submitted to USDA, and their finding was that's not a violation of the Animal Welfare Act.

THE COURT: Right, right.

MR. SIMPSON: Right now, though, all I'm doing is saying there is no evidence in the record. That's why we're trying to get in --

THE COURT: No one disputes that. I don't want to spend two hours going through something that's not really controverted. They haven't offered these records to show that you were on notice. They haven't offered these records to show

1 that indeed there were violations for which you were sanctioned. 2 The record is what the record is, and the records aren't harmful 3 to Feld. MR. SIMPSON: Well, I don't --4 5 THE COURT: It seems to me that the parties can 6 stipulate that those records don't show what you're fearful that 7 they do show. They don't show that so we don't have to waste 8 two hours bringing them in. I don't think, first of all, it would 9 MR. SIMPSON: 10 take more than fifteen minutes for Mr. Sowalsky to prove this 11 up. 12 THE COURT: Are you talking about me combing over 13 thousands of pages? 14 MR. SIMPSON: No, I'm not. I'm not. The only exhibit 15 we're offering is Defendant's Exhibit 71. 16 THE COURT: Which one? 17 MR. SIMPSON: The one that is on the screen. THE COURT: That's it? 18 19 MR. SIMPSON: There are fifteen pages --20 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. I should have listened to 21 you when you said you didn't have any objections, right? 2.2 that what you said? 23 MS. SANERIB: We have some objections to this exhibit, 24 but what was listed to come from was Mr. Sowalsky was thousands 25 of pages of records.

MR. SIMPSON: Well, your Honor's 72-hour notice made it clear if you didn't put it on there you couldn't even think about using it.

I can make a proffer right now --

THE COURT: Tell me what you want and how long it's going to take. I don't think it's a business record. Judge Friedman's opinion doesn't help you.

MR. SIMPSON: The direct examination of Mr. Sowalsky would have taken an hour.

THE COURT: It would have taken. All right.

Do you see my point? I don't know whether the parties can stipulate or not.

MR. SIMPSON: I think we're prejudiced unless they stipulate that these are husbandry practices that comply with the AWA. Now, if they're willing to stipulate to that, then fine, but they're not going to. They're claiming indirectly this all violates the Animal Welfare Act.

THE COURT: It may well be that they don't disagree with your contention that these are husbandry practices that were not sanctioned by the government. That's probably the basis for a fair stipulation, isn't it, or not?

MS. SANERIB: Your Honor, their own witness, Gary Jacobson, testified that forcing elephants to perform tricks is not a husbandry practice, so we're not going to agree that what goes into training these elephants to perform in the circus is

1 husbandry by any stretch of the imagination. 2 THE COURT: Tell me what you want. 3 MR. SIMPSON: I want to put in pages one through three. 4 THE COURT: One through three of 71? 5 6 MR. SIMPSON: Wait. One through three, four, and 7 seven through fifteen of Defendant's Exhibit 71, all of which 8 are letters from the USDA to Feld Entertainment. 9 THE COURT: And let me guess what they say. 10 action? MR. SIMPSON: No violation. It's not a problem, 11 you're not violating the law, but your Honor, unless you have 12 13 that in the record you don't have any way of knowing what the 14 position of the agency is. 15 THE COURT: Absolutely I do, because at the conclusion 16 of this trial I've heard no evidence that Feld was ever 17 sanctioned for the complaints made by the plaintiff. 18 probably going to be a finding. 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. SIMPSON: Well, except that's what they say happened in the Kenny case, and Kenny was a settlement with no finding of violation, but the constant drum beat is that that's a finding that the company violated the law. So that's the proffer on 71. There would be a chart for your Honor which I've already given the other side that we were going to call that 299A that would summarize this.

MS. SANERIB: We definitely object to that chart.

THE COURT: Hmm?

2.2

MS. SANERIB: We definitely object to that chart.

THE COURT: I know this is a chart again, but do you dispute what counsel just said with respect to 71? I'm not surprised those documents say no finding, no fault, and that's fine for what it means, whatever it means, but it doesn't carry the day for anyone, I don't think, but what's the prejudice to the plaintiffs if I allow those documents to come in? I understand they've not been certified as public records, and you probably have a good-faith basis in law to argue to keep them out as business records, but what's the harm here if I allow them in?

MS. SANERIB: Well, your Honor, the first thing about that that is harmful --

THE COURT: First of all, I want you to address you were put on notice, page eleven of that deposition, you were put on notice what he was going to testify to, so you can't really say that you never had any prior notice that Mr. Sowalsky was not going to testify about regulatory practices, etcetera, etcetera. I just happened to read further. I lost track of the lines. I said wait a minute. I know she didn't offer this, and you didn't offer it. I'm not being critical, but you were put on notice.

MS. SANERIB: I think that there's a dispute between

3 4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

the parties when we're talking about the regulatory status of these animals. Up until very recently, that was whether or not these animals were Pre-Act animals or captive-bred wildlife animals for the purposes of the Endangered Species Act.

THE COURT: This is a 2008 deposition, though, right? That's correct. It was taken last MS. SANERIB: November, and I don't think it's really until this trial started that the defendant started making this argument that somehow the USDA and Animal Welfare Act supersede what's going on with circus elephants and you shouldn't pay attention to the Endangered Species Act, so our assumption was, and if you look at Mr. Sowalsky submitted two declarations in support of defendant's motion for summary judgment. Those declarations go through what he asserts to be when they acquired those animals, when those elephants were born, and therefore whether they fall as Pre-Act animals or fall as captive wildlife-bred animals. That was the sort of basic world of Mr. Sowalsky's summary judgment affidavits, and what he said in his declaration, or sorry in his deposition, was he anticipated that to be his trial testimony, and that pertains to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the status of these animals vis-a-vis the Fish and Wildlife Service.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question. If the records became a part of the -- if those documents became a part of the evidentiary record in this case, are the plaintiffs prejudiced

1 from proceeding with making their arguments? 2 MS. SANERIB: You're talking about Defendant's Exhibit 3 71? The one he just proffered. 4 THE COURT: 5 MS. SANERIB: I don't think we're prejudiced from 6 making our arguments. 7 THE COURT: Then what's the harm? Let's get on with 8 it. MS. SANERIB: I think the thing that's prejudicial 9 here is --10 I understand the technicality, but by the 11 THE COURT: 12 same token, if you were fairly put on notice and he ran across 13 the street and got a public certification, what would be the 14 argument to keep them out of the record? MS. SANERIB: Well, I think we also have, in addition 15 16 to our hearsay objections, we also have completeness objections. 17 I think that if you look at this letter, this first page of DX 71, it shows that -- I don't even know what this is about. 18 Ιf 19 you read this letter, first of all it says, As requested in your 20 letter of May 27th, 1999 --21 THE COURT: You're probably absolutely correct, and I 2.2 think that would be a correct application of the completeness 23 rule to have the other letter brought in. I totally agree with 24 that. 25 MS. SANERIB: Yeah.

THE COURT: But worst case scenario from plaintiffs, if they came in, how are you prejudiced from making your argument? You've never alleged they were put on notice by USDA that these are improper husbandry practices, have you? You haven't mentioned that.

MS. SANERIB: We have not. We have not.

THE COURT: So what's harm here? Why are we spending two hours on this?

MS. SANERIB: Well, the first thing is, because that's how the Rules of Evidence work. And I can't tell you, your Honor, how many countless hours we spent with the USDA trying to get a business record certification and it does seem a little unfair that we devoted all that time and effort to getting our records certified.

THE COURT: I'm not minimizing that. I'm just trying to figure out, what's the harm here? I don't mind spending whatever time is necessary to get through an issue, and I think on fairness I don't think they come in as business records. You know, I just don't think so.

MS. SANERIB: And we --

THE COURT: By the same token, though, even if they don't come in as business records, there are ways to get around those rules, and counsel can testify, you know, they can testify about were you ever sanctioned, right? Did you ever receive a sanction for this? They can do that so --

1 MS. SANERIB: Well, and it --

2.2

THE COURT: So we'll spend three hours doing it that way?

MS. SANERIB: If Mr. Sowalsky had personal knowledge about this, then, yeah, we wouldn't need any of these records.

I think our concern is he's never been listed as the witness who actually handles these USDA matters for Feld Entertainment.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not so sure about that.

Counsel, what else?

MR. SIMPSON: I think that's subject to cross, number one, and number two, they represented to you that he knew nothing about the USDA. The USDA doesn't even appear in his deposition. The words aren't in there. They never asked that question, period. And I think this comes in mainly because, if they want the whole thing in, fine. I mean, that was really the only objection they had, was completeness, but I don't see how you can cherry-pick bits and pieces of USDA stuff and then not have the final say-so here. It may not ultimately be relevant at all to your Honor.

THE COURT: It may not be.

MR. SIMPSON: But they've open the door.

THE COURT: I think if the trial continues the way it has continued, there is probably a finding that will articulate that Feld was never notified by USDA or FWS that its pattern and practice of husbandry practice violated any rule, regulation, or

law. I think. I mean, if we didn't have this issue and if there's no other evidence that plaintiffs had, they've given us the best shot and there's no evidence. That's probably going to be the Court's finding, and that would be consistent with the evidence, whether these records come in or not, wouldn't you agree?

2.2

MR. SIMPSON: Well, I think that might be the case, except I don't know that we've actually put that evidence in yet. The only people who have testified about it are Mr. Feld. Mr. Sowalsky does have personal knowledge of this process, he's in charge of it, he reads these letters when they come in.

THE COURT: He's not going to offer any damaging evidence against Feld Enterprises. Up to this point there is none, but he's not going to offer any.

MR. SIMPSON: I'm not comfortable saying that this is the record as it stands now would support that finding. I mean, it has to be based on substantial evidence. I think this supplies it, this --

THE COURT: Substantial evidence or the lack of evidence?

MR. SIMPSON: Well, if you don't have -- I don't know what they're going to argue if we have an appeal in terms of what's already in. These are documents, there's no reason to believe these weren't sent from the USDA, they speak for themselves, we're not trying to say they mean more than this.

Whatever it says it says, it says. Mr. Sowalsky can tell you what investigation this pertains to. It's kind of vague on --

2.2

THE COURT: The problem, business records come in, as we all know, to accomplish one objective. First of all, to keep hard-working people from coming down and sitting down in a federal court witness room waiting to testify about matters. They can be doing the business of their principle, and they're kept in the ordinary and normal course of business and recorded contemporaneously with the event and there's some indicia of reliability.

We don't know who these people are. Just because they got a USDA logo on there, it's so easy to create anything on the Internet these days, and, the bottom line is, Mr. or Ms., whoever this person is, I don't know if it's a man or a woman, is not available to be cross-examined, so where is the indicia of reliability, the fact that it has USDA in small caps at the top of the page?

MR. SIMPSON: No. Because I think there's a process that takes place, there's an investigation, it starts for many reasons, it could be an activist complaint, it could be something that somebody inside the company saw it, it could have been a member of the public, whatever reason it starts, there's a process that occurs. This agency asks for information.

Sometimes they interview people, sometimes they get documents, and then it all goes off into a black box, and at some point

they write back and say this is what we're going to do, and Mr. Sowalsky can testify from personal knowledge that that part of it, this is what they tell us, is these letters. Now, do we know what went on in between? No. We're not privy to that. I don't have a witness who's competent to tell you what the stature of the Report of Investigation is within the agency, but we've got people that --

2.2

THE COURT: We don't even know whether Ron DeHaven signed this document.

MR. SIMPSON: But we have no reason to believe he didn't. This came in the ordinary course of business. Mr. Sowalsky --

THE COURT: Whose business, though?

MR. SIMPSON: Feld Entertainment's business. I mean, it's part of their business to interact with this agency, this agency controls their elephants.

THE COURT: That would mean that any time that Feld or any other defendant or plaintiff gets notice from the federal government or district government or any third party for any reason inquiring about anything and they keep that in a file, that comes in as a business record?

MR. SIMPSON: Well, I think if you rely --

THE COURT: It may come in as a public record, but it wasn't being offered for that purpose because you can't because under a certification, but a business record kept in the

ordinary course of business of the circus? I don't think so.

2.2

MR. SIMPSON: I think if it's part of your business to have this kind of continuous contact with a regulatory agency, the documents they send you, if you actually do receive them and rely on them in some way in running your business, could become part of your business records.

THE COURT: No one's found a regulatory agency case that deals with this? This can't be the first time this issue has come up.

MR. SIMPSON: Well, we looked. The closest one that we were able to find was the D.C. Circuit case and the Adefehinti case, at least in this Circuit. I don't think it's a big leap to say that just because it's from an outside party, if you have reason to believe what's being told to you in the record, that it comes in. The reliability is there. When DeHaven says --

THE COURT: I mean, you're opponent, though, is at a significant disadvantage. We don't know who signed that.

MR. SIMPSON: They know who he is.

THE COURT: If there's George Bush's name on there, we didn't know if the President signed it.

MR. SIMPSON: They know who he is. They put documents in with this man's name on them already. They're already in the record of this case. They went in when they sent all those exhibits in at the end of their case.

2.2

There's no reason to doubt when it says this case has been closed administratively with no action that that's untrue. Now, could they reopen it? Yes. Some of these things say we're closing this because we don't have sufficient evidence, that's a true statement. Is it possible in the future they might get sufficient evidence?

THE COURT: No action was taken against you.

MR. SIMPSON: That's true, but right now there's no proof of that, your Honor, and that's what we're trying to show.

THE COURT: All right. I don't want to repeat myself, but if things keep going the way they're going, there won't be any evidence. They've already given us their best evidence. But you don't feel comfortable with the Court saying there's no evidence of action by the USDA or Fish and Wildlife Service sanctioning Feld for what plaintiff contends to be improper husbandry practices in violation of laws, rules, and regulations.

MR. SIMPSON: Because that's not really their position as I understand it. Their position is there are gross violations of the Animal Welfare Act that this agency is not remedying for whatever reason.

THE COURT: But the agency, that's --

MR. SIMPSON: Corruption. Whatever it is. I don't know what there theory is. But that's their theory. It's not that there's no violation of the AWA, and we think based on what

these things say, there is reason to believe that there is no violation of the AWA because all this has been presented to this agency in elaborate detail and these are the responses we're getting, so I think that's a different question and that's why I think it's relevant.

2.2

THE COURT: Counsel? I should have listened to you when I took the bench. You said we have no objection to using this as demonstrative evidence? Isn't that what you said?

MS. SANERIB: I thought I said that we think some of this might come in. I definitely don't --

THE COURT: I think we're spending too much time on this. Go ahead, tell me what you think. Tell me what you have no objection to coming in.

MS. SANERIB: Well, I think the first thing I want to say, not that it's not what you want to hear, but our objection to this stuff coming in, if this was so important to their case, why didn't they get a certification for these documents, these records? We went through that process.

THE COURT: That's another issue. I'm not minimizing the hard work. I know how difficult it is to get people to certify things. I understand that, because they don't attach any importance to doing that. It detracts them from doing what they're supposed to be doing on their job and they don't want to do it. Bottom line, they don't want to do it.

Official Court Reporter

MS. SANERIB: And I think the other thing is, you look

at this first document --

2.2

THE COURT: Do you know what? You should have told me, these people are being pains in the neck and asked me to issue a subpoena to subpoena the director over here to testify, I bet you would have gotten a certification. Anyway, you got your certification, you worked hard to get it. You say they didn't do it, they shouldn't come in, they shouldn't come in as a business record, but you can't tell me how you're prejudiced.

MS. SANERIB: You're Honor, we're prejudiced in part too because there's evidence we tried to introduce in our case in chief, evidence that was before the USDA when it was investigating Feld Entertainment, that evidence didn't come in. You said that's not a business record. Now defendants turn around, the tables are turned, and they're trying to use those same arguments against us.

THE COURT: I was wondering when you were going to make that argument. You're absolutely right. That's exactly what happened.

MS. SANERIB: I think that that definitely prejudiced us.

And I think the problem with some of these things is, it's not clear at all that these are the routine practice of the USDA to issue these types of letters. If you look at this in the first paragraph of this letter right here, it says, Dear Ms. Strauss, as requested in your letter of May 27th, 1999, this

letter will serve as confirmation.

2.2

It is clear that Feld Entertainment is going to USDA and saying we need a letter that says X and they're giving them a letter that says X, and for that reason additionally we don't think these documents should come in. They can put on a witness, the witness can testify we've never been found to be in violation of the Animal Welfare Act, and I can cross-examine him.

THE COURT: That wouldn't take longer than fifteen minutes.

MS. SANERIB: Yes, I don't think it would take more than five minutes for him to do that. And that's fine, that's all they need, but to have these self-serving records coming into the record and I don't get to cross-examine these people, we don't know if they're actually the routine business of USDA to issue these letters to anyone else, that's patently unfair, that's prejudicial to us.

And the only other thing I wanted to say regarding, you know, Mr. Simpson gave us a lot of testimony and we certainly object to his testimony on these things, but I do want to point out for the record that the only standard under the Endangered Species Act is not the harassment standard which talks about standard husbandry practices, there's a lot of other words that are included in the definition of take, and I just want to get it on the record if there's a wound and if there's

harm to an animal, that's also a take, so harassment isn't the only thing that's being alleged in this case, and I want it to be perfectly clear that there is other terms that are at issue that don't deal at all with husbandry practices, and we certainly don't think that chaining elephants on trains for long hours and making them perform in a circus are by any stretch of the imagination by anyone's definition husbandry practices.

2.2

So getting back to these records, again, maybe we should go through them page by page, but I just do any think there's any indicia of trustworthiness in these records that they can come in without some sort of either business certification or witness from the USDA that we can cross-examine on these issues. If Mr. Sowalsky wants to testify if he knows that the USDA has never found Ringling Brothers to be in violation of the Animal Welfare Act, he can do that and I can cross-examine him, but I don't think these records should come in.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. SIMPSON: Well, your Honor, you know, I think
we're probably beating a dead horse here, but, I mean --

THE COURT: I hope not.

MR. SIMPSON: I mean, I think the point is, it's not clear on this AWA who has the burden of proof. I mean, I think they probably have the burden of proving that it doesn't comply, but it could turn out to be some kind of defense, so I'm

concerned that if this doesn't come into evidence, that we don't have any evidence of our defense. It's one or the other. It's got to be part of their case or part of a defense.

THE COURT: You agree you're going to accomplish the same objective if I allow you to present this witness without these records?

MR. SIMPSON: I'd have to go through each of the investigations because there have been so many and there have been so many statements.

THE COURT: How many have there been, seven?

MR. SIMPSON: The ones that are in here, there's fifteen pages, but some of these letters pertain to the same one, so I think it's about seven.

THE COURT: You're clearly entitled to do that and I guess another alternative, and I don't want to suggest it, I was going to say just have someone go across the street and get a certification. I mean, it's public records. Is that unfair? I bent over backwards trying to help you get that film in from the woman from California. I still don't know how she's going to authenticate it over the phone. I don't know. It's probably easier just to let your witness testify. These aren't business records, but go ahead, you can make your point. You can get him on the stand. You can't lead him, but you can make your point, but the parties can't stipulate, right?

MS. SANERIB: I don't think so, not on those records.

THE COURT: You know, I didn't read the last one. 1 2 read the other one. I read Friedman's and said this doesn't 3 help at all. What is that, that's the Circuit case? What's the surname? Let me just take one minute to read that one. 4 MR. SIMPSON: The United States versus Adefehinti. 5 THE COURT: I have it. I just didn't take a look at 6 7 it. Let me take one minute so I can take a look at that. 8 still don't think it's a business record, but let me take a look That dealt with the memoranda also, didn't it? 9 MR. SIMPSON: Well, it dealt basically with records 10 11 submitted by a financial institution by a third party. 12 THE COURT: That's right. By a third party, right. And that was a criminal case as well? 13 14 MR. SIMPSON: Yes, it is. THE COURT: Kind of confrontational clause issues and 15 16 all that other stuff. I don't think I need to go that far. 17 me just take a look at it. 18 How long do you need to question your --19 MR. SIMPSON: About an hour. Well, it will depend on 20 what you rule. It could be a lot shorter, but ... 21 THE COURT: All right. 2.2 (Recess taken at about 3:17 p.m.) 23 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please remain seated. This Court 24 is again in session. 25 (Back on the record at about 3:35 p.m.)

THE COURT: I think, and I'm glad that I took the opportunity to read this case, I'm sorry I didn't read it over the lunch hour, the Adefehinti, A-d-e-f-e-h-i-n-t-i, I believe supports defendant's argument for these reasons:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Looking at the decision, there were three challenges in the Circuit court, and essentially the Circuit relied on the first challenge, and that was that a bank official certified, in this case it would be this witness testifying, the authenticity of documents that the bank relied upon in making lending These were loan processing documents that a bank decisions. relied upon and a question came up as to whether or not they came in as business records, and the Circuit went on to say indeed with respect to that -- I'm not reading verbatim -- with respect to that first challenge, the Circuit said, and I quote: This is where his argument is the strongest as the way in which the other types of documents were created and used more obviously fits the business records exception. And the Circuit limited its discussion then to the certifiers of the loansupporting documents. I'm quoting from the opinion, the Circuit said, "Assuming the nontestifying certifiers, in this case it would be the USDA, had no more knowledge of the document's creation than did a third party, there are two weaknesses in the factual basis underlying the certificates. First, " and here there's no certificate because the witness is testifying, these aren't business records being offered by Feld, there's a

witness, the general counsel is going to testify, "the certifying officials have no direct knowledge of the circumstances under which the records were made in the sense of being incorporated into the bank's record. Second, the bank certifiers could not completely address the original creation of the records that had occurred in the course of the mortgage broker's business."

2.2

So the appellant's questioned whether the certifiers could legitimately assert as required by the rule that the records were made at or near the time of the occurrence of the matter set forth by or from information transmitted by a person with knowledge of these matters. And the Circuit said that neither -- strike that. Neither weakness is fatal to the admissibility of the documents, and it goes on to talk about how to lay an adequate foundation under 902.11, and this is where it's important. "Further, several courts have found," and I'm reading verbatim, "that a record of which a firm takes custody is thereby," quote/unquote, "'made' by the firm within the meaning of the rule (and thus is admissible of all the other requirements.) We're satisfied. We join those courts."

Relying on <u>U.S.</u> v <u>Duncan</u>, and I'm quoting from computer page, it looks like seven, I guess. It's headnote seven. <u>U.S.</u> v <u>Duncan</u>, 919 Fed 2d 981 found there was no requirement that the business records be created by the business having custody of them so that insurance company custodians

could lay an adequate foundation admitting records compiled by those companies from the business records of hospitals.

2.2

To the same effect is <u>U.S.</u> v <u>Childs</u>, 5 Fed 3rd 1328, which accepted documents under Rule 902.11 such as certificates of title and odometer statements that were maintained by an automobile dealership in the regular course of business, though, not originated by the dealership, and also the matter of Ola Construction Equipment, 665 Fed 2d 43, finding that business records are admissible of witnesses testifying that the records are integrated into a company's records and relied upon in its day-to-day operations. And that's what we have here in the case before this Court. I added that. And noting that relevant financial statements were completed at the bank's request and were of the type that the bank regularly used to make decisions whether to extend credit.

And further authority support is found in <u>U.S.</u> v

<u>Karonco</u>, 551 Fed 2d 1197, holding that freight bills, though
drafted by other companies, were business records of a shipping
company because they were adopted and relied upon by shipping
the company. Etcetera.

So I think there's support here, in the argument here is that Feld received these records and made business decisions, or not, based upon the information give to it by USDA, and these records were integrated into the records kept by Feld. I think they come in. I think they come in. I think the certification

has been made.

2.2

I'm going to allow the limited testimony for a couple more reasons. First of all, I don't see any prejudice to the plaintiffs, and I'm not minimizing the hard work they expended in getting their records certified. It would be just as easy for the Court to give the plaintiffs a one-hour recess and issue a subpoena to the director of the Department of Labor in his or her new job and tell that person to come down here and certify that, and my guess is we'd get a certification by a courier in the next ten minutes. So that could be done.

Secondly, there is no prejudice to the plaintiffs.

You were on notice of these documents.

And third, I don't think the documents -- well, I've already indicated I think that an argument could still be made that even if the documents don't come in, there's no evidence in the record, the defendant's aren't precluded from the making the argument there's no evidence in the record that the federal government has ever sanctioned the husbandry practices of Feld Enterprises, so there are at least three reasons for it. The most compelling reason is that I have no doubt that if I directed the director of USDA to certify these as public documents, they'd be certified within the next thirty minutes if not sooner, so for all those reasons, I'm allow the limited testimony.

I want plaintiff to preserve plaintiff's objections.

If there's a completeness argument, let me know what it is. I want to be fair about that. I'm not so sure that just because a USDA document says so this is in response to your letter that necessarily the letter becomes a part of the record, but, you know, I want you to make the argument anyway. Maybe it does for completeness purposes.

2.2

Another compelling reason is, even though I'm ruling that I'll allow the records to come in, I'm still going to -- I haven't resolved the merits. At some point I will address and resolve the merits, and I'll give these documents whatever weight, if any, they're entitled to, and I may change my mind about the admissibility at that point. It's a nonjury trial and I have the luxury of doing that, but I want to get on with this trial.

So for all those reasons, I will provisionally allow those documents to become part of the evidentiary record now subject to further objections made by plaintiffs.

MS. SANERIB: We do have some completeness objections. Should I make those now or should we do it as Mr. Simpson introduces the record?

THE COURT: You know what they are. Maybe we should do it -- maybe it would be more appropriate to let you interject at the appropriate time so there's a clear record of your objections.

MS. SANERIB: I'm happy to do that, your Honor.

1	THE COURT: All right.
2	Mr. Simpson, so we're down to fifteen minutes now,
3	right?
4	MS. SANERIB: I do want to clarify. Mr. Simpson gave
5	us a short list of these documents from Defendant's Exhibit 71
6	and we're working off that short list, correct?
7	MR. SIMPSON: That's correct, that's correct.
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	So how many minutes do you need?
10	MR. SIMPSON: Well, I don't know that it's fifteen,
11	but it will be a lot shorter than an hour.
12	The defendant calls Jerry Sowalsky.
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Sir, would you raise your right
15	hand, please?
16	Do you solemnly swear the testimony you should give in
17	trial will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the
18	truth so help you God?
19	MR. SOWALSKY: I do.
20	THE COURT: Go ahead, counsel.
21	Good afternoon, sir. How are you today?
22	THE WITNESS: Very well. Thank you.
23	JEROME SOWALSKY, WITNESS FOR THE DEFENDANT, SWORN
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. State your name for the record, sir.
- A. Jerome Sowalsky.
- Q. Are you currently employed?
- 4 | A. Yes.

2

3

5

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. What's your current position of employment?
- A. I'm executive vice president and general counsel of Feld

 Entertainment, Inc., and it's affiliate companies.
 - Q. How long have you been with Feld Entertainment, Inc.?
 - A. Thirty-six years.
- Q. Sir, would you just briefly describe your job
- 11 responsibilities for the Court?
 - A. Well, I head up a small legal department. We try to do as much of the legal work for the various entities that we have as we can in-house. It ranges from a great many contracts that we do every year, to immigration work, questions that are arise in the tax area, labor, labor and employment matters; the whole range of things that a large corporation would be involved in.
 - Q. Does the company have Asian elephants?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Does your department have any responsibility for Asian elephants?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Describe that for the Court.
- A. Well, we didn't get obviously into the care and maintenance of the elephants, but in terms of compliance with the various

laws and regulations, both federal, state and local, we try to stay on top of that and make sure that we're in compliance.

- Q. And at the federal level are those elephants regulated in some way?
- A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Describe that, please.
- A. Well, our primary point of contact with respect to regulation is the Department of Agriculture. And they have authority under the Animal Welfare Act to come out, inspect our animals, and see whether our operations are in keeping with the regulations that they have in place.
- Q. Now, as to what you just testified to, are you familiar with that process?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. How are you familiar with that process?
 - A. Well, we receive notices from our units, our traveling units, our units in Florida, of fixed facilities whenever an inspector from the USDA comes out to view the animals, and we ask that the people there cooperate of course. That's part of our standard procedure. And if any noncompliance matters arise during one of those inspections, that would be brought to our attention.
 - Q. Now, when you say "our attention," how are you, Jerry Sowalsky, involved in that process yourself?
 - A. Well, at one point when I was counsel early on in my

employment with Ringling, I would be the primary contact because I was the only lawyer. I have several people on a staff now and I would get information usually through those -- through the people who handle that on sort of a hands-on basis.

- Q. As to the USDA process currently, how do you keep yourself apprised of developments in that area?
- A. Well, Julie Strauss is generally our point of contact with the USDA and her office is right next door to mine. We meet on a daily basis. She's deputy general counsel, and if -- I would ordinarily be advised if there is an inspection going on, and then of course if there was some issue that arose as a result of the inspection, she would keep me apprised of what was going on.
- Q. Now, has the United States Department of Agriculture done any investigations of the company?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Are you familiar with that process?
- 17 A. Yes.

- Q. How are you familiar with that process?
- A. Well, usually we're contacted by -- it develops in
 different ways. Sometimes we're contacted again by one of our
 units saying that a USDA investigator has come out to
 investigate a complaint that has been made, frequently by an
 animal rights group, or it might be on their own initiative, and
 we then contact the USDA and try to arrange to have them come at
 a time that would be convenient when somebody from the legal

department would be there. We have the right to be there on the premises while they talk to our people and investigate whatever it is they're investigating.

THE COURT: Do you ever get any complaints from people who just buy a ticket to attend the circus?

THE WITNESS: Well, sometimes it's hard to tell because we get complaints from somebody who appears to be a ticket-holder, but on further review we think they're probably a member of one of the groups.

THE COURT: How would you know that?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think frequently we get that from the USDA themselves. They let us know where the complaint is coming from.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

2.2

- Q. Now, are you personally involved in this investigative process with the USDA?
- A. I have been on occasion, but again, Julie Strauss usually handles -- if there's going to be an interview and somebody needs to be there, it would usually be Julie who would be on the scene and we would discuss whatever issues arose as a result of the investigation and I would be involved if there are any decisions to be made.
- Q. So she reports to you?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you believe you're fully informed about what goes on

with these USDA investigations?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Do the USDA investigations generate any kind of documents from the government, from the USDA?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What does that process generate in terms of documents from the USDA to the company?
- A. Well, ultimately I guess if statements are taken from any of our employees, we will get copies of those. We would then get a report, a copy of the report that was submitted by the investigator, with his conclusion so that we would be in a position then to respond to that.

