IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.,)
Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 13-cv-1363 (EGS)
v.)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,))
Defendant.))
)

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S AUGUST 14, 2015 STATUS REPORT

Plaintiff Judicial Watch, Inc., by counsel, respectfully submits this response to Defendant's August 14, 2015 Status Report:

- 1. Like its previous filings, Defendant's August 14, 2015 Status Report fails to provide the basic information requested by the Court. *See* Plaintiff's August 10, 2015 Response.
- 2. The Court ordered Defendant to identify any and all servers, accounts, hard drives, or other devices currently in the possession or control of the State Department or otherwise that may contain responsive information. In response, Defendant submitted a declaration by the head of Defendant's FOIA office in which he testifies that Defendant "is not currently aware of any personal computing devices issued by the Department to former Secretary Clinton, Ms. Abedin, or Ms. Mills that may contain responsive records." Defendant's August 14, 2015 Status Report at ¶ 8.
- 3. Taking this sworn statement on its face, it appears as though the declarant made no effort whatsoever to find out what electronic devices the former head of the agency and two

of her closest advisors used to conduct official government business for four years and where these electronic devices may be located or if they are still in existence.

- 4. Similarly, Defendant offered no evidence whatsoever concerning servers, backups, or other devices in its possession.
- 5. In addition, Defendant does not identify whether former Secretary Clinton was provided or used a state.gov email address.
- 6. Moreover, only now more than 18 months after the initial searches were conducted does Defendant disclose that it searched the state.gov email accounts of "two other former employees." August 14, 2015 Status Report at ¶ 7. Defendant does not identify who those employees are or whether they also used former Secretary Clinton's email server or any other non-state.gov email address to conduct official government business. The mere fact that two other unnamed individuals may have records responsive to Plaintiff's FOIA request is material, should have been disclosed at the July 31, 2015 Status Hearing, if not sooner, and raises a variety of additional questions.
- 7. While wholly ignoring the Court's directive, Defendant dismisses the Court's concerns as irrelevant by attempting to revive an argument already rejected by the Court.
- 8. During the July 31, 2015 Status Hearing, Defendant argued that this case is an ordinary FOIA lawsuit and the next step should be dispositive briefing concerning the adequacy of Defendant's searches. The Court rejected this argument. The Court stated:

But there's one thing about me sending the Government off on a fishing expedition to try and find something. There's another thing though for the Government to ask former government employees tell us whether or not you maintained our files on your private servers and other electronic devices or otherwise. And otherwise would be electronic devices or in that box in their garage or whatever. Tell us that. And if the answer is yes, you must declare under

The full transcript for the July 31, 2015 Status Hearing is attached as Exhibit A.

penalty whether or not you have provided the Government with copies of all of those materials. And if you haven't, give us those materials and then we

determine whether bases exist for other kinds of discovery.

Transcript at 21 (emphasis added).

9. Following the July 31, 2015 Status Hearing, the Court gave Defendant the

opportunity to provide answers to questions that are fundamental to whether Defendant has

satisfied its obligations under FOIA. Defendant did not do so. It has only submitted partial

answers with material omissions. Until complete answers are provided to these questions, the

Court and Plaintiff cannot even hope to understand – let alone determine – whether Defendant

has conducted searches reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents.

10. Because Defendant and the three individuals – who apparently are really five

individuals – have now failed to comply with the Court's order and to provide complete answers

to basic questions, Plaintiff agrees with the Court's assessment that a time may come that "other

kinds of discovery" would be appropriate. That time may be now.

11. A Status Hearing is currently scheduled for September 10, 2015. Because two

weeks have gone by and the Court and Plaintiff are no closer to knowing where responsive

records may exist, Plaintiff requests that the Court advance the scheduled hearing to this week to

discuss the possibility of discovery or other means to gather the necessary information.

Dated: August 17, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael Bekesha

Michael Bekesha JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.

425 Third Street S.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20024

(202) 646-5172

Counsel for Plaintiff Judicial Watch, Inc.

- 3 -

Exhibit A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.,

Plaintiff,

CA No.

13-CV-1363 (EGS) Washington, DC

vs.

July 31, 2015

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT

11:22 a.m.

OF STATE,

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: MICHAEL BEKESHA, ATTORNEY

Judicial Watch, Inc.

425 Third Street, SW, Suite 800

Washington, DC 20024

202-646-5172

For the Defendant: PETER T. WECHSLER, TRIAL ATTORNEY

U.S. Department of Justice

Federal Programs Branch - Civil Div.

20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

202-514-2705

Court Reporter: JEFF M. HOOK, CSR, RPR

Official Court Reporter

U.S. Courthouse, Room 4700-C

333 Constitution Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

202-354-3373

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

PROCEEDINGS

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Calling civil action 13-1363,

Judicial Watch, Inc. versus Department of State. Would

counsel please approach the lecturn and identify themselves

for the record.

MR. BEKESHA: Good morning, your Honor. Michael
Bekesha on behalf of Judicial Watch. Along with me is Paul
Orfanedes and Tom Fitton.

THE COURT: Alright, good morning.

MR. WECHSLER: Good morning, your Honor. Peter
Wechsler from the Department of Justice representing the State
Department. Along with me are Elizabeth Shapiro and Marcia
Berman.

THE COURT: Alright, good morning. There was a document filed last evening that seems to suggest that whatever disputes there were, they've been resolved, is that correct? Have you seen that?

MR. BEKESHA: Yes, we have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't you come forward. Do you agree?

MR. BEKESHA: Thank you, your Honor. With respect to what was filed yesterday, when we filed the joint status report on July 1st, there were three issues that were involved: When the State Department would search the 55,000 pages of e-mails; when the State Department would search

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1 ||e-mails provided to them by Ms. Abedin and Ms. Mills; and then the third issue was whether those additional searches was sufficient to satisfy the standards of FOIA. So when we filed it, there were three issues of contention. The Department of State changed their position. They satisfied now two of our concerns, the first two issues, but one issue does remain.

THE COURT: Alright. And the remaining issue is which one?

MR. BEKESHA: Whether the State Department will conduct additional searches, because the searches that have been conducted to date are incomplete.

THE COURT: Okay. Does not the last paragraph of the document, document 17, address that issue, that the Department will also conduct a revised search of the records system that were initially searched? Does that not resolve the third issue?

It does not, your Honor. MR. BEKESHA: would be would be searching the same systems of records with these search terms. Our concern and the issue before the Court is whether or not that search is sufficient because they are incomplete systems records. And the State Department has known for the past three years -- or two years, that those systems of records are incomplete. Mrs. Clinton, several of her aides used non State Department e-mail addresses to conduct official business. Those e-mails will not necessarily be right in the system of records they search.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

THE COURT: So what do you believe that the Government should be doing then to address the third issue that you contend is unresolved?

MR. BEKESHA: I think what we had originally asked for was some information so that we had a better sense of what systems of records are out there. But for example, there may be computer equipment, devices within the State Department that may contain this information. If Mrs. Clinton used a desktop or a BlackBerry while at the State Department, when she left that may have went to storage. If it was unplugged from the internet, it may be sitting in a basement with all of her e-mails on it. Those records could be searched. may be backups of these devices that could be searched. may be servers that may be able to be searched. We just don't know what all the possibilities are because the State Department is unwilling to work with us and provide us this very limited, very important information. All we're trying to do is figure out where else the State Department can look within the State Department so that they satisfy their obligations under FOIA.

I mean, the other possibility is, you know, it is not at all clear and there's no evidence that all records -- that the 55,000 pages is all records that Mrs. Clinton has. Judge Leon on Wednesday held a hearing, asked the head of the FOIA

department for the State Department to testify. And during that hearing Mr. Hackett, who's head of the State Department's FOIA, said that he does not know if all of the work related e-mails have been turned over. And he said that about Mrs. Clinton, Ms. Abedin and Ms. Mills. I have copies of the transcript. It was a two hour hearing so the court reporter didn't get it done until 9:00 a.m. this morning. So I brought copies with me, and I'm happy to add it onto the record after we're here. I can point the Court to a few places where the State Department admits that it does not know whether all of the records that have been returned -- that were taken from the State Department have actually been returned.

THE COURT: Are we addressing the same issue, my colleague and I, Judge Leon?

MR. BEKESHA: Judge Leon's concern is more about the processing because it's taken place over a four year period of time. In fact, whether or not there are other additional searches does not appear to be at issue in that case. That case is primarily about the searching of the 55,000 pages which the State Department has done here as well as other records. But nothing about where else the State Department is obligated to search to find responsive records.

THE COURT: So I want to make sure I understand what you're saying. You're saying that it's not enough for the Government to say that it searched its own files, it should be

searching something else. And what is the something else?

MR. BEKESHA: Well, the something --

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with the Government saying it searched its own files for the relevant time period, and that it will -- as I understand this status report, will research some of its own files? What is it that you contend the Government should be doing in addition to searching its own files?

MR. BEKESHA: Well, like when they searched the first time around in 2013, they're searching incomplete systems of records. They're searching places where they know some records don't exist, and they don't want to go and search where records could exist. So for example, I'll make it a little bit easier because when it gets into electronic records it can be confusing. But if you are storing records in a box, you know, put paper in a box, and you know that you have a federal record here and it's not in that box and that it could be several hundred pages haven't been put in that box. The Government can't just go search that box and say, "I've done a reasonable search," because they know that the records that they're looking for aren't in that box, they're somewhere else. And that's what we have here, we have an instance where --

THE COURT: So you seem to suggest that the

Government knows that there are records elsewhere that they

aren't searching, and they're intentionally not searching those records elsewhere?

MR. BEKESHA: That's correct, your Honor. And I think the evidence shows that. Secretary Clinton for her four years used an e-mail address that was not state.gov. She said she sent e-mails to people in the State Department, so the State Department knew that her records would not be in the database they searched. And they didn't tell us that when they told us they searched her records. They didn't tell us that before we closed the case, they didn't tell us that after we closed the case. We read about it in the news, and we filed the motion to reopen the case.

