1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 3 JUDICIAL WATCH Plaintiff, 4 vs. Docket No. CV 16-2369 RDM 5 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Washington, D.C. January 24, 2017 6 Defendant. 7 8 TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE 9 BEFORE THE HONORABLE SENIOR JUDGE RANDOLPH D. MOSS 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE APPEARANCES: 11 12 For the Plaintiff: Michael Bekesha, Esquire JUDICIAL WATCH 13 426 Third Street, SW - Suite 800 Washington, DC 20024 14 15 For the Defendant: Cesar a. Lopez-Morales, Esquire U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 16 Federal Program Branch 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW 17 Washington, DC 20530 18 Cathryn J. Jones, RPR 19 Court Reporter: Official Court Reporter 20 Room 6521, U.S. District Court 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. 21 Washington, D.C. 20001 2.2 23 2.4 Proceedings recorded by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. 25

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Civil Action 16-2369, Judicial
3	Watch versus the U.S. Department of Justice. Counsel,
4	please approach the podium and identify yourself for the
5	record.
6	MR. BEKESHA: Good afternoon, your Honor. Michael
7	Bekesha on behalf of Judicial Watch. Along with me at
8	counsel table is Tom Fenton, president of Judicial Watch.
9	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Bekesha.
10	MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Good afternoon, your Honor, my
11	name is Cesar Lopez-Morales on behalf of defendant, U.S.
12	Department of Justice. And with me at counsel's table is
13	Marcy Berman also the U.S. Department of Justice and
14	Christian Ellis of the FBI.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. So Mr. Bekesha, why don't
16	we start with you. And just let me know where things stand
17	from your prospective.
18	MR. BEKESHA: Sure. So as you know the Judicial
19	Watch submitted a FOIA request in October. It had two parts
20	to it. One was asking for all records that were discovered,
21	retrieved, found on Datto device which is our understanding
22	it was one of the devices that the FBI collected during its
23	investigation of Secretary Clinton's email usage. The
24	second part of the request is for records related to that
25	collection and related to that device.

An answer has been filed. No response from the 1 2 agency yet about if there are any responsive records. Let 3 me say no formal or official response. Counsel we spoke 4 yesterday briefly about where the process is. It looks as 5 though probably make more sense for the government's 6 attorney to explain what their position is and then have me 7 come back and talk about it. 8 THE COURT: Okay. That sounds good. So 9 Mr. Lopez-Morales. 10 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: So your Honor, as opposing 11 counsel mentioned there are two parts to the request that 12 was submitted by Judicial Watch in October. And our 13 position is somewhat similar with respect to each part even 14 though the source or the location where the responsive 15 records are different with respect to each part. 16 With respect to the first part, I informed 17 opposing counsel yesterday that any responsive records to 18 this part of the request is located in the materials that 19 were transferred to the Department of State for processing 20 for FOIA purposes, and is being governed by the production 21 schedule agreed in your case as you're familiar Leopold 2.2 versus Department of Justice. And in that, those materials 23 are being processed pursuant to your October 3, 2016 order, 24 which is in Docket 26.

3

25

So that any responsive records to that first part

of the request are part of those materials the Department of State has been processing them. The Department of Justice filed a status report the beginning of January, so you may be well aware in the Leopold case forming the status of that production.

6 And as part of those, as part of that production 7 there have been some records that could have been retrieved 8 from the Datto device which is what plaintiff is interested I don't have any numbers of what has been released 9 in. 10 already and what is remaining, but what we know is that anything that was recovered, retrieved from the Datto device 11 12 is in the materials that were transferred to the State 13 Department.

14 THE COURT: Remind me in Leopold is the State 15 Department then posting the materials that it's releasing in 16 response to Leopold's request on the Internet somehow 17 generally accessible?

MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Yes, your Honor, they are being released to the public in the electronic FOIA library, and not just to Mr. Leopold's request but also to the hundreds of requests that the State Department is handling. And so that's how Judicial Watch would have access to the responsive records as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Does that cover everything then in one, everything -- well, you may not know this, but maybe

1 you do. Does the Leopold request encompass everything that 2 is requested in number one?

MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: I'm not sure, your Honor. But what we do know is that anything that would be responsive is in the materials in the State Department. And regardless of whether it's responsive to the Leopold request it will be processed in accordance with the processing schedule.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Anything that is responsive to 9 question number one that is not subject to a FOIA exemption 10 will be posted by the State Department on public library, 11 electronic library?

MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Exactly, yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Request number two?

14 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Request number two as opposing 15 counsel is very familiar we heavily discussed and litigated 16 this issue before Judge Chutkan in another lawsuit that was 17 filed Judicial Watch against the Department of Justice. 18 That case is number 16-2046. And as we discussed then we 19 told Judge Chutkan and Judge Chutkan agreed with us. She 20 approved our processing schedule of 500 pages per month on 21 the Clinton investigative files.

What I should emphasize about the second part of the request is that any, to the extent that there are any responsive records to that part of the request which relates to the FBI's efforts in retrieving or recovering or

discovering the information in the Datto device that is in 1 2 the FBI's possession, and that is in the FBI's investigative 3 file. The FBI has received hundreds of requests for records 4 in the Clinton investigative file. And as we informed Judge 5 Chutkan in that case Judicial Watch was requesting 302 6 forms. They were also requesting correspondence and 7 communications between officials at the FBI, between the FBI 8 and the White House, et cetera.

9 So what we said long before plaintiff filed a 10 lawsuit and even before they filed this request the FBI had already stated its commitment to handle the requests that it 11 12 was receiving and to release all nonexempt portions of the 13 Clinton investigative file. It has been doing so for 14 several months. The last release was Friday, January 6th, 15 2016. And the FBI will continue pursuant to Judge Chutkan's 16 order and our policy of, for complex FOIA requests. It will 17 continue to process 500 pages a month the Clinton 18 investigative file. And that's what we litigated in that 19 case.

And also I forgot to mention that the FBI has received at least nine requests for the whole Clinton investigative file, and they were received long before plaintiff had filed this request. So in accordance with our policy for complex requests and the first in, first out policy we have been processing the requests accordingly and

1 the FBI has released all nonexempt portions of that file as 2 it goes on in that process.

3 THE COURT: Are those also being processed to some 4 publicly available --

> MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Yes, your Honor, yes. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Bekesha.

5

6

7 MR. BEKESHA: Thank you, your Honor. I'll briefly 8 talk about the second part of the request first. You know, 9 first I would disagree with the characterization that it was 10 litigated before Judge Chutkan this idea of 500 pages a 11 month being produced. We filed a status report. We each 12 had positions. There was a status conference about it. 13 There was a discussion.

Judge Chutkan at that time has agreed to go along with the production schedule that the State Department, or that the Department of Justice proposed, but it wasn't litigated. I think Judge Chutkan it's fair to say may reevaluate her decision at that time depending on how the production goes. What counsel also didn't say --

THE COURT: Before you move off that, are you asking that I do anything different? Or do we just leave that to Judge Chutkan and if she changes the schedule there that would affect --

24 MR. BEKESHA: I'm asking for something different 25 here, your Honor. So the Clinton investigative file is a

little over 10,000 pages. What we've asked for -- so at 500 1 2 pages a month the Justice Department, the government has 3 said would be between 20 and 24 months for all the material 4 to be produced. What we've asked for is a very limited set 5 of records. Records only about the Datto device. And so 6 unlike in the case that we had in front of Judge Chutkan 7 where we asked for types of documents, Form 302s and 8 communications which may be different, may be difficult to 9 separate out from the full 10,000 pages.

In this instance all the material, the 10,000 pages are already posted, are already online or not online but on an electronic database. It can be key word searched. So our proposal in this case is for the government first part two to search the word Datto of the 10,000 pages, see how many potentially responsive pages there are and then we can meet and confer and discuss a production schedule.

17 If Datto only appears on ten pages it makes sense 18 for the agency to review and produce those ten pages instead 19 of requiring us to wait 24 months to have an entire 20 investigative file that we then need to go through and 21 figure out where those ten instances are on 10,000 plus 2.2 pages, or those ten pages could be withheld in full and then 23 or not the 10,000 but parts of the 10,000 pages, so then we 24 wouldn't even know where Datto appeared on those records. 25 THE COURT: What is the relevance of the Datto

device? How is that distinct from everything else? 1 2 MR. BEKESHA: So when the FBI was conducting its 3 investigation they gathered several laptops, several 4 Blackberries from Secretary Clinton. They also collected 5 other devices from third parties, other former government 6 officials. These are, the Datto device is one of the 7 devices that they collected from a company that had a 8 contract with Secretary Clinton for, to back up information. 9 And so we're looking for in the second part 10 records about what the FBI did with respect to this specific 11 device. So we're not talking about the entire investigative 12 file. We just want the government to type in Datto into 13 their database and lets see how many hits there are. 14 THE COURT: Are you content to live with that as 15 the scope of the search? 16 MR. BEKESHA: Yes, your Honor. I think it's a 17 fair interpretation, a reasonable interpretation of our 18 request without searching on the word Datto it would be 19 difficult to figure out what's responsive and what's not 20 quite honestly. So we think that would be fair. It would 21 be a relatively easy solution. I suggested and proposed 2.2 that to counsel yesterday hoping that maybe they could have conducted the search and provided us with a number. 23 24 I mean if it shows up on 10,000 pages then there 25 may be a problem. But if it shows up only ten times there

1 could be an easy solution to this case.

THE COURT: Okay.

2

3 MR. BEKESHA: With respect to the first part, we 4 still don't know and I asked this of counsel yesterday, 5 where the materials from the Datto device exists in the 6 materials transferred to the FBI, sorry to the State 7 Department. I believe the FBI transferred six disks to the 8 State Department. And right now in the Leopold case it's my 9 understanding that the State Department is processing the 10 first disk.

And so the question is, is all the material from 11 12 the Datto device on one of the six disks? Or is it spread 13 out throughout the disks? Also our request asked for more 14 than just emails. It asked for Blackberry messages, text 15 message, I-messages. And so to date the material posted in 16 the Leopold case has only been emails, so you know, we want 17 to ensure all records are being looked at and produced not 18 just emails in the Leopold case. You know, whether or not 19 it makes sense for the State Department to continue processing the case in response to Leopold as well as 20 21 another Judicial Watch case really depends where the 2.2 materials exists in the materials transferred to the State 23 Department.

24 One last point to note the State Department as 25 they're reviewing the materials transferred from the FBI may

determine some of those records are not State Department records. And so how is that going to be dealt with because in this case we sued the Justice Department and not the State Department. And so there seems to be potential for records that may get lost because we sued one agency and they want another agency to respond to us.

7 THE COURT: It does seem to the Court unlikely 8 that just given the number of lawsuits that have been 9 brought that some records are going to get lost in this 10 process because presumedly the State Department has requests 11 for everything. And I understand from counsel the State 12 Department has requests for everything covered by your 13 requests. It's true that it may turn out when the State 14 Department does it review that it concludes it's some of the 15 records are, records of third party agencies in which case I 16 assume they would handle that in the way they do is that 17 they would then presumedly send that out to the third party 18 agencies to get the position of the third party agency.

MR. BEKESHA: Right. The defendant in this case is, the agency is the Justice Department. And so how that plays out, do we wait 24 months or as long as it's going to take to process the six disks, and then what happens is the State Department transfers that material back to the Justice Department to then review the records and see if they're Justice Department records? I mean just figuring out the

logistics of that there's nothing in place now to ensure 1 2 that --3 THE COURT: So what are you proposing? 4 MR. BEKESHA: Well, I think the first thing is are 5 all the materials that were recovered from the Datto device 6 in one place. It would be helpful to know are they on one 7 disk. Are they in one database at the FBI? 8 THE COURT: You told that request one goes beyond 9 the Datto device; is that right or not? 10 MR. BEKESHA: No, it's everything, everything of 11 the Datto device, that was found on the Datto device. And 12 that may be included in the material transferred from the 13 FBI to the State Department. But is it all on one disk? 14 Does the FBI have the Datto device materials all in one 15 file? I mean how is, I think we need to know more about 16 where these records exists before we can even try to agree 17 on what makes sense and what a fair production schedule may 18 be. 19 THE COURT: Let me hear again from 20 Mr. Lopez-Morales. 21 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Well, your Honor, first of 22 all, we did look at where in the sixth disks some of the 23 potential responsive records would be located. The problem 2.4 is once again today Judicial Watch has taken the position 25 that it took last week before Judge Chutkan and was

rejected. And it's this death by a thousand cuts piecemeal 1 2 litigation approach. The agency and FOIA guarantees 3 multitracking processing ***queues as well as a first in, 4 first out policy. That is what the agency has been doing 5 which is why Judge Chutkan rejected that approach, and just 6 because obviously Judicial Watch has a right to file a 7 lawsuit with respect to its FOIA requests, but it has to 8 wait its turn in line.