THE COURT: What's the typical process? If the process was instituted by USDA, what would be the -- you'd go into your office one morning and see what or hear what?

THE WITNESS: Well, Julie probably would have gotten a phone call.

THE COURT: Phone call or --

THE WITNESS: Let's say the general manager of our

Blue Unit said that we had somebody come out to the unit today

and say that they showed us their credentials, they're

investigators from the USDA and they have a complaint and this

was the nature of the complaint, and Julie would get the

information as to who the investigator was and probably call the

investigator directly and arrange to have a meeting where they

can all get together and talk to the people who were involved with that particular unit in taking care of the animals.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

2.2

- Q. So you indicated, I think, that the company would be contacted, there would be information provided to the USDA. What happens after that?
- A. Well, then it goes into the bowels of the USDA somewhere and the AFIS division of the USDA, and ultimately they will it usually takes quite a while before there's any conclusion to any of these investigations, but sometimes we get a report saying the investigation has been concluded and basically with no violation. Other times they're just open and we're left hanging. We frequently have to call them to find out whatever happened with the investigation.
- Q. And when USDA, you say, reports back to you, what form does that report take about the outcome of the case?
- A. We try to get it in writing of course. We suggested if they've closed the matter, that they write a letter to that effect, and frequently they will do that. Sometimes it's just an oral communication.
- Q. Now, as to the ones that come to the company in written form, describe the process in terms of how they arrive at the company and what's done with them.
- A. Well, it's a letter from somebody of authority within that division of the USDA writing a letter, frequently I would say

- the letters go to Julie, just brief letters, indicating that they've investigated the matter, they have identified the investigation, and saying that the investigation is being closed because they found no violation of any of the regulations.
- Q. Do these letters come to the legal department?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Are they maintained in the legal department?
- 8 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

- 9 Q. How are they maintained?
- 10 A. We have a file for each investigation which we keep all the matters relating to that particular investigation.
- 12 Q. Does Feld Entertainment rely on these documents?
- 13 **|** A. Yes.
- 14 \ Q. How do you rely on these documents?
- A. Well, we close our file as well. We rely on them in terms of knowing that there's nothing that we have to do in order to,
- 17 you know, comply with USDA regulations.
- Q. Mr. Sowalsky, I'd like to call your attention to
 Defendant's Exhibit 71.
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Have you had occasion prior to today to review these
- 22 documents?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Would you briefly describe what that is for the Court,
- 25 these series of documents?

A. This is a letter from Ron DeHaven, who is the deputy administrator of the Animal Care Division of US --

THE COURT: Do you know him?

THE WITNESS: I have met him, yes.

THE COURT: You have met him?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- O. Who is Ron DeHaven?
- A. He's a veterinarian, and his title at that point was deputy administrator of the Animal Care Division. I believe he then became administrator, and I think within the last year or so he's left for some position in private industry or some other group, but at the time he was the one that was responding to or in charge of monitoring these investigations.
- O. And had you met with Mr. DeHaven before this letter?
- A. I don't recall whether it was before or after, but I probably had met him at least, you know, face-to-face, at least one occasion before this letter.
- Q. And the addressee on this letter is Ms. Julie Strauss, who's vice president, corporate counsel, Feld Entertainment?
- A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Is that the same Ms. Strauss you referred to prior?
- 23 A. Yes.
- THE COURT: I don't think anyone disputes that. Ms.

 Strauss is in court today.

MR. SIMPSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. Mr. Sowalsky, this makes reference to an investigation initiated in January of 1999. Do you see that?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Do you know which investigation that is?
- A. Well, it's not identified here. I think this may have been the investigations relating to a complaint that was filed by two former employees, Glen Euell and I forget the other fellow's first name, but a fellow named Stechcon, saying that they had seen some elephants abused with an ankus or something to that effect.

THE COURT: With what?

THE WITNESS: An ankus.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. Do you know which unit of the circus those two people worked on?
- A. I don't recall. I believe it was the Blue Unit, but I'm not certain of that. It was one of the traveling units.
- Q. This indicates it's been closed administratively with no action. Are you aware of any further communication from the USDA on this matter since June 1st, 1999?
- A. There may have been one follow-up letter dealing with this particular investigation, but it didn't change the conclusion.

Q. All right. Well, let me refer you to page two of this same exhibit.

MS. SANERIB: Before we move off of page one, I do want to object to the admission of page one of DX 71, again for same thing: there's no indication that this type of letter is something that's used in the day-to-day business operations of Ringling Brothers Circus.

Plaintiffs also have a completeness objection to this letter coming in, and that is, that the underlying investigative report for this, we think if the letter comes in, that underlying investigative report needs to come in. That report was produced in discovery. It was produced as PL 14099 to 107, and we have a copy of that electronically if we need to use that.

THE COURT: All right. I'll reserve ruling on the completeness argument. I mean, at some point I'll take a look at the document and I'd be interested in whatever additional legal authority you may have on the completeness argument. I'm not so sure that it comes in, but I want to see it anyway and then I'll certainly entertain your argument with points of authorities you have.

MS. SANERIB: Okay.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. Do you recognize this as page two of Exhibit 71, sir?
- A. Yes.

2.2

Q. What letter is this?

2.2

A. This is a letter from Elizabeth Goldertyer, who is the Eastern regional director of the Animal Care Division of the Department of Agriculture.

THE COURT: Do you know her?

THE WITNESS: I don't know her personally. I've spoken to her on the telephone, but I don't know her personally. BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. What do you understand her position in the USDA to be, sir?
- A. Well, the USDA has regional offices, and when a matter comes up for investigation, it's ordinarily directed to the office in which the violation, you know, the alleged violation took place, and somebody from that office would then go out, investigate and report, in this case to the Eastern regional director.
- Q. Do you recognize the case number that's been highlighted in the re: line here, FL 99028AW?
- A. I think that may have been a case involving the elephant named Benjamin.
- Q. You think that was Benjamin?
- A. I believe so.
- Q. All right. Let's move to the next document?

MS. SANERIB: And again, on this document, your Honor, we object to it coming in. We don't think there's been any testimony that these records are used in the day-to-day business

operations of Feld Entertainment, and we also have the same completeness objection to this record. We think it's the same investigation report that goes along with the second page of DX 71 as the first page.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. Do you recognize this? This is an August 21st letter from the same individual to Ms. Strauss?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 11 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q. It makes reference to a whistleblower complaint of elephant abuse. Do you remember what case that was?
 - A. Well, it's the same as the prior letter, so I think it probably related to the Benjamin incident as well.
 - Q. If we could go to the next page that I've offered in this exhibit, which is 5.
 - MS. SANERIB: And again, your Honor, we object to that page of this exhibit coming in for the same reasons. I'd also say it doesn't seem that the witness has the requisite personal knowledge to be able to certify these records as business records of the company, so I'd add that to our objections as well.
- THE COURT: All right.
- 25 BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. Page five of Defendant's Exhibit 71 is a letter to Ms.

 Strauss dated July 8th. Actually, it has two dates: July 8th and July 2nd, 2002. If we could go to the last page of that.

 Next page, please. From Chester A. Gipson. Do you see that, sir?
- 6 A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Who is Chester A. Gipson?
- A. Well, at that time he was the deputy administrator, animal care, of the USDA.
 - Q. All right. Could we go back to the first page? There is reference made to a case number, CA 302005AC. Do you see that at the top, August 25th, 2001, Humane Seat of Santa Clara Investigators and the city of San Jose police officer witnessing an animal handler for Ringling Brothers Barnum-Bailey Circus lunge toward and apparently strike a Feld-owned female Asian elephant with a bullhook or an ankus, are you familiar with that investigation?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Which performer did that investigation involve?
 - A. You're asking about the performer?
- 21 Q. The person accused of the animal abuse.
- 22 A. I think it was Troy -- his last name will come back to me,
 23 but it was --
- 24 \ Q. Could it be Mark Oliver Gebel?
- MS. SANERIB: Objection, leading; your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. There's reference made down to the next paragraph, case number 2009 and 136, abuse of elephants from June 1997 through November 1999 by a former Feld employee, stating that he witnessed several beatings and the mishandling of elephants. Do you see that?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Are you familiar with those allegations?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Do you know who that former employee is?
- 12 A. I believe that was Tom Rider.
- Q. Was there any other person that you're aware of that worked for Feld Entertainment during that time frame that made such
- 15 allegations?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. If we could go to page twelve. This is a January 31st,
- 18 2001 letter to Ms. Jeannie Parron from W. Ron DeHaven. Who is
- 19 Ms. Jeannie Parron or Dr. Jeannie Parron?
- 20 A. She's an attorney. She's also a veterinarian who is with
- 21 the law firm of Covington and Burlington who was representing us
- 22 at that time.
- Q. Do you recall this letter, sir?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \ Q. Do you recall what this was about?

1	A. This involved our Williston, Florida facility. There was
2	an elephant there by the name of Tillie. It was an elephant
3	that did not was not owned by Feld Entertainment. It was
4	owned by another individual who was out of the country at the
5	time. On an inspection that had at the facility, it was
6	determined that this elephant had tuberculosis and they
7	instructed that it go into treatment for that ailment. Our
8	veterinarian was reluctant to do that until he talked to the
9	owner and obtained permission from the owner of the elephant
10	I believe her name was Patty Zirboni and the USDA refrain
11	from forcing the issue until she returned and he could get the
12	permission to commence the treatment, which they ultimately did.
13	Q. And if we could also go in this same exhibit to page seven?
14	MS. SANERIB: I'm not sure if you're offering page
15	twelve, but if you are
16	MR. SIMPSON: I'm going to offer it all at once.
17	THE COURT: And provisionally admitted then subject to
18	plaintiffs' objections.
19	You don't have to repeat each one. You made your
20	records.
21	MS. SANERIB: Should I do my completeness at the end
22	or
23	THE COURT: Do it at the end. If you have some points
24	of authorities you want the Court to consider how voluminous
25	are the documents that you wish to offer under this completeness

1 theory? 2 MS. SANERIB: They're not particularly voluminous. 3 THE COURT: Why don't you provide the Court with copies this evening or tomorrow so I can rule on it and whatever 4 5 additional points of authorities and law you wish to rely on. 6 MS. SANERIB: Thank you, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 BY MR. SIMPSON: 9 Page seven, sir, is a letter dated August 31st, 2000 from 10 Goldentyer to Ms. Strauss? 11 THE COURT: It may well be that defendants don't 12 object, I don't know. Have you talked with them, spoken to them 13 about your completeness objection with respect to these 14 documents? 15 MS. SANERIB: No, I have not. I'll confer with them 16 before I do the filing tonight. 17 BY MR. SIMPSON: 18 This makes reference, sir, to an investigation into the 19 death of Benjamin. Are you familiar with that case? 20 MS. SANERIB: Objection; leading. 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 2.2 THE COURT: It is. Let's refrain from leading, 23 He's an attorney also. Don't lead him. 24 BY MR. SIMPSON: 25 Are you familiar with this document? Ο.

A. Yes.

2.2

- O. What does it concern?
- A. It concerns an incident involving the death of a young
 Asian elephant in Texas. The name of the elephant was Benjamin.
- Q. Does this state what the outcome of this case was?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have any reason to believe that it does not accurately state what the outcome of this case was?
- A. No. I think it does accurately state that.
- Q. And in the re: line at the top, is that the case number?
- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Let's --

THE COURT: How did Benjamin die?

who was transporting him stopped, I think it was for an overnight stop. There were two elephants that were being transported. Benjamin -- there was a pond at this facility and both the elephants went into the pond -- it was warm weather -- to bathe and to do what elephants do when they go into the water. This young -- the older elephant came out of the water. The younger one stayed in and apparently had some kind of heart condition and had what was ultimately determined to be a heart arythmia like some of the young athletes have from time to time and it drowned.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. If we could go to page eight of this same exhibit. Do you recognize this document, sir?
 - A. Yes.
- 4 \ Q. Does this concern that same case?
- 5 A. Yes.

3

- Q. Page nine, do you recognize this document, which is from Ron DeHaven to Mr. Harris Weinstein and Ms. Parron?
 - A. Yeah. If you could --
- 9 Q. Blow it up?
- 10 A. Blow it up a little, it would be easier to read. Yes.
- Q. And at the time were these two individuals representing the company?
- 13 A. They were.
- 15 A. This letter concerns the death of an elephant named Kenny
- in, I think it was in Jacksonville, Florida, while it was on
- 17 tour.
- 18 Q. What was the outcome of the Kenny investigation?
- 19 A. It was resolved through a settlement with the USDA.
- 20 Q. Was there a finding of violation of any kind?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 Q. If we could go to page --
- THE COURT: How did he die, how did Kenny die?
- 24 THE WITNESS: Well, it was determined ultimately that
- 25 he had some sort of severe viral infection that affected his

gastric system. I believe that was the outcome, yeah.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

2.2

- Q. If we could go to page thirteen. This is a letter to Ms. Strauss from Robert Gibbons. Do you know who Robert Gibbons is?
- A. I don't know Robert Gibbons, you know, personally, but I recognize the name as being the director of the Western region of the USDA.
- Q. How do you know that?
- A. Well, we have had correspondence and discussions with him about various things through the years.
- Q. This is an April 5th letter, 2001, referring to a investigation concerning alleged violations occurring in the San Francisco Bay area last fall, which would be 2000. Are you familiar with that matter?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Which matter was that?
 - A. It was a matter in which one of the animal rights people was video-taping behind the scenes. They were outside the facility but behind the scenes for a considerable period of time. He was there every day for several days video-taping what was going on in and around the circus area, and he had some footage that showed one of the animal handlers using the ankus to control the elephant in a way that he felt was abusive and I guess he reported it to the USDA.
 - Q. Okay. If we could look at page fourteen, which is a letter

from Ron DeHaven to Julie Strauss, dated July 14th, 2001. You've seen this document before?

A. Let me just take a look here. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And what, sir, did this document concern?
- A. During an investigation at our -- or it was an inspection, actually, it was not an investigation at the time, during an inspection of our facility in Polk County, Florida, the inspector saw that there were some marks on two young elephants and asked about it and determined that in the separation process from the elephant's mother, that --

THE COURT: What do you mean, separation process?

THE WITNESS: Well, they're weaned from their mothers at some point, as we do with humans actually, but there are procedures for doing that with the elephants so that the young ones don't get too excited about it and the mother doesn't get too excited about it and it's done very gradually, and usually it's done with some tethers that are wrapped in soft cotton and they're separated for short periods of time and then longer periods of time, and there was some thought that perhaps that had been done in an inappropriate way because there were marks on the young elephants's legs.

THE COURT: From the chains?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, from the tethers that had been put on him, even though they had been wrapped, and it was determined ultimately, because this was put out to a group of experts as to

whether this was an appropriate way to separate young elephants from their mother, I think there were eight or nine so-called experts who voiced an opinion about it, and virtually all of them I think except for one said that this was an appropriate way of doing it so that ultimately the matter was closed with a finding that there had been no violation.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Do you remember the identity of the two elephants involved in this matter?
- A. I think one was Doc and one was Angelica.
- Q. And if I could turn you, sir, to page fifteen of
 Defendant's Exhibit 71, which is a February 4th, 2008 letter to
 Thomas Albert from Elizabeth Goldentyer. Who is Thomas Albert?
 - A. Well, it says on the letter he's our vice president of government relations.
- 16 Q. What department does he work in?
 - A. Well, that's a department within the company government relations. It's actually a department that reports to me.
 - Q. So he reports to you?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And do you recall what this letter concerned, which matter this letter concerned?
 - A. There have been a number of them. The one in Tulsa, I think the date there is probably wrong, I think.
 - Q. Which date, the one that's underlined?

- A. Not the one on the letter, but the one in the body of the letter. It says Tulsa, Oklahoma 2007.
- Q. What should it be?

- A. I think it was a matter that arose in 2006.
- Q. And as to that particular situation, Tulsa in 2006, what was the matter, do you remember?
 - A. I'm not sure I recall precisely what that matter was. There was one instance in which an animal rights activist got pretty close to some of the elephants and I believe the elephant handler at the time who was trying to control the situation turned around and bumped into this fellow. In doing that I don't think there were any injuries involved, but as a result of that, this person filed a complaint saying that he had been threatened by our animal handler, through the use of elephants that he had been intimidated, and an investigation was undertaken, and as you can see from the letter, it was closed due to lack of evidence of any violation.
 - Q. Are you familiar with an allegation concerning Sacha Houck in Tulsa, Oklahoma in 2006?
 - A. Yes. It's this particular.
- 21 Q. Is that this case?
- 22 A. I believe it's this case, yes.
- Q. And one final document in this exhibit that I actually skipped over inadvertently is page eleven. And this is a May 3rd, 2002 letter from Goldentyer to Ms. Strauss. Do you

recognize this, sir?

2.2

- A. I recognize the letter, yes.
- Q. Do you remember what matter this concerned?
- A. Well, in 2002 I believe one of the matters related to an incident that occurred in San Jose in which there was an allegation that one of our performer animal handlers had injured one of the elephants. That was actually the subject of a criminal suit in San Jose in which the person, the alleged perpetrator was found not guilty without even presenting a case because the other side's counsel really document that anything had happened there. The other one I'm not sure. I know there was a complaint in connection with something that happened in Oakland. I'm not sure whether that's it or not.

MR. SIMPSON: Based on that, your Honor, we offer Defendant's -- we'll call it Defendant's 71A, which is pages one through three, five, and seven through fifteen.

THE COURT: Over objection and essentially for the reasons previously articulated by the Court and subject to plaintiffs offering additional evidence under plaintiffs' completeness theory or either a stipulation that defendants don't object to receipt of additional evidence.

(Defendant Exhibit No. 71A was admitted into evidence at about 4:15 p.m.)

BY MR. SIMPSON:

Q. Let me refer you, sir, to Defendant's Exhibit No. 86 at

This is an August 9th, 2001, letter to Ron DeHaven 1 2 from Jeannie Perone. Do you recognize this letter concerning 3 the handling practices of two weaning elephants? Yes. 4 Α. And let me refer you also to page forty of that same 5 Q. exhibit, which is a letter to Jeannie Perron from Ron DeHaven. 6 7 Do you recognize this letter, sir? 8 Α. Could you blow it up a bit? Thank you. Yes. 9 Ο. Does page forty respond to page 39? 10 It does. Α. MR. SIMPSON: We offer as Defendant's Exhibit 86A 11 12 pages 39 and 40 of Defendant's Exhibit 86. 13 THE COURT: Over objection, admitted. 14 (Defendant Exhibit No. 86A was admitted into evidence 15 at about 4:17 p.m.) 16 MS. SANERIB: We object, your Honor. We don't think 17 this is business records. It's rank hearsay. It doesn't come 18

Both of these letters indicate they were prepared in in. preparation with an eye toward litigation, and I don't think they come in under the business records exception.

THE COURT: Admitted over objection.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

Mr. Sowalsky, you indicated that the USDA also inspects the Q. circus?

Α. Yes.

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. When they inspect the circus, does that generate documentation?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

20

21

2.2

- 4 Q. What kind of documentation does that generate of the USDA?
 - A. An inspector fills out a form that he has, which is an inspection report, and ordinarily at the end of the inspection leave a copy with us and forward his inspection report to his home office, I guess.
 - Q. Does the representative of the company have to acknowledge receipt?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And when that document is provided to the company, does it go to your legal department?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- MS. SANERIB: Objection; leading.
- 16 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 17 BY MR. SIMPSON:
- Q. Where does that document go when it's provided to the company?
 - A. It goes to -- currently it goes to somebody who coordinates the collection of that document and then forwards copies under company procedures to the units to the legal department in the normal course of business and to I think government relations.
- Q. Do you maintain a file in the legal department of these documents?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Does the company rely on these documents?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How does it rely on these documents?
- A. Well, we rely on it to the extent if there's no violation we know that we're in compliance. If there are things that are found to be not in compliance, we would then undertake to make certain that whatever had gone wrong was taken care of within the time frame. We usually give them a time allowance to correct any deficiencies.
- Q. Let me show you Defendant's Exhibit 73.

 Enlarge that a little bit.
- 13 **|** A. Yes.
- Q. Have you had a chance to review this exhibit prior to today, sir?
- 16 A. Yes.
 - Q. And what is this exhibit, what are the documents in this exhibit?
 - A. Well, this is the inspection report that I was just referring to. This is the form that the inspector would fill out upon conclusion of his inspection.
- Q. If we could go to the bottom of that page. Do you recognize the signatures at the bottom? Well, actually, who's the second signature of?
 - A. It's somebody out on our unit. It's Jeff, and I'm not

familiar with this particular person. It would be unusual for the purchasing agent of a unit, but he must have accompanied the inspector during this inspection and been given that assignment, and what he's doing here is just acknowledging receipt of the report.

- Q. Are the documents -- let's go back to the top. Which unit of the circus does this concern?
- A. This is the Blue Unit.
- Q. Are the rest of the documents in this exhibit the same types of inspection reports?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. And you've reviewed them personally?
- 13 A. Yes.
- THE COURT: I assume same objection, correct?
 - MS. SANERIB: Actually, your Honor, we don't object to the inspection reports coming in. We think under what has occurred already in the law of the case, inspection reports are public records and they come in. We do not agree that these are business records, but we agree that they come in as public records.
 - THE COURT: Admitted.
- MR. SIMPSON: In that case, I'll also offer

 Defendant's Exhibit 74, which is inspection reports for the Red

 Unit.

MS. SANERIB: No objection, again as a public record, 1 2 coming in as a public record. 3 THE COURT: Admitted. (Defendant Exhibit Nos. 73 and 74 were marked for 4 5 identification at about 4:21 p.m.) BY MR. SIMPSON: 6 7 Is the company inspected by state and local agencies? Q. 8 Α. Yes. Does that generate any kind of documentation? 9 Ο. 10 It ordinarily generates some type of inspection report. 11 Each state has its own form. Sometimes it's informal, it's just 12 a written-out report, but ordinarily it's a form that's dictated 13 by the state authority that deals with this. 14 And when those documents are generated, do they come to the 15 company? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Do they go to the legal department? Ο. 18 MS. SANERIB: Objection; leading. 19 THE COURT: Sustained. 20 Where do they go? 21 BY MR. SIMPSON: 2.2 Where do they go? 0. 23 It's the same process. It's somebody who takes care of 24 compliance for the animal records, it goes to that particular 25 person, who then forwards copies to the legal department.

retain that in our file and it goes to whatever unit is involved. If there's something in there that would be of interest to a veterinarian, it might go to the veterinarian.

- Q. Does the company rely on those documents?
- A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. How does it rely on those documents?
- A. Well, the same as with the federal. If there is compliance, if it indicates that there's compliance, there's no action to be taken, we rely on that. If there are noncompliant matters, then we address that and make sure that there's somebody who's going to take care of that within whatever time limits are given.
- Q. Let me show you Defendant's Exhibit 80, sir. Have you had a chance to review the documents in this exhibit prior to today?
- **∥** A. Yes.
- 16 Q. What are the documents in this exhibit?
 - A. Well, this is a document issued by a state authority, the state of Florida. Somebody had come out to inspect our animals, and here it was at the Miami arena. It's just the report that was generated as a result of that inspection.
 - Q. Are the rest of the documents in Exhibit 80 of the same nature?
 - A. They are. Some relate to other states of course, but they are of the same nature, yes.
 - MR. SIMPSON: We offer Defendant's 80.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. SANERIB: Your Honor, we object on hearsay grounds. We don't think there's any exception that applies to these records. We also have an authentication objection to FEI 2190739536 and 2262. Those three pages of this exhibit, it's completely unclear who generated those documents, where they came from, so forth and so on, so we object on that basis as well.

MR. SIMPSON: We can just exclude those three.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. Let me refer you to Exhibit 81. Have you had a chance to review the documents in this exhibit, sir?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

20

- O. What are the documents in this exhibit?
- 15 A. This was an inspection report issued by the Nassau County,
 16 New York SPCA.
 - Q. Have you personally reviewed the rest of the documents in this exhibit?
- 19 A. Yes.
 - Q. Are they of the same nature?
 - A. Yes.
- 22 MR. SIMPSON: We offered Defendant's 81.
- MS. SANERIB: We object on hearsay grounds. We don't think this has anything to do with the day-to-day business operations of Feld Entertainment. These records shouldn't come

in. They're from outside entities.

THE COURT: Counsel, same argument, I assume?

MR. SIMPSON: It's the same argument. It's the same exact --

THE COURT: Admitted subject to the same. The Court recognizes the objections made by the plaintiff, and subject to the reasons previously articulated, that document will be admitted.

(Defendant Exhibit No. 81 was admitted into evidence at about 4:24 p.m.)

BY MR. SIMPSON:

2.2

- Q. Let me refer you to Plaintiffs' May Call Exhibit 33, which is a letter to Adam Pascandola of the Washington Humane Society, dated June 5th, 2005 from Julie Strauss of Feld Entertainment.

 Do you recognize this document?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What did this document concern?
 - A. It concerned an incident in which the representatives of the Washington Humane Society came to the show while it was in Washington, D.C., representing that they had authority to inspect the animals, that they had legal authority to inspect the animals when in fact they did not, but they were given access and did I believe inspect the animals at the time. This was a letter of protest saying that they had misrepresented themselves.

1 MR. SIMPSON: We offer Plaintiffs' May Call Exhibit 2 33. 3 MS. SANERIB: Your Honor, we object to this. First of all, this is a plaintiffs' exhibit, not a defendant's exhibit. 4 We elected not to introduce this in our case in chief. We don't 5 think defendants, because they neglected to put it on their 6 7 pretrial statement, should be able to use this letter. Our second objection is this is rank hearsay. 8 9 should not come in. This is an advocacy piece written by 10 someone at Feld Entertainment trying to convince a local 11 authority not to bring an enforcement action against them. 12 think the D.C. Circuit law is clear, this type of information is not a business record, it doesn't come in under that exception. 13 14 THE COURT: Was this listed, counsel? 15 MR. SIMPSON: It was listed on their exhibit list, 16 that's correct. 17 THE COURT: Not yours? 18 MR. SIMPSON: Not ours. 19 THE COURT: I'm not going to allow it. 20 MR. SIMPSON: I would just state for the record, your 21 Honor, we have a completeness objection because they introduced as Plaintiffs' Will Call 28 the letter that prompted this 2.2 23 response, so we just think the file ought to be complete. 24 THE COURT: I understand what you're saying. 25 What about that?

1 MS. SANERIB: I don't think their completeness 2 objection was reserved on their pretrial statement. 3 THE COURT: They're making it now. Why shouldn't I have all the competent evidence? 4 I'll provisionally allow that under that theory, 5 6 completeness. If plaintiffs want to keep it out and provide me 7 with some case law and persuade me not to give it any weight. 8 MS. SANERIB: I mean, your Honor, you made it clear in 9 your pretrial order when we submitted our objections, that was 10 it, that was all we got to do, so they're now raising an 11 entirely new objection that wasn't in their objections to our 12 pretrial statement to try to get this document into evidence, 13 and that's unfair. 14 THE COURT: Why didn't you make your completeness 15 argument then? 16 MR. SIMPSON: Well, it's the same process that we 17 followed before in terms of not re-listing three or four hundred 18 exhibits on their list on our list. First of all, it was a may 19 call exhibit. We didn't know if they'd offer it. 20 ultimately did. I think now that they did and you allowed it 21 in, we have a completeness issue, so all we want is a response. 2.2 THE COURT: I'm inclined to allow it. I'll focus on 23 whatever legal authority plaintiffs want to submit to persuade 24 me not to give it any weight.

(Plaintiffs' May Call Exhibit No. 33 was admitted into

1 evidence at about 4:27 p.m.) 2 BY MR. SIMPSON: 3 Mr. Sowalsky, are you familiar with the Endangered Species Act? 4 5 Α. Yes. 6 Ο. And the regulations issued under the Endangered Species 7 Act? 8 Α. Yes. Let me refer you, sir, to Defendant's Exhibit 5, which is 9 Ο. 10 already in evidence. 11 THE COURT: How much longer? We've been at it for 12 about two hours now with the argument and everything else. We'll take a ten-minute recess. 13 14 How much more time do you need? 15 MR. SIMPSON: Twenty minutes. 16 THE COURT: I'm thinking about 9:30 tomorrow start to 17 make up some time, and 9:30 definitely on Friday. 18 (Recess taken at about 4:27 p.m.) 19 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please remain seated. This Court 20 is again in session. 21 (Back on the record at about 4:49 p.m.) 2.2 THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed. 23 BY MR. SIMPSON: 24 Mr. Sowalsky, let me direct your attention, sir, to 25 Defendant's Exhibit 35, which is in evidence. Do you recognize this letter, sir?

A. Yes.

- Q. Can you describe for the Court what the circumstances of this letter were?
- A. This is a letter that I received from Fish and Wildlife Service and Department of Interior clarifying for us, meaning the circus, questions that he we had in our mind regarding whether or not we needed to apply for a permit to engage in what we regarded as our normal activities of taking the circus from state to state, Interstate Commerce, and it was an assurance to us that they had just adopted new regulations to make it clear that the provision of the Act, of the regulations that had been in effect were being clarified to say that commercial activity was not intended to include what we were doing, but it was intended to regulate transfers and sales of wildlife from people who were in the business of transferring animals.
- Q. To your knowledge, sir, has Fish and Wildlife ever withdrawn this position?
- **■** A. No.
 - Q. Has Fish and Wildlife ever indicated to the company to your knowledge that you needed any other kind of permit?
- A. Not to engage in what we regard as our normal business activities, no, sir.
- Q. And maybe make it more specific, with respect to your Asian elephants?

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

- Q. Has the Fish and Wildlife ever indicated to you or to the company that the way the company is handling its Asian elephants is a taking?
- A. No.
- Q. Has Fish and Wildlife ever indicated to the company that use of the bullhook constitutes a taking?
- A. No.
- Q. Has Fish and Wildlife ever indicated to the company that the manner in which the company restrains or chains or tethers its elephants is a taking?
- A. No.
 - Q. Let me direct your attention, sir, to Defendant's Exhibit 193 alpha, A, and, your Honor, 193 already in evidence is a series of permits, and I want to show the witness this one, which is one that just came out. Do you recognize this, Mr. Sowalsky?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 **■** Q. What is it?
- A. This is a permit issued by the federal Fish and Wildlife
 Service. It's a captive bred wildlife permit that --
- THE COURT: It's for wild animals born in captivity,
- 24 THE WITNESS: Yes, yes.
- 25 BY MR. SIMPSON:

is it?