If they had said, you know, this is an incomplete record, we probably wouldn't have closed the case at that point. We would have had to, you know, continue discussions and figure out what the State Department could do to correct that issue. So they didn't tell us at first, and now they continue not to tell us where else the records may exist. They could exist as I said on an old desktop. They could exist on a backup of a server. And they could exist in this server that Mrs. Clinton may have and that she used. And all of these places are possible places that records could be find, and the Agency has an obligation to conduct these searches because they know the system of records that they are searching is incomplete.

THE COURT: Alright, thank you. Let me hear from

Government counsel. Good morning.

1

2

3

5

7

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. WECHSLER: Good morning, your Honor. As your Honor mentioned, in the joint status report that was filed Plaintiff raised three issues: One, the Clinton e-mails, the 55,000 or so pages; two, any e-mails of Abedin or Mills that were on a personal e-mail account; and three, assurances that the searches that had been conducted of other existing Department documents were satisfactory. So the Department did the following. They agreed on search terms for the Clinton e-mails. They searched through electronically those 55,000 pages on the agreed search terms, and they determined there were no responsive records. Second, they searched the documents that have been provided to date by Ms. Mills and Ms. Abedin, and they determined that there were no responsive records. Again, using the same search terms that had been agreed upon for the Clinton e-mails. And as to the third category, the Department agreed to research or conduct a revised search of all the record systems that it had determined were reasonably likely to have responsive records. And those systems of records and offices were identified to Plaintiff in the initial record, the transmittal letter with the initial records that were provided. So as a result, the Department is going to research the

So as a result, the Department is going to research the Bureau of Human Resources, the Office of the Executive Secretariat, the Office of the Legal Adviser and the Central

2

3

5

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

||Foreign Policy Records. Now, bear in mind that Plaintiff's FOIA request in this case is extremely limited. One, any and all notifications of personnel action forms for Ms. Abedin. Those have been provided through the initial search. Two, any and all contracts including, but not limited to, personal services contracts between the Department and Ms. Abedin. far as we know, there are no such documents, but again we will research. So three is really the topic at issue in the reopening of the case: Records regarding authorization for Ms. Abedin to represent individual clients or otherwise engage in outside employment while employed by the Department. is a fairly narrow set of personnel records, records for authorization of outside employment. So it is entirely reasonable that the Department determined that, for example, the Human Resources Bureau, the Office of the Executive Secretariat and the other offices that I mentioned would be reasonably likely to have responsive records.

So at this point my suggestion is that the Department follow through on the statement in its status report that it will conduct a revised search of all those systems of records to find any additional documents, again using the agreed search terms that the parties had already come to agreement on. And that if at that point it is necessary, a declaration be submitted detailing the searches that were conducted and the processing of any additional responsive records. And only

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1 | then should Plaintiff be permitted to discuss what seem to be very far afield items such as discovery of equipment, devices, technology. Because this is a FOIA request, this is not a Federal Records Act case. And by the way, Plaintiffs did bring a Federal Records Act case against the Department regarding this exact issue of the 55,000 e-mails. before another judge, that is pending. And they can --THE COURT: Which judge is that, is that Judge Leon? MR. WECHSLER: No, that is Judge Boasberg. And by the way, the number of that is --THE COURT: Shouldn't one judge -- not me, shouldn't one judge have all these cases? Maybe the three of us should Any objection to one judge resolving all these issues? talk. MR. WECHSLER: I'm not prepared to respond to that today, but I will say that the civil action number is 15 --

THE COURT: Are there any other lawsuits kicking around in our court?

MR. WECHSLER: Oh yeah, Judicial Watch has many cases involving these records. That case number is 15-cv-785 Now, the other distinction -- so again, we're not on a Federal Records Act case here.

> THE COURT: Correct.

MR. WECHSLER: The other distinction is the AP case did not involve these FOIA requests, it was something completely different. There were five different categories,

and the only interrelation is one of them involved Ms. Abedin, but it involved a very different point. It involved her employment as a special government employee, not authorization for outside employment. That's apples and oranges. So whatever occurred in another hearing in another case brought by Plaintiff really does not bear upon whether or not the Department is exercising its reasonable efforts here.

THE COURT: So let me see if I understand what you're saying. You're proposing that the Government research using terms that have been agreed upon by the parties, and then produce as appropriate subject to challenge by the Plaintiff with respect to the adequacy of that search?

MR. WECHSLER: Yes, your Honor.

think I agree with that, that's reasonable. Because you come back and say this is what we've done, we've used the terms we've agreed to. This is what we're producing, this is what's privileged, whatever. Then Plaintiff is in a position to say, you know what judge, that's inadequate for the following reasons then. I think, but let me invite Plaintiff's counsel back. But I'm actually going to talk to my colleagues about one judge, not me, having all these cases. It seems to me I think there are too many judges.

MR. BEKESHA: Sure, your Honor, I can address that point first. Judicial Watch does have several cases.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: That address the 55,000 e-mails? MR. BEKESHA: All different issues, issues relating to Mrs. Clinton's e-mails, the actual records; some records related of other aides, their e-mails; FOIA requests about the fact that Mrs. Clinton had a private e-mail server, so we have some requests about that. There may be about 10 or so. THE COURT: 10 lawsuits? MR. BEKESHA: About 10 lawsuits on ours. There's --THE COURT: Is there a judge in this court who does not have one of these cases? MR. BEKESHA: I don't know about that. that I believe it was Judge Contreras on at least two occasions, one in one of our cases --THE COURT: I don't know if it would be burdensome for one judge to have everything. MR. BEKESHA: He asked about consolidation. THE COURT: Which judge was that? MR. BEKESHA: Contreras. THE COURT: Is he interested in that? MR. BEKESHA: I think he may have been. I know the Government's position -- I don't want to state what their position is, but I think they pretty much said they didn't think it was appropriate at that time. You know, after one of the hearings we reached out to the Government and said do we want to sit down and talk about all of these cases.

haven't heard back about that. So if you think it makes sense for one judge to handle all of these cases --

THE COURT: You know what, I'm going to send an e-mail to my colleagues, just raise it, you know. I mean, we're all independent. But if you're telling me there are 10 lawsuits that are arguably related and grow out of the same subjected matter, Mrs. Clinton's e-mails, it seems to me one judge would then -- you know, I don't know.

MR. BEKESHA: And then with respect to the Federal Records Act lawsuit that the Government talked about, that's a very different lawsuit. That's a lawsuit to compel Secretary Kerry to recover all e-mails taken from the State Department.

THE COURT: That sounds different, right.

MR. BEKESHA: Yeah, so that's very different from the case that's here. The reason I think it's improper to wait for summary judgment whenever that may occur -- and that may not occur for quite some time, the Government still hasn't said when it expects Mrs. Clinton to finish producing all of the records she may have or if she ever will. And Ms. Abedin and Mills is the same. We also relied on their statements that they conducted a search the first time around, and we learned through the media that we were mistaken in taking their word for what they did. We don't think we need to wait more time for them to conduct searches -- which they won't even say will they go search these other systems of records

1 | that would be appropriate to search.

THE COURT: It's speculation though, isn't it, about these other systems that may or may not exist? I mean, what is the extent to which the Government has an obligation to search? The Government has an obligation to search its records, right?

MR. BEKESHA: They have an obligation to search their records using methods that are reasonably expected to produce responsive records.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BEKESHA: It's not reasonably expected to produce responsive records if you know that the records aren't going to be where you're looking. The State Department wants to once again search a system of records that's incomplete. They're going to search the Office of the Executive Secretariat. That's supposed to have all the e-mails of the Office of the Secretary. They're going to search that, but Ms. Mills, Ms. Abedin and Mrs. Clinton didn't exclusively -- and Mrs. Clinton didn't use at all, the State Department's e-mail server. So those records aren't going to be there, and they know they're not going to be there. But they want to go and search there again.

THE COURT: Did Mrs. Clinton admit that she used a private server?

MR. BEKESHA: Mrs. Clinton said that she used a

2

3

5

6

7

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

server that was not state.gov. Whether or not that's personal or private is still unclear. She used it as the head of the agency for the four years she was the head of the agency. Arguably she made a decision that the system of records she was going to use was this server. Maybe that server was property of the State Department as she was the head of the agency. We don't know that, that's another issue. You know, these are all issues that we've tried to discuss with the Government, and the Government says we're searching the 55,000, you know, trust us, we're going to do the correct searches, you know, that's good enough under FOIA. Well, it's not. We did that once and now we're back. We had to reopen this case a year later, and we have to spend more time in court trying to figure out what's good enough, what we should believe the Government is doing and should we take their word on face value. And we just don't think that's appropriate at this time. We think we shouldn't have to wait until who knows when to brief the issue. Let the Court resolve it. the Court can start resolving it today.

The first step is to identify places in which information records may be stored. If there are no desktops or BlackBerries sitting around in a basement, then they can't search there. The answer to that question, that issue is off the table. If the State Department doesn't backup their systems -- backup computers, backup servers -- then they can't

search there. So that question takes that off the table. You know, that's all we're looking for. And we can go through that process. If they don't have backups, if they don't keep the technology, you know, they don't have access to the server that was used by Mrs. Clinton, Ms. Mills, Ms. Abedin, you know, all of those issues are then off the table.

But the final last issue is if Mrs. Clinton still has
this server that has at least all of her e-mails on it, if she
has the e-mails of Ms. Abedin on it. We at least know that
Ms. Abedin used an e-mail address to conduct official
business. It was huma@clintonemail.com. I attached one of
those e-mails to the joint status report. And then Ms. Mills,
we still don't know what e-mail addresses she was using when
she was not using state.gov because the Government redacted
the domain name. So we don't know if Ms. Mills' e-mail
addresses were on this Clinton e-mail server that was set up
by Mrs. Clinton to conduct official business during her four
years as Secretary of State or if Ms. Mills was using another
e-mail server or another account to conduct official business.

So we're just looking for answers so that we can move the process along, and so that we don't get stuck in the same position we were. They conduct searches, we say we trust you, you did a good search and then the New York Times writes a piece in another year and we have to reopen this case for a second time. We just don't think that makes a lot of sense.

THE COURT: Right. Counsel?