9 And we, the Department of State with respect to 10 the materials that were transferred there and the FBI with 11 respect to the Clinton investigative file both agencies have 12 received hundreds of requests for the same records. And 13 just because Judicial Watch has the inclination or the 14 resources to file a lawsuit it does not merit preferential 15 treatment over all the other requestors.

16 There is a process in place in accordance with 17 your order in the Leopold case. It provides for the 18 Department of State to first identify which records are not 19 responsive to the Leopold request. Second, to transfer as 20 you said anything that would be processed by a third party 21 agency; and third, to release to Mr. Leopold or to the 2.2 public as the Department of State has been doing, anything 23 that is responsive. And the Department of State has been 24 doing that not only with respect to Mr. Leopold's request, 25 but anything that is nonexempt that is located in the

1 materials.

2	So what we found we would have either provide this
3	information to the Court and to opposing counsel, our
4	position still is that Judicial Watch has to wait in line.
5	Judicial Watch did not request expedition in the FOIA case,
6	and they have not identified any reasons why their requests
7	should be prioritized over the hundreds of other requestors.
8	With that being said, we have identified that in
9	the materials transferred to the Department of State
10	anything that was retrieved from the Datto device would be
11	in disk one, which is what your order in the Leopold case
12	provided which is currently being processed. And we think
13	that the Department of State will be done in the next couple
14	of months processing that disk and then they will proceed to
15	disk four and five. And the information from the Datto
16	device, the Datto materials are in disk one and disk five.
17	So Judicial Watch is going to get anything that's
18	not exempted that are Datto materials. And just want to
19	correct something for the record. The Leopold request is
20	not limited to emails. The Leopold request clearly asks for
21	emails and other records that were retrieved from the
22	server. And the same applies to the second part of the
23	request, your Honor, which is why Judge Chutkan approved the
24	FBI's proposed 500 page per month schedule.
25	We could run a search of the word Datto, but that

creates an incentive which is precisely what Judicial Watch 1 2 has been doing in this instance by filing another lawsuit 3 for records in the Clinton investigative file. We will 4 continue to do so if we allow Judicial Watch to, if we 5 process these requests and favor and reallocate resources 6 that are being used right now by the agency to process the 7 whole Clinton investigative file we would have to pull out 8 specific records requested by Judicial Watch in the recent 9 FOIA request, pull those records out, process them and pull 10 them back in the file.

And to the extent, for example, with the second 11 12 part of the request they are asking for records of the FBI's 13 efforts in retrieving the Datto material. That could well 14 be in the 302s forms or in the correspondence that were the 15 subject of the requests in the case before Judge Chutkan. 16 So then we would have this messy situation in which we would 17 have a different processing schedule. We would have to pull 18 out specific records. And it does not really make sense to 19 create this distinction that opposing counsel is mentioning 20 of types of documents versus type of content. If anything, 21 it would be easier to pull out specific types of categories 2.2 of documents like the 302 forms and instead of looking 23 throughout the entire file for references to Datto.

And Datto search along doesn't really mean that we're going to get all the potential responsive records to

1 that request. So that's our position, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Do you have any sense of the quantity 3 of records subject to the request number two that relate to the Datto device? 4 5 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: So, your Honor, we did look, 6 we ran a search and we found 35 documents throughout the 7 file and in subfiles including the top secret file. We have 8 35 documents that have the word Datto in it that could be 9 under inclusive, over inclusive. It's unclear that these 10 records are to the extent that they're 302 forms, to the 11 extent that they're correspondence or any other sorts of 12 document. 13 THE COURT: The plaintiffs indicated that they 14 would be happy to live by a search just for the word Datto, so I don't think it would be under inclusive. 15 16 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Right. So if they're happy 17 with that it wouldn't be under inclusive or over inclusive 18 because they would stipulate to the adequacy of the search 19 in that instance. Our concern, your Honor, is that it would 20 just incentivize further lawsuits. And it could be 35 21 documents now. It could be 50 then and so on. And that 22 would just be a very chaotic and inefficient process while 23 the agencies try to figure out a way to allocate resources 24 effectively and handle this in a very equitable manner for 25 everyone.

THE COURT: And if we don't adopt some process to 1 2 expedite search for the Datto device how long would it take 3 for the FBI to respond to Judicial Watch's request number 4 two? 5 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: I don't have that information, 6 your Honor, but if you give me a minute I can confer with my 7 client. 8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 [Brief pause.] 10 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Thank you, your Honor. So 11 the, I think opposing counsel mentioned this. The process 12 would take 20 to 24 months at the pace of 500 pages per 13 month for the entire Clinton investigative file. And 14 plaintiff could look for the word Datto in these documents 15 including the ones that have already been released to the 16 public. And they could do so as the FBI releases the 17 documents to Leopold. THE COURT: Does Judicial Watch have a one or more 18 19 additional requests pending that are broader and more encompassing? What I'm responding to is your comment that 20 21 it interferes with the process for someone to be able to 2.2 serve a broad request. And say well, there's some parts 23 that we'd like to get sooner, so let's do another request so 24 we're going to ask you to get a search for that. And two 25 weeks later they decide there's some subset we want so let's

1 do another request now. We're going to ask you to do a 2 search for that in way that it just interferes with the 3 orderly production of records.

4 So my question is in fact is that what Judicial 5 Watch is doing here? Have they served a broader request on 6 the FBI and this is just a subset where they're seeking to 7 sort of expedite as to some subset of the documents?

8 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Your Honor, I don't have the 9 information that they've searched a broad request. What 10 they have is filed several small requests for substantive 11 documents despite the broad requests filed by other groups 12 or individuals before Judicial Watch had filed a request.

13 THE COURT: Does Judicial Watch have other 14 requests that are pending right now that you're working on? 15 MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: If you'd give me one second. 16 THE COURT: Judicial Watch may be more easily able 17 to answer that question.

18 MR. BEKESHA: I don't know, your Honor. I mean 19 I'm standing here today and this isn't -- we're not here 20 trying to harass the agency. We're not filing a larger 21 request, found out we couldn't, we weren't going to get 2.2 those records for 24 months and now we're filing a more 23 target request. That just didn't happen. If you look at 24 the timing of these requests, we sent a request for the 302s 25 and the communications after Director Comey announced during

his testimony to the, I believe it was a House committee that he was going to make all the 302s available to Congress. And so we sent a request for 302s after that because it sounded as though the FBI was processing the 302s for release to Congress, so we were going to piggyback on the work they were already doing.

7 We found out in October we've come to understand 8 there's this Datto device, so we were interested in that so 9 we sent a request. This isn't, this is the second time that 10 counsel in the past two weeks has talked about why, suggesting reasons why Judicial Watch is suing and other 11 12 requestors aren't. We're just trying to get the 13 information. We're not, this isn't, you know, we're not 14 trying to abuse the system at all.

THE COURT: The reason I posed the question which 15 16 was not actually to try to get a back question. What I was 17 going to asks is if there are other requests that the FBI is 18 currently processing for Judicial Watch. And you think this 19 is more pressing and the concern is about queue jumping. 20 And that there are third parties out there who are going to 21 get their records less quickly as a result of this someone 2.2 at the FBI has to stop -- and it's not a matter of someone 23 at the FBI just saying let me push the button and we'll 2.4 generate this 35 documents and hand them to you.

25

Presumably someone has to do a first layer review

for FOIA exemptions. If there are 302s I'm assuming there 1 2 would be a need to go through and redact those. I assume 3 then there's a second level review. I assume what we're 4 talking about here is something that would involve not an 5 hour or a half hours of work, but something that would 6 involve even though it's 35 documents, many hours of work 7 for somebody which does create an equity issue about whether 8 other people's request get pushed back.

9 So my question really was is Judicial Watch in a 10 position if the FBI is working on another Judicial Watch 11 request at this point to say we're happy to put that request 12 on hold while you do this one?

MR. BEKESHA: It could be, but the FBI hasn't identified any other Judicial Watch requests that would be interfering with them processing --

16 THE COURT: You would know more than they would 17 right now whether there are other Judicial Watch. I mean 18 the lawyers handling this case may not be handling the other 19 cases, so you would know better than they would whether 20 there are other pending cases directed at the FBI by 21 Judicial Watch.

22 MR. BEKESHA: I don't that off the top of my head. 23 We have several attorneys that handle different cases.

24 THE COURT: You've got the president of Judicial 25 Watch right here.

MR. BEKESHA: We do. I just don't have a list 1 2 currently. We don't have a list of our current litigation. 3 THE COURT: Let me ask you the question then, if 4 there are other requests would Judicial Watch prefer to say 5 fine, you can put this on hold while the FBI looks for 6 these? 7 MR. BEKESHA: Potentially, your Honor, we would --8 I would want the opportunity to take a look at our requests 9 before we made a judgment, deciding, depending on what our 10 other requests are that's pending with the FBI, where they 11 are in any litigation process. If they're towards the end 12 it may not make sense. 13 We're here, we finally heard that it was 35 14 documents. Now counsel wasn't willing to give out that 15 information. I asked yesterday about it. He had the 16 information when he first spoke to your Honor. He didn't 17 mention it. He came back up, it wasn't until you asked 18 specifically if the search had run that he was willing to 19 share this information. It's 35 documents. 20 I understand that there may be several layers of 21 review and there may be a few documents if that's required, 2.2 but we don't know. We don't know what the 35 documents are. 23 Some may be two sentences long. 24 THE COURT: That's the problem though is because

24 THE COURT: That's the problem though is because 25 for someone to know someone is going to have to drop doing

what they're doing on behalf of some other FOIA requestor and spend time going and figuring that out. The question is sort of what urgent need or more pressing need do you have to say let's get them all in the room here together and we would have a robust discussion if Mr. Leopold and some of the other FOIA requestors were all in the room here we said okay, let's decide who goes first.

8 I assume we probably would come away from that 9 with a decision where I just let's come in order. Because I 10 assume the other FOIA requestors are going to say to me I 11 don't want to have to wait extra time to get mine while 12 Judicial Watch jumps ahead in the queue. I need some other 13 reason, some particular reason why it's important here to do 14 it in this case, or some way that it can be done in a way 15 that doesn't unfairly penalize other FOIA requestors.

MR. BEKESHA: But this is penalizing FOIA request to send a narrow request. What the agency wants is they would have preferred we send a broad request for all records.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that's true.

21 MR. BEKESHA: But that's how they are processing 22 it. They want us to wait 24 months for them to review 35 23 documents because they want to do all of them instead of the 24 narrow.

25

20

THE COURT: Put yourself in the position because I

1 know Judicial Watch is in this position. Put yourself in a 2 position now where you've got other cases out there where 3 you have broader requests. And then I and the other judges 4 in this Court are going to get other FOIA requestors who are 5 going to be coming in and saying put aside Judicial Watch's 6 request because theirs is broader than mine. Mine is a 7 narrower, more targeted one, do mine first and then turn 8 back to Judicial Watch's. And in fact if we did that you know there could be such a series of those things that your 9 10 broader request may get delayed substantially, because it's not just going to be one, but a series of people coming and 11 12 saying I've got a narrower one do my first.