Q. If we could go down to Item E, capital E as in echo, do you see that, sir?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. There's a reference made in this document to authorized to take for normal husbandry practices. Do you see that?
- A. Yes.
- O. What does that mean?
 - A. Well, we took that to mean -- we take that to mean that if we're engaging in normal husbandry practices in accordance with the regulations and procedures adopted by the USDA under the Animal Welfare Act, that there's no need for us to obtain any other permit.
- Q. Now, which classification of the company's elephants does this permit apply to?
- A. Asian elephants, and I guess it's a carry-over from a time in which we had leopards, so it includes leopards as well.
- Q. Are there --

THE COURT: What does that mean, "normal husbandry practices"?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think it comes out of the Animal Welfare Act and the regulations there that where the USDA has established a bunch of standards for care and treatment of animals and in terms of what's required to normally take care of an animal or various kinds of animals. They have different categories, of course, for different animals, and it establishes

1 that as the standard, and I think that's what they're referring 2 to here. 3 BY MR. SIMPSON: Now, does this permit, 193A, apply to all of the company's 4 5 Asian elephants? 6 Α. It applies to those that were captive-bred. 7 And so are there other elephants the company has that Q. 8 aren't captive bred? 9 Α. Yes. Is your understanding of the standards in terms of how 10 Ο. 11 those animals should be handled any different than what this 12 permit says is for the captive-bred wildlife animals? 13 No. You still kept normal husbandry practices that you 14 would have to follow. Has the Fish and Wildlife Service ever indicated to the 15 16 company that a practice that is in full compliance with the Animal Welfare Act could be a taking? 17 18 Α. No. MR. SIMPSON: We offer Defendant's 193A. 19 20 THE COURT: Any objection? 21 MS. SANERIB: No objection, your Honor. 2.2 THE COURT: Admitted. 23 (Defendant Exhibit No. 193A was admitted into evidence

at about 4:55 p.m.)

BY MR. SIMPSON:

24

Q. Sir, let me refer you, if I could, to Defendant's Exhibit
1. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And also just for reference, the first page of this?
A. Yes.

Q. Well, let's get it on the screen. Page one. The next page, page two.

2.2

MS. SANERIB: Again, your Honor, that is the chart that plaintiffs have objections to the testimony section of the Pre-Act column that falls in the far right, and we talked about this chart with Mr. Jacobson. We talked about this chart again yesterday.

MR. SIMPSON: It's a different chart, your Honor. It's not the same one.

THE COURT: It's not the same one we talked about yesterday?

MR. SIMPSON: No. It's a condensed version of that document, but it's different, and I'd like to lay the foundation.

THE COURT: I told counsel I'd give him the opportunity to lay a foundation. I'm not so sure it was this chart we were talking about, but this is the chart you designated as a potential exhibit?

MR. SIMPSON: This is our own exhibit. This is a different one than the one we argued about yesterday.

MS. SANERIB: That's fine if we want to lay the foundation, but I don't know how to display the document while he's doing that.

THE COURT: You're not prejudiced by it. Let's proceed.

BY MR. SIMPSON:

2.2

- Q. Mr. Sowalsky, what does this document represent?
- A. Well, you can tell by captions of the various columns it names an elephant, gives the gender, date, and place of birth of that particular elephant, and acquisition date and the source, basically where that elephant came from. And at the time it was prepared at least, where that elephant was currently located, and then the column regulatory status and evidence thereof indicates a description of how we arrived at the conclusion that this was a Pre-Act, what's called a Pre-Act elephant.
- Q. What does that mean, Pre-Act elephant?
- A. Well, it was an elephant that was in captivity either at the time the Endangered Species Act became effective in 1973 or at the time that a particular species, such as the Asian elephant, was added to the list of endangered animals by the Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Q. And as to this column all the way over to the right-hand side with the number of materials listed, what are the materials listed in this column?
- A. Well, there's the Asian -- it starts with the Asian

elephant North American Regional Studbook. That's a common studbook. That's -- forgot the organization that maintains that studbook, but all captive elephants are supposed to be listed in this particular common studbook for all of North America.

- Q. Are you familiar with the other documents apart from the stud book, the other documents that are cited in this column?
- A. Yes. There was an affidavit prepared by one of our employees, Tim Holst, an affidavit by another woman who was an employee at the time, Donna Gautier, and there is documents in which a reference was made to the Pre-Act status of this particular elephant named Jewell.
- Q. Now, these affidavits you made reference to when they were prepared, what was the purpose of preparing them, do you know?
- A. Yes. I believe in each case it was the fact that we were taking the animals outside the United States, I think to Canada and Mexico, and there may have been a situation in which we took Asian elephants to Japan, and for that we needed a certificate or under the CITES convention, which permits it's an international convention, that government earns the transportation and transport of elephants across national borders for all the countries that are signatories to that particular treatie and the Fish and Wildlife Service is the designated management agent of that treatie for the United States and they are the authority that issues this kind of certificate and permit to transport those elephants inter—

1 nationally.

2

3

4

7

12

- Q. Is the reference there at the bottom to CITES certificate one of those certificates?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Have you personally reviewed the documents that are cited in this column in this chart?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Let me refer you to Defendant's Exhibit 3 and ask you, sir, are these the documents that you just made reference to?
- 10 A. Well, the one that's on the screen right now is the affidavit that was signed by Donna Gautier.
 - Q. Have you had a chance to review the documents in Defendant's Exhibit 3 prior to today?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- Q. And are these the documents that are cited in that righthand column of Defendant's Exhibit 1?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. Are these the documents in Defendant's Exhibit 3 documents that are maintained in the ordinary course of Feld
- 20 Entertainment's business?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Are they true and accurate copies of same?
- 23 A. Yes.
- MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, we offer Defendant's Exhibit

 1 and Defendant's Exhibit 3 as exhibits that were never objected

to by plaintiffs on any grounds other than completeness which we'd be happy to cure, but the only objection that's ever been made to either of these exhibits is that the chart that we did argue about two days ago should come in with this, which we don't have any objection to, but this is a condensed version of that same chart limited to the seven Asian elephants at issue in this case and the supporting documents therefore as to which there's been no objection made by the plaintiffs at all.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MS. SANERIB: Your Honor, we still don't think that there's a sufficient foundation for the chart that's DX 1 coming in based on DX 3.

THE COURT: All right. Admitted over objection.

(Defendant Exhibit Nos. 1 and 3 were admitted into evidence at about 5:01 p.m.)

BY MR. SIMPSON:

- Q. Mr. Sowalsky, I take it the show, the circus units travel interstate; is that right?
- A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Is there any process of documentation that the circus has to get to go from one state to another?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And briefly how does that work?
- A. Well, in some cases we need state permits to go from state to state to perform in a particular jurisdiction, and we would

apply for that in connection with those applications for permits. We would ordinarily have to provide some kind of medical certification that the animals had received their shots, they were in good health, they were not harboring any communicable diseases, and that would be issued by our veterinarian. Even in those cases where we don't need a specific permit for the animals, usually the various states will require that such a certificate from a veterinarian be submitted.

- Q. To your knowledge, has any Feld Entertainment Asian elephant ever been denied entry into a state on account of health reasons?
- 13 A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

20

- Q. Let me refer you, sir, if I could, to Defendant's Exhibit

 200. Do you recognize this document?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is this a collective bargaining agreement between the Teamsters Union and Feld Entertainment?
- 19 A. Yes.
 - Q. What is the applicable dates on this agreement?
- A. This agreement was in effect from January 1st, 1996 to
 December 31st, 1998.
- Q. Were you involved in the negotiation of this contract?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you sign it on behalf of the company?

1 A. I did.

2

3

8

- Q. Is that your signature on page fourteen?
- A. Yes, it is.

Entertainment?

- 4 Q. And you're familiar with the terms of this agreement?
- 5 A. Yeah.
- Q. Let me also show you Defendant's Exhibit 201. Do you recognize this as an agreement between the Teamsters and Feld
- 9 A. Yes.
- Q. For the period of January 1st, '99 to December 31st, 2001?
- 11 MS. SANERIB: Again, leading.
- 12 THE COURT: Let him testify.
- 13 BY MR. SIMPSON:
- 14 0. What is this document?
- 15 A. This is collective bargaining agreement between Teamsters
- 16 Local 688 and Feld Entertainment, and it was in effect from
- 17 January 1st, 1999 to December 31st, 2001.
- 18 Q. Were you involved in the negotiation of this contract?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. Are you familiar with its provisions?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Did you sign it on behalf of the company?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Is that your signature?
- 25 A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Sowalsky, let me direct your attention to the provision at Article Roman numeral XI, Discharge Or Suspension. Are you familiar with this provision?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. This is a provision common to both contracts?
- A. It is.
 - Q. Would you describe for the Court the applicability of this provision to an employee of Feld Entertainment?
 - A. It's a provision that's not uncommon in collective bargaining agreements. It says that we will not discharge any of the union members without just cause. That's basically what it is, that we would give, if we feel there was cause, we would give a warning in advance of any determination.
 - Q. And generally during the period 1997, let's say June 1997 through the end of 1999, what types of employees who worked for Feld Entertainment would have been covered by this contract?
 - A. This contract covered what we call our technical employees, people who read the circus, who are involved in lighting, electrical; that sort of thing. It involves animal handlers, people who work in the animal department, and others who we regard as what we would call just laborers, people who help set up the show but don't have any particular expertise; that sort of thing.
 - O. Would it have covered a barn man like Tom Rider?
 - A. Yes.

1	Q. This provision on termination, Article XI, are you aware of
2	any situation in which well, first of all, let me ask you
3	this: Would it be just cause under this provision for Feld
4	Entertainment to terminate an employee's employment for
5	complaining about animal abuse?
6	A. No.
7	Q. To your knowledge, has Feld Entertainment ever terminated
8	an employee for complaining about animal abuse?
9	A. No.
10	MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, we offer Defendant's 200 and
11	201.
12	THE COURT: Any objection?
13	MS. SANERIB: No objection, your Honor. We do note
14	that these were some of the documents that were belatedly
15	disclosed by Feld Entertainment. They weren't disclosed during
16	discovery.
17	THE COURT: Admitted.
18	(Defendant Exhibit Nos. 200 and 201 were admitted into
19	evidence at about 5:06 p.m.)
20	MR. SIMPSON: I have no further questions at this
21	time.
22	THE COURT: Cross-examination?
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY MS. SANERIB:
25	Q. Good evening, Mr. Sowalsky.

A. Hello.

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

16

17

- Q. Mr. Sowalsky, it's true, isn't it, that the only person you report to at Feld Entertainment is the CEO, Kenneth Feld, right?
- A. I report to Kenneth Feld.
- Q. And you've worked for Mr. Feld at Feld Entertainment for approximately 36 years; is that correct?
 - A. I've worked at Feld Entertainment for 36 years. I wouldn't say that I worked for Kenneth Feld for 36 years. He hasn't always been the CEO.
- 10 Q. Who else have you worked for?
- 11 A. His father prior to him.
- Q. And you're the only person outside the Feld family that owns any Feld shares, isn't that correct?
- 14 A. That's currently true. There were other shareholders at different points in time.
 - Q. If you left the company, you would have to give up your stock, right?
- A. There's a shareholders' agreement in effect that would require me to sell the stock back to the company.
- Q. Your primary responsibilities are in the legal area, correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. And primarily you're involved in corporate work, including financing and acquisitions, right?
 - A. That's part of what I do.

Q. You're also involved in major management decisions, such as decisions about new things with the business and major investments, right?

A. Yes.

And --

Q.

5

6

7

8

9

16

20

THE COURT: What do you estimate the value of your stock to be in the company?

THE WITNESS: Well, we get and annual evaluation and I'm not sure. It's in excess of a million dollars.

10 BY MS. SANERIB:

- 11 Q. And what's your salary?
- 12 A. My current salary is \$425,000 a year.
- Q. In addition to a salary, you also receive annual bonuses, correct?
- 15 **∥** A. I do.
 - Q. And you also receive benefits from the company?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- Q. And you received information from Tom Rider at least a couple times a month, don't you?
 - A. No.
- Q. No? Let's go to your deposition transcript at page 22, and start at line ten. There's a question: Over the course of a month, about how many e-mail messages do you receive about Tom Rider?
- 25 Answer: Very --

Mr. Simpson: Well, I object, first of all. It's an answer that's based on communications with in-house counsel or your outside lawyers. But beyond that, if you can -- if there's anything that falls outside that, you can answer the question.

The Witness: I would have trouble estimating it. Not many. It depends on Tom Rider's activity, I guess. If he's out following the shows around as he was at one period of time, making public statements, we would track, we would have someone who tracks that kind of activity. And I would be part of a group of people who would get that information. Recently, I would say, very, very few. They're probably not more than maybe a couple a month that would have that kind of information.

Did I read that correctly?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MS. SANERIB:

2.2

- Q. So you receive information about Tom Rider at least a few times a month?
- A. I did at one point in time. I don't receive -- it's been quite a while since I've received even that many communications about Tom Rider, except for papers that I see related to this litigation.
- Q. Now, Mr. Sowalsky, isn't it true that there's a number of instances in which Feld Entertainment has conflicting records regarding the date that certain elephants were born or acquired by the company?

- A. I can only think of one, but it's possible there could be others.
 - Q. And are you thinking about the elephant Sabo?
- 4 A. No.

2

3

5

- Q. What are you thinking about?
- 6 A. Nicole.
- Q. Didn't you, during your deposition, acknowledge that Feld Entertainment has conflicting records for the elephant Sabo as well?
- 10 A. It's possible. I don't recall.
- Q. And you also testified in your deposition that the elephants are valuable property, right?
- 13 **|** A. Yes.
- Q. And that in your view there's probably documentation for when Feld acquired them, isn't that correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. But that's not true, is it? There's a lot of elephants that don't have any documentation for when they were acquired?
- A. Well, we don't have the original acquisition documents, but we've been able to trace through, I think, when they were
- 21 acquired.
- Q. I'd like to go to Defendant's Exhibit 6, if we can. And
- 23 I'd like to look at page 172 of that exhibit. If you can
- 24 highlight, there's a line there that has Mysore's name in the
- 25 first column, if you could highlight that. If you can read what

it says in the fourth column here for the elephant Mysore.

- A. "Unknown per CITES 82, 31947873/9 per inventory. She was acquired from Tony Deano in Canton, Ohio in 1985.
- Q. If you look up at the top of the document, what are the columns there that you were looking at?
 - A. Name, date of birth, gender, and origin.
 - Q. Now, if we look at this page, there's also a line that has the elephant Zina's name. Can we also highlight that? And again, can you read in the fourth column, the origin column, what it says for the elephant Zina?
 - A. Unknown per CITES 823184, 78, 79/9. Acquired from Billy Smart Circus in England, 1972. Still trying to locate that file.
 - Q. Thank you. And can we also look -- I think the elephant
 Karen also appears on this page. And again, can you read what
 it says under that Origin column for Karen?
 - A. Unknown per CITES. He's 823184, animal inventory. It says Thailand.
 - Q. Thank you.

And I believe you testified earlier today that Feld Entertainment obtains permits from the Fish and Wildlife Service; is that correct?

A. Yes.

2.2

Q. And in order to obtain those permits, Feld Entertainment applies for the permits, correct?

1 A. Yes.

2

3

- Q. And they fill out a permit application, isn't that right?
- A. Yes.
- 4 Q. So Feld provides all of the information that's the basis
- 5 for the Fish and Wildlife Service permits that are part of
- 6 Defendant's Exhibit 3; is that correct?
- 7 A. Well, we provide the information that's requested. They
- 8 may acquire information from their own sources, I'm not sure,
- 9 but, yeah, we provide whatever is asked for.
 - Q. Okay. Do you personally submit those permit applications?
- 11 A. I have on some occasions. They would come from my
- 12 department.
- 13 Q. Do you review them before they get submitted to Fish and
- 14 Wildlife Service?
- 15 A. I would say in recent years probably not, but in prior
- 16 years I would have.
- 17 O. And I'd like to look at one of those permits. If we could
- 18 go to page 22 of Defendant's Exhibit 3. And again, this is a
- 19 permit issued under CITES by the Office of Management Authority
- 20 of Fish and Wildlife Service, correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And it contains a list of the elephants' names, right, on
- 23 the left-hand corner there?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And Feld supplies that information to the Fish and Wildlife

- 1 Service, doesn't it?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. And it also has a column which states the year of birth; is
- 4 that correct?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And again that information comes from Feld Entertainment,
- 7 right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And there's also on the far right a column that has the
- 10 title Description; is that right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And Feld Entertainment also provides those descriptions of
- 13 the elephants, doesn't it?
- 14 A. I believe that's correct.
- 15 Q. And those descriptions provide the defining characteristics
- of the elephants, correct?
- 18 it.
- 19 Q. So if they had a scar, that would be reflected there?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And there's a few of the permits that you're relying on
- 22 | that aren't even signed by Fish and Wildlife Service, isn't that
- 23 correct?
- 24 A. I don't know what you're talking about there.
- 25 Q. Okay. Didn't you say that you've looked through all of --

A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q. -- the permits.
- Okay. You don't recall seeing that some of those permits were unsigned, do you?
- A. I don't recall that, no.
 - Q. But yet you still think all these permits are business records of Feld Entertainment?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And you testified about CITES and what CITES is earlier this afternoon; is that correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. And it's true under CITES, isn't it, that an animal is not considered to be captive-bred unless an entity can demonstrate that both of its parents were also bred in captivity?
- 15 A. I'm not sure that's correct. I don't recall that.
 - Q. You couldn't say one way or the other?
- 17 A. That's right.
- Q. And Mr. Sowalsky, are you familiar with the Asian elephant studbook?
- 20 A. I've seen, you know, pages from it.
- Q. And isn't it true that Feld Entertainment voluntarily submits information to the studbook?
- 23 A. Yes. I think that's accurate.
- Q. So the company has no obligation to submit that information as far as you know?

- A. There's no requirement to.
- Q. And the studbook itself contains a warranty of nonreliability, doesn't it?
- A. I don't recall that.

2.2

- Q. Well, you can look at Defendant's Exhibit 4 at page four, and there's a paragraph in the middle there that says "the information," if we could highlight that. Can you read, start reading that paragraph for us?
- A. The information contained in the studbook has been obtained from numerous sources believed to be reliable. AZA and the Oregon Zoo make a diligent effort to provide a complete and accurate representation of the data and its reports, publications, and services. However, AZA and the Oregon Zoo do not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, and completeness of the information. AZA and the Oregon Zoo make no warranties or representations of any kind, expressed or implied, including but not limited to warranties, merchantability of fitness for a particular purpose. AZA and the Oregon Zoo disclaim all liability for errors or omissions that may exist, and shall not be liable for any incidental, consequential or other damages, whether resulting from negligence or otherwise, including, without limitation, exemplary damages or lost profits arising out of or in connection with the use of this publication.
- Q. Thank you. I'd like to ask you about a few of Feld's elephants. Do you know of an elephant named Mysore that's owned

- 1 by Feld Entertainment?
 - A. I know we have an elephant named Mysore.
 - Q. Do you know the date that Mysore was acquired by Feld
- 4 Entertainment?

- 5 A. It was just on the screen. I believe it was quite some
- 6 time ago, around 19 -- in the '50s or something. I'm not sure.
- 7 I'd have to look at the record.
- 8 Q. Okay. Could we look at Plaintiffs' Will Call Exhibit 1C
- 9 for Dolly? Does this letter help refresh your recollection of
- 10 when Feld Entertainment acquired Mysore?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 0. It says 1986, right?
- 13 A. 1986, yes.
- 14 Q. And Feld Entertainment purchased her from another circus,
- 15 correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 18 before she went to the circus that sold her to Feld
- 19 | Entertainment?
- 20 A. I don't know.
- 21 Q. You don't know that?
- 22 A. No.
- Q. Do you know what year the elephant Mysore was born in?
- 24 A. This indicates that Mysore was born in 1946.
- Q. Do you know if Feld Entertainment has any other record that

documents her birth?

- A. Well, we have other documents that recite the 1946 day. I don't know that we have anything that we acquired at the time of acquisition other than this.
- Q. Okay. And Mr. Sowalsky, we talked about at your deposition that Feld Entertainment has acquired at least two elephants from the Portland Zoo; is that correct?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

- Q. And those elephants are PT and Sabo, right?
- 10 A. I believe that's accurate.
- Q. And those elephants were acquired by the company after you started working there, isn't that right?
- 13 A. I believe so.
- Q. Nevertheless, you don't have a date for when those elephants were acquired, right?
 - A. I'd have to review the record. I mean, there were a lot of elephants there. I'd have to look at the list of options to see whether we have a date for that.
- Q. Mr. Sowalsky, you submitted declarations in this case in support of defendant's motion for summary judgment; is that correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. I'd like to go to page four of your declaration that
 was submitted as Exhibit 19 to defendant's motion for summary
 judgment. And if you look at paragraph eight of this document,

can you read that for us?

- A. I remember in the 1980s, FEI, which is Feld Entertainment, acquired two elephants from the Oregon Zoo in Portland, Oregon, formally known as the Washington Park Zoo where both of them were born. One of the elephants was given the name Sabu, the other was named Prince Tusk. I was personally involved in the discussions relating to FEI's acquisition of these two elephants.
- Q. You don't know the date that those elephants were acquired by Feld Entertainment?
- A. I don't have an exact date for that.
- Q. Now, part of Defendant's Exhibit 1, which is the chart you testified about, contains information about the elephant Jewell;
- 15 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

- Q. And do you know what year Feld Entertainment acquired the elephant Jewell?
- 18 A. In the 1950s sometime.
- Q. If we could look at Defendant's Exhibit 1, at page two. It says here that the acquisition date for Jewell was 1954; is that right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. And there's not a single other piece of paper that back up that acquisition date that Feld Entertainment has; is that correct?

- A. The only other thing that there would be would be the censuses that go back and list Jewell, because at the time those were started, we had a veterinarian staff, his name was Doc Henderson, whose tenure started in the '50s, prior to the '50s actually, and he would have had some recollection of approximately when that elephant was acquired, and I believe he was the one who developed the first censuses that we had of the animals. That would be the only other thing.
 - Q. There's also listed here the affidavit of Tim Holst; is that correct?
- 11 A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. I'd like to go to that. That's from Defendant's Exhibit 3 at page 13. Does this appear to be Mr. Holst's affidavit?
- 14 | A. Yes.
 - Q. Now, if you look at this affidavit, and I think it's paragraph three in particular, Mr. Holst doesn't claim any personal knowledge about the date that these elephants were born, does he?
 - A. Well, he says that he knows about their being part of the Blue Unit or as early as 1972. It says to the best of my knowledge I've been with Ringling Brothers since the year, dates stated below. So, you know...
 - Q. Again, he doesn't say that he has personal knowledge that any of these elephants were born these dates?
 - A. No. He would have attained that knowledge through some

1 other source.

2.2

- Q. And he also doesn't say that he has any personal knowledge about when those elephants joined Ringling Brothers; is that right?
- A. Well --
- Q. Except for the elephants that came in after 1972?
- A. Right.
 - Q. And he wasn't present at the time that those elephants joined Ringling Brothers except for the ones that came in after 1972, correct?
- 11 A. That's correct.
 - Q. And I'd like to go to page two of this exhibit, if we can, and that's Donna Gautier's declaration. And if we can get a look at paragraph two of her declaration. She also has no personal knowledge of when these elephants were born; isn't that right?
 - A. I'd have to see the entire affidavit. I think it would be better.
 - Q. Okay. You're not familiar with these documents?
 - A. I am familiar with them, yes. I've seen them many times.

 Well, here is basically the same as Mr. Holst, she's saying that she knows they've been in service since at least 1972, to the best of her knowledge they've been with Ringling Circus since the dates indicated, so that's something to the best of our knowledge. She too was with the circus for quite some time and

was there at a time when there were people associated with the circus that probably -- that did go back as far as 1954, so she might be talking about conversations or knowledge she obtained from other people.

- Q. But again, she doesn't say that these are the dates of birth of these elephants based on her own personal knowledge, does she?
- A. Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

20

- Q. And she also doesn't say that the day they joined Ringling Brothers is based on her own personal knowledge, does she?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- Q. She also doesn't say she was at Ringling Brothers at the time most of these elephants joined Ringling Brothers, correct?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, Feld Entertainment has also purchased elephants from Roman Cschm, haven't they?
- 17 A. Yeah.
- Q. And those elephants were purchased in 2003; is that correct?
 - A. I believe that's correct.
- Q. Now I'd like to go back to Defendant's Exhibit 1, which was the charts again. And looking at this first page, do you see the elephant Nicole is listed on this page, correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. And if we can flip through this document to the page that

has Nicole listed. Now, this chart says that Nicole was born in 1975, doesn't it?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And you testified at your deposition that she was born in 1976, isn't that right?
 - A. Well, I mentioned this before: This is one of the elephants in which we had a slight discrepancy in the year of birth. We have some records that indicate 1975 and there are other things that indicate 1976.
 - Q. But you previously submitted a declaration stating that Nicole was born in 1976, isn't that right?
 - A. I believe I did, yes.
 - Q. And you told me at your deposition you had no reason to doubt your earlier declaration saying that Nicole's date of birth was 1976?
 - A. I think I did say that. However, after that deposition I didn't go back and try to find some additional information to show what the discrepancy might be, and there's still -- there are records that do show '75 and some that show '76, and early '76 is what I was able to determine that, I'm not sure why that came about other than there was no specific date in 1975 that was given on any of the records, so I think it was a determination on someone's part to just list it as January 1, 1976. That would encompass all of 1975 as well.
 - Q. But you previously stated under oath on two different

occasions that this elephant was born in 1976, isn't that right?

- A. I did, yes. And at the time I made those statements I
- 3 believed it to be accurate and they still may be accurate, but
- 4 if 1976 was the date of birth, what I've seen in the records
- 5 would indicate that it was in January of 1976.
- 6 Q. Well, isn't it a practice that the date of birth isn't
- 7 actually known, that for that year that the animal just gets
- 8 listed as January 1st whatever the year you know the animal was
- 9 born?

10

- A. I don't know that to be a practice.
- 11 Q. You don't?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Now, Nicole was imported to the United States from west
- 14 Germany, isn't that correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And she was imported with six other elephants, isn't that
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. I believe that's correct, yes. I can't recall if it was
- 19 five or seven. It could have been five others.
- 20 Q. Okay. And we talked about the importation documents for
- 21 Nicole at your deposition. Didn't we?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And I showed you a veterinarian certificate that said all
- 24 those elephants imported from west Germany had star-shaped
- 25 brands on their hips, isn't that right?

1 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q. And Nicole doesn't have one of those star-shaped brands on her hip, does she?
- A. No.
- Q. Now, Ringling Brothers has also sold elephants during the course of its tenure of operating Ringling Brothers Circus,
- 7 isn't that correct?
 - A. We have on very few occasions, yes.
 - Q. In 1982 Ringling Brothers sold elephants to Circus World, right?
- 11 A. Yes.
 - Q. If we could go to Plaintiffs' Will Call Exhibit 86 at page ten. And this is the letter documenting that sale, isn't that right?
 - A. Well, it's one of the things that was -- yeah, one of the documents that was prepared in connection with that sale.
 - Q. And this letter is addressed to you, isn't that right?
- 18 A. Yes.
 - MS. SANERIB: Your Honor, we move the admission of this letter as Plaintiffs' Will Call 86A.
 - THE COURT: Any objection?
 - MR. SIMPSON: It's not their case, but, I mean, they rested so I don't know, they're introducing evidence now. This wasn't even talked about at cross. There's completeness --
- 25 THE COURT: From an evidentiary issue, what precludes

1 them from introducing this in your case in chief? 2 MR. SIMPSON: Because they rested. 3 THE COURT: So they're precluded from introducing any evidence? 4 5 MR. SIMPSON: I think that's right. 6 MS. SANERIB: We introduced a document a few days ago, 7 your Honor. 8 MR. SIMPSON: For completeness that's a different question, but just out of the blue for something this witness 9 10 wasn't shown on direct. 11 THE COURT: What's your proffer? Why should this be 12 allowed at this time? 13 MS. SANERIB: It's a party admission. 14 It's also irrelevant, your Honor. MR. SIMPSON: 15 elephants weren't discussed in his direct and they're not at 16 issue in the lawsuit, at least most of them aren't, and none of 17 this was gone into it. 18 THE COURT: Assuming it is a party admission, it 19 probably is, why is it relevant? 20 MS. SANERIB: This is relevant, your Honor, again, 21 because it's a question of in terms of the Pre-Act animals there 2.2 is an exception. Those animals don't have that status if we can 23 show that in their histories they were used in commercial 24 activity, so these documents indicate that there were a lot of

elephants that were bought and sold by Feld Entertainment and we

think it's very relevant to those animals' status under the 1 2 Endangered Species Act, the fact that they were used in those 3 commercial activities. THE COURT: They're not the subject of this lawsuit, 4 5 are they? 6 MS. SANERIB: They're not at this juncture, but we'd 7 like to preserve these issues for appeal. 8 THE COURT: Well, I think the issue has been reserved anyway by virtue of the summary judgment ruling, isn't it? 9 MS. SANERIB: Yes, but I think additional 10 11 documentation should come into the case. THE COURT: Was this Court informed of that at the 12 13 summary judgment stage, though? 14 MS. SANERIB: About the commercial activity? 15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 MS. SANERIB: I do believe that that was part of 17 plaintiffs' opposition to defendant's motion for summary 18 judgment. 19 THE COURT: All right. If you can give me some authority on this. I'm not so sure this is relevant at all. 20 21 Let's move on. If you want to produce some authority. I don't 2.2 need five pages, but any authority that might persuade me it 23 should become a part of the evidentiary record, I'll consider 24 it. For the time being I'm not going to allow it. 25 MS. SANERIB: Okay. This is the witness who's been

represented as having the knowledge about how these animals were acquired.

THE COURT: These animals aren't the subject of this lawsuit, though. I understand that. Let's move on.

MS. SANERIB: All right.