MR. WECHSLER: Briefly, your Honor, the Plaintiff spoke of moving the process along. That's precisely what the Department has done in the last 30 days. They agreed on search terms. They conducted a search of 55,000 or so pages of e-mails. They conducted an additional search of the e-mails provided to date by Ms. Mills and Ms. Abedin. The Department is not saying trust us, the Department is saying here is what we've done, we will complete the process, research the initial systems of record. If necessary, we will submit a declaration if the parties can't resolve --

THE COURT: But the Plaintiff's not talking about the initial systems of record, the Plaintiff appears to be addressing systems of record that may exist outside of the government agency.

MR. WECHSLER: Those are not systems of record then.

The definition of system of record is in the agency. That's under the definition of the term system of record.

THE COURT: So it would not be private servers?

MR. WECHSLER: When we say private, what we're saying is non state.gov. So whether it's owned by a company or individually is not our concern. But the point is the FOIA obligation is to search documents in the possession and control of the Department. There's no question we have done that, and we are going to research those. We've also agreed,

we've sent letters to all of the former --

THE COURT: Alright. The Plaintiff, let me just pick up his argument though. He says Mrs. Clinton or others may have personal servers, they may have personal BlackBerries that have government records. Does the Government have an obligation to attempt to search those potential records?

MR. WECHSLER: No, but what the Government did is send a letter -- two different sets of letters, one to the former secretaries requesting that they provide all documents that may be federal records including e-mails on a non state.gov account. The former secretary provided 55,000 pages.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. WECHSLER: The Government also sent a letter to Ms. Mills and Ms. Abedin in particular requesting that they send all federal records, and they're in the process of doing that. So they acknowledged the letter, they provided some documents and that is the --

THE COURT: Were they asked -- were any of those individuals asked whether or not they maintained government files on private servers, BlackBerries or other electronic devices?

MR. WECHSLER: They were simply asked to provide any documents that may constitute federal records. In other words, that were sent during the course of the --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

THE COURT: I understand what you're saying, but what about my question though? Were they expressly asked whether or not they maintained government files on any private servers, BlackBerries or other electronic devices? And if not, why shouldn't they be asked that? They were asked for the actual MR. WECHSLER: documents, the things. THE COURT: I understand that. You just gave me that answer twice, I understand that. What about my question though? Were they asked whether or not they maintained government files on any private -- let's just say electronic devices or otherwise? MR. WECHSLER: I don't believe that the letters went to that degree, but again --THE COURT: Why shouldn't they be asked that? MR. WECHSLER: Well, perhaps that would follow, but I believe the initial --THE COURT: I think I should direct the Government to ask that question of them. Because if indeed the answer is yes, then those would be devices that should be searched by the Government. Wouldn't you agree? MR. WECHSLER: No, I don't. I think that --THE COURT: Let's talk about this for a second. Alright, suppose the answer is yes, government files were maintained on a private server, a BlackBerry device and a

laptop, and that's the answer. Then what's the Government's obligation, if any?

MR. WECHSLER: The primary FOIA obligation is documents that are in the possession of the Government, documents created in the course of business that --

THE COURT: I understand that, but I'm saying if in response to your question the answer is oh yeah, by the way, government records were maintained on my private iPhone or Android or whatever it is and that's the answer, then the Government has no obligation to search those records?

MR. WECHSLER: Not to search. The obligation is to do what they've done which is to say if you have such documents including personal e-mails, provide them to us.

THE COURT: Okay. Alright, we're talking around this issue though. It seems to me unless there's -- it seems to me that the Government should be directed to ask those individuals whether or not they did in fact maintain, keep, whatever the language is, possess government materials on private electronic devices or otherwise, just that question, and get an answer. And then we figure out what the Government's obligation is at that point.

MR. WECHSLER: I believe the answer was given indirectly. That is, by furnishing e-mails that were sent from a non state.gov account, the answer is yes presumably.

THE COURT: Have they responded that they furnished

all the government materials maintained on private servers, et cetera?

MR. WECHSLER: The documents that were --

THE COURT: And if not, why shouldn't they?

MR. WECHSLER: They are in the process of completing that -- that initial documents were provided.

THE COURT: I understand what Plaintiff's saying, and I'm just trying to make it easier for everyone to get to this information if the information exists. I understand what Plaintiff's saying, he makes a good point. But there's one thing about me sending the Government off on a fishing expedition to try and find something. There's another thing though for the Government to ask former government employees tell us whether or not you maintained our files on your private servers and other electronic devices or otherwise. And otherwise would be electronic devices or in that box in their garage or whatever. Tell us that. And if the answer is yes, you must declare under penalty whether or not you have provided the Government with copies of all of those materials. And if you haven't, give us those materials and then we determine whether bases exist for other kinds of discovery.

But Counsel makes a good point, and I just think there's some questions that need to be answered though. You know, I'm not going to send you off searching here, there and everywhere. But I think those very precise questions should

1 be directed to those three individuals for the purpose of identifying whether or not there are other devices and otherwise that are in existence that have materials that the Government has that the Government's entitled to get. That's 5 my point. MR. WECHSLER: Yeah, we submit that the next step 6 7 could be that the Government provide copies of the letters that were sent to the former secretaries and to Ms. Mills and Ms. Abedin. 10 THE COURT: The Plaintiff's not seen those letters? 11 MR. WECHSLER: They have seen -- they are attached to some of their pleadings I believe. 13 THE COURT: Well, if they're attached to their pleadings they've seen them then I guess, right? 14 15 MR. WECHSLER: Yeah. THE COURT: Wait a minute, I think Counsel --16 MR. BEKESHA: May I answer, your Honor? 17 18 THE COURT: Yes. 19 MR. BEKESHA: We asked the Government to provide those letters, they did not provide them. We have sent FOIA requests asking for those records because the Government 21 wouldn't provide them in this case. 22 23 THE COURT: But you're agreeable to providing those

24

25

letters now?

MR. WECHSLER:

2

3

5

6

7

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

THE COURT: Alright, okay. Forthwith, that's fine. And we can get to the bottom of this. Look, I'm not going to impose any unreasonable barriers on anyone, especially the Government that's overburdened. But fair is fair. All they're saying is, "You know, Judge, there may be other devices that have this material." I don't know that to be the case, and you don't know. But at least the question should be asked. And maybe the questions have already been asked and answered. And if so, the answers should be part of a declaration from the Government so that the public -- that the Plaintiffs know that the Government's been duly diligent and asked the questions that should be asked. I mean, all they're trying to get is access to information that they're entitled to have access to. I'm not trying to trick you, you know, but you're going to turn those letters over?

MR. WECHSLER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And the responses, right?

MR. WECHSLER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. Do you have copies today?

MR. WECHSLER: I do not, but I can provide the substance which was that there were requests to Ms. Mills and Ms. Abedin that they make available to the Department any federal records that they may have in their possession such as e-mails concerning official government business sent or

received in a personal e-mail account while serving in their official capacities with the Department if there is any reason to believe that those records may not otherwise be preserved in the Department's recordkeeping systems.

THE COURT: Okay. So they've been asked that it sound like?

MR. WECHSLER: Yes.

THE COURT: And so all they need is a copy of that letter to them, to those individuals, and a copy of their responses, and then we can go from there. I mean, I don't think we can spend anymore time today. I mean, I would like to -- I still think what I'm proposing is not unreasonable, that in the event they've not been asked to they should be directed to, to tell you whether or not there are any additional devices that have materials that have not been heretofore turned over to the Government.

MR. WECHSLER: They were asked to provide any such documents.

THE COURT: Alright. I think you need to see the letters anyway and the responses. I mean, otherwise we're just speculating about what should be done at this point.

MR. BEKESHA: Thank you.

THE COURT: But thank you very much, I appreciate that. Thank you. Yes, Counsel?

MR. BEKESHA: Two quick points, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah, sure.

MR. BEKESHA: I don't want to confuse anything more, but also when I was talking about the BlackBerries and desktops, I meant the ones that were officially issued by the State Department. So State Department BlackBerries of Mrs. Clinton.

THE COURT: That's why I said other devices or otherwise or something like that.

MR. BEKESHA: Some of those could be in the State

Department's possession, because arguably when Mrs. Clinton no

longer was Secretary of State she turned over her BlackBerry

that was issued by the State Department.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BEKESHA: So the BlackBerry may not be in her possession, it may be in the State Department's possession.

And that was another one of the questions we had.

THE COURT: I see. So then in other words, the

State Department could have that device and not had the

opportunity to search it because it was unaware that it had

it. I mean, that's possible.

MR. BEKESHA: Or that it needed to, that they had it and they needed to because the records weren't in the box.

THE COURT: Right. Alright, here's what I'm going to do. You're going to get those questions -- you'll get a copy of the letter to those individuals and a copy of the

responses from those individuals, you'll get that information. And what I'm going to do since I don't know what the responses are -- I have an idea of what the letters say -- I'm going to issue a minute order that also directs the Government to ask the questions that I think should be asked at this point.

Now, it may well be that those questions have been answered, but I don't want to bring you back in a week or two weeks to talk about okay, where do we go from here. So I'm going to issue that. To the extent they've already been answered, then of course the Government does not need to. But I will add that additional directive that other devices be identified that may well be in the possession of the Government and have not been searched by the Government.

MR. BEKESHA: Okay, your Honor. One other possible question to be asked, during the hearing before Judge Leon, the AP attorney -- that is the Plaintiff in that case, went through a list of questions about employees that received the letters that counsel was just referring to. And the answer is -- and I can submit the transcript, was for Mrs. Clinton, she turned over 55,000 pages. We don't know if that's everything. With respect to Mr. Reines, who's not at issue in this case, he provided 20 boxes of records. When asked is that everything, the head of the FOIA for the State Department said, "I don't know what he did." So another question to -- that may be important to be posed to Ms. Mills, Ms. Abedin,

Mrs. Clinton is, "Have you produced everything?" Because right now, the State Department doesn't know if everything has been produced that's in their possession, they just know that something has been produced.

THE COURT: I think that's fair, I'll do that.