13 MR. BEKESHA: But that's why they have the track, 14 the different tracks for complex and simple requests. A 15 broad request are clearly complex because they're a lot more 16 records. Here it's a simple request. It's run a key word 17 search which they have done. They've identified 35 18 documents. We don't know how many pages those documents 19 are. Somebody can look at them. That wouldn't take that 20 much time to look, to gather. It could be a total of 70 21 pages. And so those 70 pages could be reviewed in a 2.2 relatively short period of time probably in an afternoon. THE COURT: I'm not sure that's true. 23 24 MR. BEKESHA: But the agency hasn't shown that 25 that's not true. They haven't shown --

Is that the way it works? Is that 1 THE COURT: 2 they need to go and if you file a request and come in here 3 and press on it that they then need to go and figure out how 4 much time it's going to take for them to respond to it and 5 what's there, you know, out of queue in order to then come 6 back and say well, actually this is how many hours it would 7 take us because it would take them a lot of hours to do 8 that. MR. BEKESHA: Well, I think there's some 9 10 obligation on their behalf to process the requests in a 11 timely and efficient manner. They're just not doing that in 12 this case. They're processing the entire file, 10,000 pages 13 that are very complicated because it's an entire 14 investigative file. All we're asking for here is for 15 records about one small issue, one discrete issues, 35 16 documents. That's all we're talking about, 35 documents. 17 And what their response is you have to wait two year and oh, Judicial Watch can search the records for the 18 19 key word themselves. 20 THE COURT: Two things, one is is that I'm not 21 sure they're saying you need to wait two years because it's 2.2 produced on the rolling basis. And it may be that you get your last document two years from now. Your first document 23 24 is probably I suspect already available. I wouldn't be 25 surprised it's already available because they've been

1 producing documents already. 2 MR. BEKESHA: At a minimum they should be required 3 to identify that such records have been produced. We don't 4 know if --5 THE COURT: Is the library not searchable that 6 exist? 7 MR. BEKESHA: It's not an OCR, so I guess you 8 could scroll every page and read every page and look for Datto. It's not OCR-ed. It's not electronically 9 10 searchable. I mean they're almost putting the obligation on the FOIA requestor to conduct their own FOIA search. 11 The 12 agency doesn't want to do it, so Judicial Watch you go ahead 13 and conduct your own searches. Tell us if you find anything 14 and then we can discuss it in a couple of years after we're 15 done processing the whole file. This isn't how FOIA is 16 supposed to work. 17 We appreciate the fact that they have a lot of 18 FOIA requests for the Hillary Clinton investigative file, 19 but they haven't identified that anybody else is asking 20 specifically for the records we are. We're not asking for 21 the whole file here. We're just asking for these 35 2.2 documents to be reviewed and produced in a timely fashion.

Now we can argue what a timely fashion is, but I think we would be comfortable with a three month period. Have the agency in three months start processing the records, and if

1 they hit some snags because the records are more complicated 2 and need 15 layers of review we can come back and we can 3 talk about that.

But we shouldn't have to wait until the end of the entire production for the agency to identify the 35 pages. Let us know those 35 pages and then talk about if there are any withholdings -- sorry, 35 records. If there are withholdings on the 35 records brief the issue. I mean we're talking --

10 THE COURT: Is Judicial Watch prepared to sort of 11 live by this in your other cases then too so if other FOIA 12 requestors come in that you don't have a problem with the 13 Court putting aside or the agency putting aside your 14 requests while they do more narrower ones?

MR. BEKESHA: I'm not sure the department has identified or stated specifically that they would have to stop producing other work.

18 THE COURT: They would have to slow down. There's 19 only so many hours in the day, right?

20 MR. BEKESHA: Again, we don't know how long this 21 is going to take. I mean if we're talking about --

THE COURT: It's not going to take an hour I can tell you that. It's not going to take three hours.

24 MR. BEKESHA: It could though, your Honor, we 25 don't know where these documents --

THE COURT: It's not going to take three hours
 that's not a reasonable presumption.

3 MR. BEKESHA: But over a reasonable period of 4 time. We're asking for a review of 10 documents a month. 5 THE COURT: So that's my question for you, is 6 Judicial Watch prepared for the Court to enter an order 7 saying that Judicial Watch concedes that in other cases in 8 which it has brought a request it does not object to its 9 request being delayed while more narrower searches are 10 conducted? MR. BEKESHA: Well, no, your Honor, because every 11 12 FOIA lawsuit is different. If we have a lawsuit against the 13 FBI where they've been producing records for three years and 14 there's one month left of production it doesn't make sense 15 for the agency to stop working on the last month production 16 when they could just pick up something else once that 17 production is complete. Everything is very specific to 18 circumstance situation.

Now I understand and I appreciate what the Court's concerns are, but right now we're just talking about this one FOIA request. We're talking about one set of 35 records. And you know if the agency wants you know if we want to, the agency wants to identify other FOIA lawsuits that are preventing them from reviewing these 35 records as I said Judicial Watch would be happy to take a look and work

1 something out if we think it's in our best interest.

2 THE COURT: Let me do this let me put the burden 3 on you to start with because Judicial Watch has got a lot of 4 cases pending and a lot of FOIA requests pending. Go back 5 and look and see what you have pending with the FBI, if you 6 have anything pending with the FBI. If there's something 7 that where Judicial Watch is going to say you know what 8 we're happy to shift resources. And if you want to take 9 some resources away from this other request that we have, 10 and to devote it instead to moving forward with the request 11 we're discussing today, I would request that you meet and 12 confer with Mr. Lopez-Morales and see if the parties can 13 work out something, okay, on that. And I can set a status 14 conference for six weeks from now just to check in just to 15 see where we're standing.

MR. BEKESHA: We can have a status conference a lot shorter than that, your Honor. We can probably do it in two weeks time. We can go back to the office, we can look at the other requests and see if there's any way. That's still, you know, I think that still doesn't address the first part of the FOIA request that deals with the second.

THE COURT: The first part you got in a partial answer which is that it sounds like a good portion of the materials which is being searched first. I was told that that should be done in the next couple of months.

MR. BEKESHA: Right, but we still don't know the 1 2 extent how many records are on disk five. Total records on 3 disk five. I don't believe there's been an assessment of 4 disk five. We'd just like more information about you know 5 are they going to process disk one and then disk five? Is 6 disk five going to be the last one to be processed? Again, 7 we don't know how the agency is deciding when to choose to 8 process Judicial Watch's FOIA requests. 9 It seems as though we're almost being punished, 10 because we take it, because we use the laws that are 11 available to us to make information available to the public. 12 THE COURT: I think that as I see it here it's not 13 a question of the FBI seeking to punish Judicial Watch. Т 14 think it's a question of just making sure that all FOIA 15 requestors are treated in a fair way. Because as I 16 understand the FBI has limited resources for producing the 17 FOIA requests. And although it may just be a matter of a 18 day perhaps for someone to be able to go through, find the 19 files, pull them, do an initial review of them, and then do 20 a second level review for, with respect to exemptions and 21 then presumably, I'll set up prepare a log. Maybe you can 2.2 get that done in a day I don't know. 23 Some of us who've taken time away from records, 2.4 and the question is just being fair to everybody whose got

25 the requests pending in the process.

1 MR. BEKESHA: But the FBI isn't even processing 2 the first request the State Department is. 3 THE COURT: I know, but the FBI has gone -- I know 4 from my own calendar they've got an overwhelming number of 5 FOIA requests. 6 MR. BEKESHA: But with respect to the first part 7 of the request the FBI isn't doing any work the State 8 Department is doing it. And so --9 THE COURT: So are you asking then maybe I'm --10 well, I thought we were talking about the second part, but 11 with respect to the first part of your request are you 12 asking that the State Department or the FBI do an assessment 13 of disk five? 14 MR. BEKESHA: I believe the FBI should do it 15 because they're the agency that received the FOIA request. 16 That's the agency we sued. However, if the FBI's position 17 is that the State Department is, that they've referred the 18 material to the State Department, and the State Department 19 is in a better position to do that assessment then the State 20 Department has to do it and should be required to do it. 21 That's only because the FBI seems to suggest the State 2.2 Department is in a better position. 23 THE COURT: Let's see what Mr. Lopez-Morales says 24 about just the assessment you've described. 25 MR. BEKESHA: Thank you, your Honor.

1	MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: One second, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Sure.
3	[Brief pause.]
4	MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Well, your Honor, you want me
5	to respond to the volume of the materials in disk five,
6	right?
7	THE COURT: The question is where we stand with
8	respect to the assessment of disk five. Do we know what's
9	on it with the binding records are? Do we know what
10	percentage of the records that the plaintiffs are seeking
11	are on disk five? Are they equally on disk five? Do you
12	have some sense of what's there at this point?
13	MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: So I don't have the
14	information of what's the volume of disk five. I do, and as
15	I were told I can't provide a percentage of the number of
16	responsive records to plaintiff's request in relation to the
17	volume of the disk. I do have very rough estimates of the
18	number of documents that could be potentially responsive in
19	disk five and I could provide those.
20	Your Honor, before I do I just want to mention
21	opposing counsel said that we were withholding information
22	to the Court and to Judicial Watch about the, what's the
23	number of responsive records. Our position I think which is
24	totally reasonable and I think you articulated it in terms
25	of trying to allocate resources effectively in an equitable

manner. Is that Judicial Watch is not entitled to know at 1 2 this time in accordance with the agency's complex processing 3 queue and first in first out policy which has been validated 4 a number of times by the DC Circuit and the DDC. Judicial 5 Watch simply has to wait its turn. It's not a matter of 6 well, it's 35 documents we want them now. And same with 7 respect to the State Department and the materials that were transferred there. 8

But with respect to the total number of responsive 9 10 records in disk five, there are two data sets of Datto 11 materials on disk five that contain the first Datto set, 12 contains 1,741 documents, and the second Datto set contains 13 8,435, sorry 37 retrieved documents. So there are two data 14 sets of Datto materials which are potentially responsive and 15 these are very rough estimates. I want to emphasize that on 16 disk five. So that's the information that we can provide at 17 this point.

And I would just want to emphasize again that in the words of opposing counsel we would be penalizing other requestors by very narrow requests. That is exactly what we mean by death by a thousand cuts and piecemeal litigation approach, and that is simply inconsistent with DC Circuit's decision in <u>Open America</u> and even after the congressional amendments to the FOIA statute in 1996.

25

THE COURT: Do we know when the State Department

1 is likely to have processed disk five?

2	MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: I am not personally familiar.
3	What I do know is that as I said in the next couple months
4	they will be done processing disk one, and the next step
5	would be to process disk four and disk five. And since the
6	State Department is processing these documents I'm at this
7	time not familiar with the information of where they stand
8	with respect to the next two disks.
9	THE COURT: And would the FBI be open somewhere
10	along the lines of what I was suggesting of negotiating a
11	resolution with Judicial Watch in a way in which third party
12	requestors wouldn't be penalized, but it might be possible
13	to move Judicial Watch's request to the FBI here up in the
14	queue through some negotiated agreement?
15	MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: I think your Honor we would be
16	open to hear what Judicial Watch has to say at least with
17	respect to the second part of the requests where FBI is
18	involved, yes.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20	MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: Thank you, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Bekesha, I don't know if you
22	wanted to respond to any of that?
23	MR. BEKESHA: May I have a moment, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Of course.
25	[Brief pause.]

1	MR. BEKESHA: Your Honor, the only concern we
2	still have is, you know, as the agency counsel said you know
3	the DC Circuit has come away you know <u>Open America</u> . They
4	could ask for an <u>Open America</u> stay in this case if they
5	don't think they have the capacity to respond to these FOIA
6	requests. They haven't done so. That's a legal mechanism,
7	that they could seek and get approval of this Court. If
8	they don't believe they can properly search and respond to
9	these FOIA requests then that's what they should do but they
10	haven't done so. And so again, we will go back and take a
11	look at what our other litigation is. We don't believe
12	there is much litigation against the FBI.
13	THE COURT: It's not really so much litigation I
14	think it's FOIA requests?
15	MR. BEKESHA: We have FOIA requests that are
16	pending probably for I want to say almost ten years with the
17	FBI.
18	THE COURT: Right. All I'm suggesting
19	MR. BEKESHA: And so I mean we have a lot of FOIA
20	requests, but you know, we don't even know if they're
21	processing most of our FOIA requests because we don't, no
22	one will talk to us until we sue. And so I mean one thing I
23	guess we would have to do is we could print out a list of
24	all our FOIA requests to the FBI for say the past ten years
25	that haven't been responded to, and ask the FBI which ones

1 are you actively responding to. I mean is that, that 2 doesn't seem to make sense either. I mean --

3 THE COURT: Why don't I do this, I can't really, I 4 don't have any -- I know even less about this than all of 5 you do about what requests are pending and what's being 6 worked on. Why don't I at least give you the opportunity to 7 go back and look at what you have, have a conversation with 8 Mr. Lopez-Morales to see if there's some accommodation that 9 can be reached. If there can't be we'll come back in a 10 couple of weeks and talk about what to do then and under those circumstances. 11

12 But I do think that sort of more generally and as 13 you probably gathered the Court's concern is just making 14 sure we're not giving preferences to one FOIA requestor over 15 another with respect to getting their responses and that 16 everyone is treated in an equal fashion with respect to the 17 expeditious handling. There are times in which expedition 18 is required. And if you were to come in and say here this 19 is actually something that's very pressing you know where 20 there's some world event that's getting ready to occur, we 21 need this information with respect to that world event. 2.2 That's one matter.