BY MS. SANERIB:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

18

19

20

- Q. Now, Mr. Sowalsky, you testified earlier today that you received notification from the units of the circus about USDA matters, isn't that right?
- A. Well, somebody in my office does. It's either me or Julie Strauss.
 - Q. Is that done by e-mails?
- 13 A. There could be an e-mail, but ordinarily they're telephonic communication.
 - Q. And you testified today about the death of an elephant named Benjamin, isn't that right?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. And were you aware that an investigation was conducted by the USDA into the death of that elephant?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And did you know that the investigator found that Feld
 Entertainment's employee's use of the bullhook, quote, created
 behavioral stress and trauma which precipitated in the physical
 harm and ultimate death", end quote, of the elephant?
 - A. That was in the investigation report. However, it was

found not to be accurate.

- Q. Found by whom?
- A. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Q. Now, you also testified regarding the elephant Kenny this morning, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

- Q. And isn't it true that the vet's recommendations regarding that elephant were not followed by the circus?
 - A. I think that there were decisions made by the people on the scene who were in charge of handling that elephant that may not have followed the advice of the vet precisely.
 - Q. I'd like to look at Plaintiffs' Will Call Exhibit 31, please. This is some records from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and if we could look at number two under Death of Kenny, the elephant. Can you just read that first sentence for us?
 - A. Well, let me figure out what this is first. I can't see what it is. What am I reading from?
- Q. It's an e-mail from Ron DeHaven. You testified that you've met Ron DeHaven, this morning or earlier this afternoon,
- 21 correct?
- 22 A. Yes, I did.
 - Okay. The case shows that orders from the attending veterinarian to leave Kenny in a stall during the third performance on the day he died were not followed by the trainers

Mark Oliver Gebel and Gunther Gebel-Williams. However, the veterinarian back-pedals on his initial statement and later sworn statements suggesting that he would have deferred to the trainer's judgment. I realize we feel there is a prosecutable violation and recommend filing a complaint. It is likely that Ringling Brothers would want to settle by consent agreement. Of course, I will let you know of any such offers before we agree to a settlement.

Q. Thank you. And just for the record, this is one of the documents that plaintiffs are going to offer for their completeness objections to the letter that defendant is trying to admit regarding the elephant Kenny.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MS. SANERIB:

- Q. I'd also like to show you Plaintiffs' May Call Exhibit 53, which also pertains to the elephant Kenny. If you look at the top of this document, it's from Ellen Weidner. She's one of the vets at Ringling Brothers, correct?
- A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And it's to William Lindsay, and he's also a vet at Ringling Brothers, isn't that right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And Ellen Weider writes to William Lindsay: Sounds like
 Ringling has a fairly regular history of hanging its vets out to
 dry. That's the first sentence of that message, isn't it?

- A. That's what it says.
 - Q. I'd like you to go down to William Lindsay's e-mail and I'd like you to read this paragraph for me.
 - A. Which one?

2.2

MR. SIMPSON: Your Honor, this is not proper foundation. She's not established this witness has even ever seen this, so we're broadcasting it to the finder of fact with no foundation.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MS. SANERIB: Again, your Honor, we believe these are party admissions. It's written by Feld Entertainment's own veterinarians, and I think it comes in as a party admission.

And this witness testified today about the death of Kenny, and we think there's a very different story about the death of that animal that needs to be told and these records tell that story.

THE COURT: I'll allow it over objection.

BY MS. SANERIB:

- Q. Can you please read this paragraph for is?
- A. Many years ago, probably 1997, there was a young DVM, Gary West, between Dick Houck and myself. There was a young ele, three or four years old on the Red with Gunther. He was named Kenny after Mr. Feld. The ele got sick in Miami, I think. Gary W. okayed him to stand in the ring to watch the performance rather than get anxious in the tent all by himself. He died on the train that night en route to Jacksonville. Gary lived in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Orlando so he drove to Jacks and did post in the train car. Nothing on PN, just enteritis O. The clinical signs were sudden onset of anorexia and then several hours of disentary (ph), then death. All cultures normal. No herpes C. Perfringens was put out as the cause of death.

Thank you. And if we can look back at this document, Ο. you'll see the paragraph down here that says we also agreed, and I just wanted to read to you from this. It says -- actually, I wanted to go to the paragraph above that.

The vet goes on to say, Then comes the USDA investigation. The first one ever I think. There was the usual corporate casting to blame in many directions, but Gary W. lost. No one really stood behind him. He eventually quit. We lost the investigation. Oops. I mean we settled with the USDA, so I think legal did not do a good job. The terms of the settlement were that we gave them about \$10,000 to an elephant orphanage in This may not have been the best place or best way to help the Asian elephant, but it looked good.

Did I read that correctly?

- Yes. Α.
- Mr. Sowalsky, you also testified regarding the separation of the elephants Doc and Angelica from their mothers today,
- Α. Yes.

didn't you?

And you talked about the fact that USDA consulted with 0.

several experts regarding that separation of those elephants from their mothers, isn't that right?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And I'd like to show you Plaintiffs' Will Call 43. And looking at that first paragraph of this document, and this is again a letter from the USDA to Julie Strauss, it says in starting the middle of this paragraph, "After careful consideration of the issue," can you read that for me?
- A. After careful consideration of the issue, we find that the handling of these two elephants was not in compliance with the Animal Welfare Act regulations, specifically Section 2.131(a)(1) a one, Handling of Animals, Title IX, Code of Federal Regulations. We believe there is sufficient evidence to confirm the handling of these animals caused unnecessary trauma, behavioral stress, physical harm, and discomfort to these two animals.
- Q. Thank you. And I'd also like to look at the next paragraph in this letter. And if you can just read that first sentence.
- A. It was the opinion of several of the expert reviewers that there are other methods available to separate juvenile elephants from their mothers that would be less stressful and not cause lesions such as those observed on Doc and Angelica.
- Q. Thank you. So that's contrary to your recollection of this, isn't that right?
 - A. Well, I think the majority of the experts did not arrive at

- that conclusion. They were -- I thought there was only one but there may have been another.
 - Q. The USDA said that there were several, correct?
- A. Excuse me?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

17

18

21

- Q. The USDA said that there were several experts that said there was a more humane way to separate elephants from their mothers, right?
- A. That's what they said, but our information was that there were only one or two.
 - Q. Now, Mr. Sowalsky, Judge Sullivan asked you if you ever received complaints from the public, on your direct, isn't that right?
- 13 **|** A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And Feld Entertainment does, don't they?
- 15 A. I think the question was whether the public ever complained 16 to the USDA about our care and treatment of animals.
 - Q. Feld receives regular complaints from the public, though, on its website, doesn't it?
- A. We receive some, yes. I would say that they're not a huge number, but we've received some.
 - Q. You receive hundreds, don't you?
- A. Well, when there's a campaign by one of the animal rights groups we might receive hundreds because somebody's identified something and most of the people who are writing those letters we think don't have any personal knowledge of what took place.

I'd like to show you Plaintiffs' May Call Exhibit 22. 1 2 is an example of one of those complaints, isn't it? This is an 3 example of one of those complaints, isn't it? This is a response to the complaint, and Feld spends a lot of time and 4 5 energy issuing these responses to complaints you receive regarding animal care on your website, isn't that right? 6 Well, we respond to these, but I don't know that it's an 7 Α. 8 inordinate amount of time. I think lots of companies get complaints about things that they do or products they sell and 9 10 they respond accordingly. Just one second. 11 Q. 12 (There was a pause in the proceedings.) 13 MS. SANERIB: I have no further questions, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Redirect? 15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. SIMPSON: 17 Mr. Sowalsky, in your opinion, did the Feld Entertainment Ο. 18 legal department do a good job with the Kenny case? 19 We certainly did, yes. 20 And with respect to the Doc and Angelica matter, did the Ο. 21 Department of Agriculture find the company in violation of the 2.2 law? 23 Α. No. 24 MR. SIMPSON: No further questions. 25 THE COURT: Any other questions?

1 MS. SANERIB: Nothing further, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Sowalsky, thank you. You may step 3 down. 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 5 THE COURT: I have to ask you not to discuss your 6 testimony with anyone. Have a nice evening. 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 8 MR. SIMPSON: May he be excused, your Honor? 9 THE COURT: Yes, he may be excused, sure. 10 Who's your next witness? We're not going to get to 11 him or her today, but who's your next witness? 12 MR. SIMPSON: Brian French. 13 THE COURT: Unless his testimony is only two, three 14 minutes or so, I don't know, is it? 15 MR. SIMPSON: We'd be happy to start, he's here, but 16 it's up to your Honor. 17 THE COURT: How long do you anticipate your direct to 18 be? We can go to six o'clock maybe. MR. SIMPSON: I would say maybe an hour-and-a-half at 19 20 the most. 21 THE COURT: Let's just go to six. Why don't we just 2.2 start. We'll stop at six o'clock. We'll start at 9:30 tomorrow 23 morning. I want to get through this. 24 You know, it's been a long day, counsel. I'm going to 25 vacate what I said. Let's just start at 9:30 tomorrow. We're

1 not going to accomplish anything in ten minutes. Everyone have 2 a wonderful evening. We'll work on the weather for tomorrow. 3 It's awfully warm in here. MS. SANERIB: Can we get the list of people, the order 4 5 for tomorrow? 6 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Yes. 7 What's up for tomorrow? 8 MR. SIMPSON: We would start with Mr. French. 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. SIMPSON: Angela Martin by deposition, and maybe I can discuss that with them. That's foundation for a video we'd 11 12 like you to see. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 MR. SIMPSON: Then Mike Keele, Troy Metzler. 15 probably at that point end up with several depositions, not to 16 be read, but just for the Court, and their counter-designations 17 of Mr. Pettegrew, Mr. Vargus, Mr. Houck, and Mr. Ridley. And if 18 we still have time, we would start with Dr. Schmitt, and that's 19 our last witness. 20 THE COURT: All right. We'll start at 9:30 tomorrow, 21 and as I indicated, 9:30 on Friday as well to 12:30. 2.2 Yes? 23 MS. MEYER: Your Honor, could we have Mr. Rider 24 released, please, since he's not going to be a witness? 25 MR. SIMPSON: That's fine.

THE COURT: Fine. All right. MS. MEYER: Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Have a wonderful evening everyone. COURTROOM DEPUTY: You too. THE COURT: Thank you very much for helping out today. COURTROOM DEPUTY: You're welcome. (Proceedings adjourned at about 5:47 p.m.)

1	INDEX					
2						
3	WITNESSES:					
4	JEROME SOWALSKY					
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Simpson 35					
6	Cross-examination by Ms. Sanerib 82 Redirect Examination by Mr. Simpson 110					
7						
8						
9						
10	EXHIBITS					
11	Defendant Exhibit					
12	No. Identification Markeo					
13	71A	58				
14	86A	59				
15	73 & 74	63				
16	81	66				
17	PXMC 33	68				
	193A	72				
18	1 & 3	78				
19 20	200 & 201	82				
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

CERTIFICATE I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Court Reporter, certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN

\$	1996 [1] - 79:21	77:18, 77:25, 78:12,	7	absolutely [2] - 16:21,
Þ	1997 [4] - 49:4, 81:14,	78:14, 88:6, 88:18,	/	25:17
	106:19	95:12, 114:18		Absolutely [1] - 13:15
\$10,000 [1] - 107:16	1998 [1] - 79:22	302005AC [1] - 48:11	700 [1] - 1:17	abstract [1] - 5:12
\$425,000 [1] - 84:12	1999 [9] - 6:6, 10:14,	31 [1] - 104:12	71 [15] - 5:16, 11:15,	abuse [5] - 47:13,
Ψ 120,000 [1] 04.12	16:20, 25:25, 44:5,	31947873/9 [1] - 87:2	13:5, 13:7, 13:23,	48:21, 49:4, 82:5,
ı	44:23, 49:5, 80:17,	31st [5] - 49:17, 51:9,	14:5, 16:3, 16:18,	82:8
	81:15	79:22, 80:10, 80:17	35:5, 42:19, 45:4,	abused [1] - 44:12
	1C [1] - 92:8	33 [4] - 66:12, 67:2,	45:24, 47:4, 48:1,	abusive [1] - 54:23
'50s [3] - 92:6, 95:4	1st [5] - 44:23, 79:21,	68:25, 114:16	56:12	accepted [2] - 7:21,
'75 [1] - 98:19	80:10, 80:17, 99:8	333 [1] - 2:3	71A [3] - 58:15, 58:22,	32:4
'76 [2] - 98:19, 98:20	00.10, 00.11, 00.0	35 [2] - 69:25, 114:5	114:12	access [1] - 66:23
'99 [1] - 80:10	2	36 [3] - 83:6, 83:7,	72 [1] - 114:17	accompanied [1] -
'made' [1] - 31:18		83:8	72-hour [1] - 12:1	62:2
		39 [3] - 59:1, 59:9,	73 [4] - 61:11, 62:14,	accomplish [3] - 20:4,
0	2.131(a)(1 [1] - 108:11	59:12	63:4, 114:14	28:4, 112:1
<u> </u>	200 [4] - 79:15, 82:10,	3:17 [1] - 29:22	74 [3] - 62:24, 63:4,	accordance [1] - 72:9
	82:18, 114:19	3:35 [1] - 29:25	114:14	accordingly [1] -
03-2006 [1] - 1:4	2000 [2] - 51:9, 54:13	3rd [2] - 32:3, 57:25	78 [2] - 87:11, 114:18	110:10
	20001 [1] - 2:4	JI W [2] 102.0, 01.20	79/9 [1] - 87:11	account [1] - 79:11
1	20004 [1] - 1:22	4		accuracy [1] - 91:14
<u>•</u>	20009 [1] - 1:17	4	8	accurate [7] - 77:22,
	2001 [8] - 10:15,		0	90:23, 91:12, 93:10,
1 [10] - 74:2, 77:16,	48:12, 49:18, 54:11,	4 [1] - 91:5		99:3, 104:1
77:25, 78:11, 78:14,	55:1, 59:1, 80:10,	40 [1] - 59:12	80 [3] - 64:13, 64:21,	accurately [2] - 52:8,
94:12, 94:19, 97:21,	80:17	43 [2] - 32:8, 108:4	64:25	52:9
98:23, 114:18	2002 [3] - 48:3, 57:25,	4:15 [1] - 58:23	801 [1] - 1:22	accused [1] - 48:21
107 [1] - 45:12	58:4	4:17 [1] - 59:15	81 [4] - 65:11, 65:22,	acknowledge [2] -
11 [1] - 1:6	2003 [1] - 97:18	4:21 [1] - 63:5	66:9, 114:15	_
110 [1] - 114:6	2005 [1] - 66:14	4:24 [1] - 66:10	82 [3] - 87:2, 114:5,	60:9, 86:7
1197 [1] - 32:17	2006 [3] - 57:4, 57:5,	4:27 [2] - 69:1, 69:18	114:19	acknowledging [1] -
12:30 [1] - 112:21	57:19	4:49 [1] - 69:21	823184 [2] - 87:11,	62:4
13 [1] - 95:13	2007 [1] - 57:2		87:17	acquire [2] - 5:2, 88:8
1328 [1] - 32:3	2008 [2] - 15:5, 56:12	4:55 [1] - 73:24 4th [1] - 56:12	86 [3] - 58:25, 59:12,	Acquired [1] - 87:11
136 [1] - 49:4	2009 [2] - 1:6, 49:4	4u1 [1] - 30. 12	100:12	acquired [17] - 15:14, 85:24, 86:15, 86:18,
14099 [1] - 45:12	201 [4] - 80:6, 82:11,	E	86A [4] - 59:11, 59:14,	
14th [1] - 55:1	82:18, 114:19	5	100:20, 114:13	86:21, 87:3, 92:3,
15 [1] - 3:15	202-354-3187 [1] - 2:4		8th [2] - 48:2	92:10, 93:3, 93:6,
1601 [1] - 1:16	202-364-4092 [1] -	5 [3] - 32:3, 47:17,	Gar [2] 40.2	93:11, 93:15, 94:3,
172 [1] - 86:23	1:18	69:9	9	94:9, 94:16, 95:6,
19 [2] - 92:6, 93:24		53 [1] - 105:15	9	103:2
193 [2] - 71:14	202-662-4504 [1] -	551 [1] - 32:17		acquisition [7] - 3:11,
193A [4] - 73:4, 73:19,	1:23 2190739536 (4) - 65:5	58 [1] - 114:12	902.11 [2] - 31:15,	75:10, 86:19, 93:4,
73:23, 114:17	2190739536 [1] - 65:5	59 [1] - 114:12	32:4	94:7, 94:20, 94:24
1946 [2] - 92:24, 93:2	21 st [1] - 47:7	5:01 [1] - 78:15	919 [1] - 31:23	acquisitions [1] -
1950s [1] - 94:18	22 [3] - 84:21, 88:18,		981 [1] - 31:23	83:24
1950s [1] - 94:18 1954 [2] - 94:20, 97:2	110:1	5:06 [1] - 82:19	99028 AW [1] - 46:17	Act [28] - 7:22, 10:17,
	2262 [1] - 65:5	5:47 [1] - 113:8	9:30 [6] - 69:16, 69:17,	12:17, 15:3, 15:4,
1972 [5] - 87:12, 95:20, 96:6, 96:10,	25th [1] - 48:12	5th [2] - 54:11, 66:14	111:22, 111:25,	15:9, 15:11, 15:16,
	27th [2] - 16:20, 25:25	^	112:20, 112:21	23:20, 26:7, 26:22,
96:22 1073 (4) 75:19	28 [1] - 67:22	6	9th [1] - 59:1	27:15, 37:9, 69:4,
1973 [1] - 75:18	299A [1] - 13:25		Jun [1] 00.1	69:7, 70:12, 72:11,
1975 [4] - 98:2, 98:8,	2:47 [1] - 1:7	6 (4) - 86·22	٨	72:21, 73:17, 74:10,
98:21, 98:24	2d [3] - 31:23, 32:8,	6 [1] - 86:22	Α	75:15, 75:16, 75:18,
1976 [8] - 98:5, 98:9,	32:17	63 [1] - 114:14		76:10, 101:21,
98:11, 98:15, 98:24,	2nd [1] - 48:3	66 [1] - 114:15	able [6] - 7:11, 22:11,	102:2, 108:11
99:1, 99:4, 99:5		665 [1] - 32:8	47:21, 67:7, 86:20,	action [10] - 6:7, 7:6,
1980s [1] - 94:2	3	68 [1] - 114:16	98:20	10:8, 13:10, 23:2,
1982 [1] - 100:9		6820 [1] - 2:3	above-entitled [1] -	23:7, 23:14, 44:22,
1985 [1] - 87:3 1986 [2] - 92:12, 92:13	3 [10] - 77:8, 77:13,	688 [1] - 80:16	115:4	64:9, 67:11 actions [2] - 7:13,

9:22 activist [2] - 20:20, 57:8 activities [3] - 70:9, 70:23, 102:3 activity [5] - 70:13, 85:6, 85:9, 101:24, 102:14 Adam [1] - 66:13 add [1] - 47:22 added [2] - 32:12, 75:20 addition [2] - 16:15, 84:13 additional [6] - 45:17, 51:5, 58:19, 58:21, 98:17, 102:10 additionally [1] - 26:4 address [4] - 14:16, 31:5, 34:9, 64:10 addressed [1] -100:17 addressee [1] - 43:19 **ADEFEHINTI** [1] - 30:3 Adefehinti [5] - 4:8, 4:25, 22:12, 29:5, 30:3 adequacy [1] - 91:14 adequate [2] - 31:15, 32:1 adjourned [1] - 113:8 administratively [3] -6:7, 23:2, 44:21 administrator [5] -6:2, 43:2, 43:10, 43:11, 48:8 admissibility [5] -3:25, 4:14, 7:8, 31:14, 34:12 admissible [2] -31:19, 32:9 admission [5] - 45:4, 100:19, 101:13, 101:18, 106:12 admissions [1] -106:11 admit [1] - 105:12 Admitted [8] - 59:21, 62:22, 63:3, 66:5, 73:22, 78:13, 82:17, 114:11 admitted [10] - 50:17, 58:22, 59:13, 59:14, 66:8, 66:9, 68:25, 73:23, 78:14, 82:18 admitting [1] - 32:1 adopted [3] - 32:19, 70:11, 72:10 advance [1] - 81:13 advice [1] - 104:11

advised [1] - 38:10 advocacy [1] - 67:9 affected [1] - 53:25 **affidavit** [7] - 76:7, 76:8, 77:11, 95:9, 95:13, 95:15, 96:17 affidavits [3] - 8:13, 15:18, 76:12 affiliate [1] - 36:7 AFIS [2] - 6:3, 41:8 afternoon [3] - 35:21, 90:10, 104:20 AFTERNOON [1] -1:11 **agencies** [1] - 63:7 **agency** [12] - 6:13, 9:11, 13:14, 20:23, 21:6, 21:15, 21:16, 22:3, 22:7, 23:20, 23:22, 24:3 agent [2] - 62:2, 76:23 ago [4] - 78:4, 92:6, 101:6, 106:19 agree [8] - 9:5, 12:24, 16:23, 19:6, 28:4, 62:19, 62:20, 105:7 agreed [1] - 107:7 agreement [8] - 79:17, 79:20, 79:21, 80:4, 80:7, 80:15, 83:18, 105:6 agreements [1] -81:10 agrees [1] - 7:19 **Agriculture** [5] - 37:8, 38:13, 46:4, 104:14, 110:21 ahead [4] - 5:21, 24:12, 28:22, 35:20 aided [1] - 2:7 ailment [1] - 50:7 Albert [2] - 56:13 allegation [2] - 57:18, 58:6 allegations [2] - 49:9, 49:15 alleged [5] - 17:3, 27:2, 46:12, 54:12, 58:8 alleging [1] - 6:12 allow [15] - 5:18, 6:20, 7:2, 14:9, 14:12, 28:5, 33:2, 33:23, 34:8, 34:15, 67:19, 68:5, 68:22, 102:24, 106:16 allowance [1] - 61:9

allowed [2] - 68:20,

alpha [1] - 71:14

101:12

alternative [1] - 28:15 America [1] - 76:4 **AMERICAN** [1] - 1:3 American [1] - 76:1 amount [1] - 110:8 Angela [1] - 112:10 Angelica [4] - 56:10, 107:22, 108:22, 110:20 Animal [15] - 7:22, 10:17, 12:17, 15:9, 23:20, 26:7, 27:15, 37:9, 43:2, 43:10, 46:3. 72:11. 72:20. 73:17, 108:11 animal [24] - 6:3, 27:1, 38:23, 48:8, 48:14, 48:21, 54:17, 54:22, 57:8, 57:14, 58:6, 63:24, 72:24, 81:19, 81:20, 82:5, 82:8, 87:17, 90:12, 99:7, 99:8, 106:15, 109:22, 110:6 **ANIMALS** [1] - 1:4 animals [35] - 8:3, 15:2, 15:3, 15:4, 15:14, 15:16, 15:21, 37:10, 37:18, 41:2, 64:18, 66:21, 66:22, 66:23, 70:16, 71:22, 72:23, 72:24, 72:25, 73:11, 73:12, 75:20, 76:15, 79:3, 79:7, 95:8, 101:21, 101:22, 103:1, 103:3, 108:14, 108:16, 109:16 **Animals** [1] - 108:12 animals' [1] - 102:1 ankus [4] - 44:12, 44:15, 48:16, 54:22 annual [2] - 84:8, 84:13 anorexia [1] - 107:3 answer [5] - 3:13, 3:14, 85:2, 85:4 **Answer** [1] - 84:25 anticipate [1] - 111:17 anticipated [1] - 15:19 anxious [1] - 106:24 **anyway** [3] - 34:5, 45:19, 102:9 **Anyway** [1] - 25:5 **apart** [1] - 76:5 76:17, 78:6, 79:10, appeal [2] - 19:22, 90:18, 107:18 102:7 assert [1] - 31:9 appear [2] - 18:12, asserts [1] - 15:14

1:13 appellant's [1] - 31:8 applicability [1] - 81:7 applicable [2] - 9:23, 79:20 application [2] -16:22, 88:2 applications [2] -79:1, 88:10 applies [4] - 7:19, 65:3, 73:6, 87:25 **apply** [4] - 70:8, 72:14, 73:4, 79:1 apprised [2] - 38:6, 38:12 appropriate [4] -34:22, 34:23, 56:1, 56:4 April [1] - 54:11 area [5] - 36:16, 38:6, 54:13, 54:21, 83:20 arena [1] - 64:19 argue [3] - 14:11, 19:22, 78:4 argued [1] - 74:25 argument [20] - 4:6, 8:23, 15:8, 16:14, 17:3, 25:17, 30:4, 30:15, 32:21, 33:14, 33:17, 34:1, 34:5. 45:16, 45:18, 45:20, 66:2, 66:3, 68:15, 69:12 arguments [3] - 16:1, 16:6, 25:15 arise [2] - 36:15, 37:20 arising [1] - 91:22 arose [3] - 38:11, 39:20, 57:4 arrange [2] - 38:24, 40:25 arrive [2] - 41:22, 108:25 arrived [1] - 75:14 Article [2] - 81:2, 82:1 articulate [1] - 18:23 articulated [2] - 58:18, 66:7 arythmia [1] - 52:23 Asia [1] - 107:17 Asian [16] - 36:18, 36:20, 48:15, 52:4, 70:24, 71:3, 72:15, 73:5, 75:19, 75:25,

assignment [1] - 62:3

associated [1] - 97:1

assume [5] - 3:8, 8:4, 8:6, 62:15, 66:2 Assuming [2] - 30:20, 101:18 assuming [1] - 7:18 assumption [1] -15:11 assurance [1] - 70:10 athletes [1] - 52:23 attach [1] - 24:21 attained [1] - 95:25 attend [1] - 39:5 attending [1] - 104:23 attention [9] - 3:14, 8:13, 15:10, 37:22, 37:23, 42:18, 69:24, 71:13, 81:1 attorney [2] - 49:20, 51:23 August [4] - 47:7, 48:12, 51:9, 59:1 authentic [1] - 9:15 authenticate [1] -28:20 authentication [1] -65:4 authenticity [1] - 30:8 authorities [3] - 45:21, 50:24, 51:5 authority [14] - 32:16, 37:9, 41:24, 45:18, 63:13, 64:17, 66:20, 66:21, 67:11, 68:23, 76:24, 102:20, 102:21, 102:22 Authority [1] - 88:19 authorized [1] - 72:4 authors [1] - 4:19 automobile [1] - 32:6 available [2] - 20:15, 108:20 **Avenue** [3] - 1:16, 1:22, 2:3 AWA [4] - 12:15, 23:25, 24:2, 27:23 aware [4] - 44:22, 49:13, 82:1, 103:18 awfully [1] - 112:3 AZA [4] - 91:10, 91:13, 91:15, 91:18

В

back-pedals [1] backwards [1] - 28:18 Bailey [2] - 6:6, 48:14 bank [7] - 4:4, 30:7, 30:9, 30:10, 31:4,

APPEARANCES [1] -

32:14 bank's [2] - 31:4, 32:13 bargaining [3] - 79:17, 80:15, 81:10 barn [1] - 81:24 Barnum [2] - 6:5, 48:14 Barnum-Bailey [1] -48:14 Based [1] - 58:14 based [8] - 3:19, 19:17, 23:25, 32:23, 78:12, 85:2, 97:6, 97:10 basic [1] - 15:17 basis [12] - 3:24, 4:14, 9:12, 10:1, 12:21, 14:11, 30:23, 38:4, 38:9, 65:7, 88:4 bathe [1] - 52:19 **Bay** [1] - 54:13 beat [1] - 13:21 beating [1] - 27:20 beatings [1] - 49:6 became [4] - 15:24, 43:11. 75:18 become [4] - 10:1. 22:5, 34:16, 102:23 becomes [1] - 34:4 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:11 behalf [2] - 79:25, 80:22 behavioral [2] -103:23, 108:15 behind [3] - 54:18, 54:19, 107:13 belatedly [1] - 82:14 below [1] - 95:22 **BENCH** [1] - 1:11 bench [1] - 24:7 **benefits** [1] - 84:16 Benjamin [11] - 8:15, 8:17, 46:19, 46:20, 47:15, 51:19, 52:4, 52:13, 52:14, 52:17, 103:16 bent [1] - 28:18 best [9] - 4:18, 4:22, 19:3, 23:12, 95:20, 96:23, 96:24, 107:17 bet [1] - 25:5 better [1] - 96:18 between [6] - 14:25, 21:4, 79:17, 80:7, 80:15, 106:20 beyond [1] - 85:3 big [1] - 22:13 bills [1] - 32:17 Billy [1] - 87:11

binding [1] - 8:12 birth [9] - 75:9, 87:6, 89:3, 93:1, 97:6, 98:8, 98:15, 99:4, 99:6 **bit** [2] - 59:8, 61:12 bits [1] - 18:17 black [1] - 20:25 blame [1] - 107:12 **Blow** [2] - 53:9, 53:10 blow [1] - 59:8 Blue [4] - 40:20, 44:19, 62:8, 95:20 **blue** [1] - 101:9 Boca [1] - 4:9 body [1] - 57:1 bonuses [1] - 84:13 **book** [1] - 76:6 borders [1] - 76:21 born [14] - 15:15. 71:22, 85:24, 92:23, 92:24, 94:5, 95:18, 95:24, 96:15, 98:1, 98:4, 98:11, 99:1, 99:9 **bottom** [5] - 8:4, 20:13, 61:22, 61:23, 77:2 Bottom [1] - 24:24 bought [1] - 101:25

77:2

Bottom [1] - 24:24

bought [1] - 101:25

bowels [1] - 41:7

box [1] - 20:25

brands [2] - 99:25,
100:2

bred [8] - 15:3, 15:16,
71:21, 73:6, 73:8,
73:12, 90:13, 90:14

73:12, 90:13, 90: Brian [1] - 111:12 brief [1] - 42:1 briefly [3] - 36:10, 42:24, 78:23 bring [1] - 67:11 bringing [1] - 11:8 broadcasting [1] -106:7