MR. BEKESHA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll try to put together a fair minute order and I'll issue that. I think that's fair. If there are objections then the Government can object, but I think that's fair. I'm going to direct that those letters -- was it just one letter to each of the three individuals, Counsel, or a series of letters, the letter and the responses?

MR. WECHSLER: One letter to Ms. Mills and
Ms. Abedin, a separate letter was sent to former Secretary
Clinton.

THE COURT: Alright. And the Government has agreed to turn over those letters and the responses to Plaintiff's counsel and post them on the docket, correct?

MR. WECHSLER: Yes.

THE COURT: Alright, that's fine.

MR. BEKESHA: I'm sorry, your Honor, my co-counsel reminded me of one other small point. As I demonstrated in the joint status report, Ms. Abedin at least used one e-mail address that was on clintonemail.com. We don't know what other e-mail accounts are on the server of Mrs. Clinton. It

```
1 | would be helpful for Mrs. Clinton to identify what -- if
 2 Ms. Mills and Ms. Abedin used her server to conduct official
  business. Because Ms. Mills and Ms. Abedin may not have
 4 access to the server, Mrs. Clinton may have it.
5
              THE COURT: I'm trying to make it easy for everyone,
   that's why I said other devices, et cetera or otherwise.
 6
   we'll figure out some language to use to answer that
   legitimate concern.
9
              MR. BEKESHA: Thank you, your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: Alright, we'll try to do that. Anything
11
    else? Do we have another status hearing date?
12
              MR. WECHSLER: No, your Honor.
13
              MR. BEKESHA: No, your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: I should bring you back maybe after
   Labor Day or so. What about that?
              MR. BEKESHA: That's fine.
16
17
              MR. WECHSLER: That's fine.
              THE COURT: Alright. Let's pick a date. Counsel,
18
    I'm going to suggest September the 10<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 o'clock.
19
    Is that a bad date or bad time? Good date?
20
              MR. BEKESHA: That's okay, your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: You sure? Is that a bad date?
22
23
    if there's a better date I can give you --
24
              MR. BEKESHA: It's fine, your Honor.
              THE COURT: September the 10<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m., and
25
```

1 | that will be a status hearing. We'll try to put together an 2 appropriate minute order that addresses the concerns. are good concerns, you'll get answers. The Government is going to research. 5 What about producing the results of the research that you refer to in your status report filed yesterday, how much time 6 7 do you need for that? 8 MR. WECHSLER: We suggest that 14 days to actually do the search, notify Plaintiff of responsive records and then process thereafter. 10 11 THE COURT: I think that's fair enough, alright. Anything else? 13 MR. BEKESHA: No, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Alright, everyone have a nice weekend. 15 Good to see everyone. (Proceedings concluded at 11:58 a.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE

I, Jeff M. Hook, CSR, RPR, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-titled matter.

Date: August 4, 2015

Jeff M. Hook, CSR, RPR



<u></u>	•	1
1 Case 1:13-cv-01363-EGS	<u> </u>	at [23]04/19/24/24 5/78 7/14 7/17 9/8 9/18
	addition [1] 6/7 additional [8] 3/2 3/10 5/17 9/21 9/25	9/23 12/12 12/23 14/19 15/16 16/8 16/9 20/21 23/7 24/21 26/5 26/21 27/23
10:00 [1] 28/19	17/6 24/15 26/11	28/19 28/25 29/16
10:00 a.m [1] 28/25	address [7] 3/13 4/3 7/5 11/24 12/1	attached [3] 16/11 22/11 22/13
10th [2] 28/19 28/25	16/10 27/24	attempt [1] 18/6
11:22 [1] 1/6	addresses [4] 3/24 16/13 16/16 29/2	attorney [3] 1/13 1/16 26/16
11:58 [1] 29/16	addressing [2] 5/13 17/14	authorization [3] 9/9 9/13 11/3
	adequacy [1] 11/12	available [1] 23/23
	admit [1] 14/23	Avenue [2] 1/18 1/21
	admits [1] 5/10 Adviser [1] 8/25	В
	afield [1] 10/2	back [6] 11/16 11/21 13/1 15/12 26/7
	after [4] 5/8 7/10 12/23 28/14	28/14
	again [7] 8/15 9/7 9/21 10/20 14/14	backup [4] 7/19 15/24 15/25 15/25
1st [1] 2/23	14/22 19/14	backups [2] 4/14 16/3
2	against [1] 10/5	bad [3] 28/20 28/20 28/22
	agency [6] 7/22 15/3 15/3 15/7 17/15	barriers [1] 23/3
20 [2] 1/18 26/22 20001 [1] 1/22	17/17	basement [2] 4/12 15/22 bases [1] 21/21
	agree [4] 2/20 11/14 11/15 19/21 agreeable [1] 22/23	be [62]
	agreed [10] 8/9 8/11 8/16 8/17 9/21	bear [2] 9/1 11/6
2015 [1] 1/5	11/10 11/17 17/4 17/25 27/16	because [17] 3/10 3/20 4/16 5/16 6/14
202-354-3373 [1] 1/22	agreement [1] 9/22	6/20 7/23 10/3 11/15 16/14 19/19 22/21
	aided [1] 1/25	25/10 25/19 25/22 27/1 28/3
	aides [2] 3/24 12/4	been [22] 2/16 3/11 5/4 5/11 5/12 6/18
	all [36]	8/7 8/13 8/15 9/4 11/10 12/20 23/8
2705 [1] 1/19	along [4] 2/7 2/12 16/21 17/3 already [3] 9/22 23/8 26/9	23/11 24/5 24/13 24/15 26/6 26/9 26/13 27/3 27/4
3	alright [16] 2/9 2/14 3/7 7/25 18/2 19/24	before [5] 1/10 3/19 7/10 10/7 26/15
30 [1] 17/4	20/14 23/1 24/19 25/23 27/16 27/20	behalf [1] 2/7
31 [1] 1/5	28/10 28/18 29/11 29/14	BEKESHA [2] 1/13 2/7
333 [1] 1/21	also [6] 3/14 13/20 17/25 18/14 25/3	believe [8] 4/2 12/12 15/15 19/13 19/17
3373 [1] 1/22	26/4	20/22 22/12 24/3
4	Android [1] 20/9	Berman [1] 2/13
425 [1] 1/14	another [11] 10/7 11/5 11/5 15/7 16/18	better [2] 4/6 28/23
4700-C [1] 1/21	16/19 16/24 21/12 25/16 26/24 28/11 answer [14] 15/23 19/9 19/19 19/24	between [1] 9/6 bit [1] 6/14
		BlackBerries [6] 15/22 18/4 18/21 19/4
5	22/17 26/18 28/7	25/3 25/5
5172 [1] 1/15	answered [4] 21/23 23/9 26/6 26/9	BlackBerry [4] 4/10 19/25 25/11 25/14
55,000 [11] 2/24 4/24 5/19 8/5 8/10 10/6	answers [3] 16/20 23/9 29/3	Boasberg [1] 10/9
12/1 15/10 17/5 18/11 26/20 		bottom [1] 23/2
7		box [8] 6/15 6/16 6/17 6/18 6/19 6/21 21/16 25/22
785 [1] 10/19	23/23 24/2 24/14 24/17 anymore [1] 24/11	boxes [1] 26/22
	anyone [1] 23/3	Branch [1] 1/17
	anything [3] 25/2 28/10 29/12	brief [1] 15/18
800 [1] 1/14	anyway [1] 24/20	Briefly [1] 17/2
9	AP [2] 10/23 26/16	bring [3] 10/5 26/7 28/14
9:00 a.m [1] 5/7	appear [1] 5/18	brought [2] 5/7 11/5
	APPEARANCES [1] 1/12	burdensome [1] 12/14
Α	appears [1] 17/13 apples [1] 11/4	Bureau [2] 8/24 9/15 business [7] 3/25 16/11 16/17 16/19
a.m [4] 1/6 5/7 28/25 29/16	appres [1] 11/4 appreciate [1] 24/23	20/5 23/25 28/3
Abedin [22] 3/1 5/5 8/5 8/14 9/3 9/6 9/10	approach [1] 2/4	but [35]
11/1 13/19 14/18 10/5 10/9 10/10 1///	appropriate [5] 11/11 12/23 14/1 15/16	C
18/15 22/9 23/23 26/25 27/14 27/23	29/2	
able [1] 1/15	are [34]	CA [1] 1/4
about [27] 5/4 5/15 5/10 5/21 7/11 11/21	aren't [4] 6/21 7/1 14/12 14/20	Calling [1] 2/2
10/4 10/6 10/6 10/0 10/11 10/16 10/06	arguably [3] 13/6 15/4 25/10	can [15] 4/19 5/9 6/15 10/7 11/24 15/19 16/2 16/20 23/2 23/21 24/10 24/11
13/1 13/10 14/2 17/12 10/2 10/0 10/23	argument [1] 18/3 around [5] 6/10 10/17 13/21 15/22 20/14	26/19 27/9 28/23
21/11 24/21 25/3 26/8 26/17 28/15 29/5	as [17] 5/20 5/20 6/5 7/18 8/2 8/16 8/23	can't [4] 6/19 15/22 15/25 17/11
above [1] 30/4	9/6 9/7 10/2 11/3 11/11 15/2 15/6 16/18	can't resolve [1] 17/11
above-titled [1] 30/4	23/24 27/22	capacities [1] 24/2
	ask [4] 19/19 20/16 21/13 26/4	case [21] 5/18 5/19 7/10 7/11 7/12 7/14
account [5] 8/6 16/19 18/11 20/24 24/1 accounts [1] 27/25	asked [22] 4/5 4/25 12/16 18/19 18/20	9/2 9/9 10/4 10/5 10/19 10/21 10/23
acknowledged [1] 18/17	18/23 19/2 19/5 19/6 19/10 19/15 22/19	11/5 13/15 15/13 16/24 22/22 23/7
Act [4] 10/4 10/5 10/21 13/10	23/8 23/8 23/12 23/12 24/5 24/13 24/17	26/16 26/22
action [3] 2/2 9/3 10/15	26/5 26/15 26/22	cases [8] 10/12 10/19 11/22 11/25 12/10 12/13 12/25 13/2
actual [2] 12/3 19/6	asking [1] 22/21 assurances [1] 8/6	categories [1] 10/25
actually [3] 5/12 11/21 29/8		