But I would need to have some reason to think well, we should put aside sort of the normal, treat everyone alike standard and have a different standard that would

apply here, so if you come back that's --1 MR. BEKESHA: Sure, but there is a strong public 2 3 interest in investigative materials. 4 THE COURT: I know there is. I think that's 5 probably what a big portion of what the FBI's backlog is 6 about. 7 MR. BEKESHA: Or if that's the case then the FBI 8 should follow what the State Department did which was add 9 additional people to conducting the reviews. 10 THE COURT: You know one of the things I'm not 11 sure that they can do that right now, you know. Maybe there 12 is some way to bring people over on detail, I don't know. 13 MR. BEKESHA: I mean what the State Department was 14 they didn't go out and hire new people. They brought people 15 over to detail to conduct reviews because they had numerous 16 court orders. Again, that would seem appropriate in a case 17 that the FBI hasn't sought in an Open America stay. They 18 haven't said that they can't process these FOIA requests. 19 Until they do so they have --20 THE COURT: Did the State Department seek a stay? 21 MR. BEKESHA: The State Department I don't believe 22 sought a stay. They just start hiring more, they had people 23 detailed and they start reviewing records, and were able to review at one point I think it was over 3,000 pages a month. 2.4 25 The FBI is only reviewing 500 pages a month.

THE COURT: My impression in this there is a 1 2 separate conversation we can take up next. My impression is 3 it's a fairly substantial staff already at the FBI that is 4 reviewing FOIA requests. I could be mistaken. I seem to 5 recall that from other cases and having looked at 6 declarations from the FBI with respect to their mechanisms. 7 I hear you and I understand your concern. Everyone wants to 8 get the records and I understand that you view this as sort 9 of a fairly targeted search they can respond to quickly. 10 Why don't we see if there is a way they can have a 11 conversation with government's counsel. You can work 12 something out. And if not, we can take it up next time. I 13 would say Mr. Lopez-Morales, next time I guess one question 14 I might have for you is if you're unable to work something 15 out is whether you have some sense of how much time it would 16 actually take the FBI to review and produce these files. 17 Are we're talking about something that is, you know, an hour 18 which seems improbable or is it something that is more 19 substantial than that. 20 Okay. Anything further today? 21 MR. BEKESHA: No, your Honor. 2.2 THE COURT: Okay. I'll set another status 23 conference in about two weeks from now. 24 MR. BEKESHA: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: We're done. 25

1	[Thereupon, the proceedings adjourned at 3:21
2	p.m.]
3	CERTIFICATE
4	I, Cathryn J. Jones, an Official Court Reporter
5	for the United States District Court of the District of
6	Columbia, do hereby certify that I reported, by machine
7	shorthand, the proceedings had and testimony adduced in the
8	above case.
9	I further certify that the foregoing 37 pages
10	constitute the official transcript of said proceedings as
11	transcribed from my machine shorthand notes.
12	In witness whereof, I have hereto subscribed my
13	name, this the 6th day of February, 2017.
14	
15	/s/_Cathryn J. Jones
16	Cathryn J. Jones, RPR Official Court Reporter
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	8	18/1 20/10 35/15 37/22
MR. BEKESHA: [43]	8,435 [1] 32/13	answer [3] 3/1 18/17 28/23
MR. LOPEZ-MORALES: [20] 2/9 3/9	800 [1] 1/13	any [16] 3/2 3/17 3/25 4/9 5/23 5/23
4/17 5/2 5/11 5/13 7/4 12/20 16/4		14/6 16/2 16/11 20/14 21/11 26/7 28/19 30/7 33/22 35/4
16/15 17/4 17/9 18/7 18/14 30/25 31/3	<u>A</u>	anybody [1] 25/19
31/12 33/1 33/14 33/19	able [4] 17/21 18/16 29/18 36/23	anything [13] 4/11 5/4 5/8 7/21 13/20
THE COURT: [62]	about [32] 3/2 3/4 3/7 5/22 7/8 7/12 8/5 9/10 9/11 12/15 19/10 19/19 20/4	13/22 13/25 14/10 14/17 15/20 25/13
THE DEPUTY CLERK: [1] 2/1	20/7 21/15 24/15 24/16 26/3 26/6	28/6 37/20
	26/21 27/20 27/21 29/4 30/10 30/24	APPEARANCES [1] 1/11
.x [1] 1/6	31/22 35/4 35/5 35/10 36/6 37/17	appeared [1] 8/24
	37/23	appears [1] 8/17
/	above [1] 38/8	applies [1] 14/22 apply [1] 36/1
/s [1] 38/15	abuse [1] 19/14	appreciate [2] 25/17 27/19
1	access [1] 4/22 accessible [1] 4/17	approach [4] 2/4 13/2 13/5 32/22
1,741 [1] 32/12	accommodation [1] 35/8	appropriate [1] 36/16
10 [1] 27/4	accordance [4] 5/7 6/23 13/16 32/2	approval [1] 34/7
10,000 [9] 8/1 8/9 8/10 8/14 8/21 8/23	accordingly [1] 6/25	approved [2] 5/20 14/23
8/23 9/24 24/12	Action [1] 2/2	are [75] aren't [1] 19/12
15 [1] 26/2	actively [1] 35/1	argue [1] 25/23
16-2046 [1] 5/18 16-2369 [2] 1/4 2/2	actually [4] 19/16 24/6 35/19 37/16	articulated [1] 31/24
1996 [1] 32/24	add [1] 36/8 additional [2] 17/19 36/9	as [35] 2/18 3/4 3/10 3/21 4/6 4/6 4/23
	address [1] 28/20	5/14 5/18 6/4 7/1 9/14 10/20 10/20
2	adduced [1] 38/7	10/24 11/21 11/21 13/3 13/3 13/19
20 [3] 1/16 8/3 17/12	adequacy [1] 16/18	13/22 17/16 18/7 19/4 19/21 27/24
20001 [1] 1/21	adjourned [1] 38/1	29/9 29/12 29/15 31/14 33/3 34/2 35/12 37/8 38/10
20024 [1] 1/13 2016 [2] 3/23 6/15	adopt [1] 17/1	aside [4] 23/5 26/13 26/13 35/24
2017 [2] 1/5 38/13	affect [1] 7/23 after [4] 18/25 19/3 25/14 32/23	ask [5] 17/24 18/1 21/3 34/4 34/25
2046 [1] 5/18	afternoon [4] 2/6 2/9 2/10 23/22	asked [8] 8/1 8/4 8/7 10/4 10/13 10/14
20530 [1] 1/17	again [7] 12/19 12/24 26/20 29/6	21/15 21/17
2369 [2] 1/4 2/2	32/18 34/10 36/16	asked for [1] 8/1
24 [7] 1/5 8/3 8/19 11/21 17/12 18/22	against [3] 5/17 27/12 34/12	asking [11] 2/20 7/21 7/24 15/12 24/14 25/19 25/20 25/21 27/4 30/9
22/22 26 [1] 3/24	agencies [4] 11/15 11/18 13/11 16/23	30/12
2:30 [1] 1/6	agency [24] 3/2 8/18 11/5 11/6 11/18 11/20 13/2 13/4 13/21 15/6 18/20	asks [2] 14/20 19/17
l	22/17 23/24 25/12 25/25 26/5 26/13	assessment [5] 29/3 30/12 30/19
3	27/15 27/22 27/23 29/7 30/15 30/16	30/24 31/8
3,000 [1] 36/24	34/2	assume [5] 11/16 20/2 20/3 22/8 22/10
302 [3] 6/5 15/22 16/10	agency's [1] 32/2	assuming [1] 20/1 attorney [1] 3/6
302s [7] 8/7 15/14 18/24 19/2 19/3 19/4 20/1	agree [1] 12/16	attorneys [1] 20/23
333 [1] 1/20	agreed [3] 3/21 5/19 7/14	available [6] 7/4 19/2 24/24 24/25
35 [20] 16/6 16/8 16/20 19/24 20/6	agreement [1] 33/14 ahead [2] 22/12 25/12	29/11 29/11
21/13 21/19 21/22 22/22 23/17 24/15	aided [1] 1/24	Avenue [2] 1/16 1/20
24/16 25/21 26/5 26/6 26/7 26/8 27/21	alike [1] 35/25	aware [1] 4/4
27/24 32/6 27 [2] 32/13 38/9	all [25] 2/20 6/12 7/1 8/3 8/10 10/11	away [4] 22/8 28/9 29/23 34/3
37 [2] 32/13 38/9 3:21 [1] 38/1	10/17 12/5 12/13 12/14 12/22 13/15	В
	15/25 19/2 19/14 22/4 22/6 22/18 22/23 24/14 24/16 29/14 34/18 34/24	back [16] 3/7 9/8 11/23 15/10 19/16
4	35/4	20/8 21/17 23/8 24/6 26/2 28/4 28/18
426 [1] 1/13	allocate [2] 16/23 31/25	34/10 35/7 35/9 36/1
5	allow [1] 15/4	backlog [1] 36/5 basis [1] 24/22
50 [1] 16/21	almost [3] 25/10 29/9 34/16	be [72]
500 [7] 5/20 6/17 7/10 8/1 14/24 17/12	along [4] 2/7 7/14 15/24 33/10 already [10] 4/10 6/11 8/11 8/11 17/15	because [28] 11/2 11/5 11/10 13/6
36/25	19/6 24/24 24/25 25/1 37/3	13/13 16/18 19/4 21/24 22/9 22/23
6	also [8] 2/13 4/20 6/6 6/20 7/3 7/19 9/4	22/25 23/6 23/10 23/15 24/7 24/13
6521 [1] 1/20	10/13	24/21 24/25 26/1 27/11 28/3 29/10 29/10 29/15 30/15 30/21 34/21 36/15
6th [2] 6/14 38/13	although [1] 29/17	been [20] 3/1 4/2 4/7 4/7 4/9 6/13 6/25
	am [1] 33/2	10/16 11/8 13/4 13/22 13/23 15/2
7	amendments [1] 32/24 America [4] 32/23 34/3 34/4 36/17	17/15 24/25 25/3 27/13 29/3 32/3
70 [2] 23/20 23/21	announced [1] 18/25	34/25
	another [9] 5/16 10/21 11/6 15/2 17/23	before [13] 1/9 5/16 6/9 6/10 6/22 7/10