106:7
broker's [1] - 31:7
Brothers [16] - 6:5,
27:14, 45:7, 48:14,
95:21, 96:3, 96:9,
97:10, 97:12, 97:13,
100:5, 100:6, 100:9,
105:6, 105:18,

brought [2] - 16:23, 37:21 bullhook [4] - 8:1, 48:16, 71:7, 103:22 bullhooks [1] - 8:5 bumped [1] - 57:11 bunch [1] - 72:22 burden [2] - 27:23, 27:24 Burlington [1] - 49:21 Bush's [1] - 22:20 business [53] - 4:5, 9:16, 9:18, 10:3, 12:6, 14:12, 17:12, 17:18, 17:22, 20:3, 20:7, 20:8, 21:11, 21:13, 21:14, 21:15, 21:21, 21:25, 22:1, 22:2, 22:5, 22:6, 25:8, 25:13, 26:15, 27:11, 28:21, 29:8, 30:12, 30:17, 30:25, 31:7, 31:24, 32:2, 32:6, 32:8, 32:18, 32:22, 45:6, 46:25, 47:21, 59:17, 59:20, 60:23, 62:20, 65:24, 67:13, 70:16, 70:22, 77:20, 84:2, 90:6 buy [1] - 39:5 BY [39] - 35:25, 39:14, 41:3, 43:7, 44:3, 44:16, 45:23, 46:8, 47:6. 47:25. 49:2. 51:8, 51:17, 51:24, 52:25, 54:2, 56:7, 58:24, 59:22, 60:17, 63:6, 63:21, 65:10, 66:11, 69:2, 69:23, 71:25, 73:3, 73:25, 75:6, 78:16, 80:13, 82:24, 84:10, 85:15, 103:6. 105:14. 106:17, 110:16

C

CA [2] - 1:4, 48:11 California [2] - 10:13, 115:1 28:19 campaign [1] - 109:22 Canada [1] - 76:15 79:8, 99:23 **Canton** [1] - 87:3 capital [1] - 72:1 caps [1] - 20:16 captions [1] - 75:8 captive [8] - 15:3, 15:16, 71:21, 73:6, 73:8, 73:12, 76:3, 33:9. 79:3 90:13 captive-bred [4] -15:3, 73:6, 73:12, 33:5, 33:22 90:13 captivity [3] - 71:22, 75:17, 90:14 certify [5] - 24:21, car [1] - 107:1 33:8, 33:21, 47:21,

Care [3] - 43:2, 43:10, 46:3 care [11] - 6:3, 36:24, 41:2, 48:9, 61:8, 63:23, 64:11, 72:22, 72:23, 109:16, 110:6 careful [2] - 108:7, 108:9 carry [2] - 14:7, 72:15 carry-over [1] - 72:15 case [57] - 4:2, 4:6, 4:15, 4:25, 6:9, 7:7, 7:20, 8:15, 10:8, 13:20, 15:25, 17:1, 19:7, 22:7, 22:11, 22:12, 22:24, 22:25, 23:1, 24:16, 25:10, 27:2, 28:3, 29:3, 29:13, 30:2, 30:8, 30:20, 32:11, 41:16, 46:14, 46:16, 46:18, 47:13, 48:11, 49:3, 51:19, 52:5, 52:8, 52:10, 53:4, 57:21, 57:22, 58:9, 62:18, 62:23, 67:5, 68:7, 76:14. 78:7. 93:19. 100:22, 101:1, 102:11, 104:23, 110:18 cases [2] - 78:24, 79:6 casting [1] - 107:12 **categories** [1] - 72:25 caused [1] - 108:14 censuses [2] - 95:2, 95:7 CEO [2] - 83:3, 83:9 certain [3] - 44:20, 61:8, 85:24 certainly [4] - 26:20, 27:5, 45:20, 110:19 CERTIFICATE [1] certificate [6] - 30:24, 76:17, 76:25, 77:2, certificates [3] -30:23, 32:4, 77:3 certification [11] -16:13, 17:12, 21:25, 24:17, 25:5, 25:6, 27:12, 28:17, 32:25, certified [6] - 9:13, 14:10, 17:14, 30:7, certifiers [4] - 30:18, 30:20, 31:5, 31:8

115:3 certifying [1] - 31:2 **chaining** [1] - 27:5 chains [2] - 55:22, 71:10 challenge [2] - 30:7, 30:14 challenges [1] - 30:5 chance [4] - 61:14, 64:14, 65:11, 77:12 change [2] - 34:11, 44:25 characteristic [1] -89:17 characteristics [1] -89:15 charge [3] - 19:11, 43:14, 104:10 chart [16] - 13:23, 14:1, 14:3, 14:4, 74:8, 74:11, 74:13, 74:22, 77:6, 78:3, 78:6, 78:11, 94:12, 98:1 charts [1] - 97:22 cherry [1] - 18:17 cherry-pick [1] - 18:17 Chester [2] - 48:4, 48:7 chief [3] - 25:11, 67:5, 101:1 Childs [1] - 32:3 **Circuit** [13] - 4:25, 7:8, 22:11, 22:12, 29:3, 30:6, 30:12, 30:14, 30:17, 30:19, 31:12, 67:12 circumstances [3] -7:9, 31:3, 70:3 **Circus** [7] - 6:6, 45:7, 48:14, 87:12, 96:23, 100:6, 100:9 circus [22] - 12:25, 15:10, 22:1, 27:6, 39:5, 44:17, 54:21, 59:24, 60:1, 62:7, 70:7, 70:9, 78:17, 78:20, 81:18, 92:14, 92:17, 92:18, 96:25, 97:2, 103:8, 104:8 cited [4] - 3:14, 76:6, 77:5, 77:15 **CITES** [9] - 76:18, 77:2, 87:2, 87:11, 87:17, 88:19, 90:9, 90:12 city [1] - 48:13 claim [1] - 95:16 claiming [3] - 9:21, 10:6, 12:16

Clara [1] - 48:12 clarified [1] - 70:13 clarify [1] - 35:4 **clarifying** [1] - 70:6 classification [1] -72:13 clause [1] - 29:15 clear [9] - 12:2, 25:22, 26:2, 27:3, 27:23, 34:23, 67:12, 68:8, clearly [1] - 28:14 clinical [1] - 107:2 close [2] - 42:15, 57:9 closed [8] - 6:6, 9:7, 23:2, 41:18, 42:3, 44:21, 56:5, 57:16 closes [1] - 10:8 closest [1] - 22:10 closing [1] - 23:4 Code [1] - 108:12 collection [1] - 60:21 **collective** [3] - 79:17, 80:15, 81:9 **COLUMBIA** [1] - 1:1 column [14] - 74:10, 75:13, 75:22, 75:24, 76:6, 77:6, 77:16, 86:25, 87:1, 87:9, 87:16, 89:3, 89:9 columns [2] - 75:8, combed [1] - 8:22 combing [1] - 11:12 comfortable [2] -19:15, 23:13 coming [11] - 20:5, 24:13, 24:16, 26:13, 39:13, 45:9, 46:24, 47:19, 62:17, 63:2, 78:11 commence [1] - 50:12 comments [1] - 8:17 Commerce [1] - 70:10 commercial [4] -70:13, 101:23, 102:3, 102:14 common [3] - 76:1, 76:4, 81:5 communicable [1] -79:5 communication [3] -41:20, 44:22, 103:14 communications [3] -8:14, 85:2, 85:19 companies [4] - 32:2, 32:18, 36:7, 110:8 company [42] - 3:20, 6:9, 13:22, 20:21, 31:25, 32:19, 32:20,

36:18, 38:14, 40:7, 41:4, 41:21, 41:23, 47:22, 53:12, 56:17, 60:9, 60:12, 60:19, 60:22, 61:2, 63:7, 63:15, 64:4, 70:20, 71:3, 71:6, 71:9, 71:10. 73:7. 73:16. 79:25, 80:22, 83:16, 83:19, 84:7, 84:16, 85:25, 90:24, 93:11, 110:21 company's [3] -32:10, 72:13, 73:4 compelling [2] -33:20, 34:7 competent [2] - 21:5, 68:4 compiled [1] - 32:1 complained [2] - 7:13, 109:15 complaining [2] -82:5, 82:8 complaint [11] - 20:20, 38:22. 39:12. 40:22. 40:23, 44:9, 47:12, 57:13, 58:12, 105:5, 110:4 complaints [10] - 7:25, 13:17, 39:4, 39:7, 109:11, 109:17, 110:2, 110:3, 110:5, 110:9 complete [2] - 67:23, 91:11 completed [1] - 32:13 **completely** [3] - 9:9, 31:5, 65:6 completeness [24] -16:16, 16:22, 18:16, 34:1, 34:6, 34:18, 45:8, 45:16, 45:18, 47:2, 50:21, 50:25, 51:13, 58:20, 67:21, 68:1, 68:6, 68:14, 68:21, 78:1, 91:14, 100:24, 101:8, 105:11 compliance [9] -36:25, 37:2, 61:6, 61:7, 63:24, 64:8, 73:16, 108:10 complies [1] - 7:22 comply [3] - 12:14, 27:24, 42:17

comport [1] - 3:12

comports [1] - 3:16

computer [2] - 2:7,

computer-aided [1] -

31:22

2:7 concern [8] - 7:14, 18:6, 52:2, 53:4, 53:14, 55:4, 62:7, 66:17 concerned [6] - 10:2, 28:1, 56:21, 56:22, 58:3, 66:18 concerning [3] -54:12, 57:18, 59:2 concerns [2] - 52:3, 53:15 concluded [1] - 41:11 conclusion [7] -13:15, 40:11, 41:9, 44:25, 61:21, 75:14, 109:1 condensed [2] -74:17, 78:5 condition [1] - 52:22 conducted [1] -103:18 confer [1] - 51:15 **confirm** [1] - 108:13 confirmation [1] -26:1 conflicting [2] - 85:23, 86:8 confrontational [1] -29:15 Connecticut [1] - 1:16 connection [4] -58:12, 79:1, 91:23, 100:16 **consent** [1] - 105:6 consequential [1] -91:20 consider [2] - 50:24, 102:23 considerable [1] -54:19 consideration [2] -108:8, 108:9 considered [1] - 90:13 consistent [1] - 19:4 constant [1] - 13:21 constitutes [1] - 71:7 Constitution [1] - 2:3 Construction [1] -32:8 consulted [1] - 107:25 contact [5] - 22:3, 37:7, 38:1, 38:7, 38:24 contacted [3] - 38:19, 38:20, 41:5 contained [1] - 91:9 contains [3] - 88:22, 91:2, 94:13 contemplating [1] -

7:6 contemporaneously [1] - 20:9 contends [1] - 23:15 contention [1] - 12:19 continued [1] - 18:23 continues [1] - 18:22 continuous [1] - 22:3 contract [4] - 79:23, 80:18, 81:16, 81:17 contracts [2] - 36:14, 81:5 contrary [1] - 108:23 control [2] - 54:23, 57:10 **controls** [1] - 21:16 controverted [1] -10:24 convenient [1] - 38:25 convention [2] -76:18, 76:19 conversations [1] -97:3 convince [1] - 67:10 cooperate [1] - 37:19 coordinates [1] -60:20 copies [5] - 40:9, 51:4, 60:21, 63:25, 77:22 copy [4] - 3:6, 40:10, 45:13, 60:7 corner [1] - 88:23 corporate [4] - 5:24, 43:20, 83:23, 107:12 **corporation** [6] - 4:20, 5:2, 5:6, 9:17, 9:19, 36:17 correct [49] - 8:7, 15:6, 16:21, 16:22, 35:6, 35:7, 61:10, 62:15, 67:16, 83:6, 83:13, 83:21, 84:14, 84:17, 86:15, 87:22, 87:25, 88:6, 88:20, 89:4, 89:14, 89:16, 89:23, 90:10, 90:15, 92:15, 93:7, 93:21, 94:14, 94:25, 95:10, 96:10, 96:11, 97:11, 97:13, 97:14, 97:19, 97:20, 97:23, 99:14, 99:17, 99:18, 100:7, 104:5, 104:21, 105:18, 109:3, 115:3 correctly [2] - 85:13, 107:19 correspondence [1] -54:9 Corruption [1] - 23:23 cotton [1] - 55:17

counsel [17] - 3:2, 5:21, 5:24, 14:5, 17:23, 31:1, 35:20, 36:6, 37:25, 38:9, 43:20, 51:23, 58:10, 67:14, 74:20, 85:2, 111:24 Counsel [5] - 18:9, 24:6, 66:2, 78:9, 106:9 **counter** [1] - 112:16 counterdesignations [1] -112:16 countless [1] - 17:11 countries [1] - 76:21 country [1] - 50:4 County [2] - 55:7, 65:15 couple [3] - 33:2, 84:19, 85:12 courier [1] - 33:9 course [15] - 20:8, 21:11, 22:1, 31:6, 32:6, 37:19, 38:11, 41:17, 60:23, 64:23, 72:25, 77:19, 84:22, 100:6, 105:7 COURT [176] - 1:1, 3:2, 4:9, 4:13, 5:8, 5:13, 5:17, 5:21, 6:10, 6:18, 6:20, 7:1, 7:5, 7:17, 8:4, 8:8, 8:10, 8:20, 9:2, 9:8, 9:12, 9:18, 10:18, 10:22, 11:5, 11:12, 11:16, 11:18, 11:20, 12:5, 12:10, 12:18, 13:2, 13:5, 13:9, 13:15, 14:2, 14:4, 14:16, 15:5, 15:23, 16:4, 16:7, 16:11, 16:21, 17:1, 17:7, 17:15, 17:21, 18:2, 18:8. 18:20. 18:22. 19:12, 19:19, 20:3, 21:8, 21:13, 21:17, 21:23, 22:7, 22:17, 22:20, 23:7, 23:10, 23:22, 24:6, 24:11, 24:19, 25:2, 25:16, 26:9, 27:18, 27:21, 28:4, 28:10, 28:14, 29:1, 29:6, 29:12, 29:15, 29:21, 30:1, 34:21, 35:1, 35:8, 35:13, 35:20, 39:4, 39:10, 40:13, 40:18, 43:3. 43:5. 43:24. 44:2, 44:14, 45:15,

46:5, 47:5, 47:24, 49:1, 50:17, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:11, 51:22, 52:13, 53:23, 55:11, 55:22, 58:17, 59:13, 59:21, 60:16, 62:15, 62:22, 63:3, 63:19, 65:1, 66:2. 66:5, 67:14, 67:17, 67:19, 67:24, 68:3, 68:14, 68:22, 69:11, 69:16, 69:22, 71:22, 72:18, 73:20, 73:22, 74:15, 74:20, 75:4, 78:9, 78:13, 80:12, 82:12, 82:17, 82:22, 84:6, 100:21, 100:25, 101:3, 101:11, 101:18, 102:4, 102:8, 102:12, 102:15, 102:19, 103:3, 105:13, 106:9, 106:16, 110:14, 110:25, 111:2, 111:5, 111:9, 111:13, 111:17, 111:21, 112:6, 112:9, 112:13, 112:20, 113:1, 113:3, 113:6 Court [21] - 2:2, 2:2, 5:10, 7:19, 23:13, 29:23, 32:12, 33:6, 36:11, 36:23, 42:24, 50:24, 51:3, 58:18, 66:5, 69:19, 70:3, 81:7, 102:12, 112:16, 115:2 court [3] - 20:6, 30:6, Court's [2] - 3:14, 19:4 Courthouse [1] - 2:3 COURTROOM [5] -29:23, 35:14, 69:19, 113:5, 113:7 courts [2] - 31:16, 31:20 covered [3] - 81:16, 81:17, 81:24 Covington [1] - 49:21 create [1] - 20:12 created [3] - 30:16, 31:24, 103:22 creation [2] - 30:22, 31:5 **credence** [1] - 8:22 credentials [1] - 40:21 credit [1] - 32:15 criminal [2] - 29:13,

58:8 critical [1] - 14:23 cross [7] - 18:10, 20:15, 26:7, 26:14, 27:12, 27:16, 100:24 Cross [2] - 82:22, 114:5 CROSS [1] - 82:23 Cross-examination [2] - 82:22, 114:5 CROSS-EXAMINATION [1] -82:23 cross-examine [4] -26:7, 26:14, 27:12, 27:16 cross-examined [1] -20:15 **CRUELTY** [1] - 1:3 Crystal [1] - 1:16 Cschm [1] - 97:16 cultures [1] - 107:4 cure [1] - 78:2 current [2] - 36:5, 84:12 custodians [1] - 31:25 **custody** [2] - 31:17, 31:25

D

D.C [8] - 1:6, 1:17. 1:22, 2:4, 4:25, 22:11, 66:20, 67:12 daily [1] - 38:9 damages [2] - 91:20, 91:22 damaging [1] - 19:12 data [1] - 91:12 date [18] - 56:24, 56:25, 75:9, 75:10, 85:24, 87:6, 92:3, 93:14, 93:18, 94:9, 94:11, 94:20, 94:24, 95:17, 98:14, 98:21, 99:4, 99:6 dated [4] - 48:2, 51:9, 55:1, 66:14 dates [6] - 48:2, 79:20, 95:21, 95:24, 96:24, 97:5 day-to-day [4] - 32:11, 45:6, 46:25, 65:24 days [6] - 6:15, 6:17, 20:13, 54:20, 78:4, 101:6 dead [1] - 27:20 deal [1] - 27:4 dealership [2] - 32:6,

32:7 dealing [1] - 44:24 deals [2] - 22:8, 63:13 dealt [2] - 29:9, 29:10 **Deano** [1] - 87:3 Dear [1] - 25:24 death [10] - 51:19, 52:3, 53:15, 103:15, 103:19, 103:24, 106:13, 106:14, 107:4, 107:5 Death [1] - 104:14 December [3] - 79:22, 80:10.80:17 decision [1] - 30:5 decisions [7] - 30:10, 32:14, 32:22, 39:22, 84:1, 84:2, 104:9 declaration [6] -15:18, 93:23, 96:13, 96:14, 98:10, 98:14 declarations [3] -15:12, 15:13, 93:19 **Defendant** [9] - 1:8, 58:22, 59:14, 63:4, 66:9, 73:23, 78:14, 82:18, 114:10 defendant [4] - 15:8, 21:18, 35:12, 105:11 **DEFENDANT** [1] -35:23 defendant's [8] - 3:7, 15:13, 30:4, 33:16,

67:4, 93:20, 93:24, 102:17 Defendant's [41] -5:16, 11:15, 13:7, 16:2, 35:5, 42:19, 48:1, 56:12, 58:15, 58:25, 59:11, 59:12, 61:11, 62:14, 62:24, 64:13, 64:25, 65:22, 69:9, 69:25, 71:13, 73:19, 74:1, 77:8, 77:13, 77:16, 77:18, 77:24, 77:25, 79:14, 80:6, 82:10, 86:22, 88:6, 88:18, 91:5, 94:12, 94:19, 95:12, 97:21 defendants [4] -25:13, 51:11, 58:20, **Defendants** [2] - 1:19, 4:1 defense [3] - 27:25, 28:2. 28:3 deferred [1] - 105:3 deficiencies [1] -

defining [1] - 89:15 definitely [5] - 14:1, 14:3, 24:10, 25:19, 69:17 definition [3] - 7:23, 26:24, 27:7 DeHaven [13] - 6:2, 21:8, 22:16, 43:1, 43:8, 43:15, 49:18, 53:7, 55:1, 59:1, 59:6, 104:19, 104:20 **DELCIANNA** [1] - 1:15 demonstrate [2] - 5:4, 90:13 demonstrative [2] -5:19, 24:8 denied [1] - 79:11 department [16] -36:12, 36:20, 39:1, 42:5, 42:7, 56:16, 56:17, 56:18, 60:13, 60:22, 60:24, 63:17, 63:25, 81:20, 88:12, 110:18 **Department** [7] - 33:7, 37:8, 38:13, 46:4, 70:6, 104:13, 110:21 deponent [2] - 4:17, 4:18 deposition [15] - 3:3, 4:17, 14:17, 15:5, 15:19, 18:13, 84:21, 86:7, 86:11, 93:5, 98:4, 98:13, 98:16, 99:21, 112:10 depositions [1] -112:15 **DEPUTY** [5] - 29:23, 35:14, 69:19, 113:5, 113:7 deputy [5] - 6:2, 38:9, 43:1, 43:9, 48:8 describe [5] - 36:10, 41:22, 42:24, 70:3, 81:7 Describe [2] - 36:23, 37:6 Description [1] -89:10 description [1] - 75:14 descriptions [2] -89:12, 89:15 designated [2] -74:23, 76:23 designations [1] -112:16

detail [1] - 24:3

81:13, 98:23

determination [2] -

determine [1] - 98:20

determined [5] - 50:6, 52:22, 53:24, 55:9, 55:24 detracts [1] - 24:22 developed [1] - 95:7 developments [1] develops [1] - 38:19 devoted [1] - 17:13 Dick [1] - 106:20 dictated [1] - 63:12 die [3] - 52:13, 53:23 died [3] - 8:18, 104:25, 106:24 different [14] - 9:8, 9:9, 24:4, 38:20, 72:24, 72:25, 73:11, 74:13, 74:18, 74:25, 83:15, 98:25, 101:8, 106:14 difficult [1] - 24:20 diligent [1] - 91:11 direct [9] - 12:8, 31:2, 69:24, 71:13, 81:1, 101:10, 101:15, 109:11, 111:17 **DIRECT** [1] - 35:24 Direct [1] - 114:5 directed [2] - 33:21, 46:11 directions [1] - 107:12 directly [1] - 40:25 director [6] - 25:4, 33:7, 33:21, 46:3, 46:15, 54:6 disadvantage [1] -22:18 disagree [1] - 12:18 **Discharge** [1] - 81:2 discharge [1] - 81:10 disclaim [1] - 91:18 disclosed [2] - 82:15 discomfort [1] -108:15 discovery [2] - 45:12, 82:16 discrepancy [2] -98:7, 98:18 discuss [3] - 39:20, 111:5, 112:11 discussed [1] -101:15 discussing [1] - 3:19 **discussion** [1] - 30:18 discussions [2] -54:9, 94:7 diseases [1] - 79:5 disentary [1] - 107:3 display [1] - 75:2 dispute [3] - 9:3, 14:5,

14:25 disputes [3] - 8:8, 10:22, 43:24 district [1] - 21:19 **DISTRICT** [3] - 1:1, 1:1, 1:12 **Division** [3] - 43:2, 43:10, 46:3 division [3] - 6:3, 41:8, 41:25 **Doc** [5] - 56:10, 95:3, 107:22, 108:22, document [37] - 6:8, 21:9, 25:1, 34:3, 45:17, 46:22, 46:23, 47:10, 51:25, 53:2, 53:6, 55:2, 55:4, 57:23, 58:10, 60:12, 60:18, 60:21, 64:17, 66:7, 66:15, 66:17, 68:12, 72:4, 74:2, 74:18, 75:2, 75:7, 79:15, 80:14, 87:4, 93:25, 97:25, 101:6, 105:17, 107:6, 108:5 document's [1] -30:21 documentation [7] -60:2, 60:4, 63:9, 78:20, 86:14, 86:18, 102:11 documenting [1] -100:13 documents [73] -3:25, 4:16, 4:18, 4:19, 4:20, 5:11, 5:13, 9:10, 14:6, 14:9, 15:24, 19:23, 20:24, 22:4, 22:22, 24:17, 26:5, 30:9, 30:10, 30:16, 30:19, 31:14, 32:4, 33:12, 33:13, 33:15, 33:22, 34:10, 34:16, 35:5, 40:3, 40:6, 42:12, 42:14, 42:22, 42:25, 50:25, 51:14, 60:25, 61:2, 61:4, 61:17, 62:6, 62:9, 63:14, 64:4, 64:6, 64:14, 64:16, 64:21, 65:6,

65:12, 65:14, 65:17,

76:5, 76:6, 76:9,

77:5, 77:9, 77:12,

77:15, 77:18, 78:7,

82:14, 86:19, 93:1,

93:2. 96:19. 99:20.

100:16, 101:24,

105:10

dollars [1] - 84:9 **Dolly** [1] - 92:9 done [7] - 33:10, 38:13, 41:23, 55:16, 55:17, 55:20, 103:12 Donna [3] - 76:9, 77:11, 96:13 door [2] - 18:21, 38:8 doubt [4] - 5:10, 23:1, 33:20, 98:14 down [13] - 4:18, 6:1, 6:20, 20:5, 33:8, 35:2, 49:3, 72:1, 106:2, 107:7, 111:3 **Dr** [2] - 49:19, 112:18 drafted [1] - 32:18 drove [1] - 107:1 drowned [1] - 52:24 drum [1] - 13:21 dry [1] - 105:25 due [1] - 57:17 Duncan [2] - 31:21, 31:23 during [9] - 37:21, 49:14, 55:6, 62:3, 81:14, 82:15, 86:7, 100:5, 104:24 **During** [1] - 55:5 **DVM** [1] - 106:19 **DX** [5] - 16:17, 45:4,

Ε

47:3, 78:11, 78:12

e-mail [4] - 84:23, 103:13, 104:19, 106:2 e-mails [1] - 103:12 early [3] - 37:25, 95:20, 98:19 earns [1] - 76:19 easier [2] - 28:21, 53:10 Eastern [2] - 46:3, 46:14 easy [2] - 20:12, 33:5 echo [1] - 72:1 effect [7] - 32:3, 41:19, 44:13, 70:13, 79:21, 80:16, 83:18 effective [1] - 75:18 effort [2] - 17:13, 91:11 eight [3] - 53:1, 56:2, 93:25 either [6] - 9:22. 27:11, 58:20, 75:17, 78:3, 103:10 elaborate [1] - 24:3

electrical [1] - 81:19 electronically [1] -45:13 elephant [51] - 10:15, 46:18, 47:12, 48:16, 50:2, 50:6, 50:9, 52:4, 52:20, 53:15, 54:23, 57:9, 75:9, 75:10, 75:11, 75:12, 75:15, 75:16, 75:17, 75:20, 76:1, 76:11, 79:11, 86:3, 86:8, 87:1, 87:8, 87:10, 87:14, 90:18, 91:25, 92:2, 92:23, 94:13, 94:17, 95:6, 97:23, 99:1, 103:15, 103:19, 103:24, 104:4, 104:8, 104:10, 104:15, 105:12, 105:16, 107:16, 107:18 elephant's [1] - 55:10 elephants [78] - 3:11, 3:16, 3:18, 8:2, 10:14, 12:23, 12:25, 15:10, 15:15, 21:16, 27:5, 36:18, 36:21, 36:25, 37:3, 44:12, 49:4, 49:6, 52:16, 52:18, 52:19, 55:8, 55:14, 56:1, 56:8, 57:9, 57:14, 58:7, 59:3, 70:25, 71:3, 71:11, 72:13, 72:15, 73:5, 73:7, 76:3, 76:17, 76:20, 76:25, 78:6, 85:24, 86:12, 86:17, 89:13, 89:16, 91:25, 93:6, 93:9, 93:11, 93:15, 93:17, 94:3, 94:5, 94:8, 94:9, 95:17, 95:24, 96:3, 96:6, 96:8, 96:15, 97:6, 97:13, 97:15, 97:18, 98:7, 99:16, 99:24, 100:5, 100:9, 101:15, 101:25, 107:22, 108:1, 108:10, 108:20, 109:6 elephants' [1] - 88:22 elephants's [1] -55:21 eleven [5] - 3:4, 3:5,

ele [2] - 106:20,

elected [1] - 67:5

106:22

56:13 Ellen [2] - 105:17, 105:23 **EMMET** [1] - 1:11 employed [1] - 36:3 employee [5] - 49:5, 49:11, 76:9, 81:8, 82:8 employee's [2] - 82:4, 103:22 employees [5] - 40:9, 44:10, 76:8, 81:15, employment [4] -36:5, 36:16, 38:1, 82:4 en [1] - 106:25 encompass [1] -98:24 end [8] - 3:12, 22:25, 50:21, 50:23, 60:6, 81:15, 103:24, 112:15 Endangered [7] -15:4, 15:11, 26:22, 69:3, 69:6, 75:18, 102:2 endangered [1] -75:20 energy [1] - 110:5 enforcement [1] -67:11 engage [2] - 70:8, 70:22 engaging [1] - 72:9 England [1] - 87:12 **Enlarge** [1] - 61:12 enteritis [1] - 107:2 Enterprises [2] -19:13, 33:19 entertain [1] - 45:20 ENTERTAINMENT [1] - 1:7 Entertainment [50] -5:25. 13:8. 18:7. 25:12, 26:2, 36:7, 36:8, 42:12, 43:20, 47:1, 49:14, 50:3, 65:25, 66:14, 67:10, 79:10, 79:18, 80:8, 80:16, 81:8, 81:16, 82:4, 82:7, 82:15, 83:3, 83:5, 83:7, 85:23, 86:8, 87:21, 87:24, 89:6, 89:12, 90:7, 90:21, 92:1, 92:4, 92:10, 92:14, 92:19, 92:25, 93:6, 94:2, 94:10, 94:16, 94:24, 97:15,

101:25, 109:14, 110:17 Entertainment's [4] -21:14, 77:20, 103:22, 106:11 entire [1] - 96:17 entirely [1] - 68:11 entities [2] - 36:13, 66:1 entitled [3] - 28:14, 34:11, 115:4 entity [1] - 90:13 entry [1] - 79:11 **Equipment** [1] - 32:8 errors [1] - 91:19 **ESQ** [8] - 1:14, 1:15, 1:15, 1:19, 1:19, 1:20, 1:20, 1:21 essentially [2] - 30:6, 58:17 established [2] -72:22, 106:6 establishes [1] -72:25 estimate [1] - 84:6 **estimating** [1] - 85:5 Etcetera [1] - 32:20 etcetera [2] - 14:20, 14:21 **Euell** [1] - 44:10 evaluation [1] - 84:8 evening [5] - 51:4, 82:25, 111:6, 112:2, 113:3 event [1] - 20:9 eventually [1] - 107:13 evidence [50] - 4:22, 6:8. 6:14. 6:22. 7:24. 8:18. 9:24. 10:9. 10:20, 13:16, 19:2, 19:3, 19:5, 19:8, 19:13, 19:17, 19:19, 19:20, 23:4, 23:6, 23:12, 23:14, 24:8, 25:10, 25:11, 25:12, 28:1, 28:2, 33:15, 33:17, 57:17, 58:19, 58:21, 58:22, 59:14, 66:9, 68:4, 68:12, 69:1, 69:10, 69:25, 71:14, 73:23, 75:13, 78:15. 82:19. 100:23, 101:4, 108:13 **Evidence** [1] - 17:10 evidentiary [6] - 9:25, 10:1, 15:25, 34:16, 100:25, 102:23 exact [2] - 66:4, 94:11 exactly [1] - 25:17