-	1	l
C Case 1:13-cv-01363-EGS	Detricing entities 17/4 18/108/19/15	8/ p₈/5 <i>8</i> / 13 38/ f 6 37 /6 12/1 12/3 12/4
category [1] 8/17	28/20 28/20 28/22 28/23 30/8 date I [1] 28/23	13/7 73/12 14/16 16/8 16/9 16/12 17/6 17/7 18/10 20/13 20/23 23/25
Central [1] 8/25	Day [1] 28/15	each [1] 27/11
certify [1] 30/2	days [2] 17/4 29/8	easier [2] 6/14 21/8
cetera [2] 21/2 28/6	DĆ [4] 1/5 1/15 1/18 1/22	easy [1] 28/5
challenge [1] 11/11	decision [1] 15/4	efforts [1] 11/7
changed [1] 3/5	declaration [3] 9/23 17/11 23/10	EGS [1] 1/4
civil [3] 1/17 2/2 10/15 clear [1] 4/23	declare [1] 21/18	electronic [7] 6/14 18/21 19/4 19/11 20/19 21/15 21/16
clients [1] 9/10	Defendant [2] 1/7 1/16 definition [2] 17/17 17/18	electronically [1] 8/10
Clinton [28] 3/23 4/9 4/24 5/5 7/4 7/20	degree [1] 19/14	Elizabeth [1] 2/12
8/4 8/9 8/16 12/5 13/18 14/18 14/19	demonstrated [1] 27/22	else [8] 4/19 5/21 6/1 6/1 6/22 7/18
14/23 14/25 16/5 16/7 16/16 16/17 18/3	department [52]	28/11 29/12
25/6 25/10 26/19 27/1 27/15 27/25 28/1	Department's [5] 5/2 14/19 24/4 25/10	elsewhere [2] 6/25 7/2
28/4 Clinton's [2] 12/3 13/7	25/15 doskton [2] 4/10 7/10	EMMET [1] 1/10 employed [1] 9/11
clintonemail.com [2] 16/11 27/24	desktop [2] 4/10 7/19 desktops [2] 15/21 25/4	employee [1] 11/3
closed [3] 7/10 7/11 7/14	detailing [1] 9/24	employees [2] 21/13 26/17
co [1] 27/21	determine [1] 21/21	employment [4] 9/11 9/13 11/3 11/4
co-counsel [1] 27/21	determined [4] 8/11 8/14 8/19 9/14	engage [1] 9/10
colleague [1] 5/14	device [2] 19/25 25/18	enough [4] 5/24 15/11 15/14 29/11
colleagues [2] 11/21 13/4 COLUMBIA [1] 1/1	devices [16] 4/8 4/14 10/2 18/22 19/4 19/12 19/20 20/19 21/15 21/16 22/2	entirely [1] 9/13 entitled [2] 22/4 23/13
come [3] 2/19 9/22 11/15	23/6 24/15 25/7 26/11 28/6	equipment [2] 4/8 10/2
company [1] 17/21	did [11] 8/8 10/4 10/24 13/23 14/23	especially [1] 23/3
compel [1] 13/11	15/12 16/23 18/7 20/17 22/20 26/24	et [2] 21/1 28/6
complete [1] 17/9	didn't [8] 5/7 7/8 7/9 7/10 7/17 12/22	even [1] 13/25
completing [1] 10/25	14/18 14/19 different [8] 10/25 10/25 11/2 12/2 12/11	evening [1] 2/15
completing [1] 21/5 computer [2] 1/25 4/8	different [8] 10/25 10/25 11/2 12/2 13/11 13/13 13/14 18/8	ever[1] 24/13 ever[1] 13/19
computer-aided [1] 1/25	diligent [1] 23/11	everyone [4] 21/8 28/5 29/14 29/15
computers [1] 15/25	direct [2] 19/18 27/10	everything [5] 12/15 26/21 26/23 27/1
concern [4] 3/19 5/15 17/22 28/8	directed [3] 20/16 22/1 24/14	27/2
concerning [1] 23/25 concerns [3] 3/6 29/2 29/3	directive [1] 26/11	everywhere [1] 21/25
concluded [1] 29/16	directs [1] 26/4 discovery [2] 10/2 21/21	evidence [2] 4/23 7/4 exact [1] 10/6
conduct [12] 3/10 3/14 3/25 7/23 8/17	discuss [2] 10/1 15/8	example [3] 4/7 6/13 9/14
9/20 13/24 16/10 16/17 16/19 16/22	discussions [1] 7/15	exclusively [1] 14/18
28/2	disputes [1] 2/16	Executive [3] 8/24 9/15 14/15
conducted [6] 3/11 8/7 9/24 13/21 17/5	distinction [2] 10/20 10/23	exercising [1] 11/7
confuse [1] 25/2	DISTRICT [3] 1/1 1/1 1/11 Div [1] 1/17	exist [9] 6/12 6/13 7/18 7/18 7/19 7/20 14/3 17/14 21/21
confusing [1] 6/15		existence [1] 22/3
consolidation [1] 12/16	15/10 20/12 23/19 23/21 25/24 26/2	existing [1] 8/7
constitute [1] 18/24	26/8 27/5 28/10 28/11 29/7 29/9	exists [1] 21/9
Constitution [1] 1/21	docket [1] 27/18	expected [2] 14/8 14/11
contain [1] 4/9 contend [2] 4/4 6/6	document [3] 2/15 3/13 3/13 documents [15] 8/8 8/13 9/7 9/21 17/23	expects [1] 13/18 expedition [1] 21/12
contention [1] 3/4	18/9 18/18 18/24 19/7 20/4 20/5 20/13	expressly [1] 19/2
continue [2] 7/15 7/17	21/3 21/6 24/18	extent [2] 14/4 26/9
contracts [2] 9/5 9/6	documents that [1] 21/3	extremely [1] 9/2
Contreras [2] 12/12 12/18	does [12] 3/6 3/12 3/15 3/17 5/3 5/10	F
control [1] 17/24 copies [5] 5/5 5/8 21/19 22/7 23/19	5/18 11/6 11/25 12/9 18/5 26/10 doesn't [2] 15/24 27/2	face [1] 15/16
copy [4] 24/8 24/9 25/25 25/25	doing [4] 4/3 6/7 15/15 18/16	fact [3] 5/17 12/5 20/17
correct [7] 2/17 7/3 7/16 10/22 15/10	domain [1] 16/15	fair [7] 23/4 23/4 27/5 27/7 27/8 27/10
27/18 30/3	don't [29] 2/19 4/15 6/12 6/12 12/11	29/11
could [12] 4/13 4/14 6/13 6/17 7/16 7/18		fairly [1] 9/12
7/19 7/20 7/22 22/7 25/9 25/18 counsel [12] 2/4 8/1 11/20 17/1 21/22	16/3 16/4 16/13 16/15 16/21 16/25 19/13 19/22 23/6 23/7 24/10 25/2 26/2	far [2] 9/7 10/2 federal [10] 1/17 6/17 10/4 10/5 10/21
22/16 24/24 26/18 27/11 27/18 27/21	26/7 26/20 26/24 27/24	13/9 18/10 18/16 18/24 23/24
28/18	done [9] 5/7 5/20 6/19 11/16 17/4 17/9	few [1] 5/9
course [3] 18/25 20/5 26/10	17/24 20/12 24/21	figure [5] 4/19 7/15 15/14 20/20 28/7
court [11] 1/1 1/20 1/20 3/20 5/6 5/9	down [1] 12/25	filed [7] 2/15 2/22 2/22 3/3 7/12 8/3 29/6
10/17 12/9 15/14 15/18 15/19	duly [1] 23/11	files [9] 5/25 6/4 6/6 6/8 18/21 19/3
Courthouse [1] 1/21 created [1] 20/5	during [4] 5/1 16/17 18/25 26/15	19/11 19/24 21/14 final [1] 16/7
CSR [3] 1/20 30/2 30/9	E	find [4] 5/22 7/22 9/21 21/12
cv [2] 1/4 10/19		fine [6] 23/1 23/19 27/20 28/16 28/17
D	16/10 16/13 16/15 16/16 16/19 24/1	28/24
database [1] 7/8		finish [1] 13/18 first [6] 3/6 6/10 7/17 11/25 13/21 15/20
luatabase [1] 1/0	e-mails [26] 2/25 3/1 3/25 4/13 5/4 7/6	first [6] 3/6 6/10 7/17 11/25 13/21 15/20

