

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
 2) SS:
 3 COUNTY OF COOK)
 4 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
 5 COUNTY DEPARTMENT - CHANCERY DIVISION
 6
 7 JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.,)
 8 Plaintiff,)
 9 vs.) No. 16 CH 00462
 10 THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR)
 11 OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO)
 12 and)
 13 RAHM EMANUEL, in his)
 14 official capacity as)
 15 Mayor of the City of)
 16 Chicago,)
 17 Defendant.)
 18 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS at the hearing of
 19 the above-entitled cause before the
 20 Honorable ANNA HELEN DEMACOPOULOS, Judge of said
 21 Court, on November 15, 2017, at the hour of
 22 9:30 a.m.
 23 Reported by: Patricia L. Wangler, CSR
 24 License No.: 084-002417

1

1 (whereupon, the following
 2 proceedings were held in open
 3 court.)
 4 THE COURT: Good morning.
 5 MS. SVENSON: Good morning.
 6 MS. RITTER: Good morning, Judge. Amber Ritter
 7 on behalf of the City.
 8 MR. PHILLIP: Phillip Santell, S-A-N-T-E-L-L,
 9 corporation counsel on behalf of the defendants.
 10 MS. SVENSON: Christine Svenson on behalf of
 11 the plaintiff.
 12 THE COURT: All right. So we continued this
 13 from last week on a couple of issues.
 14 MS. RITTER: Right.
 15 THE COURT: So go ahead, Miss Ritter.
 16 MS. RITTER: So last time we were here a week
 17 ago, your Honor, a few things we had to come back
 18 and explain to the court. And so the first one is
 19 I am going to give the court and Miss Svenson a
 20 packet of materials that you asked us to go
 21 through. So we will go through that together.
 22 The first page of this packet and the
 23 second page is the -- your Honor had asked us to
 24 verify with our tech people to show the court when

3

1 APPEARANCES:
 2 SVENSON LAW OFFICES, by
 3 MS. CHRISTINE SVENSON
 4 505 North LaSalle Street, Suite 350
 5 Chicago, Illinois 60654
 6 (312) 467-2900
 7 christine@svensonlawoffices.com
 8 Representing the Plaintiff,
 9
 10 CITY OF CHICAGO - DEPARTMENT OF LAW, by
 11 MS. AMBER ACHILLES RITTER
 12 MR. PHILLIP SANTELL
 13 30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1720
 14 Chicago, Illinois 60602
 15 (312) 744-0741
 16 amber.ritter@cityofchicago.org
 17 phillip.santell@cityofchicago.org
 18 Representing the Defendant.
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24

2

1 this search for the 21 mayoral custodian was first
 2 done, when we, you know, expressed to plaintiff
 3 that it was going to be a very voluminous search.
 4 So the first entry -- I should say this is
 5 the log that the tech department maintains to show
 6 searches that they conduct on -- you know, of
 7 emails. So this is a printout, a screenshot,
 8 printout from their log that they, you know,
 9 maintain in the normal course of business.
 10 So the first entry, you see it says date
 11 received, February 28th of 2017. And that reflects
 12 the 21 custodians that we are talking about as you
 13 can see in the custodian column.
 14 And then where it says number of items, it
 15 says 399,000, that is a little bit larger than the
 16 number we expressed which was approximately 100,000
 17 because that includes -- that's hits as opposed to
 18 emails from what I'm told. So, in other words, it
 19 is still -- it is a huge number, but it probably
 20 translates to about 100,000 emails and 400,000
 21 items.
 22 THE COURT: So let's back up before we go any
 23 further and get into any greater detail. So is
 24 this in response to plaintiff's petition for rule

4



1 to show cause as it relates to when you actually
2 began making the request of the IT department of
3 the new search terms?
4 MS. RITTER: Correct.
5 THE COURT: But weren't the new search terms --
6 when were the new search terms agreed upon?
7 MS. RITTER: Well, I don't know that they have
8 ever been agreed upon, but it was then, in
9 February -- let's pull up those emails again that
10 we discussed last week. And I think counsel is
11 pulling them up.
12 It was as I recall from our conversation
13 here last week that exact time. It was February of
14 2017. So this was in result of that request to run
15 this search.
16 I am afraid I may not have those emails
17 with me today, but I think counsel -- it looks like
18 counsel does where we -- and, of course, the search
19 terms that we are talking about here are the ones
20 that are -- that we have discussed last week, the
21 nine search terms that are release with an
22 exclamation point and different words.
23 And as I recall -- I mean certainly as I
24 recall from our conversation last week it was