14:17, 57:24

Elizabeth [2] - 46:2,

examination [3] -12:8, 82:22, 114:5 Examination [2] -114:5, 114:6 **EXAMINATION** [3] -35:24, 82:23, 110:15 examine [4] - 26:7, 26:14, 27:12, 27:16 examined [1] - 20:15 example [6] - 5:10, 5:16, 5:22, 8:15, 110:2, 110:3 except [5] - 13:19, 19:8, 56:4, 85:20, 96:9 Except [1] - 96:6 exception [5] - 30:17, 59:20, 65:3, 67:13, 101:22 excess [1] - 84:9 excited [2] - 55:15, 55:16 **exclude** [1] - 65:9 Excuse [1] - 109:4 excused [2] - 111:8, 111:9 **executive** [1] - 36:6 exemplary [1] - 91:22 Exhibit [54] - 5:16, 11:15, 13:7, 16:2, 35:5, 42:19, 45:24, 48:1, 56:12, 58:22, 58:25, 59:11, 59:12, 59:14, 61:11, 62:24, 63:4, 64:13, 64:21, 65:11, 66:9, 66:12, 67:1, 68:25, 69:9, 69:25, 71:13, 73:23, 74:1, 77:8, 77:13, 77:16, 77:18, 77:24, 77:25, 78:14, 79:14, 80:6, 82:18, 86:22, 88:6, 88:18, 91:5, 92:8, 93:24, 94:12, 94:19, 95:12, 97:21, 100:12, 104:12, 105:15, 110:1, 114:11 exhibit [28] - 5:19, 11:14, 11:23, 45:2, 47:17, 47:19, 50:13, 53:1, 57:23, 59:6, 61:14, 61:17, 61:18, 62:9, 64:14, 64:16, 65:5, 65:12, 65:14, 65:18, 67:4, 67:15, 68:19, 74:23, 74:24, 86:23, 96:12 exhibits [5] - 8:16, 22:25, 68:18, 77:25,

78:3
exist [1] - 91:19
expended [1] - 33:4
expert [2] - 3:23,
108:19
expertise [1] - 81:22
experts [5] - 55:25,
56:3, 108:1, 108:25,
109:5
expressed [1] - 91:16
extend [1] - 32:15
extent [1] - 61:5
eye [1] - 59:19

F

face [2] - 43:17 face-to-face [1] -43:17 facilities [1] - 37:17 facility [5] - 50:1, 50:5, 52:17, 54:19, 55:7 fact [8] - 7:10, 8:20, 20:16, 66:22, 76:14, 102:2, 106:7, 107:25 factual [1] - 30:23 factually [1] - 6:24 fair [3] - 3:22, 12:21, 34:2 fairly [2] - 16:12, 105:24 fairness [1] - 17:18 faith [1] - 14:11 **fall** [3] - 15:15, 15:16, 54:13 falls [2] - 74:10, 85:4 familiar [19] - 37:12, 37:15, 38:16, 38:18, 48:16, 49:9, 51:19, 51:25, 54:14, 57:18, 62:1, 69:3, 76:5, 80:4, 80:20, 81:3, 90:18, 96:19, 96:20 family [1] - 83:12 far [5] - 29:16, 74:10, 89:9, 90:25, 97:2 fatal [1] - 31:13 father [1] - 83:11 fault [1] - 14:6 favorite [1] - 8:16 fearful [1] - 11:6 February [1] - 56:12 Fed [4] - 31:23, 32:3, 32:8, 32:17 federal [7] - 20:6, 21:18, 33:17, 37:1, 37:3, 64:7, 71:20 Federal [1] - 108:12 **FEI** [2] - 65:4, 94:2

Feld [84] - 3:16, 5:24, 6:12, 7:13, 8:4, 10:3, 11:3, 13:8, 13:16, 18:7, 18:24, 19:9, 19:13, 21:14, 21:17, 23:15, 25:12, 26:2, 30:25, 32:22, 32:24, 33:18, 36:6, 36:8, 42:12, 43:20, 47:1, 48:15, 49:5, 49:14, 50:3, 65:25, 66:14, 67:10, 77:19, 79:10, 79:18, 80:7, 80:16, 81:8, 81:16, 82:3, 82:7, 82:15, 83:3, 83:4, 83:5, 83:7, 83:8, 83:12, 83:13, 85:23, 86:7, 86:15, 87:20, 87:24, 88:4, 88:25, 89:6, 89:12, 90:7, 90:21, 92:1, 92:3, 92:10, 92:14, 92:18, 92:25, 93:6, 94:2, 94:10, 94:16, 94:24, 97:15, 101:25, 103:21, 106:11, 106:22, 109:14, 109:17, 110:4, 110:17 Feld's [2] - 3:18, 91:24 Feld-owned [1] -48:15 fellow [3] - 8:17, 44:11, 57:11 fellow's [1] - 44:10 felt [1] - 54:23 female [1] - 48:15 few [6] - 85:11, 85:16, 89:21, 91:24, 100:8, 101:6 fifteen [9] - 11:10, 11:19, 13:7, 26:9, 28:12, 35:2, 35:10, 56:11, 58:16 figure [2] - 17:16, 104:17 file [7] - 21:20, 42:10, 42:15, 60:24, 64:1, 67:23, 87:13 filed [2] - 44:9, 57:13 files [1] - 8:22 filing [3] - 5:3, 51:16, 105:5 fill [2] - 61:20, 88:2 fills [1] - 60:5 film [1] - 28:18 final [2] - 18:18, 57:23 financial [2] - 29:11,

FEI's [2] - 3:11, 94:7

FELD [1] - 1:7

32:13 financing [1] - 83:24 finder [1] - 106:7 Fine [1] - 113:1 fine [6] - 12:16, 14:7, 18:15, 26:12, 75:1, 112:25 firm [3] - 31:17, 31:18, 49:21 First [6] - 14:16, 20:4, 30:23, 33:3, 67:3, 68:18 first [31] - 3:6, 4:9, 4:16, 6:4, 10:2, 11:9, 14:14, 16:17, 16:19, 17:9, 22:8, 24:14, 25:1, 25:24, 30:7, 30:14, 44:11, 47:4, 48:10, 74:4, 82:2, 85:1, 86:25, 95:7, 97:22, 104:15, 104:17, 105:25, 107:11, 108:5, 108:18 Fish [23] - 6:23, 7:23, 9:22, 15:20, 15:21, 23:14, 70:5, 70:17, 70:20, 71:2, 71:6, 71:9, 71:20, 73:15, 75:21, 76:22, 87:21, 88:5, 88:13, 88:20, 88:25, 89:22, 104:3 fitness [1] - 91:17 fits [1] - 30:17 five [7] - 3:6, 26:12, 48:1, 58:16, 99:19, 102:22 fixed [1] - 37:17 FL [1] - 46:17 flip [1] - 97:25 Florida [5] - 37:17, 50:1, 53:16, 55:7, 64:18 flow [1] - 5:6 focus [1] - 68:22 follow [3] - 4:13, 44:24, 73:14 follow-up [1] - 44:24 followed [5] - 4:12, 68:17, 104:8, 104:11, 104:25 following [1] - 85:7

footage [1] - 54:22

FOR [3] - 1:1, 1:3,

forcing [2] - 12:23,

foregoing [1] - 115:3

forget [1] - 44:10

forgot [1] - 76:2

35:23

50:11

form [6] - 41:15, 41:22, 60:5, 61:20, 63:11, 63:12 formally [1] - 94:4 former [3] - 44:10, 49:5, 49:11 forth [2] - 31:11, 65:7 forty [2] - 59:5, 59:9 forward [1] - 60:7 forwards [2] - 60:21, 63:25 **foundation** [10] - 5:1, 31:15, 32:1, 74:19, 74:21, 75:2, 78:11, 106:6, 106:8, 112:11 four [5] - 13:6, 68:17, 91:5, 93:23, 106:21 fourteen [2] - 54:25, 80:2 fourth [2] - 87:1, 87:9 frame [2] - 49:14, 61:9 framework [2] - 4:12, 4:13 Francisco [1] - 54:13 freight [1] - 32:17 French [2] - 111:12, 112:8 frequently [5] - 38:22, 39:11, 41:13, 41:19, 41:25 **Friday** [2] - 69:17, 112:21 Friedman [2] - 4:3, 4:23 Friedman's [4] - 4:1, 4:10, 12:7, 29:2 Fulbright [1] - 1:21 full [1] - 73:16 fully [1] - 39:25 future [1] - 23:5 FWS [1] - 18:24

G

Gary [5] - 12:22, 106:19, 106:22, 106:25, 107:12 gastric [1] - 54:1 Gautier [2] - 76:9, 77:11 Gautier's [1] - 96:13 Gebel [3] - 48:24, 105:1 Gebel-Williams [1] -105:1 gender [2] - 75:9, 87:6 general [5] - 3:13, 31:1, 36:6, 38:9, 40:19

generally [3] - 7:21, 38:7, 81:14 generate [5] - 40:3, 40:6, 60:1, 60:4, 63:9 generated [4] - 9:15, 63:14, 64:20, 65:6 generates [1] - 63:10 George [1] - 22:20 Germany [2] - 99:14, 99:24 Gibbons [3] - 54:4, 54:5 Gipson [2] - 48:4, 48:7 given [10] - 3:13, 7:14, 13:24, 19:2, 23:12, 62:3, 64:12, 66:22, 94:5, 98:22 glad [1] - 30:1 Glen [1] - 44:10 Glitzenstein [1] - 1:16 God [1] - 35:18 Goldentyer [3] -51:10, 56:13, 57:25 Goldertyer [1] - 46:2 good-faith [1] - 14:11 government [11] -4:21, 7:12, 12:20, 21:19, 33:18, 40:4, 56:15, 56:17, 60:23, 76:19 gradually [1] - 55:16 great [1] - 36:14 Green [1] - 8:17 gross [1] - 23:19 grounds [3] - 65:3, 65:23, 78:1 group [4] - 38:23, 43:13, 55:25, 85:10 groups [2] - 39:9, 109:23 guarantee [1] - 91:14 guess [9] - 13:9, 28:15, 31:22, 33:9, 40:8, 54:24, 60:8, 72:15, 85:6 guilty [1] - 58:9 Gunther [2] - 105:1, 106:21

Н

half [1] - 111:19 hand [4] - 35:15, 75:22, 77:16, 88:23 handle [2] - 8:3, 38:4 handled [1] - 73:11 handler [3] - 48:14, 57:10, 57:14 handlers [3] - 54:22, 58:6, 81:19 handles [2] - 18:7, 39:18 handling [5] - 59:3, 71:3, 104:10, 108:10, 108:14 Handling [1] - 108:12 hands [1] - 38:4 hands-on [1] - 38:4 hanging [2] - 41:13, 105:24 happy [3] - 34:25, 78:2. 111:15 harassment [3] - 7:24, 26:22, 27:1 **harboring** [1] - 79:4 hard [5] - 20:5, 24:20, 25:6, 33:4, 39:6 hard-working [1] -20:5 harm [7] - 14:12, 16:7, 17:7, 17:16, 27:1, 103:24, 108:15 harmful [2] - 11:2, 14:15 Harris [1] - 53:7 head [1] - 36:12 headnote [1] - 31:22 health [2] - 79:4, 79:12 hear [2] - 24:15, 40:15 heard [1] - 13:16 hearsay [6] - 7:7, 16:16, 59:17, 65:2, 65:23, 67:8 heart [2] - 52:21, 52:22 Hello [1] - 83:1 **help** [9] - 4:2, 4:10, 12:7, 28:18, 29:3, 35:18, 81:21, 92:9, 107:17 helping [1] - 113:6 helps [1] - 4:2 Henderson [1] - 95:4 herpes [1] - 107:4 highlight [4] - 86:24, 86:25, 87:8, 91:7 highlighted [1] - 46:16 himself [1] - 106:24 hip [1] - 100:3 hips [1] - 99:25 histories [1] - 101:23 history [5] - 3:10, 3:15, 3:18, 3:20, 105:24 Hmm [1] - 14:2

holder [1] - 39:8

holding [1] - 32:17

Holst [4] - 76:8, 95:9, 95:16, 96:21 Holst's [1] - 95:13 home [1] - 60:8 Honor [46] - 4:7, 5:18, 5:23, 6:25, 8:13, 10:7, 12:22, 13:12, 13:23, 14:14, 17:11, 18:19, 23:9, 25:9, 27:19, 34:25, 46:23, 47:18, 48:25, 51:6, 58:14, 59:16, 62:16, 65:2, 67:3, 67:21, 68:8, 71:14, 73:21, 74:8, 74:13, 77:24, 78:10, 82:10, 82:13, 100:19, 101:7, 101:14, 101:20, 106:5, 106:10, 110:13, 111:1, 111:8, 111:16, 112:23 Honor's [1] - 12:1 HONORABLE [1] -1:11 hope [1] - 27:21 horse [1] - 27:20 hospitals [1] - 32:2 Houck [3] - 57:18, 106:20, 112:17 hour [7] - 10:12, 12:9, 29:19, 30:3, 33:6, 35:11, 111:19 hour-and-a-half [1] -111:19 hours [10] - 6:18, 6:19, 10:23, 11:8, 17:8, 17:11, 18:2, 27:6, 69:12, 107:3 house [2] - 36:14, 85:2 huge [1] - 109:19 Humane [3] - 48:12, 66:13, 66:19 humane [1] - 109:6 humans [1] - 55:13 hundred [1] - 68:17 hundreds [2] - 109:21, 109:23 husbandry [17] - 7:21, 8:2. 12:14. 12:19. 12:24, 13:1, 17:4, 18:25, 23:16, 26:23, 27:4, 27:7, 33:18, 72:5, 72:9, 72:18, 73:13

ı Identification [1] -114:11 identification [1] -63:5 identified [3] - 42:2, 44:8, 109:23 identity [1] - 56:8 ignore [1] - 8:12 imagination [2] - 13:1, 27:7 immigration [1] -36:15 implied [1] - 91:16 **importance** [1] - 24:22 important [3] - 3:5, 24:16, 31:16 importantly [1] - 10:4 importation [1] -99:20 imported [3] - 99:13, 99:16, 99:24 improper [2] - 17:4, 23:15 in-house [2] - 36:14, 85:2 inadvertently [1] -57:24 inappropriate [1] -55:20 **INC** [1] - 1:7 **Inc** [2] - 36:7, 36:8 incident [5] - 10:14, 47:15, 52:3, 58:5, 66:18 incidental [1] - 91:20 inclined [1] - 68:22 include [1] - 70:14 included [1] - 26:24 includes [1] - 72:16 including [4] - 3:11, 83:23, 91:16, 91:21 inclusive [1] - 3:15 incorporated [1] -31:4 indeed [6] - 7:13, 8:23, 9:23, 9:25, 11:1, 30:13 independent [2] -3:24, 9:25 indicate [5] - 59:18, 98:8, 98:9, 99:5, 101:24 indicated [10] - 33:14, 41:4, 59:23, 70:20, 71:2, 71:6, 71:9,

73:15, 96:24, 112:21

indicates [4] - 44:21,

64:8, 75:14, 92:24 indicating [1] - 42:1 indication [1] - 45:5 indicia [3] - 20:9, 20:15, 27:10 indirectly [1] - 12:16 individual [2] - 47:8, 50:4 individuals [1] - 53:11 industry [1] - 43:12 infection [1] - 53:25 informal [1] - 63:11 **information** [26] - 4:3, 5:5, 20:23, 31:11. 32:23, 38:3, 40:24, 41:5, 67:12, 84:18, 85:10, 85:12, 85:16, 88:4, 88:7, 88:8, 88:25, 89:6, 90:22, 90:24, 91:7, 91:9, 91:15, 94:13, 98:17, 109:8 informed [2] - 39:25, 102:12 Infraction [1] - 8:23 initial [1] - 105:2 initiated [2] - 6:6, 44:5 initiative [1] - 38:23 injured [1] - 58:6 injuries [1] - 57:12 **inordinate** [1] - 110:8 inquiring [1] - 21:20 inside [1] - 20:21 Insofar [1] - 10:2 inspect [6] - 37:9, 60:1, 64:18, 66:21, 66:23 inspected [1] - 63:7 inspection [18] -38:10, 38:12, 50:5, 55:5, 55:7, 60:6, 60:7, 61:19, 61:21, 62:3, 62:10, 62:17, 62:18, 62:24, 63:10, 64:20, 65:15 inspections [1] -37:21 inspector [5] - 37:18, 55:8, 60:5, 61:20, 62:3 inspects [1] - 59:23 instance [1] - 57:8 instances [1] - 85:23 instituted [1] - 40:14 institution [1] - 29:11 instructed [1] - 50:7 insufficient [1] - 10:9 insurance [1] - 31:25 integrated [2] - 32:10, 32:24

intended [2] - 70:14, 70:15 inter [1] - 76:25 interact [1] - 21:15 interest [1] - 64:3 interested [1] - 45:17 **Interior** [1] - 70:6 interject [1] - 34:22 international [1] -76:19 Internet [1] - 20:13 interstate [1] - 78:18 Interstate [1] - 70:10 interview [2] - 20:24, 39:18 **intimidated** [1] - 57:15 introduce [2] - 25:10, 67:5 introduced [2] -67:21, 101:6 introduces [1] - 34:20 introducing [3] -100:23, 101:1, 101:3 inventory [2] - 87:2, 87:17 investigate [3] -38:22, 39:2, 46:14 investigated [1] - 42:2 investigating [2] -25:12, 39:3 Investigation [2] -8:16, 21:6 investigation [27] -6:5, 20:2, 20:19, 39:21, 41:11, 41:14, 42:3, 42:10, 42:11, 44:4. 44:7. 44:25. 46:11, 47:3, 48:17, 48:19, 51:18, 53:18, 54:12, 55:5, 55:6, 57:15, 103:18, 103:25, 107:11, 107:14 investigations [8] -7:25, 28:8, 38:14, 40:1, 40:3, 41:10, 43:14, 44:9 investigative [3] -39:15, 45:9, 45:11 investigator [5] -38:21, 40:11, 40:24, 40:25, 103:21 Investigators [1] -48:13 investigators [2] -8:14, 40:22 investments [1] - 84:3 involve [1] - 48:19 involved [15] - 36:17, 37:24, 39:15, 39:21,

41:1, 50:1, 56:8, 57:12, 64:2, 79:23, 80:18, 81:18, 83:23, 84:1, 94:6 involves [1] - 81:19 involving [2] - 46:18, 52:3 irrelevant [1] - 101:14 issue [18] - 17:17, 19:1, 22:8, 24:19, 25:4, 25:23, 26:16, 27:3, 33:6, 38:11, 50:11, 68:21, 78:6, 100:25, 101:16, 102:8, 108:8, 108:9 issued [6] - 64:17, 65:15, 69:6, 71:20, 79:5, 88:19 issues [5] - 27:13, 29:15, 39:20, 76:24, 102:7 issuing [1] - 110:5 Item [1] - 72:1 itself [2] - 6:9, 91:2 IX [1] - 108:12

J

Jacks [1] - 107:1

Jacksonville [2] -

53:16, 106:25

74:11

Jacobson [2] - 12:23,

JACQUELINE [3] -

2:2, 115:2, 115:5

44:5, 49:17, 79:21,

80:10, 80:17, 98:23,

January [9] - 6:6,

99:5, 99:8

Japan [1] - 76:17

Jaworski [1] - 1:21

Jeannie [5] - 49:18,

49:19, 59:2, 59:6

JEROME [2] - 35:23,

Jerome [1] - 36:2

Jerry [2] - 35:12,

Jewell [5] - 76:11,

job [5] - 24:23, 33:8,

joined [4] - 96:3, 96:9,

36:10, 107:15,

JOHN [1] - 1:20

join [1] - 31:20

97:9, 97:13

94:13, 94:17, 94:20,

Jeff [1] - 61:25

114:4

37:23

95:2

110:18

JOINER [1] - 1:19 Jose [3] - 48:13, 58:5, 58:8 Judge [6] - 4:1, 4:3, 4:10, 4:23, 12:6, 109:10 JUDGE [1] - 1:12 judgment [8] - 15:13, 15:18, 93:20, 93:25, 102:9, 102:13, 102:18, 105:4 Julie [11] - 38:7, 39:17, 39:19, 40:16, 40:23, 42:1, 43:19, 55:1, 66:14, 103:10, 108:6 July [4] - 48:2, 48:3, 55:1 juncture [1] - 102:6 June [4] - 44:23, 49:4, 66:14, 81:14 jurisdiction [1] - 78:25 juvenile [1] - 108:20

K

KARA [1] - 1:19 **Karen** [2] - 87:15, 87:16 Karonco [1] - 32:17 **KATHERINE** [1] - 1:14 Keele [1] - 112:14 keep [9] - 14:11, 16:14, 20:4, 21:20, 23:11, 38:5, 38:12, 42:10, 68:6 keeping [1] - 37:10 Kenneth [3] - 83:3, 83:4, 83:8 Kenny [13] - 13:20, 53:15, 53:18, 53:23, 104:4, 104:15, 104:24, 105:12, 105:16, 106:13, 106:22, 110:18 kept [4] - 20:8, 21:25, 32:24, 73:13 Kind [1] - 29:15 kind [14] - 20:2, 22:3, 27:25, 40:3, 52:21, 53:20, 60:4, 63:9, 70:21, 76:24, 79:2, 85:9, 85:12, 91:16 kinds [2] - 10:13, 72:24 **know..** [1] - 95:22 knowing [2] - 13:13, 42:16 knowledge [26] - 3:17, 5:5, 18:4, 19:10, 21:2, 30:21, 31:2, 31:12, 47:21, 70:17, 70:21, 79:10, 82:7, 95:17, 95:21, 95:23, 95:25, 96:2, 96:15, 96:23, 96:25, 97:3, 97:6, 97:10, 103:1, 109:25 known [3] - 5:25, 94:4, 99:7 knows [3] - 27:13, 95:19, 96:22

L

labor [2] - 36:16 Labor [1] - 33:7 laborers [1] - 81:21 lack [2] - 19:19, 57:17 **LANCE** [1] - 1:21 large [2] - 8:3, 36:17 last [8] - 3:7, 15:6, 29:1, 43:11, 48:3, 48:22, 54:13, 112:19 law [11] - 9:23, 13:12, 13:22, 14:11, 19:1, 49:21, 51:5, 62:18, 67:12, 68:7, 110:22 laws [2] - 23:16, 37:1 **lawsuit** [3] - 101:16, 102:4, 103:4 lawyer [1] - 38:2 lawyers [1] - 85:3 lay [6] - 5:1, 31:15, 32:1, 74:18, 74:21, 75:1 lead [2] - 28:23, 51:23 leading [6] - 48:25, 51:20, 51:22, 60:15, 63:18, 80:11 leap [1] - 22:13 least [11] - 3:6, 22:12, 33:19, 43:17, 75:12, 84:18, 85:16, 93:6, 96:22, 101:16 leave [2] - 60:7, 104:24 left [4] - 41:12, 43:12, 83:16, 88:23 left-hand [1] - 88:23 legal [17] - 3:10, 36:12, 36:13, 38:25, 42:5, 42:7, 45:18, 60:13, 60:22, 60:24, 63:17, 63:25, 66:21, 68:23, 83:20, 107:15, 110:18 legitimately [1] - 31:9

legs [1] - 55:21 lending [1] - 30:9 leopards [2] - 72:16 lesions [1] - 108:22 less [1] - 108:21 letter [65] - 5:23, 6:4, 8:19, 16:17, 16:19, 16:20, 16:23, 25:24, 25:25, 26:1, 26:3, 26:4, 34:3, 34:4, 41:18, 41:24, 41:25, 43:1, 43:15, 43:18, 43:19, 44:24, 45:5, 45:9, 45:10, 46:1, 46:2, 47:7, 47:14, 48:1, 49:18, 49:23, 51:9, 53:14, 53:15, 54:3, 54:11, 54:25, 56:12, 56:14, 56:21, 56:22, 57:1, 57:2, 57:16, 57:25, 58:2, 59:1, 59:2, 59:6, 59:7, 66:13, 66:24, 67:7, 67:22, 70:1, 70:4, 70:5, 92:9, 100:13. 100:17. 100:20. 105:11. 108:6, 108:18 letters [12] - 10:9, 13:8, 19:11, 21:3, 25:23, 26:16, 28:12, 42:1, 42:5, 59:18, 109:24 level [3] - 8:14, 9:11, 37:3 **liability** [1] - 91:19 liable [1] - 91:20 lighting [1] - 81:18 likely [1] - 105:5 **limitation** [1] - 91:22 limited [5] - 30:18, 33:2, 33:23, 78:6, 91:17 limits [1] - 64:12 **Lindsay** [2] - 105:20, 105:23 **Lindsay's** [1] - 106:2 line [9] - 3:6, 8:4, 20:13, 24:24, 46:17, 52:10, 84:22, 86:24, 87:7 lines [1] - 14:22 **LISA** [1] - 1:19 list [11] - 35:5, 35:6, 67:15, 68:18, 75:20, 88:22, 93:17, 95:2, 98:23, 112:4 listed [11] - 11:24, 18:6, 67:14, 67:15,

75:23, 75:24, 76:3,

95:9, 97:23, 98:1, 99:8 listened [2] - 11:20, 24:6 listening [1] - 10:12 listing [1] - 68:17 litigation [2] - 59:19, 85:21 lived [1] - 106:25 **LLP** [1] - 1:21 loan [2] - 30:10, 30:18 Local [1] - 80:16 local [3] - 37:1, 63:7, 67:10 locate [1] - 87:12 located [1] - 75:12 **logo** [1] - 20:12 look [30] - 8:19, 15:11, 16:17, 24:25, 25:23, 29:6, 29:7, 29:8, 29:17, 45:16, 54:25, 55:3, 86:23, 87:4, 87:7, 87:14, 88:17, 91:5, 92:7, 92:8, 93:17, 93:25, 94:19, 95:15, 96:14, 104:12, 104:14, 105:16, 107:6, 108:17 looked [3] - 22:10, 89:25, 107:18 **Looking** [1] - 30:5 looking [3] - 87:5, 97:22, 108:5 looks [1] - 31:22 **loop's** [1] - 9:6 **lost** [4] - 14:21, 91:22, 107:12, 107:13 low [1] - 8:14 low-level [1] - 8:14 lower [1] - 9:11 lunch [1] - 30:3 luncheon [1] - 6:11 **lunge** [1] - 48:15 luxury [1] - 34:13

M

machine [1] - 2:7 mail [4] - 84:23, 103:13, 104:19, 106:2 mails [1] - 103:12 maintain [2] - 5:3, 60:24 maintained [5] - 10:3, 32:5, 42:7, 42:9, 77:19

maintains [1] - 76:2

34:10

message [1] - 105:25

messages [1] - 84:23

methods [1] - 108:20

43:15, 43:17, 104:20

met [5] - 43:4, 43:5,

maintenance [1] -36:24 major [2] - 84:1, 84:2 majority [1] - 108:25 man [3] - 3:22, 20:14, 81:24 man's [1] - 22:23 Management [1] management [2] -76:23, 84:1 manager [1] - 40:19 manner [1] - 71:10 March [1] - 1:6 Mark [2] - 48:24, 105:1 marked [1] - 63:4 Marked [1] - 114:11 marks [2] - 55:8, 55:20 Martin [1] - 112:10 materials [2] - 75:23 matter [19] - 8:20, 31:11, 32:7, 41:18, 42:2, 44:23, 46:10, 54:14, 54:16, 54:17, 56:5, 56:9, 56:21, 57:4, 57:6, 57:7, 58:3, 110:20, 115:4 matters [9] - 18:7, 20:6, 31:12, 36:16, 37:20, 42:11, 58:4, 64:10, 103:9 mean [23] - 4:3, 18:15, 19:1, 19:16, 19:25, 21:14, 21:17, 22:17, 27:20, 27:22, 27:23, 28:17, 45:16, 55:11, 68:8, 72:7, 72:8, 72:18, 75:16, 93:16, 100:22, 107:14 meaning [2] - 31:19, 70:6 means [2] - 14:7 medical [1] - 79:3 meet [1] - 38:8 meeting [1] - 40:25 member [2] - 20:22, 39:9 members [1] - 81:11 memoranda [1] - 29:9 mentioned [2] - 17:5, 98:6 merchantability [1] -91:17 merits [2] - 34:9,

Metzler [1] - 112:14 Mexico [1] - 76:16 MEYER [3] - 1:14, 112:23, 113:2 Meyer [1] - 1:16 Miami [2] - 64:19, 106:22 MICHELLE [1] - 1:20 middle [2] - 91:6, 108:7 might [9] - 19:7, 23:5, 24:10, 38:23, 64:3, 97:3, 98:18, 102:22, 109:23 Mike [1] - 112:14 million [1] - 84:9 mind [3] - 17:16, 34:11, 70:7 mine [1] - 38:8 minimizing [3] -17:15, 24:19, 33:4 minute [8] - 6:10, 6:21, 7:1, 9:2, 14:22, 29:4, 29:7, 69:13 minutes [11] - 6:20, 11:10, 26:10, 26:12, 33:10, 33:22, 35:2, 35:9, 69:15, 111:14, 112:1 mishandling [1] - 49:6 misreading [1] - 4:10 misrepresented [1] -66:24 monitoring [1] - 43:14 month [4] - 84:19, 84:23, 85:12, 85:17 morning [4] - 40:15, 104:5, 104:20, 111:23 mortgage [1] - 31:6 most [5] - 33:20, 97:13, 101:16, 109:24, 111:20 mother [3] - 55:10, 55:15, 56:2 mothers [5] - 55:12, 107:22, 108:2, 108:21, 109:7 motion [4] - 15:13,

12:8, 12:13, 13:3, 13:6, 13:11, 13:19, 18:10, 18:21, 19:7, 19:15, 19:21, 20:18, 21:10, 21:14, 21:22, 22:2, 22:10, 22:19, 22:22. 23:8. 23:18. 23:23, 27:19, 27:22, 28:7, 28:11, 29:5, 29:10, 29:14, 29:19, 35:7, 35:10, 35:19, 35:25, 39:14, 41:3, 43:7, 44:1, 44:3, 44:16, 45:23, 46:8, 47:6, 47:25, 49:2, 50:16, 51:8, 51:17, 51:24, 52:25, 54:2, 56:7, 58:14, 58:24, 59:11, 59:22, 60:17, 62:14, 62:23, 63:6, 63:21, 64:25, 65:9, 65:10, 65:22, 66:3, 66:11, 67:1, 67:15, 67:18, 67:20, 68:16, 69:2, 69:15, 69:23, 71:25, 73:3, 73:19, 73:25, 74:13, 74:17, 74:24, 75:6, 77:24, 78:16, 80:13, 82:10, 82:20, 100:22, 101:2, 101:5, 101:8, 101:14, 106:5, 110:16, 110:24, 111:8, 111:12, 111:15, 111:19, 112:8, 112:10, 112:14, 112:25 MS [78] - 5:18, 9:5, 11:23, 12:22, 14:1, 14:3, 14:14, 14:25, 15:6, 16:2, 16:5, 16:9, 16:15, 16:25, 17:6, 17:9, 17:20, 18:1, 18:4, 24:9, 24:14, 24:25, 25:9, 25:19, 26:11, 28:25, 34:18, 34:25, 35:4, 45:3, 45:22, 46:23, 47:18, 48:25, 50:14, 50:21, 51:2, 51:6, 51:15, 51:20, 59:16, 60:15, 62:16, 63:1, 63:18, 65:2, 65:23, 67:3, 68:1, 68:8, 73:21, 74:8, 75:1, 78:10, 80:11, 82:13, 82:24, 84:10, 85:15, 100:19, 101:6, 101:13, 101:20, 102:6, 102:10,

11:17, 11:19, 12:1,

102:14, 102:16, 102:25, 103:5, 103:6, 105:14, 106:10, 106:17, 110:13, 111:1, 112:4, 112:23, 113:2 must [1] - 62:2 Mysore [8] - 87:1, 91:25, 92:2, 92:3, 92:10, 92:17, 92:23, 92:24 Mysore's [1] - 86:24 Ν

N.W [2] - 1:16, 1:22 Name [1] - 87:6 name [16] - 3:8, 3:9, 22:20, 22:23, 36:1, 44:11, 48:22, 50:2, 50:10, 52:4, 54:6, 86:24, 87:8, 94:5, 95:3 named [10] - 8:17, 44:11, 46:19, 53:15, 76:11, 91:25, 92:2, 94:6, 103:16, 106:21 names [2] - 75:9, 88:22 narrow [1] - 4:18 Nassau [1] - 65:15 **national** [1] - 76:20 **nationally** [1] - 77:1 nature [4] - 40:23, 64:22, 64:24, 65:20 near [1] - 31:10 necessarily [1] - 34:4 necessary [1] - 17:17 neck [1] - 25:3 need [12] - 18:5, 26:3, 26:13, 29:16, 29:18, 35:9, 45:13, 69:14, 72:11, 78:24, 79:6, 102:22 needed [3] - 70:8, 70:21, 76:17 needs [3] - 39:19, 45:11, 106:15 neglected [1] - 67:6 **negligence** [1] - 91:21 negotiation [2] -79:23, 80:18 never [11] - 7:3, 7:12, 8:5, 14:19, 17:3, 18:6, 18:13, 18:24, 26:6, 27:14, 77:25 Nevertheless [1] -93:14 **new** [4] - 33:8, 68:11,

93:20, 93:24, 102:17

move [5] - 45:3, 46:22,

100:19, 102:21,

MR [131] - 4:7, 4:11,

4:15, 5:9, 5:15, 5:22,

6:17, 6:19, 6:25, 7:4,

7:16, 7:18, 8:7, 8:9,

9:14. 10:7. 10:19.