F Case 1:13-cv-01363-EGS	Decetofore 11 24/10 Filed 08/17/15	J Page 34 of 37
fishing [1] 21/11	Honor [24] 2/6 2/10 2/18 2/21 3/17 7/3	JEB [1] 10/20
Fitton [1] 2/8 five [1] 10/25	8/2 8/3 11/13 11/24 17/2 22/17 23/16 23/18 24/25 26/14 27/6 27/21 28/9	JEFF [3] 1/20 30/2 30/9 joint [4] 2/22 8/3 16/12 27/23
FOIĂ [13] 3/3 4/21 4/25 5/3 9/2 10/3	28/12 28/13 28/21 28/24 29/13	judge [21] 1/11 4/24 5/14 5/15 10/7 10/8
10/24 12/4 15/11 17/22 20/3 22/20 26/23	HONORABLE [1] 1/10 HOOK [3] 1/20 30/2 30/9	10/8 10/9 10/11 10/12 10/13 11/19 11/22 12/9 12/12 12/15 12/17 13/2 13/8
follow [2] 9/19 19/16	hour [1] 5/6	23/5 26/15
following [2] 8/9 11/19 foregoing [1] 30/3	how [1] 29/6 huma [1] 16/11	judges [1] 11/23 judgment [1] 13/16
Foreign [1] 9/1	Human [2] 8/24 9/15	JUDICIAL [6] 1/3 1/14 2/3 2/7 10/18
former [6] 18/1 18/9 18/11 21/13 22/8 27/14	hundred [1] 6/18	11/25 July [2] 1/5 2/23
forms [1] 9/3		July 1st [1] 2/23
Forthwith [1] 23/1 forward [1] 2/19	' [4] 6/13 27/5 27/7 27/8 'm [18] 5/8 10/14 11/21 13/3 20/6 21/8	just [16] 4/15 6/19 13/4 15/16 16/20 16/25 18/2 19/8 19/11 20/19 21/8 21/22
four [4] 5/16 7/4 15/3 16/17	21/23 23/2 23/14 24/12 25/23 26/2 26/3	24/21 26/18 27/3 27/10
furnished [1] 20/25 furnishing [1] 20/23	26/8 27/10 27/21 28/5 28/19 I've [1] 6/19	Justice [2] 1/17 2/11
G	idea [1] 26/3	K
garage [1] 21/17	identified [2] 8/20 26/11 identify [3] 2/4 15/20 28/1	keep [2] 16/3 20/17 Kerry [1] 13/12
gave [1] 19/8	identify what [1] 28/1	kicking [1] 10/16
get [11] 5/7 16/21 20/20 21/8 22/4 23/2 23/13 25/24 25/24 26/1 29/3	identifying [1] 22/2	kinds [1] 21/21 knew [1] 7/7
gets [1] 6/14		know [46]
give [2] 21/20 28/23 given [1] 20/22	impose [1] 23/3 improper [1] 13/15	known [1] 3/22 knows [2] 6/25 15/17
go [7] 6/12 6/19 13/25 14/21 16/2 24/10	in [69]	
26/8 going [22] 8/23 11/21 13/3 14/13 14/15	inadequate [1] 11/19 INC [3] 1/3 1/14 2/3	Labor [1] 28/15
14/17 14/20 14/21 15/5 15/10 17/25	including [3] 9/5 18/10 20/13	language [2] 20/18 28/7
21/24 23/2 23/15 25/23 25/24 26/2 26/3 26/8 27/10 28/19 29/4	incomplete [7] 3/11 3/21 3/23 6/10 7/13 7/24 14/14	laptop [1] 20/1 last [4] 2/15 3/12 16/7 17/4
good [14] 2/6 2/9 2/10 2/14 8/1 8/2	indeed [1] 19/19	later [1] 15/13
15/11 15/14 16/23 21/10 21/22 28/20 29/3 29/15	independent [1] 13/5 indirectly [1] 20/23	lawsuit [3] 13/10 13/11 13/11 lawsuits [4] 10/16 12/7 12/8 13/6
government [54]	indirectly [1] 20/23 individual [1] 9/10	learned [1] 13/22
Government's [5] 12/21 20/1 20/21 22/4 23/11	individually [1] 17/22 individuals [7] 18/20 20/17 22/1 24/9	least [5] 12/12 16/8 16/9 23/7 27/23 lecturn [1] 2/4
grow [1] 13/6	25/25 26/1 27/11	left [1] 4/11
guess [1] 22/14	information [8] 4/6 4/9 4/18 15/20 21/9 21/9 23/13 26/1	Legal [1] 8/25 legitimate [1] 28/8
Н		Leon [4] 4/24 5/14 10/8 26/15
Hackett [1] 5/2 had [14] 4/5 4/6 7/13 7/15 8/7 8/15 8/18	19/17 21/6 initially [1] 3/15	Leon's [1] 5/15 let [5] 7/25 11/8 11/20 15/18 18/2
9/22 12/5 15/12 25/16 25/18 25/19	instance [1] 6/22	let's [3] 19/11 19/23 28/18
25/21 handle [1] 13/2	intentionally [1] 7/1 interested [1] 12/19	letter [10] 8/21 18/8 18/14 18/17 24/9 25/25 27/11 27/12 27/13 27/14
happy [1] 5/8	interested [1] 12/19 internet [1] 4/12	letters [14] 18/1 18/8 19/13 22/7 22/10
has [16] 3/21 4/24 5/20 7/22 10/18 14/4 14/5 16/7 16/8 16/9 17/4 20/10 22/4	interrelation [1] 11/1	22/20 22/24 23/15 24/20 26/3 26/18 27/10 27/12 27/17
27/2 27/4 27/16	into [1] 6/14 invite [1] 11/20	like [4] 6/9 24/6 24/11 25/8
hasn't [1] 13/17 have [60]	involve [1] 10/24 involved [4] 2/24 11/1 11/2 11/2	likely [2] 8/19 9/17 limited [3] 4/18 9/2 9/5
haven't [3] 6/18 13/1 21/20	involving [1] 10/19	list [1] 26/17
having [1] 11/22 he [9] 5/3 5/4 12/16 12/19 12/20 18/3		little [1] 6/14 longer [1] 25/11
21/10 26/22 26/24	lis [88] lis the [1] 18/18	look [2] 4/19 23/2
head [6] 4/25 5/2 15/2 15/3 15/6 26/23 hear [1] 7/25	isn't [1] 14/2 issue [21] 3/2 3/6 3/7 3/13 3/16 3/19 4/3	looking [4] 6/21 14/13 16/2 16/20 lot [1] 16/25
heard [1] 13/1	5/13 5/18 7/16 9/8 10/6 15/7 15/18	M
hearing [8] 1/10 4/25 5/2 5/6 11/5 26/15 28/11 29/1	15/23 16/7 20/15 26/4 26/9 26/21 27/8 issued [2] 25/4 25/12	made [1] 15/4
hearings [1] 12/24	issues [9] 2/23 3/4 3/6 8/4 10/13 12/2	mail [14] 3/24 7/5 8/6 12/5 13/4 14/20
held [1] 4/25 helpful [1] 28/1	12/2 15/8 16/6 it [60]	16/10 16/13 16/15 16/16 16/19 24/1 27/23 27/25
her [11] 3/24 4/13 7/4 7/7 7/9 11/2 16/8	it's [9] 5/16 5/24 6/17 13/15 14/2 14/11	mails [26] 2/25 3/1 3/25 4/13 5/4 7/6 8/4
16/17 25/11 25/14 28/2 here [10] 5/9 5/20 6/17 6/22 10/21 11/7	15/11 17/21 28/24 items [1] 10/2	8/5 8/10 8/16 10/6 12/1 12/3 12/4 13/7 13/12 14/16 16/8 16/9 16/12 17/6 17/7
13/15 17/9 21/24 26/8	its [7] 5/25 6/4 6/6 6/7 9/19 11/7 14/5	18/10 20/13 20/23 23/25
here's [1] 25/23		maintain [1] 20/17 maintained [7] 18/20 19/3 19/10 19/25
İ	i	i