B	Circuit [2] 32/4 34/3	court [15] 1/1 1/19 1/19 1/20 11/7 14/
before [7] 7/20 12/16 12/25 15/15	Circuit's [1] 32/22	23/4 26/13 27/6 31/22 34/7 36/16 38/4
18/12 21/9 31/20	circumstance [1] 27/18	38/5 38/16
beginning [1] 4/3	circumstances [1] 35/11	Court's [2] 27/19 35/13
behalf [4] 2/7 2/11 22/1 24/10	Civil [1] 2/2	cover [1] 4/24
being [14] 3/20 3/23 4/19 7/3 7/11	clearly [2] 14/20 23/15	covered [1] 11/12
10/17 14/8 14/12 15/6 27/9 28/24 29/9	client [1] 17/7 Clinton [13] 5/21 6/4 6/13 6/17 6/21	create [2] 15/19 20/7 creates [1] 15/1
29/24 35/5	7/25 9/4 9/8 13/11 15/3 15/7 17/13	current [1] 21/2
Bekesha [6] 1/12 2/7 2/9 2/15 7/6	25/18	currently [3] 14/12 19/18 21/2
33/21	Clinton's [1] 2/23	cuts [2] 13/1 32/21
believe [7] 10/7 19/1 29/3 30/14 34/8	collected [3] 2/22 9/4 9/7	CV [1] 1/4
34/11 36/21	collection [1] 2/25	
Berman [1] 2/13	COLUMBIA [2] 1/2 38/6	D
best [1] 28/1	come [12] 3/7 19/7 22/8 22/9 24/2	D.C [2] 1/5 1/21
better [3] 20/19 30/19 30/22	24/5 26/2 26/12 34/3 35/9 35/18 36/1	data [2] 32/10 32/13
between [3] 6/7 6/7 8/3	Comey [1] 18/25	database [3] 8/12 9/13 12/7
beyond [1] 12/8	comfortable [1] 25/24	date [1] 10/15
big [1] 36/5 binding [1] 31/9	coming [2] 23/5 23/11	Datto [38] 2/21 4/8 4/11 6/1 8/5 8/14
Blackberries [1] 9/4	comment [1] 17/20	8/17 8/24 8/25 9/6 9/12 9/18 10/5
Blackberry [1] 10/14	commitment [1] 6/11	10/12 12/5 12/9 12/11 12/11 12/14
both [1] 13/11	committee [1] 19/1	14/10 14/15 14/16 14/18 14/25 15/13
Branch [1] 1/16	communications [3] 6/7 8/8 18/25	15/23 15/24 16/4 16/8 16/14 17/2
brief [4] 17/9 26/8 31/3 33/25	company [1] 9/7	17/14 19/8 25/9 32/10 32/11 32/12
briefly [2] 3/4 7/7	complete [1] 27/17	32/14
bring [1] 36/12	complex [5] 6/16 6/24 23/14 23/15	day [4] 26/19 29/18 29/22 38/13
broad [5] 17/22 18/9 18/11 22/18	32/2	DC [5] 1/13 1/17 32/4 32/22 34/3
23/15	complicated [2] 24/13 26/1	DC Circuit [2] 32/4 34/3
broader [5] 17/19 18/5 23/3 23/6	computer [1] 1/24	DC Circuit's [1] 32/22
23/10	computer-aided [1] 1/24	DDC [1] 32/4
brought [3] 11/9 27/8 36/14	concedes [1] 27/7	deals [1] 28/21
burden [1] 28/2	concern [5] 16/19 19/19 34/1 35/13	dealt [1] 11/2
button [1] 19/23	37/7	death [2] 13/1 32/21
^	concerns [1] 27/20	decide [2] 17/25 22/7 deciding [2] 21/9 29/7
C	concludes [1] 11/14 conduct [3] 25/11 25/13 36/15	decision [3] 7/18 22/9 32/23
calendar [1] 30/4	conducted [2] 9/23 27/10	declarations [1] 37/6
came [1] 21/17	conducting [2] 9/2 36/9	defendant [4] 1/6 1/15 2/11 11/19
can [29] 8/12 8/16 12/16 17/6 21/5	confer [3] 8/16 17/6 28/12	delayed [2] 23/10 27/9
22/14 23/19 24/18 25/14 25/23 26/2	conference [5] 1/8 7/12 28/14 28/16	department [57]
26/2 26/22 28/12 28/13 28/16 28/17 28/18 28/18 20/21 22/16 24/8 25/0	37/23	depending [2] 7/18 21/9
28/18 28/18 29/21 32/16 34/8 35/9	Congress [2] 19/3 19/5	depends [1] 10/21
36/11 37/2 37/9 37/10 37/11 37/12	congressional [1] 32/23	described [1] 30/24
can't [4] 31/15 35/3 35/9 36/18 capacity [1] 34/5	constitute [1] 38/10	despite [1] 18/11
case [27] 3/21 4/4 5/18 6/5 6/19 8/6	Constitution [1] 1/20	detail [2] 36/12 36/15
8/13 10/1 10/8 10/16 10/18 10/20	contain [1] 32/11	detailed [1] 36/23
10/21 11/3 11/15 11/19 13/17 14/5	contains [2] 32/12 32/12	determine [1] 11/1
14/11 15/15 20/18 22/14 24/12 34/4	content [2] 9/14 15/20	device [21] 2/21 2/25 4/8 4/11 6/1 8/5
36/7 36/16 38/8	continue [4] 6/15 6/17 10/19 15/4	9/1 9/6 9/11 10/5 10/12 12/5 12/9
cases [8] 20/19 20/20 20/23 23/2	contract [1] 9/8	12/11 12/11 12/14 14/10 14/16 16/4
26/11 27/7 28/4 37/5	conversation [3] 35/7 37/2 37/11	17/2 19/8
categories [1] 15/21	correct [1] 14/19	devices [3] 2/22 9/5 9/7
Cathryn [4] 1/19 38/4 38/15 38/16	correspondence [3] 6/6 15/14 16/11	devote [1] 28/10
CERTIFICATE [1] 38/3	could [24] 4/7 8/22 9/22 10/1 14/25	did [7] 9/10 12/22 14/5 16/5 23/8 36/8
certify [2] 38/6 38/9	15/13 16/8 16/20 16/21 17/14 17/16	36/20
Cesar [2] 1/15 2/11	20/13 23/9 23/20 23/21 25/8 26/24	didn't [4] 7/19 18/23 21/16 36/14
cetera [1] 6/8	27/16 31/18 31/19 34/4 34/7 34/23	different [9] 3/15 7/21 7/24 8/8 15/17
changes [1] 7/22	37/4	20/23 23/14 27/12 35/25
chaotic [1] 16/22	couldn't [1] 18/21	difficult [2] 8/8 9/19
characterization [1] 7/9	counsel [19] 2/3 2/8 3/3 3/11 3/17	directed [1] 20/20
check [1] 28/14	5/15 7/19 9/22 10/4 11/11 14/3 15/19	Director [1] 18/25
choose [1] 29/7	17/11 19/10 21/14 31/21 32/19 34/2	disagree [1] 7/9
Christian [1] 2/14	37/11	discovered [1] 2/20
Chutkan [13] 5/16 5/19 5/19 6/5 7/10	counsel's [1] 2/12	discovering [1] 6/1
	couple [5] 14/13 25/14 28/25 33/3	discrete [1] 24/15
7/14 7/17 7/22 8/6 12/25 13/5 14/23		
7/14 7/17 7/22 8/6 12/25 13/5 14/23 15/15 Chutkan's [1] 6/15	35/10 course [1] 33/24	discuss [2] 8/16 25/14 discussed [2] 5/15 5/18

D	equal [1] 35/16	follow [1] 36/8
	equally [1] 31/11	foregoing [1] 38/9
discussing [1] 28/11	equitable [2] 16/24 31/25	forgot [1] 6/20
discussion [2] 7/13 22/5 disk [29] 10/10 12/7 12/13 14/11 14/14	equity [1] 20/7	Form [1] 8/7
14/15 14/16 14/16 29/2 29/3 29/4 29/5	Esquire [2] 1/12 1/15	formal [1] 3/3
29/5 29/6 30/13 31/5 31/8 31/11 31/11	estimates [2] 31/17 32/15	former [1] 9/5
31/14 31/17 31/19 32/10 32/11 32/16	et [1] 6/8	forming [1] 4/4
33/1 33/4 33/5 33/5	even [9] 3/13 6/10 8/24 12/16 20/6	forms [4] 6/6 15/14 15/22 16/10
disks [6] 10/7 10/12 10/13 11/22 12/22	30/1 32/23 34/20 35/4	forward [1] 28/10
33/8	event [2] 35/20 35/21	found [6] 2/21 12/11 14/2 16/6 18/21
distinct [1] 9/1	every [3] 25/8 25/8 27/11	19/7
distinction [1] 15/19	everybody [1] 29/24	four [2] 14/15 33/5
DISTRICT [6] 1/1 1/2 1/10 1/20 38/5	everyone [4] 16/25 35/16 35/24 37/7	Friday [1] 6/14
38/5		front [1] 8/6
do [49]	11/12 12/10 12/10 27/17	full [2] 8/9 8/22
Docket [2] 1/4 3/24	exactly [2] 5/12 32/20	further [3] 16/20 37/20 38/9
document [3] 16/12 24/23 24/23	example [1] 15/11	G
documents [30] 8/7 15/20 15/22 16/6	exempted [1] 14/18	
16/8 16/21 17/14 17/17 18/7 18/11	exemption [1] 5/9	gather [1] 23/20
19/24 20/6 21/14 21/19 21/21 21/22	exemptions [2] 20/1 29/20	gathered [2] 9/3 35/13
22/23 23/18 23/18 24/16 24/16 25/1	exist [1] 25/6	generally [2] 4/17 35/12 generate [1] 19/24
25/22 26/25 27/4 31/18 32/6 32/12	exists [3] 10/5 10/22 12/16 expedite [2] 17/2 18/7	get [20] 11/5 11/9 11/18 14/17 15/25
32/13 33/6	expedite [2] 17/2 18/7 expedition [2] 14/5 35/17	17/23 17/24 18/21 19/12 19/16 19/21
does [11] 4/24 5/1 11/7 11/14 12/14	expeditions [1] 35/17	20/8 22/4 22/11 23/4 23/10 24/22
13/14 15/18 17/18 18/13 20/7 27/8	explain [1] 3/6	29/22 34/7 37/8
doesn't [6] 15/24 22/15 25/12 27/14	extent [5] 5/23 15/11 16/10 16/11 29/2	
28/20 35/2	extra [1] 22/11	give [4] 17/6 18/15 21/14 35/6
doing [12] 6/13 13/4 13/22 13/24 15/2		given [1] 11/8
18/5 19/6 21/25 22/1 24/11 30/7 30/8	F	giving [1] 35/14
don't [36] 2/15 4/9 10/4 16/15 17/1	fact [3] 18/4 23/8 25/17	go [12] 7/14 8/20 20/2 24/2 24/3 25/12
17/5 18/8 18/18 20/22 21/1 21/2 21/22 21/22 22/11 23/18 25/3 26/12 26/20	fair [6] 7/17 9/17 9/20 12/17 29/15	28/4 28/18 29/18 34/10 35/7 36/14
26/25 29/1 29/3 29/7 29/22 31/13	29/24	goes [4] 7/2 7/19 12/8 22/7
33/21 34/5 34/8 34/11 34/20 34/21	fairly [2] 37/3 37/9	going [26] 11/2 11/9 11/21 14/17
35/3 35/4 35/6 36/12 36/21 37/10	familiar [4] 3/21 5/15 33/2 33/7	15/25 17/24 18/1 18/21 19/2 19/5
done [10] 14/13 22/14 23/17 25/15	fashion [3] 25/22 25/23 35/16	19/17 19/20 21/25 22/2 22/10 23/4
28/25 29/22 33/4 34/6 34/10 37/25	favor [1] 15/5	23/5 23/11 24/4 26/21 26/22 26/23
down [1] 26/18	FBI [54]	27/1 28/7 29/5 29/6
drop [1] 21/25	FBI's [7] 5/25 6/2 6/2 14/24 15/12 30/16 36/5	gone [1] 30/3 good [5] 2/6 2/9 2/10 3/8 28/23
during [2] 2/22 18/25	February [1] 38/13	got [5] 2/24 23/2 23/12 28/3 28/22
E	Federal [1] 1/16	29/24 30/4
	Fenton [1] 2/8	governed [1] 3/20
each [3] 3/13 3/15 7/11	few [1] 21/21	government [4] 8/2 8/13 9/5 9/12
easier [1] 15/21	figure [4] 8/21 9/19 16/23 24/3	government's [2] 3/5 37/11
easily [1] 18/16	figuring [2] 11/25 22/2	groups [1] 18/11
easy [2] 9/21 10/1	file [26] 6/3 6/4 6/13 6/18 6/22 7/1 7/25	guarantees [1] 13/2
ed [1] 25/9 effectively [2] 16/24 31/25	8/20 9/12 12/15 13/6 13/11 13/14 15/3	guess [3] 25/7 34/23 37/13
efficient [1] 24/11	15/7 15/10 15/23 16/7 16/7 17/13 24/2	Н
efforts [2] 5/25 15/13	24/12 24/14 25/15 25/18 25/21	
either [2] 14/2 35/2	filed [10] 3/1 4/3 5/17 6/9 6/10 6/23	had [12] 2/19 6/10 6/23 7/12 8/6 9/7
electronic [3] 4/19 5/11 8/12	7/11 18/10 18/11 18/12	18/12 21/15 21/18 36/15 36/22 38/7
electronically [1] 25/9	files [3] 5/21 29/19 37/16	half [1] 20/5
Ellis [1] 2/14	filing [3] 15/2 18/20 18/22	hand [1] 19/24
else [3] 9/1 25/19 27/16	finally [1] 21/13	handle [4] 6/11 11/16 16/24 20/23 handling [4] 4/21 20/18 20/18 35/17
email [1] 2/23	find [2] 25/13 29/18 fine [1] 21/5	happen [1] 18/23
emails [5] 10/14 10/16 10/18 14/20	first [29] 3/16 3/25 6/24 6/24 7/8 7/9	happens [1] 11/22
14/21	8/13 10/3 10/10 12/4 12/21 13/3 13/4	happy [5] 16/14 16/16 20/11 27/25
emphasize [3] 5/22 32/15 32/18	13/18 19/25 21/16 22/7 23/7 23/12	28/8
encompass [1] 5/1	24/23 28/21 28/22 28/24 30/2 30/6	harass [1] 18/20
encompassing [1] 17/20	30/11 32/3 32/3 32/11	has [34] 3/1 4/2 4/9 6/3 6/13 6/20 7/1
end [2] 21/11 26/4	five [19] 14/15 14/16 29/2 29/3 29/4	7/14 8/2 10/16 11/10 11/12 12/24 13/4
ensure [2] 10/17 12/1 enter [1] 27/6	29/5 29/6 30/13 31/5 31/8 31/11 31/11	13/6 13/7 13/13 13/22 13/23 14/4 15/2
entire [7] 8/19 9/11 15/23 17/13 24/12	31/14 31/19 32/10 32/11 32/16 33/1	19/10 19/22 19/25 26/15 27/8 28/3
24/13 26/5	33/5	29/16 30/3 30/20 32/3 32/5 33/16 34/3
entitled [1] 32/1	FOIA [42]	hasn't [3] 20/13 23/24 36/17