11:4, 11:9, 11:14,

8:11, 8:25, 9:6, 9:10,

70:11, 84:2 New [1] - 65:16 Next [1] - 48:4 next [10] - 33:10, 33:22, 38:8, 46:22, 47:16, 49:3, 74:6, 108:17, 111:10, 111:11 nice [1] - 111:6 Nicole [8] - 86:6, 97:23, 98:1, 98:11, 99:13, 99:21, 100:2 Nicole's [1] - 98:14 night [1] - 106:25 **nine** [2] - 53:6, 56:2 noncompliance [1] -37:20 noncompliant [1] -64:9 none [2] - 19:14, 101:16 nonjury [1] - 34:12 nonreliability [1] -91:3 nontestifying [1] -30:20 normal [9] - 20:8, 60:23, 70:9, 70:22, 72:5, 72:9, 72:18, 73:13, 107:4 normally [1] - 72:23 North [2] - 76:1, 76:4 **Nos** [3] - 63:4, 78:14, 82:18 note [2] - 3:3, 82:13 **nothing** [3] - 18:12, 35:17, 42:16 Nothing [2] - 107:2, 111:1 Notice [2] - 8:23, 9:3 notice [21] - 3:22, 6:13, 6:23, 7:3, 7:12, 7:13, 7:15, 9:21, 10:5, 10:6, 10:7, 10:25, 12:1, 14:17, 14:18, 14:19, 14:24, 16:12, 17:3, 21:18, 33:12 notices [1] - 37:16 notification [1] - 103:8 notified [1] - 18:24 noting [1] - 32:12 November [2] - 15:7, 49:5 number [11] - 18:10, 18:11, 46:16, 48:11, 49:4. 52:10. 56:23. 75:23, 85:22, 104:14, 109:20 numeral [1] - 81:2

numerous [1] - 91:10 **NW** [1] - 2:3

0

o'clock [2] - 111:18, 111:22 Oakland [1] - 58:13 oath [1] - 98:25 **object** [16] - 5:19, 14:1, 14:3, 26:20, 45:4, 46:24, 47:18, 51:12, 58:21, 59:16, 62:16, 65:2, 65:7, 65:23, 67:3, 85:1 objected [1] - 77:25 objection [29] - 6:21, 18:16, 24:7, 24:13, 24:15, 45:8, 47:2, 51:13, 58:17, 59:13, 59:21, 62:15, 63:1, 65:1, 65:4, 67:8, 67:21, 68:2, 68:11, 73:20, 73:21, 78:2, 78:5, 78:8, 78:13, 82:12, 82:13, 100:21, 106:16 Objection [4] - 48:25, 51:20, 60:15, 63:18 objections [15] -11:21, 11:23, 16:16, 33:25, 34:17, 34:18, 34:24, 47:22, 50:18, 66:6. 68:9. 68:11. 74:9, 105:11 objective [2] - 20:4, 28:5 obligation [1] - 90:24 observed [1] - 108:22 obtain [2] - 72:11, 87:24 obtained [3] - 50:9, 91:9, 97:3 obtains [1] - 87:21 obviously [2] - 30:17, 36:24 occasion [3] - 39:17, 42:21, 43:18 occasions [3] - 88:11, 99:1, 100:8 occurred [3] - 31:6, 58:5, 62:18 occurrence [1] - 31:10 occurring [1] - 54:12 occurs [1] - 20:23 odometer [1] - 32:5

OF [3] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:11

offer [18] - 3:4, 14:22,

14:23, 19:12, 19:14,

59:11, 62:14, 62:23, 64:25, 67:1, 68:19, 73:19, 77:24, 82:10, 105:10 offered [9] - 3:22, 6:14, 6:22, 10:24, 10:25, 21:24, 30:25, 47:16, 65:22 offering [4] - 6:7, 11:15, 50:14, 58:19 offers [1] - 105:7 Office [1] - 88:19 office [6] - 38:8, 40:15, 46:12, 46:13, 60:8. 103:10 officer [2] - 10:12, 48:13 offices [1] - 46:10 official [1] - 30:7 Official [2] - 2:2, 115:2 officials [1] - 31:2 Ohio [1] - 87:3 okayed [1] - 106:23 Oklahoma [2] - 57:2, 57:19 **Ola** [1] - 32:7 old [1] - 106:21 older [1] - 52:20 Oliver [2] - 48:24, 105:1 omissions [1] - 91:19 once [1] - 50:16 One [3] - 13:5, 13:6, 94:5 one [83] - 3:23, 7:15, 8:8, 8:15, 10:8, 10:22, 11:16, 11:17, 13:3, 16:4, 18:11, 20:4, 22:10, 28:2, 28:13, 29:1, 29:2, 29:4, 29:7, 33:6, 37:21, 37:25, 38:20, 39:9, 40:15, 43:13, 43:18, 44:20, 44:24, 45:3, 45:4, 50:19, 52:21, 54:17, 54:22, 56:4, 56:10, 56:23, 56:25, 57:1, 57:8, 57:23, 58:4, 58:6, 58:7, 58:11, 58:15, 71:15, 71:16, 74:6, 74:14, 74:15, 74:25, 76:7, 77:3, 77:10, 78:21, 85:7, 85:18, 86:1, 88:17, 90:16, 95:7, 98:6, 100:2, 100:15, 105:9, 105:17, 106:4,

50:16, 50:25, 58:14,

108:12, 109:1, 109:9, 109:22, 110:2, 110:3, 110:11 one's [1] - 22:7 one-hour [1] - 33:6 ones [4] - 28:11, 41:21, 55:15, 96:9 onset [1] - 107:3 Oops [1] - 107:14 open [2] - 18:21, 41:12 operating [1] - 100:6 operations [5] - 32:11, 37:10, 45:6, 47:1, 65:25 opinion [8] - 4:1, 4:10, 7:8, 12:7, 30:19, 56:3, 108:19, 110:17 opponent [1] - 22:17 **opportunity** [2] - 30:2, 74:21 opposition [1] -102:17 options [1] - 93:17 oral [1] - 41:20 order [4] - 42:16, 68:9, 87:24, 112:4 orders [1] - 104:23 ordinarily [7] - 38:10, 46:11, 60:6, 63:10, 63:12, 79:2, 103:13 ordinary [4] - 20:8, 21:11, 22:1, 77:19 Oregon [6] - 91:11, 91:13, 91:15, 91:18, 94:3 organization [1] - 76:2 origin [2] - 87:6, 87:9 Origin [1] - 87:16 original [2] - 31:5, 86:19 originated [1] - 32:7 **Orlando** [1] - 107:1 orphanage [1] -107:16 otherwise [1] - 91:21 ought [1] - 67:23 outcome [5] - 41:16, 52:5, 52:8, 53:18, 54:1 outside [7] - 22:13, 54:18, 66:1, 76:15, 83:12, 85:3, 85:4 overnight [1] - 52:16 own [8] - 12:22, 38:23, 63:11, 74:24, 88:8, 97:6, 97:10, 106:11 owned [4] - 48:15, 50:3, 50:4, 91:25 owner [2] - 50:9

owns [1] - 83:13

Ρ

p.m [14] - 1:7, 29:22, 29:25, 58:23, 59:15, 63:5, 66:10, 69:1, 69:18, 69:21, 73:24, 78:15, 82:19, 113:8 page [55] - 3:4, 3:5, 3:7, 3:8, 6:2, 14:17, 16:17, 20:17, 27:9, 31:22, 45:1, 45:3, 45:4, 45:24, 47:3, 47:4, 47:16, 47:19, 48:3, 48:4, 48:10, 49:17, 50:13, 50:14, 53:1, 53:22, 54:3, 54:25, 56:11, 57:24, 59:1, 59:5, 59:9, 61:22, 74:4, 74:7, 80:2, 84:21, 86:23, 87:7, 87:15, 88:18, 91:5, 93:23, 94:19, 95:13, 96:12, 97:22, 97:23, 97:25, 100:12 Page [4] - 48:1, 51:9, 53:6, 74:6 pages [12] - 3:6, 11:13, 11:19, 11:25, 13:3, 28:12, 58:15, 59:12, 65:5, 90:20, 102:22, 115:3 pains [1] - 25:3 paper [1] - 94:23 papers [1] - 85:20 paragraph [15] - 6:4, 25:24, 49:3, 91:6, 91:8, 93:25, 95:16, 96:14, 106:3, 106:18, 107:7, 107:9, 108:5, 108:7, 108:17 **PARDO** [1] - 1:20 parents [1] - 90:14 Park [1] - 94:4 Parron [4] - 49:18, 49:19, 53:7 part [24] - 7:16, 7:18, 9:11, 10:1, 15:24, 21:2, 21:15, 22:2, 22:6, 25:9, 28:3, 34:4, 34:16, 37:19, 83:25, 85:9, 88:5, 94:12, 95:19, 98:23, 102:16. 102:23 particular [16] - 41:2, 42:11, 44:25, 57:5, 57:20, 62:1, 63:24,

107:11, 107:13,

75:10, 75:19, 76:4, 76:11, 76:22, 78:25, 81:22, 91:18, 95:16 particularly [1] - 51:2 parties [5] - 7:11, 11:5, 12:11, 15:1, 28:24 party [9] - 21:19, 22:13, 29:11, 29:12, 30:22, 101:13, 101:18, 106:11, 106:12 Pascandola [1] -66:13 patently [1] - 26:16 pattern [1] - 18:24 Patty [1] - 50:10 pause [1] - 110:12 pay [2] - 8:13, 15:10 **pedals** [1] - 105:2 Pennsylvania [1] -1:22 people [27] - 4:19, 19:9, 20:5, 20:11, 20:24, 21:7, 24:20, 25:3, 26:14, 37:19, 38:2, 38:4, 39:2, 39:4, 41:1, 44:17, 54:17, 70:15, 81:18, 81:20, 81:21, 85:10, 97:1, 97:4, 104:9, 109:24, 112:4 per [4] - 87:2, 87:11, 87:17 **perfectly** [1] - 27:3 perform [4] - 12:23, 12:25, 27:6, 78:25 performance [2] -104:25, 106:23 **performer** [3] - 48:19, 48:20, 58:6 Perfringens [1] -107:4 perhaps [1] - 55:19 period [5] - 18:14, 54:19, 80:10, 81:14, 85:7 periods [2] - 55:18, 55:19 **permission** [2] - 50:9, 50:12 permit [13] - 70:8, 70:21, 71:20, 71:21, 72:12, 72:14, 73:4, 73:12, 76:25, 79:7, 88:2, 88:10, 88:19 permits [13] - 71:15, 76:18, 78:24, 79:2, 87:21, 87:24, 87:25, 88:5, 88:17, 89:21,

90:2, 90:4, 90:6 permitting [1] - 3:11 **Perone** [1] - 59:2 perpetrator [1] - 58:9 **Perron** [1] - 59:6 person [12] - 20:14, 31:11, 33:8, 48:21, 49:13, 52:14, 57:13, 58:8, 62:1, 63:25, 83:2, 83:12 personal [12] - 5:4, 18:4, 19:10, 21:2, 47:20, 95:17, 95:23, 96:2, 96:15, 97:6, 97:10, 109:25 personally [10] - 5:25, 39:15, 46:6, 46:7, 54:5, 62:12, 65:17, 77:5, 88:10, 94:6 persuade [3] - 68:7, 68:23, 102:22 pertain [1] - 28:12 pertains [3] - 15:20, 20:2, 105:16 Pettegrew [1] - 112:17 **PETTEWAY** [1] - 1:19 **ph** [1] - 107:3 **Phone** [1] - 40:18 phone [2] - 28:20, 40:17 photographs [1] -10:13 physical [2] - 103:23, 108:15 pick [1] - 18:17 **piece** [2] - 67:9, 94:23 pieces [1] - 18:17 PL [1] - 45:12 place [7] - 5:5, 20:19, 37:11, 46:13, 75:9, 107:17, 109:25 plaintiff [8] - 3:3, 3:14, 3:21, 13:17, 21:18, 23:15, 33:25, 66:6 **Plaintiff** [1] - 1:5 plaintiff's [1] - 33:25 plaintiffs [17] - 6:12, 8:22, 14:9, 15:25, 17:1, 19:2, 33:4, 33:6, 33:11, 34:17, 58:19, 68:6, 68:23, 74:9, 78:1, 78:8, 105:10 Plaintiffs [2] - 1:14, 45:8 Plaintiffs' [11] - 66:12, 67:1, 67:22, 68:25, 92:8, 100:12,

100:20, 104:12,

105:15, 108:4, 110:1

plaintiffs' [4] - 50:18, 58:19, 67:4, 102:17 **PN** [1] - 107:2 point [20] - 6:11, 8:24, 10:4, 12:11, 19:13, 20:25, 26:21, 27:22, 28:22, 28:23, 34:9, 34:12, 37:7, 37:25, 38:7, 43:9, 45:16, 55:13, 85:18, 112:15 **points** [4] - 45:20, 50:23, 51:5, 83:15 police [2] - 10:12, 48:13 political [1] - 8:12 Polk [1] - 55:7 pond [2] - 52:17, 52:18 Portland [2] - 93:7, 94:3 position [9] - 6:24, 13:14, 23:18, 23:19, 36:5, 40:12, 43:12, 46:9, 70:18 possible [3] - 23:5, 86:1, 86:10 post [1] - 107:1 potential [1] - 74:23 practice [8] - 7:22, 12:24, 18:25, 25:22, 73:16, 99:6, 99:10 practices [16] - 8:2, 12:14, 12:19, 14:20, 17:4, 23:16, 26:23. 27:4, 27:7, 33:18, 59:3, 72:5, 72:9, 72:19, 73:13 Pre [8] - 15:3, 15:16, 74:10, 75:15, 75:16, 76:10, 101:21 Pre-Act [8] - 15:3, 15:16, 74:10, 75:15, 75:16, 76:10, 101:21 precipitated [1] -103:23 precisely [2] - 57:7, 104:11 precluded [2] - 33:16, 101:3 precludes [1] - 100:25 predicate [1] - 4:24 **prejudice** [3] - 14:8, 33:3, 33:11 prejudiced [12] - 6:15, 6:22, 7:10, 9:20, 12:13, 15:25, 16:5, 17:2, 25:8, 25:9, 25:19, 75:4 prejudicial [2] - 16:9, 26:17

premises [1] - 39:2 preparation [1] -59:19 prepared [5] - 59:18, 75:12, 76:7, 76:13, 100:16 preparing [1] - 76:13 present [2] - 28:5, presented [1] - 24:2 presenting [1] - 58:9 preserve [2] - 33:25, 102:7 President [1] - 22:21 president [4] - 5:24, 36:6, 43:20, 56:14 pretrial [5] - 3:7, 67:7, 68:2, 68:9, 68:12 pretty [1] - 57:9 PREVENTION [1] - 1:3 previously [5] - 3:19, 58:18, 66:7, 98:10, 98:25 primarily [2] - 3:18, 83:23 primary [3] - 37:7, 38:1. 83:20 Prince [1] - 94:6 principle [1] - 20:7 **private** [1] - 43:12 privy [1] - 21:4 problem [6] - 4:15, 9:1, 9:6, 13:11, 20:3, 25:21 procedure [1] - 37:20 procedures [3] -55:14. 60:22. 72:10 proceed [2] - 69:22, 75:5 proceeding [1] - 16:1 proceedings [2] -110:12, 115:4 **Proceedings** [2] - 2:7, 113:8 process [21] - 9:11, 19:10, 20:18, 20:23, 24:18, 37:13, 37:15, 37:24, 38:5, 38:16, 38:18, 39:16, 40:6, 40:13, 40:14, 41:22, 55:9, 55:11, 63:23, 68:16, 78:20 processing [1] - 30:10 produce [1] - 102:21 produced [3] - 2:7, 45:12 products [1] - 110:9 proffer [3] - 12:4,

13:23, 101:11

proffered [1] - 16:4

profits [1] - 91:22 prohibition [1] - 7:19 prompted [1] - 67:22 prong [1] - 3:23 proof [2] - 23:9, 27:23 proper [2] - 4:23, 106:5 property [1] - 86:12 prosecutable [1] -105:4 protest [1] - 66:24 **prove** [2] - 4:16, 11:10 provide [9] - 3:24, 4:14, 51:3, 68:6, 79:2, 88:7, 88:9, 89:15, 91:11 provided [5] - 7:12, 41:5, 60:12, 60:18 provides [2] - 88:4, 89:12 proving [1] - 27:24 provision [8] - 70:12, 81:1, 81:3, 81:5, 81:8, 81:9, 82:1, 82:3 provisionally [3] -34:15, 50:17, 68:5 provisions [1] - 80:20 **PT** [1] - 93:9 **public** [14] - 14:10, 16:13, 20:22, 21:23, 28:17, 33:21, 62:19, 62:20, 63:1, 63:2, 85:8, 109:11, 109:15, 109:17 publication [1] - 91:23 publications [1] -91:13 Pull [1] - 5:21 pull [1] - 5:16 purchased [3] - 92:14, 97:15, 97:18 purchasing [1] - 62:2 **purports** [1] - 5:9 purpose [4] - 7:9, 21:24, 76:13, 91:18 purposes [2] - 15:4, 34:6 put [17] - 9:7, 9:10, 9:21, 12:2, 13:3, 14:17, 14:23, 16:12, 17:3, 19:8, 22:22, 26:5, 55:23, 55:25, 67:6, 107:4 **PXMC** [1] - 114:16

Q

questioned [1] - 31:8

questions [6] - 36:15, 70:7, 82:20, 110:13, 110:24, 110:25 quit [1] - 107:13 quite [4] - 41:9, 85:19, 92:5, 96:25 quote [5] - 3:10, 3:12, 30:14, 103:22, 103:24 quote/unquote [1] -31:18 quoting [2] - 30:19, 31:21

R

raise [1] - 35:14 raising [1] - 68:10 ran [1] - 16:12 range [1] - 36:17 ranges [1] - 36:14 rank [3] - 7:7, 59:17, 67:8 rather [1] - 106:24 re [3] - 46:17, 52:10, 68:17 re-listing [1] - 68:17 read [25] - 8:18, 14:21, 16:19, 29:1, 29:2, 29:4, 30:2, 53:10, 81:18, 85:13, 86:25, 87:9, 87:15, 91:7, 94:1, 104:15, 106:3, 106:18, 107:8, 107:19, 108:8, 108:18, 112:16 reading [4] - 30:13, 31:17, 91:8, 104:18 reads [1] - 19:11 real [1] - 9:16 realize [1] - 105:4 really [8] - 4:17, 10:23, 14:18, 15:7, 18:15, 23:18, 58:10, 107:13 reason [14] - 5:10, 19:23, 20:22, 21:10, 21:20, 22:14, 23:1, 23:21, 24:1, 26:4, 33:20, 34:7, 52:7, 98:13 reasons [10] - 20:20, 30:4, 33:3, 33:19, 33:23, 34:15, 47:19, 58:18, 66:7, 79:12 receipt [3] - 58:21, 60:10, 62:4 receive [12] - 17:24, 22:4, 37:16, 84:13, 84:16, 84:23, 85:16,

85:18, 109:19, 109:21, 109:23, 110:5 received [9] - 4:4, 32:22. 70:5. 79:3. 84:18, 85:19, 103:8, 109:11, 109:20 receives [1] - 109:17 recent [1] - 88:15 **Recently** [1] - 85:10 recently [1] - 15:2 Recess [2] - 29:22, recess [3] - 6:11, 33:6, 69:13 recite [1] - 93:2 recognize [18] - 45:24, 46:16, 47:7, 47:10, 53:2, 53:6, 54:6, 58:1, 58:2, 59:2, 59:7, 61:23, 66:15, 69:25, 71:16, 74:2, 79:15, 80:7 recognized [1] - 4:3 recognizes [1] - 66:6 recollection [3] - 92:9, 95:5, 108:23 recommend [1] -105:5 recommendations [1] - 104:7 record [52] - 4:5, 5:20. 7:9. 8:20. 8:21. 8:25. 9:17, 9:18, 9:25. 10:1, 10:20, 11:2, 12:6, 13:13, 15:25, 16:14, 17:12, 19:16, 21:21, 21:23, 21:25, 22:15, 22:24, 25:8, 25:13, 26:14, 26:21, 26:25, 29:8, 29:25, 31:4, 31:17, 33:16, 33:17, 34:4, 34:16, 34:20, 34:23, 36:1, 47:2, 63:1, 63:2, 67:13, 67:20, 69:21, 92:7, 92:25, 93:16, 102:23, 105:9, 115:4 recorded [1] - 20:8 records [70] - 3:18, 8:21, 9:3, 9:13, 10:2, 10:3, 10:24, 10:25, 11:2, 11:6, 11:25, 14:10, 14:12, 15:23, 17:14, 17:18, 17:22, 18:5, 19:5, 20:3, 22:6, 24:18, 26:13, 27:8, 27:10, 27:16,

28:6, 28:17, 28:22,

28:25, 29:10, 30:12,

30:17, 30:25, 31:3, 31:6, 31:10, 31:24, 32:1, 32:2, 32:9, 32:10, 32:18, 32:22, 32:24, 33:5, 34:8, 46:25, 47:21, 47:22, 50:20, 59:17, 59:20, 62:19. 62:20. 62:21. 63:24, 65:4, 65:25, 85:23, 86:8, 90:7, 98:8, 98:19, 98:22, 99:4, 104:13, 106:15 Red [2] - 62:24, 106:21 Redirect [2] - 110:14, 114:6 REDIRECT [1] -110:15 refer [9] - 45:1, 58:25, 59:5, 65:11, 66:12, 69:9, 74:1, 77:8, 79:14 reference [11] - 44:4, 47:12, 48:11, 49:3, 51:18, 72:4, 74:4, 76:10, 76:12, 77:2, 77:9 referred [1] - 43:22 referring [3] - 54:11, 61:20, 73:1 reflected [1] - 89:19 refrain [2] - 50:10, 51:22 refresh [1] - 92:9 regard [2] - 70:22, 81:21 regarded [1] - 70:9 regarding [9] - 26:18, 70:7, 85:24, 104:4, 104:7, 105:12, 107:21, 108:1, 110:6 region [1] - 54:6 regional [3] - 46:3, 46:10, 46:14 Regional [1] - 76:1 regular [3] - 32:6, 105:24, 109:17 regularly [1] - 32:14 regulate [1] - 70:15 regulated [1] - 37:3 regulation [3] - 7:20, 18:25, 37:8 regulations [11] -23:17, 37:1, 37:11, 42:4, 42:17, 69:6, 70:11, 70:12, 72:10, 72:21, 108:11 Regulations [1] -108:13 regulatory [7] - 3:12,

7:23, 14:20, 15:1, 22:3, 22:7, 75:13 relate [1] - 64:23 related [3] - 47:15, 58:4, 85:20 relating [3] - 42:11, 44:9, 94:7 relations [3] - 56:15, 56:18, 60:23 **Relatorium** [1] - 3:10 released [1] - 112:24 relevant [8] - 3:4, 18:18, 24:5, 32:12, 101:19, 101:20, 102:1, 102:20 reliability [3] - 20:10, 20:16, 22:15 reliable [2] - 4:5, 91:10 relied [5] - 30:6, 30:9, 30:11, 32:10, 32:19 reluctant [1] - 50:8 rely [13] - 4:1, 21:22, 22:5, 42:12, 42:14, 42:15, 51:5, 61:2, 61:4, 61:5, 64:4, 64:6, 64:9 Relying [1] - 31:21 relying [1] - 89:21 remain [2] - 29:23, 69:19 remedying [1] - 23:21 remember [5] - 47:13, 56:8, 57:6, 58:3, 94:2 reopen [1] - 23:3 repeat [2] - 23:10, 50:19 Report [2] - 8:16, 21:6 report [20] - 40:10, 41:10, 41:16, 45:10, 45:11, 46:14, 47:3, 60:6, 60:7, 61:19, 62:5, 63:10, 63:12, 64:19, 65:15, 83:3, 83:4, 103:25 reported [2] - 2:7, 54:24 Reporter [3] - 2:2, 2:2, 115:2 reports [10] - 6:4, 39:23, 41:15, 56:18, 56:19, 62:10, 62:17, 62:18, 62:24, 91:12 represent [1] - 75:7 representation [1] -91:12 representations [1] -91:16 representative [1] -

60:9 representatives [1] -66:18 represented [2] -18:11, 103:1 representing [3] -49:21, 53:11, 66:20 request [1] - 32:13 requested [3] - 16:19, 25:25, 88:7 require [2] - 79:8, 83:19 required [2] - 31:9, 72:23 requirement [2] -31:24, 91:1 requirements [1] -31:20 requisite [1] - 47:20 reserve [1] - 45:15 reserved [2] - 68:2, 102:8 resolve [1] - 34:10 resolved [2] - 34:9, 53:19 respect [7] - 14:5, 30:13, 30:14, 37:7, 51:13, 70:24, 110:20 respond [4] - 40:12, 59:9, 110:7, 110:10 responding [1] -43:13 response [4] - 34:3, 67:23, 68:21, 110:4 responses [2] - 24:3, 110:5 responsibilities [2] -36:11, 83:20 responsibility [1] -36:20 rest [3] - 62:9, 64:21, 65:17 rested [2] - 100:23, 101:2 restrains [1] - 71:10 result [5] - 4:11, 38:11, 39:20, 57:12, 64:20 resulting [1] - 91:21 retain [1] - 64:1 returned [1] - 50:11 review [8] - 39:8, 42:21, 61:14, 64:14, 65:12, 77:12, 88:13, 93:16 reviewed [3] - 62:12, 65:17, 77:5 reviewers [1] - 108:19 Rider [7] - 49:12, 81:24, 84:18, 84:24,

85:16, 85:20, 112:23 Rider's [1] - 85:6 Ridley [1] - 112:17 right-hand [1] - 75:22 rights [4] - 38:23, 54:17, 57:8, 109:22 ring [1] - 106:23 Ringling [19] - 6:5, 27:14, 38:1, 45:7, 48:14, 95:21, 96:3, 96:9, 96:23, 97:9, 97:12, 97:13, 100:5, 100:6, 100:9, 105:6, 105:18, 105:21, Robert [3] - 54:4, 54:5 Roman [2] - 81:2, 97:16 **Ron** [11] - 6:2, 21:8, 43:1, 43:8, 49:18, 53:7, 55:1, 59:1, 59:6, 104:19, 104:20 Room [1] - 2:3 room [1] - 20:6 route [1] - 106:25 routine [2] - 25:22, 26:15 **RPR** [1] - 2:2 rule [6] - 16:23, 18:25, 29:20, 31:9, 31:19, 51:4 Rule [1] - 32:4 ruled [1] - 4:25 Rules [1] - 17:10 rules [2] - 17:23, 23:16 ruling [3] - 34:7, 45:15, 102:9 running [1] - 22:5