	4	
M Case 1:13-cv-01363-EGS	ውውፎኒ(ከተፈተስተ 27-1 Filed 08/17/15	^{17#5} a196 ¹ 3569937
•••	next [1] 22/6	paper [1] 6/16
maintained [3] 20/8 21/1 21/14 make [5] 5/23 6/13 21/8 23/23 28/5	nice [1] 29/14 no [15] 1/4 4/23 8/12 8/14 9/7 10/9	paragraph [1] 3/12
makes [4] 13/1 16/25 21/10 21/22	15/21 17/24 18/7 19/22 20/10 25/10	part [1] 23/9 particular [1] 18/15
many [2] 10/18 11/23	28/12 28/13 29/13	parties [3] 9/22 11/10 17/11
Marcia [1] 2/12	non [4] 3/24 17/21 18/10 20/24	past [1] 3/22
Massachusetts [1] 1/18	not [67]	Paul [1] 2/7
material [1] 23/6	nothing [1] 5/21	penalty [1] 21/18
materials [6] 20/18 21/1 21/19 21/20	notifications [1] 9/3	pending [1] 10/7
22/3 24/15	notify [1] 29/9	people [1] 7/6
matter [2] 13/7 30/4 may [33]		perhaps [1] 19/16 period [2] 5/16 6/4
maybe [4] 10/12 15/5 23/8 28/14	number [3] 10/10 10/15 10/19	period [2] 3/16 6/4 permitted [1] 10/1
me [17] 2/7 2/12 5/8 7/25 10/11 11/8	NW [2] 1/18 1/21	personal [7] 8/6 9/5 15/1 18/4 18/4
11/20 11/22 11/22 13/5 13/7 18/2 19/8	0	20/13 24/1
20/15 20/16 21/11 27/22		personnel [2] 9/3 9/12
mean [10] 4/22 11/14 13/4 14/3 23/12		PETER [2] 1/16 2/10
24/10 24/11 24/20 25/20 28/22		pick [2] 18/3 28/18
meant [1] 25/4 mechanical [1] 1/24	objection [1] 10/13 objections [1] 27/9	piece [1] 16/24
media [1] 13/22		place [1] 5/16 places [5] 5/9 6/11 7/21 7/22 15/20
mentioned [2] 8/3 9/16	obligation [11] 7/23 14/4 14/5 14/7 17/23	Plaintiff [13] 1/4 1/13 8/4 8/21 10/1 11/6
methods [1] 14/8	18/6 20/2 20/3 20/10 20/11 20/21	11/12 11/18 17/2 17/13 18/2 26/16 29/9
MICHAEL [2] 1/13 2/6	obligations [1] 4/21	Plaintiff's [7] 9/1 11/20 17/12 21/7 21/10
Mills [17] 3/1 5/5 8/5 8/13 13/20 14/18	occasions [1] 12/13	22/10 27/17
16/5 16/12 16/18 17/7 18/15 22/8 23/22	occur [2] 13/16 13/17	Plaintiffs [2] 10/4 23/11
26/25 27/13 28/2 28/3	occurred [1] 11/5	pleadings [2] 22/12 22/14
Mills' [1] 16/15 mind [1] 9/1	off [5] 15/23 16/1 16/6 21/11 21/24 Office [5] 8/24 8/25 9/15 14/15 14/17	please [1] 2/4
minute [4] 22/16 26/4 27/7 29/2	offices [2] 8/20 9/16	point [14] 5/9 7/14 9/18 9/23 11/2 11/25 17/22 20/21 21/10 21/22 22/5 24/21
mistaken [1] 13/22	official [8] 1/20 3/25 16/10 16/17 16/19	26/5 27/22
more [4] 5/15 13/24 15/13 25/2	23/25 24/2 28/2	points [1] 24/25
morning [7] 2/6 2/9 2/10 2/14 5/7 8/1 8/2		Policy [1] 9/1
motion [1] 7/12	oh [2] 10/18 20/7	posed [1] 26/25
move [1] 16/20	okay [8] 3/12 20/14 23/1 23/19 24/5	position [5] 3/5 11/18 12/21 12/22 16/22
moving [1] 17/3 Mr. [2] 5/2 26/21	26/8 26/14 28/21 old [1] 7/19	possess [1] 20/18
Mr. Hackett [1] 5/2	on [34]	possession [8] 17/23 20/4 23/24 25/10 25/15 25/15 26/12 27/3
Mr. Reines [1] 26/21	once [2] 14/14 15/12	possibilities [1] 4/16
Mrs [1] 18/3	one [25] 3/6 3/8 8/4 9/2 10/11 10/12	possibility [1] 4/22
Mrs. [23] 3/23 4/9 4/24 5/5 7/20 12/3		possible [3] 7/22 25/20 26/14
12/5 13/7 13/18 14/18 14/19 14/23		post [1] 27/18
14/25 16/5 16/7 16/17 25/6 25/10 26/19	25/16 26/14 27/11 27/13 27/22 27/23	potential [1] 18/6
27/1 27/25 28/1 28/4 Mrs. Clinton [21] 3/23 4/9 4/24 5/5 7/20	ones [1] 25/4 only [2] 9/25 11/1	precise [1] 21/25
12/5 13/18 14/18 14/19 14/23 14/25	,	precisely [1] 17/3 prepared [1] 10/14
16/5 16/7 16/17 25/6 25/10 26/19 27/1		preserved [1] 24/3
27/25 28/1 28/4	or [46]	presumably [1] 20/24
Mrs. Clinton's [2] 12/3 13/7	oranges [1] 11/4	pretty [1] 12/22
Ms [2] 17/7 18/15		primarily [1] 5/19
Ms. [35]	Orfanedes [1] 2/8	primary [1] 20/3
Ms. Abedin [19] 3/1 5/5 8/14 9/3 9/6 9/10 11/1 13/19 14/18 16/5 16/9 16/10	originally [1] 4/5 other [25] 4/22 5/17 5/20 8/7 9/16 10/16	private [13] 12/5 14/24 15/2 17/19 17/20 18/21 19/3 19/11 19/25 20/8 20/19 21/1
22/9 23/23 26/25 27/14 27/23 28/2 28/3	10/20 10/23 12/4 13/25 14/3 18/21	21/15
Ms. Mills [15] 3/1 5/5 8/13 14/18 16/5	18/24 19/4 21/15 21/21 22/2 23/5 25/7	privileged [1] 11/18
16/12 16/18 17/7 18/15 22/8 23/22	25/17 26/11 26/14 27/22 27/25 28/6	probably [1] 7/14
26/25 27/13 28/2 28/3	others [1] 18/3	proceedings [3] 1/24 29/16 30/4
Ms. Mills' [1] 16/15		process [7] 16/3 16/21 17/3 17/9 18/16
much [3] 12/22 24/23 29/6	21/16 22/3 24/3 24/20 25/8 28/6	21/5 29/10
must [1] 21/18 my [9] 5/13 9/18 11/21 13/4 19/2 19/9	our [6] 3/5 3/19 10/17 12/13 17/22 21/14 ours [1] 12/8	
20/8 22/5 27/21	out [8] 4/7 4/19 7/16 12/24 13/6 15/14	produce [3] 11/11 14/9 14/12 produced [4] 1/25 27/1 27/3 27/4
	20/20 28/7	producing [3] 11/17 13/18 29/5
N		Programs [1] 1/17
name [1] 16/15	over [7] 5/4 5/16 23/15 24/16 25/11	property [1] 15/6
narrow [1] 9/12	26/20 27/17	proposing [2] 11/9 24/12
necessarily [1] 3/25		provide [10] 4/17 18/9 18/23 20/13 22/7
necessary [2] 9/23 17/10 need [6] 13/23 21/23 24/8 24/19 26/10	own [4] 5/25 6/4 6/6 6/8 owned [1] 17/21	22/19 22/20 22/22 23/21 24/17 provided [10] 3/1 8/13 8/22 9/4 17/7
29/7		18/11 18/17 21/6 21/19 26/22
needed [2] 25/21 25/22	Р	providing [1] 22/23
New [1] 16/23	pages [9] 2/25 4/24 5/19 6/18 8/5 8/11	public [1] 23/10
	1	

_	1 40/40 00/44 00/4- 0-/40	I 143 07/04
P Case 1:13-cv-01363-EGS	D&&&A&A&277 45/ F3I&&0874 7/15 Room[1]	so ppdde2361 of 37 sound11 24/6
purpose [1] 22/1	RPR [3] 1/20 30/2 30/9	sounds [1] 13/13
put [4] 6/16 6/18 27/7 29/1	S	special [1] 11/3
IQ .		speculating [1] 24/21
question [11] 15/23 16/1 17/24 19/2	said [12] 5/3 5/4 7/5 7/13 7/19 12/22 12/24 13/18 14/25 25/7 26/24 28/6	speculation [1] 14/2 spend [2] 15/13 24/11
19/9 19/19 20/7 20/19 23/7 26/15 26/24	same [6] 3/18 5/13 8/15 13/6 13/20	spoke [1] 17/3
questions [9] 21/23 21/25 23/8 23/12	16/21	standards [1] 3/3
25/16 25/24 26/5 26/6 26/17	satisfactory [1] 8/8	start [1] 15/19
quick [1] 24/25 quite [1] 13/17	satisfied [2] 3/5 6/3 satisfy [2] 3/3 4/20	state [39] state.gov [6] 7/5 15/1 16/14 17/21 18/11
	say [11] 5/25 6/19 10/15 11/16 11/18	20/24
R	13/25 16/22 17/20 19/11 20/12 26/3	statement [1] 9/19
raise [1] 13/4	saying [12] 5/24 5/24 6/4 11/9 17/8 17/8	statements [1] 13/20
raised [1] 8/4 reached [1] 12/24	17/21 19/1 20/6 21/7 21/10 23/5 says [2] 15/9 18/3	STATES [3] 1/1 1/6 1/11
read [1] 7/11	search [40]	status [10] 1/10 2/22 6/5 8/3 9/19 16/12 27/23 28/11 29/1 29/6
really [2] 9/8 11/6	searched [13] 3/15 4/13 4/14 4/15 5/25	stenography [1] 1/24
reason [2] 13/15 24/2	6/4 6/9 7/8 7/9 8/10 8/12 19/20 26/13	step [2] 15/20 22/6
reasonable [4] 6/20 9/14 11/7 11/15 reasonably [4] 8/19 9/17 14/8 14/11	searches [10] 3/2 3/10 3/10 5/18 7/23	still [5] 13/17 15/2 16/7 16/13 24/12
reasons [1] 11/20	8/7 9/24 13/24 15/11 16/22 searching [11] 3/18 5/19 6/1 6/7 6/10	storage [1] 4/11
received [2] 24/1 26/17	6/11 7/1 7/1 7/24 15/9 21/24	stored [1] 15/21 storing [1] 6/15
record [13] 2/5 5/8 6/17 7/13 8/18 8/21	second [3] 8/12 16/25 19/23	Street [1] 1/14
17/10 17/13 17/14 17/16 17/17 17/18	Secretariat [3] 8/25 9/16 14/16	stuck [1] 16/21
30/3 recorded [1] 1/24	secretaries [2] 18/9 22/8	subject [1] 11/11
recorded [1] 1/24 recordkeeping [1] 24/4	secretary [7] 7/4 13/11 14/17 16/18 18/11 25/11 27/14	subjected [1] 13/7 submit [3] 17/11 22/6 26/19
records [68]	see [4] 11/8 24/19 25/17 29/15	submitted [1] 9/24
recover [1] 13/12	seem [2] 6/24 10/1	substance [1] 23/22
redacted [1] 16/14	seems [5] 2/15 11/22 13/7 20/15 20/15	such [5] 9/7 10/2 20/12 23/24 24/17
refer [1] 29/6 referring [1] 26/18	seen [4] 2/17 22/10 22/11 22/14 send [4] 13/3 18/8 18/16 21/24	sufficient [2] 3/3 3/20 suggest [4] 2/15 6/24 28/19 29/8
regarding [2] 9/9 10/6	sending [1] 21/11	suggestion [1] 9/18
Reines [1] 26/21	sense [3] 4/6 13/1 16/25	Suite [1] 1/14
related [3] 5/3 12/4 13/6	sent [9] 7/6 18/1 18/14 18/25 20/23 22/8	
relating [1] 12/2 relevant [1] 6/4	22/20 23/25 27/14 separate [1] 27/14	summary [1] 13/16 suppose [1] 19/24
relied [1] 13/20	September [2] 28/19 28/25	supposed [1] 14/16
remain [1] 3/6	September the [2] 28/19 28/25	sure [4] 5/23 11/24 25/1 28/22
remaining [1] 3/7	series [1] 27/12	SW [1] 1/14
reminded [1] 27/22 reopen [3] 7/12 15/12 16/24	server [16] 7/20 7/20 12/5 14/20 14/24 15/1 15/5 15/5 16/4 16/8 16/16 16/19	system [7] 3/15 4/1 7/24 14/14 15/4 17/17 17/18
reopening [1] 9/9	19/25 27/25 28/2 28/4	systems [16] 3/18 3/21 3/23 4/7 6/11
report [7] 2/23 6/5 8/3 9/19 16/12 27/23	servers [8] 4/15 15/25 17/19 18/4 18/21	8/18 8/20 9/20 13/25 14/3 15/25 17/10
29/6	19/4 21/1 21/15	17/13 17/14 17/16 24/4
reporter [3] 1/20 1/20 5/6 represent [1] 9/10	services [1] 9/6	T
representing [1] 2/11	serving [1] 24/1 set [2] 9/12 16/16	table [3] 15/24 16/1 16/6
request [2] 9/2 10/3	sets [1] 18/8	take [1] 15/15
requesting [2] 18/9 18/15	several [3] 3/23 6/18 11/25	taken [3] 5/11 5/16 13/12
requests [5] 10/24 12/4 12/6 22/21 23/22	Shapiro [1] 2/12	takes [1] 16/1
research [9] 6/6 8/17 8/23 9/8 11/9	she [18] 4/11 7/5 7/6 7/21 13/19 13/19 14/23 14/25 15/2 15/3 15/4 15/4 15/6	taking [1] 13/22 talk [5] 10/13 11/21 12/25 19/23 26/8
17/10 17/25 29/4 29/5	16/8 16/13 16/14 25/11 26/20	talked [1] 13/10
resolve [3] 3/15 15/18 17/11	should [18] 4/3 5/25 6/7 10/1 10/12	talking [3] 17/12 20/14 25/3
resolving [2] 10/13 15/19	15/14 15/15 19/18 19/20 20/16 21/25	technology [2] 10/3 16/4
resolving [2] 10/13 15/19 Resources [2] 8/24 9/15	23/7 23/9 23/12 24/13 24/21 26/5 28/14 shouldn't [6] 10/11 10/11 15/17 19/5	tell [8] 7/8 7/9 7/10 7/17 7/18 21/14 21/17 24/14
respect [4] 2/21 11/12 13/9 26/21	19/15 21/4	telling [1] 13/5
respond [1] 10/14	shows [1] 7/4	term [1] 17/18
responded [1] 20/25	simply [1] 18/23	terms [8] 3/19 8/9 8/11 8/15 9/22 11/10
response [1] 20/7 responses [7] 23/17 24/10 24/20 26/1	since [1] 26/2 sit [1] 12/25	11/16 17/5 testify [1] 5/1
26/2 27/12 27/17	sit[1] 12/25 sitting [2] 4/12 15/22	thank [7] 2/21 7/25 24/22 24/23 24/24
responsive [9] 5/22 8/12 8/14 8/19 9/17	small [1] 27/22	27/6 28/9
9/25 14/9 14/12 29/9	so [45]	that [233]
result [1] 8/23 results [1] 29/5	some [11] 4/6 6/6 6/12 12/3 12/6 13/17	that's [37]
returned [2] 5/11 5/12	18/17 21/23 22/12 25/9 28/7 something [7] 6/1 6/1 6/2 10/24 21/12	the former [1] 18/1 their [16] 3/5 4/20 12/4 12/21 13/20
revised [3] 3/14 8/18 9/20	25/8 27/4	13/23 14/8 15/15 15/24 21/17 22/12
right [11] 4/1 13/13 14/6 14/10 17/1	somewhere [1] 6/21	22/13 23/24 24/1 24/9 27/3