Н	indicated [1] 16/13	larger [1] 18/20
have [72]	individuals [1] 18/12 inefficient [1] 16/22	last [6] 6/14 10/24 12/25 24/23 27/15 29/6
haven't [6] 23/25 25/19 34/6 34/10	information [17] 6/1 9/8 14/3 14/15	later [1] 17/25
34/25 36/18	17/5 18/9 19/13 21/15 21/16 21/19	laws [1] 29/10
having [1] 37/5	29/4 29/11 31/14 31/21 32/16 33/7	lawsuit [7] 5/16 6/10 13/7 13/14 15/2
he [6] 19/2 21/15 21/16 21/16 21/17 21/18	35/21	27/12 27/12
head [1] 20/22	informed [2] 3/16 6/4	lawsuits [3] 11/8 16/20 27/23
hear [3] 12/19 33/16 37/7	initial [1] 29/19	lawyers [1] 20/18
heard [1] 21/13	instance [3] 8/10 15/2 16/19	layer [1] 19/25
heavily [1] 5/15	instances [1] 8/21	layers [2] 21/20 26/2
helpful [1] 12/6	instead [4] 8/18 15/22 22/23 28/10	least [3] 6/21 33/16 35/6 leave [1] 7/21
her [1] 7/18	interest [2] 28/1 36/3 interested [2] 4/8 19/8	left [1] 27/14
here [18] 7/25 18/5 18/19 18/19 20/4	interferes [2] 17/21 18/2	legal [1] 34/6
20/25 21/13 22/4 22/6 22/13 23/16	interfering [1] 20/15	Leopold [17] 3/21 4/4 4/14 5/1 5/6
24/2 24/14 25/21 29/12 33/13 35/18 36/1	Internet [1] 4/16	10/8 10/16 10/18 10/20 13/17 13/19
hereby [1] 38/6	interpretation [2] 9/17 9/17	13/21 14/11 14/19 14/20 17/17 22/5
hereto [1] 38/12	investigation [2] 2/23 9/3	Leopold's [3] 4/16 4/20 13/24
Hillary [1] 25/18	investigative [16] 5/21 6/2 6/4 6/13	less [2] 19/21 35/4
hire [1] 36/14	6/18 6/22 7/25 8/20 9/11 13/11 15/3	let [8] 2/16 3/2 12/19 19/23 21/3 26/6
hiring [1] 36/22	15/7 17/13 24/14 25/18 36/3 involve [2] 20/4 20/6	28/2 28/2 let's [6] 17/23 17/25 22/4 22/7 22/9
his [1] 19/1	involved [1] 33/18	30/23
hit [1] 26/1	is [149]	lets [1] 9/13
hits [1] 9/13	isn't [6] 18/19 19/9 19/13 25/15 30/1	level [2] 20/3 29/20
hold [2] 20/12 21/5	30/7	library [4] 4/19 5/10 5/11 25/5
honestly [1] 9/20 Honor [34] 2/6 2/10 3/10 4/18 5/3 5/12	issue [4] 5/16 20/7 24/15 26/8	like [4] 15/22 17/23 28/23 29/4
7/5 7/7 7/25 9/16 12/21 14/23 16/1	issues [1] 24/15	likely [1] 33/1
16/5 16/19 17/6 17/10 18/8 18/18 21/7	it [85]	limited [3] 8/4 14/20 29/16
21/16 26/24 27/11 28/17 30/25 31/1	it's [36] 4/15 5/6 7/17 9/16 10/8 11/13	line [2] 13/8 14/4
31/4 31/20 33/15 33/20 33/23 34/1	11/14 11/21 12/10 13/1 16/9 19/22	lines [1] 33/10
37/21 37/24	20/6 21/19 22/13 23/10 23/16 23/16 24/4 24/13 24/21 24/25 25/7 25/9 25/9	list [3] 21/1 21/2 34/23 litigated [4] 5/15 6/18 7/10 7/17
HONORABLE [1] 1/9	26/22 26/23 27/1 28/1 29/12 29/14	litigation [7] 13/2 21/2 21/11 32/21
hoping [1] 9/22	32/5 32/6 34/13 34/14 37/3	34/11 34/12 34/13
hour [3] 20/5 26/22 37/17	its [7] 2/22 6/11 9/2 13/7 13/8 27/8	little [1] 8/1
hours [7] 20/5 20/6 24/6 24/7 26/19 26/23 27/1	32/5	live [3] 9/14 16/14 26/11
House [2] 6/8 19/1	J	located [3] 3/18 12/23 13/25
how [18] 4/22 7/18 8/15 9/1 9/13 11/2		location [1] 3/14
11/20 12/15 17/2 22/21 23/18 24/3	January [3] 1/5 4/3 6/14 Jones [4] 1/19 38/4 38/15 38/16	log [1] 29/21
24/6 25/15 26/20 29/2 29/7 37/15	JUDGE [16] 1/9 1/10 5/16 5/19 5/19	logistics [1] 12/1 long [6] 6/9 6/22 11/21 17/2 21/23
However [1] 30/16	6/4 6/15 7/10 7/14 7/17 7/22 8/6 12/25	26/20
hundreds [4] 4/21 6/3 13/12 14/7	13/5 14/23 15/15	look [13] 12/22 16/5 17/14 18/23 21/8
1	judges [1] 23/3	23/19 23/20 25/8 27/25 28/5 28/18
 	judgment [1] 21/9	34/11 35/7
I'm [13] 5/3 7/24 17/20 18/19 20/1	JUDICIAL [55]	looked [2] 10/17 37/5
22/20 23/23 24/20 26/15 30/9 33/6	jumping [1] 19/19	looking [2] 9/9 15/22
34/18 36/10	jumps [1] 22/12	looks [2] 3/4 21/5
l've [1] 23/12	just [37] 2/16 4/20 7/21 9/12 10/14 10/18 11/8 11/25 13/5 13/13 14/18	Lopez [8] 1/15 2/11 3/9 12/20 28/12
I-messages [1] 10/15	16/14 16/20 16/22 18/2 18/6 18/23	30/23 35/8 37/13 Lopez-Morales [6] 1/15 2/11 28/12
idea [1] 7/10	19/12 19/23 21/1 22/9 23/11 24/11	30/23 35/8 37/13
identified [6] 14/6 14/8 20/14 23/17	25/21 27/16 27/20 28/14 28/14 29/4	lost [2] 11/5 11/9
25/19 26/16 identify [5] 2/4 13/18 25/3 26/5 27/23	29/14 29/17 29/24 30/24 31/20 32/18	lot [7] 23/15 24/7 25/17 28/3 28/4
important [1] 22/13	35/13 36/22	28/17 34/19
impression [2] 37/1 37/2	JUSTICE [14] 1/5 1/15 2/3 2/12 2/13	M
improbable [1] 37/18	3/22 4/2 5/17 7/16 8/2 11/3 11/20	
incentive [1] 15/1	11/23 11/25	machine [3] 1/24 38/6 38/11
incentivize [1] 16/20	К	made [1] 21/9 make [7] 3/5 15/18 19/2 21/12 27/14
inclination [1] 13/13	key [3] 8/12 23/16 24/19	29/11 35/2
included [1] 12/12	know [55]	makes [3] 8/17 10/19 12/17
including [2] 16/7 17/15		making [2] 29/14 35/13
inclusive [5] 16/9 16/9 16/15 16/17 16/17		manner [3] 16/24 24/11 32/1
inconsistent [1] 32/22	laptops [1] 9/3	many [7] 8/15 9/13 20/6 23/18 24/6

м	N
many [2] 26/19 29/2	N.W [1] 1/20
Marcy [1] 2/13	name [2] 2/11 38/13
Massachusetts [1] 1/16	narrow [3] 22/17 22/24 32/20
material [8] 8/3 8/10 10/11 10/15	narrower [4] 23/7 23/12 26/14 27/9
11/23 12/12 15/13 30/18	need [12] 8/20 12/15 20/2 22/3 22/3
materials [24] 3/18 3/22 4/1 4/12 4/15 5/5 10/5 10/6 10/22 10/22 10/25 12/5	22/12 24/2 24/3 24/21 26/2 35/21 35/23
12/14 13/10 14/1 14/9 14/16 14/18	negotiated [1] 33/14
28/24 31/5 32/7 32/11 32/14 36/3	negotiating [1] 33/10
matter [4] 19/22 29/17 32/5 35/22	new [1] 36/14
may [21] 4/3 4/25 7/17 8/8 8/8 9/25	next [8] 14/13 28/25 33/3 33/4 33/8
10/25 11/5 11/13 12/12 12/17 18/16	37/2 37/12 37/13
20/18 21/12 21/20 21/21 21/23 23/10 24/22 29/17 33/23	nine [1] 6/21 no [7] 1/4 3/1 3/3 12/10 27/11 34/21
maybe [5] 4/25 9/22 29/21 30/9 36/11	37/21
me [15] 2/7 2/12 2/16 3/3 3/6 4/14	nonexempt [3] 6/12 7/1 13/25
12/19 17/6 18/15 19/23 21/3 22/10	normal [1] 35/24
28/2 28/2 31/4	not [56]
mean [15] 9/24 11/25 12/15 15/24	note [1] 10/24
18/18 20/17 25/10 26/8 26/21 32/21	notes [1] 38/11
34/19 34/22 35/1 35/2 36/13 mechanism [1] 34/6	nothing [1] 12/1 now [18] 10/8 12/1 15/6 16/21 18/1
mechanisms [1] 37/6	18/14 18/22 20/17 21/14 23/2 24/23
meet [2] 8/16 28/11	25/23 27/19 27/20 28/14 32/6 36/11
mention [3] 6/20 21/17 31/20	37/23
mentioned [2] 3/11 17/11	number [15] 5/2 5/9 5/13 5/14 5/18
mentioning [1] 15/19	9/23 11/8 16/3 17/3 30/4 31/15 31/18
merit [1] 13/14 message [1] 10/15	31/23 32/4 32/9 numbers [1] 4/9
messages [2] 10/14 10/15	numerous [1] 36/15
messy [1] 15/16	NW [1] 1/16
Michael [2] 1/12 2/6	0
might [2] 33/12 37/14	
mine [4] 22/11 23/6 23/6 23/7	object [1] 27/8 obligation [2] 24/10 25/10
minimum [1] 25/2 minute [1] 17/6	obviously [1] 13/6
mistaken [1] 37/4	occur [1] 35/20
moment [1] 33/23	OCR [2] 25/7 25/9
month [12] 5/20 6/17 7/11 8/2 14/24	OCR-ed [1] 25/9
17/13 25/24 27/4 27/14 27/15 36/24 36/25	October [4] 2/19 3/12 3/23 19/7 off [2] 7/20 20/22
months [11] 6/14 8/3 8/19 11/21 14/14	
17/12 18/22 22/22 25/25 28/25 33/3	official [5] 1/19 3/3 38/4 38/10 38/16
Morales [8] 1/15 2/11 3/9 12/20 28/12	officials [2] 6/7 9/6
30/23 35/8 37/13	oh [1] 24/18
more [19] 3/5 10/13 12/15 17/18 17/19 18/16 18/22 19/19 20/16 22/3 23/7	окау [9] 3/8 4/24 5/8 10/2 22/7 28/13 33/19 37/20 37/22
23/15 26/1 26/14 27/9 29/4 35/12	once [2] 12/24 27/16
36/22 37/18	one [40]
MOSS [1] 1/9	ones [3] 17/15 26/14 34/25
most [1] 34/21	online [2] 8/11 8/11
move [2] 7/20 33/13	only [9] 8/5 8/17 9/25 10/16 13/24
moving [1] 28/10 Mr [9] 2/9 2/15 7/6 13/24 28/12 30/23	26/19 30/21 34/1 36/25 open [6] 32/23 33/9 33/16 34/3 34/4
33/21 35/8 37/13	36/17
Mr. [5] 3/9 4/20 12/20 13/21 22/5	opportunity [2] 21/8 35/6
Mr. Leopold [2] 13/21 22/5	opposing [8] 3/10 3/17 5/14 14/3
Mr. Leopold's [1] 4/20	15/19 17/11 31/21 32/19 order [7] 3/23 6/16 13/17 14/11 22/9
Mr. Lopez-Morales [2] 3/9 12/20 much [5] 23/20 24/4 34/12 34/13	24/5 27/6
37/15	orderly [1] 18/3
multitracking [1] 13/3	orders [1] 36/16
my [13] 2/10 10/8 17/6 18/4 20/9 20/22	other [35] 9/5 9/5 13/15 14/7 14/21
23/12 27/5 30/4 37/1 37/2 38/11 38/12	16/11 18/11 18/13 19/11 19/17 20/8 20/14 20/17 20/18 20/20 21/4 21/10
	20/14/20/17/20/18/20/20/21/4/21/10