S

Sabo [3] - 86:3, 86:8, 93:9 **Sabu** [1] - 94:5 Sacha [1] - 57:18 salary [3] - 84:11, 84:12, 84:13 sale [2] - 100:13, 100:16 sales [1] - 70:15 **San** [4] - 48:13, 54:12, 58:5, 58:8 sanction [1] - 17:25 **sanctioned** [6] - 8:5, 11:1, 12:20, 13:17, 17:24, 33:18 sanctioning [1] -23:15

51:2, 51:6, 51:15, 51:20, 59:16, 60:15, 62:16, 63:1, 63:18, 65:2, 65:23, 67:3, 68:1, 68:8, 73:21, 74:8, 75:1, 78:10, 80:11, 82:13, 82:24, 84:10, 85:15, 100:19, 101:6, 101:13, 101:20, 102:6, 102:10, 102:14, 102:16, 102:25, 103:5, 103:6, 105:14, 106:10, 106:17, 110:13, 111:1, 112:4 Santa [1] - 48:12 satisfied [1] - 31:20 saw [2] - 20:21, 55:8 say-so [1] - 18:18 scar [1] - 89:19 scenario [1] - 17:1 scene [2] - 39:20, 104:10 scenes [2] - 54:18, 54:19 Schmitt [1] - 112:18 scope [1] - 3:22 screen [4] - 11:17, 74:6, 77:10, 92:5 scroll [1] - 6:1 Seat [1] - 48:12 **seated** [2] - 29:23, 69:19 second [5] - 3:9, 47:3, 61:24, 67:8, 110:11 Second [1] - 31:4 secondly [1] - 10:3 Secondly [1] - 33:11 section [1] - 74:9 Section [1] - 108:11 see [23] - 3:5, 3:8, 4:2, 12:11, 18:16, 33:3, 37:10, 40:15, 44:5, 45:19, 48:4, 48:11, 49:7, 57:16, 72:2,

Sanerib [1] - 114:5

SANERIB [77] - 1:15,

5:18, 9:5, 11:23,

12:22, 14:1, 14:3,

16:2, 16:5, 16:9,

14:14, 14:25, 15:6,

16:15, 16:25, 17:6,

17:9, 17:20, 18:1,

18:4, 24:9, 24:14,

24:25, 25:9, 25:19,

34:25, 35:4, 45:3,

26:11, 28:25, 34:18,

45:22, 46:23, 47:18,

48:25, 50:14, 50:21,

72:5, 85:20, 93:17, 96:17, 97:22, 104:17, 107:7, 112:12 **seeing** [1] - 90:3 seem [2] - 17:12, 47:20 **self** [1] - 26:13 self-serving [1] -26:13 sell [2] - 83:19, 110:9 send [1] - 22:4 sense [2] - 5:7, 31:3 sent [3] - 6:8, 19:24, 22:24 **sentence** [3] - 104:15, 105:25, 108:18 **separate** [3] - 56:1, 108:20, 109:6 **separated** [1] - 55:18 **separation** [4] - 55:9, 55:11, 107:21, 108:1 series [2] - 42:25, 71:15 serve [1] - 26:1 service [1] - 96:22 Service [17] - 6:23, 9:22, 15:20, 15:22, 23:14, 70:6, 71:21, 73:15, 75:21, 76:22, 87:22, 88:5, 88:14, 88:20, 89:1, 89:22, 104:3 **services** [1] - 91:13 **serving** [1] - 26:13 **SESSION** [1] - 1:11 session [2] - 29:24, 69:20 set [2] - 31:11, 81:21 sets [1] - 4:11 settle [1] - 105:6 settled [1] - 107:14 settlement [4] - 13:20, 53:19, 105:8, 107:15 seven [10] - 13:7, 28:10, 28:13, 31:22, 31:23, 50:13, 51:9, 58:16, 78:6, 99:19 several [12] - 9:7, 9:10, 31:16, 38:2, 49:6, 54:20, 107:3, 108:1, 108:19, 109:3, 109:5, 112:15 severe [1] - 53:25 **shall** [1] - 91:19 shaped [2] - 99:24, 100:2 shareholders [1] -83:14 shareholders' [1] -

83:18 shares [1] - 83:13 **SHEA** [1] - 1:21 shipping [2] - 32:18, 32:19 **short** [3] - 35:5, 35:6, 55:18 shorter [2] - 29:20, 35:11 shorthand [1] - 2:7 **shot** [1] - 19:3 shots [1] - 79:3 **show** [26] - 5:8, 5:10, 9:3, 10:5, 10:6, 10:24, 10:25, 11:6, 11:7, 23:9, 61:11, 64:13, 66:19, 71:15, 78:17, 80:6, 81:22, 98:18. 98:19. 101:23, 105:15, 108:4, 110:1 **showed** [3] - 40:21, 54:22, 99:23 **shown** [1] - 101:10 shows [4] - 9:24, 16:18, 85:7, 104:23 sick [1] - 106:22 side [2] - 13:24, 75:23 side's [1] - 58:10 sign [2] - 79:25, 80:22 signatories [1] - 76:21 signature [3] - 61:24, 80:2, 80:24 **signatures** [1] - 61:23 signed [5] - 21:9, 22:18, 22:21, 77:11, 89:22 significant [2] - 10:11, 22:18 signs [1] - 107:2 **Simpson** [7] - 26:19, 34:19, 35:2, 35:4, 85:1, 114:5, 114:6 SIMPSON [131] - 1:20, 4:7, 4:11, 4:15, 5:9, 5:15, 5:22, 6:17, 6:19, 6:25, 7:4, 7:16, 7:18, 8:7, 8:9, 8:11, 8:25, 9:6, 9:10, 9:14, 10:7, 10:19, 11:4, 11:9, 11:14, 11:17, 11:19, 12:1, 12:8, 12:13, 13:3, 13:6, 13:11, 13:19, 18:10, 18:21, 19:7, 19:15, 19:21, 20:18, 21:10, 21:14, 21:22, 22:2, 22:10, 22:19, 22:22, 23:8, 23:18, 23:23, 27:19, 27:22, 28:7,

28:11, 29:5, 29:10, 29:14, 29:19, 35:7, 35:10, 35:25, 39:14, 41:3, 43:7, 44:1, 44:3, 44:16, 45:23, 46:8, 47:6, 47:25, 49:2, 50:16, 51:8, 51:17. 51:24. 52:25. 54:2, 56:7, 58:14, 58:24, 59:11, 59:22, 60:17, 62:14, 62:23, 63:6, 63:21, 64:25, 65:9, 65:10, 65:22, 66:3, 66:11, 67:1, 67:15, 67:18, 67:20, 68:16, 69:2, 69:15, 69:23, 71:25, 73:3, 73:19, 73:25, 74:13, 74:17, 74:24, 75:6, 77:24, 78:16, 80:13, 82:10, 82:20, 100:22, 101:2, 101:5, 101:8, 101:14, 106:5, 110:16, 110:24, 111:8, 111:12, 111:15, 111:19, 112:8, 112:10, 112:14, 112:25 single [1] - 94:23 **sitting** [1] - 20:5 situation [4] - 57:5, 57:10, 76:16, 82:2 six [5] - 36:9, 99:16, 111:18, 111:21, 111:22 skipped [1] - 57:24 slight [1] - 98:7 small [2] - 20:16, 36:12 **Smart** [1] - 87:12 **so-called** [1] - 56:2 **SOCIETY** [1] - 1:3 Society [2] - 66:13, 66:19 soft [1] - 55:17 sold [4] - 92:18, 100:5, 100:9, 101:25 **solemnly** [1] - 35:16 **someone** [3] - 28:16, 67:10, 85:8 **sometime** [1] - 94:18 Sometimes [4] -20:24, 38:20, 41:19, 63:11 sometimes [3] -20:24, 39:6, 41:10 somewhere [1] - 41:7 sooner [1] - 33:23 sorry [5] - 11:20,

31:1, 80:12

testifying [3] - 30:8,

15:19, 30:2, 107:9, 112:6 sort [6] - 15:17, 27:11, 38:4, 53:25, 81:19, 81:22 Sounds [1] - 105:23 source [2] - 75:10, 96:1 sources [2] - 88:8, 91:10 Sowalsky [36] - 3:9, 5:25, 11:10, 11:24, 12:8, 14:19, 15:12, 18:4, 19:10, 20:1, 21:2, 21:12, 27:13, 35:12, 36:2, 37:24, 42:18, 44:4, 59:23, 69:3, 69:24, 71:17, 75:7, 78:17, 81:1, 82:25, 83:2, 85:22, 90:18, 93:5, 93:19, 103:7, 107:21, 109:10, 110:17, 111:2 SOWALSKY [3] -35:19, 35:23, 114:4 Sowalsky's [1] - 15:17 **SPCA** [1] - 65:16 **speaks** [1] - 6:9 **species** [1] - 75:19 **Species** [7] - 15:4, 15:11, 26:22, 69:3, 69:6, 75:18, 102:2 specific [3] - 70:24, 79:7, 98:21 specifically [1] -108:11 spend [4] - 6:15, 6:17, 10:23, 18:2 spending [3] - 17:7, 17:16, 24:11 spends [1] - 110:4 spent [2] - 10:11, 17:11 spoken [2] - 46:7, 51:12 staff [2] - 38:2, 95:3 stage [1] - 102:13 stall [1] - 104:24 stand [2] - 28:23, 106:23 standard [5] - 26:21, 26:22, 26:23, 37:20, 73:1 standards [2] - 72:22, 73:10 stands [1] - 19:16 star [2] - 99:24, 100:2 star-shaped [2] -99:24, 100:2

start [10] - 69:16, 84:22, 91:7, 111:15, 111:22, 111:25, 112:8, 112:18, 112:20 started [5] - 15:7, 15:8, 93:12, 95:3, 95:4 starting [1] - 108:7 starts [3] - 20:19, 20:22, 75:25 State [1] - 36:1 state [17] - 37:1, 52:5, 52:8, 52:9, 63:7, 63:11, 63:13, 64:17, 64:18, 67:20, 70:10, 78:21, 78:24, 78:25, 79:11 statement [6] - 3:7, 23:5, 67:7, 68:2, 68:12, 105:2 statements [7] - 28:9, 32:5, 32:13, 40:8, 85:8, 99:2, 105:3 states [3] - 64:23, 79:7, 89:3 **States** [6] - 4:7, 29:5, 38:13, 76:15, 76:24, 99:13 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:12 stating [2] - 49:5, 98:10 stature [1] - 21:6 status [9] - 3:12, 6:5, 6:9, 15:1, 15:21, 75:13, 76:10, 101:22, 102:1 stay [1] - 37:2 stayed [1] - 52:21 Stechcon [1] - 44:11 step [1] - 111:2 Still [1] - 87:12 still [12] - 3:23, 4:14, 28:19, 29:8, 33:14, 34:8, 73:13, 78:10, 90:6, 98:18, 99:3, 112:18 stipulate [6] - 7:11, 11:6, 12:12, 12:14, 12:15, 28:24 stipulated [1] - 9:14 stipulation [3] - 9:15, 12:21, 58:20 stock [3] - 83:17, 83:19, 84:7 stood [1] - 107:13 stop [2] - 52:16, 111:22 stopped [1] - 52:15

story [2] - 106:14,

47:8, 48:2, 51:10, 54:4, 55:1, 57:25, 66:14, 103:11, 108:6 **street** [2] - 16:13, 28:16 stress [2] - 103:23, 108:15 stressful [1] - 108:21 stretch [2] - 13:1, 27:6 strike [2] - 31:13, **strongest** [1] - 30:15 stud [1] - 76:6 Studbook [1] - 76:1 studbook [7] - 76:2, 76:3, 76:4, 90:19, 90:22, 91:2, 91:9 stuff [4] - 10:14, 18:17, 24:16, 29:16 subject [11] - 3:10, 4:4, 18:10, 34:17, 50:17, 58:7, 58:18, 66:5, 66:6, 102:4, 103:3 submit [3] - 68:23, 88:10, 90:24 **submits** [1] - 90:22 submitted [11] -10:15, 10:16, 15:12, 29:11. 40:10. 68:9. 79:9, 88:13, 93:19, 93:24, 98:10 subpoena [3] - 25:4, 33:7 substantial [1] - 19:17 Substantial [1] - 19:19 sudden [1] - 107:2 sufficient [4] - 23:4, 23:6, 78:11, 108:13 suggest [1] - 28:15 suggested [1] - 41:17 suggesting [1] - 105:3 **suit** [1] - 58:8 Suite [1] - 1:17 **Sullivan** [1] - 109:10 **SULLIVAN** [4] - 1:11, 2:2, 115:2, 115:5 **summarize** [1] - 13:25 **summary** [7] - 15:13, 15:17, 93:20, 93:24, 102:9, 102:13, 102:17 **supersede** [1] - 15:9 supplies [2] - 19:18,

106:15

Strauss [16] - 5:24,

25:25, 38:7, 39:17,

43:19, 43:22, 43:25,

19:16, 32:16, 32:21, 93:20 supporting [2] -30:19, 78:7 supports [3] - 4:6, 7:8, 30:4 supposed [2] - 24:23, 76:3 surname [1] - 29:4 surprised [1] - 14:6 **Suspension** [1] - 81:2 **Sustained** [3] - 49:1, 60:16, 63:19 swear [1] - 35:16 **sworn** [1] - 105:3 **SWORN** [1] - 35:23 **system** [1] - 54:1 Т

tables [1] - 25:14 talks [1] - 26:23 **TANYA** [1] - 1:15 taping [2] - 54:18, 54:20 tax [1] - 36:16 Teamsters [3] - 79:18, 80:7, 80:15 technical [1] - 81:17 technicality [1] -16:11 telephone [1] - 46:7 telephonic [1] -103:13 ten [7] - 3:6, 3:8, 33:10, 69:13, 84:22, 100:13, 112:1 ten-minute [1] - 69:13 tent [1] - 106:24 tenure [2] - 95:4, 100:6 terminate [1] - 82:4 terminated [1] - 82:7 termination [1] - 82:1 terms [14] - 3:15, 5:3, 19:22, 27:3, 36:25, 40:6, 41:22, 42:15, 68:17, 72:23, 73:10, 80:4, 101:21, 107:15 testified [14] - 12:23, 19:9, 37:12, 86:11, 87:20, 90:9, 94:13, 98:4, 103:7, 103:15, 104:4, 104:19, 106:13, 107:21 testify [13] - 7:3, 14:18, 14:20, 17:23, 20:6, 21:2, 25:4, 26:6, 27:13, 28:21,

30:24, 32:9 testimony [13] - 3:3, 3:4, 3:10, 15:20, 26:19, 26:20, 33:2, 33:24, 35:16, 46:25, 74:9, 111:6, 111:13 tethering [1] - 8:1 tethers [3] - 55:17, 55:23, 71:10 Texas [1] - 52:4 Thailand [1] - 87:18 **THE** [199] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:11, 3:2, 4:9, 4:13, 5:8, 5:13, 5:17, 5:21, 6:10, 6:18, 6:20, 7:1, 7:5, 7:17, 8:4, 8:8, 8:10, 8:20, 9:2, 9:8, 9:12, 9:18, 10:18, 10:22, 11:5, 11:12, 11:16, 11:18, 11:20, 12:5, 12:10, 12:18, 13:2, 13:5, 13:9, 13:15, 14:2, 14:4, 14:16, 15:5, 15:23, 16:4, 16:7, 16:11, 16:21, 17:1, 17:7, 17:15, 17:21, 18:2, 18:8, 18:20, 18:22, 19:12, 19:19, 20:3, 21:8, 21:13, 21:17, 21:23, 22:7, 22:17, 22:20, 23:7, 23:10, 23:22, 24:6, 24:11, 24:19, 25:2, 25:16, 26:9, 27:18, 27:21, 28:4, 28:10, 28:14, 29:1, 29:6, 29:12, 29:15, 29:21, 30:1, 34:21, 35:1, 35:8, 35:13, 35:20, 35:22, 35:23, 39:4, 39:6, 39:10, 39:11, 40:13, 40:16, 40:18, 40:19, 43:3, 43:4, 43:5, 43:6, 43:24, 44:2, 44:14, 44:15, 45:15, 46:5, 46:6, 47:5, 47:24, 49:1, 50:17, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:11, 51:21, 51:22, 52:13, 52:14, 53:23, 53:24, 55:11, 55:12, 55:22, 55:23, 58:17, 59:13, 59:21, 60:16, 62:15, 62:22, 63:3, 63:19, 65:1, 66:2, 66:5, 67:14, 67:17, 67:19, 67:24, 68:3,

support [5] - 15:12,

68:14, 68:22, 69:11, 69:16, 69:22, 71:22, 71:24, 72:18, 72:20, 73:20, 73:22, 74:15, 74:20, 75:4, 78:9, 78:13, 80:12, 82:12, 82:17, 82:22, 84:6, 84:8. 85:14. 100:21. 100:25, 101:3, 101:11, 101:18, 102:4, 102:8, 102:12, 102:15, 102:19, 103:3, 105:13, 106:9, 106:16, 110:14, 110:25, 111:2, 111:4, 111:5, 111:7, 111:9, 111:13, 111:17, 111:21, 112:6, 112:9, 112:13, 112:20, 113:1, 113:3, 113:6 themselves [4] - 8:15, 19:25, 39:12, 66:25 theory [5] - 23:24, 51:1, 58:20, 68:5 thereby [1] - 31:18 therefore [2] - 15:15, 78:7 thereof [1] - 75:13 they've [8] - 6:14, 14:10, 18:21, 19:2, 41:18, 42:2, 96:22, 96:23 **They've** [1] - 23:12 thinking [3] - 69:16, 86:3. 86:5 third [6] - 21:19, 29:11, 29:12, 30:22, 33:13, 104:24 thirteen [1] - 54:3 thirty [1] - 33:22 Thirty [1] - 36:9 Thirty-six [1] - 36:9 **Thomas** [2] - 56:13 thousands [2] - 11:13, 11:24 threatened [1] - 57:14 three [15] - 4:19, 5:1, 13:4, 13:5, 13:6, 18:2, 30:5, 33:19, 58:16, 65:5, 65:9, 68:17, 95:16, 106:21, 111:13 **Throughout** [1] - 5:13 ticket [2] - 39:5, 39:8 ticket-holder [1] -39:8 Tillie [1] - 50:2 Tim [2] - 76:8, 95:9

title [3] - 32:5, 43:9, 89:10 Title [1] - 108:12 TO [1] - 1:3 today [14] - 35:21, 40:20, 42:21, 43:25, 61:15, 64:14, 77:13, 87:20, 103:7, 103:15, 106:13, 107:22, 111:11, 113:6 together [1] - 41:1 token [2] - 16:12, 17:21 Tom [7] - 49:12, 81:24, 84:18, 84:23, 85:6, 85:16, 85:20 tomorrow [8] - 51:4, 69:16, 111:22, 111:25, 112:2, 112:5, 112:7, 112:20 tonight [1] - 51:16 **Tony** [1] - 87:3 took [8] - 6:11, 6:23, 24:7, 30:1, 46:13, 72:8, 76:16, 109:25 top [8] - 3:9, 20:17, 37:2, 48:12, 52:10, 62:6, 87:4, 105:17 totally [1] - 16:23 tour [1] - 53:17 toward [2] - 48:15, 59:19 trace [1] - 86:20 track [2] - 14:21, 85:8 tracks [1] - 85:9 train [2] - 106:25, 107:1 trainer's [1] - 105:4 trainers [1] - 104:25 training [1] - 12:25 trains [1] - 27:5 TRANSCRIPT [1] -1:11 transcript [3] - 2:7, 84:21, 115:3 transcription [1] - 2:7 transferring [1] -70:16 transfers [1] - 70:15 transit [1] - 52:14 transmitted [1] - 31:11 transport [2] - 76:20, 76:25 transportation [1] -76:20

transported [1] -

transporting [1] -

52:17

52:15

108:14 travel [1] - 78:17 traveling [2] - 37:16, 44:20 treatie [2] - 76:22, 76:23 treatment [4] - 50:7, 50:12, 72:22, 109:16 trial [8] - 5:13, 13:16, 15:7, 15:19, 18:22, 34:12, 34:14, 35:17 TRIAL [1] - 1:11 tricks [1] - 12:23 tried [1] - 25:10 trouble [1] - 85:5 **Troy** [2] - 48:22, 112:14 true [11] - 23:5, 23:8, 77:22, 83:2, 83:14, 85:22, 86:17, 90:12, 90:21, 92:17, 104:7 trustworthiness [1] -27:10 trustworthy [2] - 5:6, 5:8 truth [3] - 35:17, 35:18 try [6] - 36:12, 37:1, 38:24, 41:17, 68:12, 98:17 trying [14] - 4:16, 4:21, 8:24, 10:21, 17:11, 17:15, 19:25, 23:9, 25:14, 28:18, 57:10, 67:10, 87:12, 105:11 tuberculosis [1] - 50:6 Tulsa [4] - 56:23, 57:2, 57:5, 57:19 turn [4] - 3:7, 25:13, 27:25, 56:11 turned [2] - 25:14, 57:11 Tusk [1] - 94:6 twelve [2] - 49:17, 50:15 Twenty [1] - 69:15 two [36] - 6:15, 6:17, 6:18, 6:19, 6:20, 10:23, 11:8, 15:12, 17:8, 18:11, 30:22, 44:9, 44:17, 45:1, 45:24, 48:2, 52:16, 53:11, 55:8, 56:8, 59:3, 69:12, 74:7, 78:4, 93:6, 94:3, 94:7, 94:19, 96:12, 96:14, 98:25, 104:14, 108:10, 108:15, 109:9,

trauma [2] - 103:23,

type [4] - 32:14, 45:5, 63:10, 67:12 **types** [5] - 9:22, 25:23, 30:16, 62:10, 81:15 **typical** [1] - 40:13

U

U.S [6] - 2:3, 31:21, 31:23, 32:3, 32:16, 104:13 ultimate [1] - 103:24 ultimately [9] - 18:18, 40:8, 41:8, 50:12, 52:22, 53:24, 55:25, 56:5, 68:20 unclear [1] - 65:6 uncommon [1] - 81:9 under [26] - 3:9, 7:9, 9:23, 21:25, 26:21, 31:3, 31:15, 32:4, 37:9, 50:25, 58:19, 59:20, 60:21, 62:17, 67:13, 68:5, 69:6, 72:10. 76:18. 82:3. 87:16. 88:19. 90:12. 98:25, 102:1, 104:14 underlined [1] - 56:25 underlying [3] - 30:23, 45:9, 45:11 undertake [1] - 61:7 undertaken [1] - 57:16 unfair [4] - 17:13, 26:16, 28:17, 68:13 Union [1] - 79:18 union [1] - 81:11 Unit [5] - 40:20, 44:19, 62:8, 62:25, 95:20 unit [7] - 40:20, 41:2, 44:17, 61:25, 62:2, 62:6, 64:1 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 1:12 United [6] - 4:7, 29:5, 38:13, 76:15, 76:23, 99:13 units [8] - 37:16, 37:17, 38:21, 44:20, 60:22, 78:17, 103:8 Unknown [3] - 87:2, 87:11, 87:17 Unless [2] - 4:9, 111:13 unless [3] - 12:13, 13:12, 90:13 unnecessary [1] -108:14 unsigned [1] - 90:4

untrue [1] - 23:2

unusual [2] - 62:1,

89:17 **Up** [2] - 15:2, 19:13 **up** [20] - 4:16, 5:16, 5:21, 11:11, 22:9, 30:11, 36:12, 44:24, 46:11, 53:9, 53:10, 59:8, 69:17, 81:22, 83:16, 87:4, 94:23, 111:16, 112:7, 112:15 **US** [1] - 43:2 **USDA** [75] - 5:13, 6:3, 6:13, 7:6, 7:9, 8:5, 8:21, 8:24, 9:15, 9:21, 10:15, 10:16, 13:8, 15:9, 17:3, 17:11, 18:7, 18:12, 18:17, 18:24, 19:24, 20:12, 20:16, 23:14, 25:11, 25:23, 26:2, 26:15, 27:12, 27:14, 30:21, 32:23, 33:21, 34:3, 37:18, 38:5, 38:8, 38:21, 38:24, 39:12, 39:16, 40:1, 40:3, 40:4, 40:7, 40:14, 40:22, 41:5, 41:7, 41:8, 41:15, 41:25, 42:17, 44:23, 46:9, 46:10, 48:9, 50:10, 53:19, 54:7, 54:24, 59:23, 60:4, 72:10, 72:21, 103:8, 103:19, 107:10, 107:14, 107:25, 108:6, 109:3, 109:5, 109:16 usual [1] - 107:11

V

vacate [1] - 111:25 vague [1] - 20:2 valuable [1] - 86:12 **value** [1] - 84:6 Vargus [1] - 112:17 various [6] - 36:13, 36:25, 54:10, 72:24, 75:8, 79:7 variously [1] - 10:8 verbatim [2] - 30:13, 31:17 version [2] - 74:17, 78:5 versus [2] - 4:8, 29:5 vet [3] - 104:11, 105:20, 107:10 vet's [1] - 104:7 veterinarian [11] -

43:9, 49:20, 50:8, 64:3, 79:6, 79:8, 95:3, 99:23, 104:24, 105:2 veterinarians [1] -106:12 vets [2] - 105:18, 105:24 vice [4] - 5:24, 36:6, 43:20, 56:14 **video** [3] - 54:18, 54:20, 112:11 video-taping [2] -54:18, 54:20 videotape [1] - 10:13 view [3] - 10:4, 37:18, 86:14 violated [2] - 13:22, 18:25 violates [1] - 12:17 violating [1] - 13:12 violation [19] - 10:10, 10:17, 13:11, 13:21, 23:16, 23:25, 24:2, 26:7, 27:15, 41:12, 42:4, 46:12, 53:20, 56:6, 57:17, 61:5, 105:5, 110:21 violations [3] - 11:1, 23:20, 54:12 Violations [1] - 9:4 viral [1] - 53:25 virtually [1] - 56:3 virtue [1] - 102:9 vis [2] - 15:21 vis-a-vis [1] - 15:21 voiced [1] - 56:3 voluminous [2] -50:24, 51:2

W

voluntarily [1] - 90:21

Wait [5] - 6:10, 7:1, 7:5, 9:2, 13:6 wait [2] - 6:21, 14:22 waiting [1] - 20:6 wants [1] - 27:13 warm [2] - 52:18, 112:3 warning [1] - 81:13 warranties [2] - 91:15, 91:17 warranty [1] - 91:2 **Washington** [8] - 1:6, 1:17, 1:22, 2:4, 66:13, 66:19, 66:20, 94:4 waste [1] - 11:7

watch [1] - 106:23 water [2] - 52:20 ways [2] - 17:22, 38:20 weakness [1] - 31:13 weaknesses [1] -30:22 weaned [1] - 55:12 weaning [1] - 59:3 weather [2] - 52:18, 112:2 website [2] - 109:18, 110:6 Wednesday [1] - 1:6 weekend [1] - 3:2 Weider [1] - 105:23 Weidner [1] - 105:17 weight [3] - 34:11, 68:7, 68:24 Weinstein [1] - 53:7 welcome [1] - 113:7 Welfare [12] - 7:22, 10:17, 12:17, 15:9, 23:20, 26:7, 27:15. 37:9, 72:11, 72:21, 73:17, 108:11 West [1] - 106:20 west [2] - 99:13, 99:24 Western [1] - 54:6 whistleblower [1] -47:12 whole [3] - 18:15, 35:17, 36:16 wild [1] - 71:22 Wildlife [23] - 6:23, 7:23, 9:22, 15:20, 15:21, 23:14, 70:5, 70:17, 70:20, 71:2, 71:6, 71:9, 71:20, 73:15, 75:21, 76:22, 87:21, 88:5, 88:14, 88:20, 88:25, 89:22, 104:3

1

wildlife [5] - 15:3, 15:16, 70:15, 71:21, 73:12 wildlife-bred [1] -15:16 William [3] - 105:20, 105:23, 106:2 Williams [1] - 105:1 willing [2] - 5:18, 12:15 Williston [1] - 50:1 WINDERS [1] - 1:15 wish [2] - 50:25, 51:5 withdrawn [1] - 70:18 WITNESS [21] - 35:22, 35:23, 39:6, 39:11, 40:16, 40:19, 43:4,

43:6, 44:15, 46:6, 51:21, 52:14, 53:24, 55:12, 55:23, 71:24, 72:20, 84:8, 85:14, 111:4, 111:7 Witness [1] - 85:5 witness [25] - 4:22, 5:4, 7:2, 12:22, 18:6, 20:6, 21:5, 26:6, 27:12, 28:5, 28:21, 30:8, 30:24, 31:1, 47:20, 71:15, 101:9, 102:25, 106:6, 106:13, 111:10, 111:11, 112:19, 112:24 witnessed [1] - 49:6 witnesses [1] - 32:9 WITNESSES [1] -114:3 witnessing [1] - 48:13 woman [3] - 20:14, 28:19, 76:8 wonderful [2] - 112:2, 113:3 wondering [1] - 25:16 worded [1] - 10:8 words [2] - 18:13, 26:24 works [1] - 6:1 World [1] - 100:9 world [1] - 15:17 worst [1] - 17:1 wound [1] - 26:25 wrapped [2] - 55:17, 55:24 write [2] - 21:1, 41:18 writes [1] - 105:23 writing [3] - 41:17, 41:25, 109:24 written [5] - 5:23, 41:21, 63:12, 67:9,

X

written-out [1] - 63:12

XI [2] - 81:2, 82:1

wrote [1] - 4:17

106:11

Υ

year [10] - 36:15, 43:11, 84:12, 89:3, 92:23, 94:16, 95:21, 98:7, 99:7, 99:8 years [9] - 36:9, 54:10, 83:6, 83:7, 83:8, 88:15, 88:16, 106:19, 106:21 yesterday [3] - 74:12, 74:16, 74:25 York [1] - 65:16 young [9] - 52:3, 52:20, 52:23, 55:8, 55:14, 55:21, 56:1, 106:19, 106:20 younger [1] - 52:21 yourself [2] - 37:24, 38:5

Ζ

Zina [1] - 87:10 Zina's [1] - 87:8 Zirboni [1] - 50:10 Zoo [7] - 91:11, 91:13, 91:15, 91:18, 93:7, 94:3, 94:4