Case 1:13-cv-01363-EGS them [10] 3/1 11/1 13/24 19/19 20/13 22/14 22/20 22/22 24/9 27/18 themselves [1] 2/4 then [25] 3/1 4/3 10/1 11/11 11/18 11/20 13/8 13/9 15/22 15/25 16/6 16/12 16/23 17/16 19/20 20/1 20/9 20/20 21/20 22/14 24/10 25/17 26/9 27/9 29/9 there's [8] 4/23 12/8 17/24 20/15 21/10 21/12 21/22 28/23 thereafter [1] 29/10 these [15] 3/19 4/14 7/21 7/23 10/12 10/13 10/19 10/24 11/22 12/10 12/25 13/2 13/25 14/3 15/8 they [78] they're [13] 6/10 6/11 6/21 6/21 7/1 14/15 14/17 14/21 18/16 22/13 23/5 23/12 23/13 they've [6] 2/16 20/12 22/14 24/5 24/13 26/9 thing [2] 21/11 21/12 things [1] 19/7 think [29] 4/5 7/4 11/14 11/15 11/20 11/23 12/20 12/22 12/23 13/1 13/15 13/23 15/16 15/17 15/18 16/25 19/18 19/22 21/22 21/25 22/16 24/11 24/12 24/19 26/5 27/5 27/8 27/9 29/11 think that [1] 19/22 third [5] 1/14 3/2 3/16 4/3 8/16 this [30] 4/9 4/17 5/7 6/5 7/13 7/20 9/2 9/18 10/3 10/3 10/6 11/16 11/17 11/17 12/9 15/5 15/13 15/17 16/8 16/16 16/24 19/23 20/15 21/9 22/22 23/2 23/6 24/21 26/5 26/22 those [38] though [7] 14/2 18/3 19/2 19/10 20/15 21/13 21/23 three [9] 2/23 3/4 3/22 8/4 8/6 9/8 10/12 22/1 27/11 through [6] 8/10 9/4 9/19 13/22 16/2 26/17 time [13] 5/17 6/4 6/10 12/23 13/17 13/21 13/24 15/13 15/17 16/25 24/11 28/20 29/6 Times [1] 16/23 titled [1] 30/4 today [4] 10/15 15/19 23/20 24/11 together [2] 27/7 29/1 told [1] 7/9 Tom [1] 2/8 too [1] 11/23 were [34] topic [1] 9/8 transcript [5] 1/10 1/24 5/6 26/19 30/3 transcription [1] 1/25 transmittal [1] 8/21 TRIAL [1] 1/16 trick [1] 23/14 tried [1] 15/8 trust [3] 15/10 16/22 17/8 try [4] 21/12 27/7 28/10 29/1 trying [6] 4/18 15/14 21/8 23/13 23/14 turn [2] 23/15 27/17 turned [4] 5/4 24/16 25/11 26/20 twice [1] 19/9 two [10] 3/5 3/6 3/22 5/6 8/5 9/4 12/12 18/8 24/25 26/7

U.S [2] 1/17 1/21 unaware [1] 25/19 **Discontist 15/27-1** Filed 08/17/15 whp 160 2/139719/15 21/4 25/7 28/6 under [4] 4/21 15/11 17/18 21/18 will [14] 3/9 3/14 3/25 6/5 6/5 9/7 9/20 understand [9] 5/23 6/5 11/8 19/1 19/8 19/9 20/6 21/7 21/9 UNITED [3] 1/1 1/6 1/11 unless [1] 20/15 unplugged [1] 4/11 unreasonable [2] 23/3 24/12 unresolved [1] 4/4 until [2] 5/7 15/17 unwilling [1] 4/17 up [2] 16/16 18/3 upon [3] 8/16 11/6 11/10 us [15] 4/17 4/17 7/8 7/9 7/9 7/10 7/17 7/18 10/12 15/10 17/8 20/13 21/14 21/17 21/20 use [3] 14/19 15/5 28/7 used [12] 3/24 4/9 7/5 7/21 11/16 14/23 14/25 15/2 16/5 16/10 27/23 28/2 using [7] 8/15 9/21 11/10 14/8 16/13 16/14 16/18 value [1] 15/16 versus [1] 2/3 very [8] 4/18 4/18 10/2 11/2 13/11 13/14 York [1] 16/23 21/25 24/23 wait [4] 13/16 13/23 15/17 22/16 want [7] 5/23 6/12 12/21 12/25 14/21 25/2 26/7 wants [1] 14/13 was [37] Washington [4] 1/5 1/15 1/18 1/22 WATCH [6] 1/3 1/14 2/3 2/7 10/18 11/25 way [3] 10/4 10/10 20/7 we [65] we'll [3] 28/7 28/10 29/1 we're [13] 4/18 5/9 10/20 11/17 13/5 15/9 15/10 15/12 16/2 16/20 17/20 20/14 24/20 we've [7] 11/16 11/16 11/17 15/8 17/9 17/25 18/1 WECHSLER [2] 1/16 2/11 Wednesday [1] 4/25 week [1] 26/7 weekend [1] 29/14 weeks [1] 26/7 well [8] 5/20 6/2 6/9 15/11 19/16 22/13 26/6 26/12 went [3] 4/11 19/13 26/16

were sent [1] 18/25

what's [3] 11/17 15/14 20/1

21/14 21/18 21/21 22/2 24/14

weren't [1] 25/22

what [44]

21/17

25/10 26/22

whenever [1] 13/16

7/18 14/13 26/8

15/20 20/12 23/22 while [3] 4/10 9/11 24/1

who [2] 12/9 15/17

who's [2] 5/2 26/21

yeah [6] 10/18 13/14 20/7 22/6 22/15 25/1 whatever [6] 2/16 11/5 11/18 20/9 20/18 when [15] 2/22 2/24 2/25 3/3 4/10 6/9 6/14 7/8 13/18 15/18 16/13 17/20 25/3 where [9] 4/19 5/9 5/21 6/11 6/13 6/23 whether [17] 3/2 3/9 3/20 5/10 5/17 11/6 15/1 17/21 18/20 19/3 19/10 20/17 which [9] 3/8 5/20 10/8 12/17 13/24 14/4

10/15 13/19 13/25 17/9 17/10 26/10 29/1 within [2] 4/8 4/20 won't [1] 13/24 word [2] 13/23 15/15 words [2] 18/25 25/17 work [2] 4/17 5/3 would [17] 2/3 2/24 2/25 3/18 3/18 7/7 7/15 9/16 12/14 13/8 14/1 17/19 19/16 19/20 21/16 24/11 28/1 would then [1] 13/8 wouldn't [3] 7/14 19/21 22/22 writes [1] 16/23

year [3] 5/16 15/13 16/24 years [5] 3/22 3/22 7/5 15/3 16/18 yes [13] 2/18 11/13 19/20 19/24 20/24 21/18 22/18 22/25 23/16 23/18 24/7 24/24 27/19 yesterday [2] 2/22 29/6 you [61] you'll [3] 25/24 26/1 29/3 you're [10] 5/24 5/24 11/9 11/9 13/5 14/13 19/1 22/23 23/15 25/24 your [27] 2/6 2/10 2/18 2/21 3/17 7/3 8/2 8/2 11/13 11/24 17/2 20/7 21/14 22/17 23/16 23/18 24/25 26/14 27/6 27/21 28/9 28/12 28/13 28/21 28/24 29/6 29/13