23/4 26/11 26/11 26/17 27/7 27/23 28/9 28/19 32/19 34/11 37/5 our [19] 2/21 3/12 5/20 6/16 6/23 8/13 9/17 10/13 14/3 16/1 16/19 21/2 21/8 21/9 28/1 31/23 34/11 34/21 34/24 out [30] 6/24 8/9 8/21 9/19 10/13 11/13 11/17 11/21 11/25 13/4 15/7 15/9 15/18 15/21 16/23 18/21 19/7 19/20 21/14 22/2 23/2 24/3 24/5 28/1 28/13 32/3 34/23 36/14 37/12 37/15 over [10] 8/1 13/15 14/7 16/9 16/17 27/3 35/14 36/12 36/15 36/24 overwhelming [1] 30/4 own [3] 25/11 25/13 30/4 Ρ p.m [2] 1/6 38/2 pace [1] 17/12 page [3] 14/24 25/8 25/8 pages [25] 5/20 6/17 7/10 8/1 8/2 8/9 8/11 8/14 8/15 8/17 8/18 8/22 8/22 8/23 9/24 17/12 23/18 23/21 23/21 24/12 26/5 26/6 36/24 36/25 38/9 part [23] 2/24 3/13 3/15 3/16 3/18 3/25 4/1 4/6 4/6 5/22 5/24 7/8 8/14 9/9 10/3 14/22 15/12 28/21 28/22 30/6 30/10 30/11 33/17 partial [1] 28/22 particular [1] 22/13 parties [3] 9/5 19/20 28/12 parts [4] 2/19 3/11 8/23 17/22 party [5] 11/15 11/17 11/18 13/20 33/11 past [2] 19/10 34/24 pause [3] 17/9 31/3 33/25 penalize [1] 22/15 penalized [1] 33/12 penalizing [2] 22/16 32/19 pending [11] 17/19 18/14 20/20 21/10 28/4 28/4 28/5 28/6 29/25 34/16 35/5 people [6] 23/11 36/9 36/12 36/14 36/14 36/22 people's [1] 20/8 per [3] 5/20 14/24 17/12 percentage [2] 31/10 31/15 perhaps [1] 29/18 period [3] 23/22 25/24 27/3 personally [1] 33/2 pick [1] 27/16 piecemeal [2] 13/1 32/21 piggyback [1] 19/5 place [3] 12/1 12/6 13/16 plaintiff [6] 1/3 1/12 4/8 6/9 6/23 17/14 plaintiff's [1] 31/16 plaintiffs [2] 16/13 31/10 plays [1] 11/21 please [1] 2/4 plus [1] 8/21 podium [1] 2/4 point [5] 10/24 20/11 31/12 32/17 36/24 policy [5] 6/16 6/24 6/25 13/4 32/3 portion [2] 28/23 36/5 portions [2] 6/12 7/1 posed [1] 19/15 position [14] 3/6 3/13 11/18 12/24 14/4 16/1 20/10 22/25 23/1 23/2 30/16

Р	put [7] 20/11 21/5 22/25 23/1 23/5	resolution [1] 33/11
position [3] 30/19 30/22 31/23	28/2 35/24	resources [7] 13/14 15/5 16/23 28/8
positions [1] 7/12	putting [3] 25/10 26/13 26/13	28/9 29/16 31/25
possession [1] 6/2	Q	respect [21] 3/13 3/15 3/16 9/10 10/3
possible [1] 33/12	quantity [1] 16/2	13/7 13/9 13/11 13/24 29/20 30/6
posted [3] 5/10 8/11 10/15	quantity [1] 16/2 question [15] 5/9 10/11 18/4 18/17	30/11 31/8 32/7 32/9 33/8 33/17 35/15 35/16 35/21 37/6
posting [1] 4/15	19/15 19/16 20/9 21/3 22/2 27/5 29/13	respond [8] 11/6 17/3 24/4 31/5 33/22
potential [3] 11/4 12/23 15/25	29/14 29/24 31/7 37/13	34/5 34/8 37/9
potentially [4] 8/15 21/7 31/18 32/14	queue [5] 19/19 22/12 24/5 32/3 33/14	
precisely [1] 15/1	queues [1] 13/3	responding [2] 17/20 35/1
prefer [1] 21/4	quickly [2] 19/21 37/9	response [5] 3/1 3/3 4/16 10/20 24/17
preferences [1] 35/14	quite [1] 9/20	responses [1] 35/15
preferential [1] 13/14		responsive [20] 3/2 3/14 3/17 3/25
preferred [1] 22/18 prepare [1] 29/21	R	4/23 5/4 5/6 5/8 5/24 8/15 9/19 12/23
prepared [2] 26/10 27/6	ran [1] 16/6	13/19 13/23 15/25 31/16 31/18 31/23
president [2] 2/8 20/24	RANDOLPH [1] 1/9	32/9 32/14
press [1] 24/3	RDM [1] 1/4	result [1] 19/21
pressing [3] 19/19 22/3 35/19	reached [1] 35/9	retrieved [6] 2/21 4/7 4/11 14/10 14/21
presumably [2] 19/25 29/21	read [1] 25/8 ready [1] 35/20	32/13
presumedly [2] 11/10 11/17	reallocate [1] 15/5	retrieving [2] 5/25 15/13
presumption [1] 27/2	really [6] 10/21 15/18 15/24 20/9 34/13	review [13] 8/18 11/14 11/24 19/25
preventing [1] 27/24	35/3	29/20 36/24 37/16
print [1] 34/23	reason [4] 19/15 22/13 22/13 35/23	reviewed [2] 23/21 25/22
prioritized [1] 14/7	reasonable [4] 9/17 27/2 27/3 31/24	reviewing [5] 10/25 27/24 36/23 36/25
probably [8] 3/5 22/8 23/22 24/24	reasons [2] 14/6 19/11	37/4
28/17 34/16 35/13 36/5	recall [1] 37/5	reviews [2] 36/9 36/15
problem [4] 9/25 12/23 21/24 26/12 proceed [1] 14/14	received [5] 6/3 6/21 6/22 13/12 30/15	right [15] 10/8 11/19 12/9 13/6 15/6
proceedings [4] 1/24 38/1 38/7 38/10	receiving [1] 6/12	16/16 18/14 20/17 20/25 26/19 27/20
process [20] 3/4 6/17 7/2 11/10 11/22	recent [1] 15/8	29/1 31/6 34/18 36/11
13/16 15/5 15/6 15/9 16/22 17/1 17/11	record [2] 2/5 14/19	robust [1] 22/5
17/21 21/11 24/10 29/5 29/8 29/25	recorded [1] 1/24 records [62]	rolling [1] 24/22
33/5 36/18	recovered [2] 4/11 12/5	room [3] 1/20 22/4 22/6 rough [2] 31/17 32/15
processed [7] 3/23 5/7 7/3 13/20	recovering [1] 5/25	RPR [2] 1/19 38/16
14/12 29/6 33/1	redact [1] 20/2	run [3] 14/25 21/18 23/16
processing [22] 3/19 4/2 5/7 5/20 6/25	reevaluate [1] 7/18	
10/9 10/20 13/3 14/14 15/17 19/4 19/18 20/15 22/21 24/12 25/15 25/25	references [1] 15/23	S
30/1 32/2 33/4 33/6 34/21	referred [1] 30/17	said [11] 6/9 8/3 13/20 14/8 22/6 27/25
produce [2] 8/18 37/16	regardless [1] 5/5	31/21 33/3 34/2 36/18 38/10
produced [7] 1/24 7/11 8/4 10/17	rejected [2] 13/1 13/5	same [3] 13/12 14/22 32/6
24/22 25/3 25/22	relate [1] 16/3	say [15] 3/3 7/17 7/19 17/22 20/11
producing [4] 25/1 26/17 27/13 29/16	related [2] 2/24 2/25 relates [1] 5/24	21/4 22/4 22/10 24/6 28/7 33/16 34/16 34/24 35/18 37/13
production [12] 3/20 4/5 4/6 7/15 7/19	relation [1] 31/16	saying [5] 19/23 23/5 23/12 24/21 27/7
8/16 12/17 18/3 26/5 27/14 27/15	relatively [2] 9/21 23/22	says [1] 30/23
27/17	release [4] 6/12 6/14 13/21 19/5	schedule [9] 3/21 5/7 5/20 7/15 7/22
Program [1] 1/16	released [4] 4/9 4/19 7/1 17/15	8/16 12/17 14/24 15/17
properly [1] 34/8	releases [1] 17/16	scope [1] 9/15
proposal [1] 8/13 proposed [3] 7/16 9/21 14/24	releasing [1] 4/15	scroll [1] 25/8
proposing [1] 12/3	relevance [1] 8/25	search [17] 8/14 9/15 9/23 14/25
prospective [1] 2/17	remaining [1] 4/10	15/24 16/6 16/14 16/18 17/2 17/24
provide [4] 14/2 31/15 31/19 32/16	Remind [1] 4/14	18/2 21/18 23/17 24/18 25/11 34/8
provided [2] 9/23 14/12	report [2] 4/3 7/11 reported [1] 38/6	37/9
provides [1] 13/17	Reporter [4] 1/19 1/19 38/4 38/16	searchable [2] 25/5 25/10 searched [3] 8/12 18/9 28/24
public [6] 4/19 5/10 13/22 17/16 29/11	request [65]	searches [2] 25/13 27/9
36/2	requested [2] 5/2 15/8	searching [1] 9/18
publicly [1] 7/4	requesting [2] 6/5 6/6	second [16] 2/24 5/22 7/8 9/9 13/19
pull [6] 15/7 15/9 15/9 15/17 15/21	requestor [3] 22/1 25/11 35/14	14/22 15/11 18/15 19/9 20/3 28/21
29/19	requestors [11] 13/15 14/7 19/12 22/6	29/20 30/10 31/1 32/12 33/17
punish [1] 29/13 punished [1] 29/9	22/10 22/15 23/4 26/12 29/15 32/20	secret [1] 16/7
purposes [1] 3/20	33/12	Secretary [3] 2/23 9/4 9/8
pursuant [2] 3/23 6/15	requests [48]	see [11] 8/14 9/13 11/24 28/5 28/12
push [1] 19/23	required [4] 21/21 25/2 30/20 35/18	28/15 28/19 29/12 30/23 35/8 37/10
pushed [1] 20/8	requiring [1] 8/19	seek [2] 34/7 36/20

S 27/17specifically [3] 21/18 25/20 26/16 seeking [3] 18/6 29/13 31/10 spend [1] 22/2 seem [4] 11/7 35/2 36/16 37/4 spoke [2] 3/3 21/16 seems [4] 11/4 29/9 30/21 37/18 spread [1] 10/12 send [3] 11/17 22/17 22/18 staff [1] 37/3 SENIOR [1] 1/9 stand [3] 2/16 31/7 33/7 sense [11] 3/5 8/17 10/19 12/17 15/18 standard [2] 35/25 35/25 16/2 21/12 27/14 31/12 35/2 37/15 standing [2] 18/19 28/15 sent [3] 18/24 19/3 19/9 start [5] 2/16 25/25 28/3 36/22 36/23 sentences [1] 21/23 State [42] separate [2] 8/9 37/2 stated [2] 6/11 26/16 series [2] 23/9 23/11 STATES [3] 1/1 1/10 38/5 serve [1] 17/22 status [8] 1/8 4/3 4/4 7/11 7/12 28/13 served [1] 18/5 28/16 37/22 server [1] 14/22 statute [1] 32/24 set [7] 8/4 27/21 28/13 29/21 32/11 stay [4] 34/4 36/17 36/20 36/22 32/12 37/22 step [1] 33/4 sets [2] 32/10 32/14 still [6] 10/4 14/4 28/20 28/20 29/1 several [6] 6/14 9/3 9/3 18/10 20/23 34/2 21/20 stipulate [1] 16/18 share [1] 21/19 stop [3] 19/22 26/17 27/15 she [2] 5/19 7/22 Street [1] 1/13 shift [1] 28/8 strong [1] 36/2 short [1] 23/22 subfiles [1] 16/7 shorter [1] 28/17 subject [3] 5/9 15/15 16/3 shorthand [3] 1/24 38/7 38/11 submitted [2] 2/19 3/12 should [9] 5/22 14/7 25/2 28/25 30/14 subscribed [1] 38/12 30/20 34/9 35/24 36/8 subset [3] 17/25 18/6 18/7 shouldn't [1] 26/4 substantial [2] 37/3 37/19 shown [2] 23/24 23/25 substantially [1] 23/10 shows [2] 9/24 9/25 substantive [1] 18/10 similar [1] 3/13 such [2] 23/9 25/3 simple [2] 23/14 23/16 sue [1] 34/22 simply [2] 32/5 32/22 sued [3] 11/3 11/5 30/16 since [1] 33/5 suggest [1] 30/21 situation [2] 15/16 27/18 suggested [1] 9/21 six [4] 10/7 10/12 11/22 28/14 suggesting [3] 19/11 33/10 34/18 sixth [1] 12/22 suing [1] 19/11 slow [1] 26/18 Suite [1] 1/13 small [2] 18/10 24/15 supposed [1] 25/16 snags [1] 26/1 sure [11] 2/18 5/3 22/20 23/23 24/21 so [66] 26/15 29/14 31/2 35/14 36/2 36/11 solution [2] 9/21 10/1 surprised [1] 24/25 some [27] 4/7 7/3 11/1 11/9 11/14 suspect [1] 24/24 12/22 17/1 17/22 17/25 18/7 21/23 SW [1] 1/13 22/1 22/5 22/12 22/13 22/14 24/9 26/1 system [1] 19/14 28/9 29/23 31/12 33/14 35/8 35/20 35/23 36/12 37/15 Т somebody [2] 20/7 23/19 table [2] 2/8 2/12 somehow [1] 4/16 take [19] 11/22 17/2 17/12 21/8 23/19 someone [7] 17/21 19/21 19/22 19/25 24/4 24/7 24/7 26/21 26/22 26/23 27/1 21/25 21/25 29/18 27/25 28/8 29/10 34/10 37/2 37/12 something [13] 7/24 14/19 20/4 20/5 37/16 27/16 28/1 28/6 28/13 35/19 37/12 taken [2] 12/24 29/23 37/14 37/17 37/18 talk [6] 3/7 7/8 26/3 26/6 34/22 35/10 somewhat [1] 3/13 talked [1] 19/10 somewhere [1] 33/9 talking [9] 9/11 20/4 24/16 26/9 26/21 sooner [1] 17/23 27/20 27/21 30/10 37/17 sorry [3] 10/6 26/7 32/13 target [1] 18/23 sort [6] 18/7 22/3 26/10 35/12 35/24 targeted [2] 23/7 37/9 37/8 tell [2] 25/13 26/23 sorts [1] 16/11 ten [7] 8/17 8/18 8/21 8/22 9/25 34/16 sought [2] 36/17 36/22 34/24 sounded [1] 19/4 terms [1] 31/24 sounds [2] 3/8 28/23 testimony [2] 19/1 38/7 source [1] 3/14 text [1] 10/14 specific [5] 9/10 15/8 15/18 15/21

than [7] 10/14 20/16 20/19 23/6 28/17 35/4 37/19 Thank [8] 2/15 7/6 7/7 17/10 30/25 33/19 33/20 37/24 that [225] that's [27] 4/22 6/18 14/17 16/1 21/10 21/21 21/24 22/20 22/21 23/13 23/23 23/25 24/16 27/2 27/5 28/19 30/16 30/21 32/16 34/6 34/9 35/19 35/20 35/22 36/1 36/4 36/7 their [9] 3/6 9/13 14/6 19/21 24/10 24/17 25/11 35/15 37/6 theirs [1] 23/6 them [15] 4/2 15/9 15/10 19/24 20/15 22/4 22/22 22/23 23/19 24/4 24/7 27/24 29/19 29/19 32/6 themselves [1] 24/19 then [32] 3/6 4/15 4/24 5/18 8/15 8/20 8/22 8/23 9/24 11/17 11/22 11/24 14/14 15/16 16/21 20/3 21/3 23/3 23/7 24/3 24/5 25/14 26/6 26/11 29/5 29/19 29/21 30/9 30/19 34/9 35/10 36/7 there [41] there's [13] 12/1 17/22 17/25 19/8 20/3 24/9 26/18 27/14 28/6 28/19 29/3 35/8 35/20 Thereupon [1] 38/1 these [16] 9/6 12/16 15/5 16/9 17/14 18/24 21/6 25/21 26/25 27/24 32/15 33/6 34/5 34/9 36/18 37/16 they [70] they're [15] 10/25 11/24 16/10 16/11 16/16 18/6 21/11 22/1 23/15 24/11 24/12 24/21 25/10 30/15 34/20 they've [6] 18/9 23/17 24/25 27/13 30/4 30/17 thing [2] 12/4 34/22 things [4] 2/16 23/9 24/20 36/10 think [24] 7/17 9/16 9/20 12/4 12/15 14/12 16/15 17/11 19/18 24/9 25/23 28/1 28/20 29/12 29/14 31/23 31/24 33/15 34/5 34/14 35/12 35/23 36/4 36/24 third [9] 1/13 9/5 11/15 11/17 11/18 13/20 13/21 19/20 33/11 this [60] those [18] 3/22 4/1 4/6 7/3 8/18 8/21 8/22 8/24 11/1 15/9 18/22 20/2 23/9 23/18 23/21 26/6 31/19 35/11 though [7] 3/5 3/14 19/4 20/6 21/24 26/24 29/9 thought [1] 30/10 thousand [2] 13/1 32/21 three [5] 25/24 25/25 26/23 27/1 27/13 through [4] 8/20 20/2 29/18 33/14 throughout [3] 10/13 15/23 16/6 time [16] 7/14 7/18 19/9 22/2 22/11 23/20 23/22 24/4 27/4 28/18 29/23 32/2 33/7 37/12 37/13 37/15 timely [3] 24/11 25/22 25/23 times [3] 9/25 32/4 35/17 timing [1] 18/24 today [4] 12/24 18/19 28/11 37/20 together [1] 22/4 told [4] 5/19 12/8 28/24 31/15 Tom [1] 2/8 too [1] 26/11

T	wants [4] 22/17 27/22 27/23 37/7	16/14 17/14 23/16 24/19
took [1] 12/25	was [28] 2/20 2/22 3/12 4/11 5/16 6/5	words [1] 32/19
top [2] 16/7 20/22	6/12 6/14 7/9 7/12 7/13 9/2 12/11	work [10] 19/6 20/5 20/6 25/16 26/17
total [3] 23/20 29/2 32/9	12/25 14/10 19/1 19/2 19/4 19/16	27/25 28/13 30/7 37/11 37/14
totally [1] 31/24	19/16 20/9 21/13 21/18 28/24 33/10	worked [1] 35/6
towards [1] 21/11	36/8 36/13 36/24	working [3] 18/14 20/10 27/15
	Washington [4] 1/5 1/13 1/17 1/21	works [1] 24/1
track [1] 23/13	wasn't [3] 7/16 21/14 21/17	world [2] 35/20 35/21
tracks [1] 23/14	WATCH [50]	would [59]
transcribed [1] 38/11	Watch's [5] 17/3 23/5 23/8 29/8 33/13	wouldn't [5] 8/24 16/17 23/19 24/24
transcript [3] 1/8 1/24 38/10	way [11] 11/16 16/23 18/2 22/14 22/14	
transcription [1] 1/24	24/1 28/19 29/15 33/11 36/12 37/10	
transfer [1] 13/19		Υ
transferred [10] 3/19 4/12 10/6 10/7	we [120]	Voor [1] 04/19
10/22 10/25 12/12 13/10 14/9 32/8	we'd [2] 17/23 29/4	year [1] 24/18
transfers [1] 11/23	we'll [2] 19/23 35/9	years [6] 24/21 24/23 25/14 27/13
treat [1] 35/24	we're [31] 9/9 9/11 15/25 17/24 18/1	34/16 34/24
treated [2] 29/15 35/16	18/19 18/20 18/22 19/12 19/13 19/13	yes [7] 4/18 5/12 7/5 7/5 9/16 17/8
treatment [1] 13/15	20/3 20/11 21/13 24/14 24/16 25/14	33/18
true [4] 11/13 22/20 23/23 23/25	25/20 25/21 26/9 26/21 27/4 27/20	yesterday [5] 3/4 3/17 9/22 10/4 21/15
	27/21 28/8 28/11 28/15 29/9 35/14	yet [1] 3/2
try [3] 12/16 16/23 19/16	37/17 37/25	you [88]
trying [4] 18/20 19/12 19/14 31/25	we've [3] 8/1 8/4 19/7	you'd [1] 18/15
turn [4] 11/13 13/8 23/7 32/5	week [1] 12/25	you're [3] 3/21 18/14 37/14
two [19] 2/19 3/11 5/13 5/14 8/14 16/3	weeks [6] 17/25 19/10 28/14 28/18	you've [3] 20/24 23/2 30/24
17/4 17/24 19/10 21/23 24/17 24/20	35/10 37/23	your [49]
24/21 24/23 28/18 32/10 32/13 33/8	well [16] 4/4 4/23 4/25 10/20 12/4	yourself [3] 2/4 22/25 23/1
37/23		yoursen [s] LIT LLILS LOIT
type [2] 9/12 15/20	12/21 13/3 15/13 17/22 24/6 24/9	
types [3] 8/7 15/20 15/21	27/11 30/10 31/4 32/6 35/24	
	were [19] 2/20 3/19 4/12 6/6 6/22 12/5	
U	13/10 14/21 15/14 19/5 19/6 19/8 22/6	
U.S [6] 1/5 1/15 1/20 2/3 2/11 2/13	30/10 31/15 31/21 32/7 35/18 36/23	
unable [1] 37/14	weren't [1] 18/21	
	what [52]	
unclear [1] 16/9	what's [8] 9/19 9/19 24/5 31/8 31/12	
under [4] 16/9 16/15 16/17 35/10	31/14 31/22 35/5	
understand [7] 11/11 19/7 21/20	when [6] 9/2 11/13 21/16 27/16 29/7	
27/19 29/16 37/7 37/8	32/25	
understanding [2] 2/21 10/9	where [23] 2/16 3/4 3/14 8/7 8/21 8/24	
unfairly [1] 22/15		
UNITED [3] 1/1 1/10 38/5	10/5 10/21 12/16 12/22 18/6 21/10	
unlike [1] 8/6	22/9 23/2 23/2 26/25 27/13 28/7 28/15	
unlikely [1] 11/7	31/7 33/7 33/17 35/19	
until [4] 21/17 26/4 34/22 36/19	whereof [1] 38/12	
up [9] 9/8 9/24 9/25 21/17 27/16 29/21	whether [6] 5/6 10/18 20/7 20/17	
33/13 37/2 37/12	20/19 37/15	
	which [27] 2/21 3/24 4/8 5/24 8/8	
urgent [1] 22/3	11/15 13/5 13/18 14/11 14/12 14/23	
us [11] 5/19 8/19 9/23 11/6 22/22 24/7	15/1 15/16 19/15 20/7 23/17 27/8	
25/13 26/6 29/11 29/23 34/22	28/23 28/24 31/23 32/3 32/14 33/11	
usage [1] 2/23	34/25 35/17 36/8 37/18	
use [1] 29/10	while [6] 16/22 20/12 21/5 22/11 26/14	
used [1] 15/6	27/9	
V		
	White [1] 6/8	
validated [1] 32/3	who [3] 19/20 22/7 23/4	
versus [3] 2/3 3/22 15/20	who've [1] 29/23	
very [10] 5/15 8/4 16/22 16/24 24/13	whole [4] 6/21 15/7 25/15 25/21	
27/17 31/17 32/15 32/20 35/19	whose [1] 29/24	
view [1] 37/8	why [11] 2/15 13/5 14/6 14/23 19/10	
volume [3] 31/5 31/14 31/17	19/11 22/13 23/13 35/3 35/6 37/10	
	will [10] 5/6 5/10 6/15 6/16 14/13	
W	14/14 15/3 33/4 34/10 34/22	
wait [10] 8/19 11/21 13/8 14/4 22/11	willing [2] 21/14 21/18	
22/22 24/17 24/21 26/4 32/5	withheld [1] 8/22	
	withholding [1] 31/21	
want [18] 9/12 10/16 11/6 14/18 17/25	withholdings [2] 26/7 26/8	
21/8 22/11 22/22 22/23 25/12 27/23	without [1] 9/18	
28/8 31/4 31/20 32/6 32/15 32/18	witness [1] 38/12	
34/16	word [9] 8/12 8/14 9/18 14/25 16/8	
wanted [1] 33/22	WOID [3] 0/12 0/14 3/10 14/23 10/8	