5

1 February that those emails were exchanged asking us
2 to run that search. So this is the result of that.
3 THE COURT: All right. If you can just give me
4 one minute.
5 MS. RITTER: Sure.
6 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
7 MS. RITTER: So, your Honor, as I was saying,
8 the -- and I am afraid I don't have a copy of those
9 emails that we discussed a week ago, but I see that
10 counsel does. So she can clarify --
11 MS. SVENSON: You can look at them.
12 THE COURT: I am looking at them as well. It
13 looks like it is March 21st of 2017.
14 MS. RITTER: Is the day that we -- that is the
15 day that we produced the -- the second -- that is
16 the day that we searched for the second -- so you
17 can see the second line on this log shows that on
18 March 3rd those particular -- I should back up.
19 I have -- I personally have in my own
20 software the emails of all of the custodians over
21 these five individuals. So I asked -- because they
22 were not searched earlier, I asked the IT folks to
23 then search these five custodians for those
24 extra search terms. This would be the LM, Laquan,

6

1 Van Dyke and then Vandyke spelled without a space.
2 So that is what the IT folks gave to me.
3 And as you can see, it says results file produced.
4 They gave me the emails on March 3rd.
5 THE COURT: Okay. So, Miss Svenson, have you
6 seen this printout?
7 MS. SVENSON: I have not until this morning.
8 THE COURT: So would you like an opportunity to
9 look at that and have Miss Ritter go over it with
10 you to explain what is contained in there before we
11 go forward here?
12 MS. SVENSON: That would be helpful.
13 THE COURT: I think that would be helpful.
14 MS. RITTER: Sure.
15 THE COURT: So I'm just going to take a short
16 recess with you folks. I am going to ask the
17 court reporter to stay. I am going to handle some
18 other cases and then call you folks back up.
19 MS. SVENSON: Sure.
20 And, your Honor, I have a motion to
21 adjudicate a lien in Judge Ehrlich's courtroom.
22 would you like me to step down there now or --
23 THE COURT: whatever you want.
24 MS. SVENSON: -- see if I can go early.

7

1 THE COURT: whatever you want.
2 MS. SVENSON: It is uncontested so -- as it
3 turns out.
4 THE COURT: I don't have anything, right?
5 Go down there now.
6 MS. SVENSON: I will try and do that and get
7 that done.
8 THE COURT: Sure.
9 (Recess taken.)
10 (whereupon, Mr. Santell left
11 the proceeding.)
12 (whereupon, the following
13 proceedings were held in open
14 court.)
15 THE COURT: So if you want to identify
16 yourselves for the record.
17 MS. SVENSON: Sure. Christine Svenson on
18 behalf of plaintiff.
19 MS. RITTER: Amber Ritter for defendant.
20 THE COURT: All right. So, Miss Svenson, did
21 you have an opportunity to meet with Miss Ritter to
22 go over the document that she has now provided to
23 the Court?
24 MS. SVENSON: we did.

8



<p>1 THE COURT: All right. And I have had a chance 2 to look at it as well. And I think I understand 3 it. So I just want to make sure that the record is 4 clear about what we discussed on the last court 5 date and what we are discussing today. So what is 6 currently pending is Judicial Watch's second rule 7 to show cause as it relates to the court's order 8 from September of 2016.</p> <p>9 what the court had asked the mayor's 10 office to do on the last court date, which was 11 November 8th for today's hearing, was to produce 12 some documentation to show when it actually was 13 that they asked the IT department to run the new 14 search terms that were at least discussed between 15 the parties in March of 2017.</p> <p>16 And I also asked the parties to confer 17 with each other to see if they could still come to 18 an agreement about terms that can be searched based 19 on what was disclosed on the last court date about 20 how voluminous the search would reveal if we went 21 with the terms that were tentatively discussed -- I 22 shouldn't say tentatively discussed, the terms that 23 were discussed in the March emails.</p> <p>24 So let's do the first thing first, as it</p> <p style="text-align: right;">9</p>	<p>1 order in September ordered the parties to sit down 2 and come up with and agree to search terms.</p> <p>3 It's really kind of unclear from the 4 emails whether or not there was an agreement that 5 these were the search terms that were going to be 6 run and then turned over or if the agreement was we 7 will run these search terms to see how many hits it 8 will produce to see if it's possible for us to run 9 these terms and then turn over those documents.</p> <p>10 That might be my error. I should have 11 been a little more clear in my court order 12 probably. Or we can say that it's the parties' 13 fault in not bringing it to my attention or maybe 14 the plaintiff did bring it to my attention and I 15 may not have been as diligent on it.</p> <p>16 On the other hand, I don't see any emails 17 from the mayor's office either. And I know, 18 Miss Ritter, you have said to me that it was done 19 in verbal communication with them.</p> <p>20 And I can't go back and forth on this, 21 right? I'm not going to have a full hearing on 22 he said/she said and the emails that it's going to 23 produce this many. I want to get to the merits 24 here. All right?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11</p>
<p>1 relates to when the mayor's office actually made 2 the request of their IT department to run the 3 searches, which is I think what -- the 4 documentation that you have produced today, 5 Miss Ritter?</p> <p>6 MS. RITTER: Correct.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.</p> <p>8 MS. RITTER: And I did speak with counsel in 9 the hallway. And I won't speak for her, but she 10 did say she wanted to run it by her client also, 11 but I am happy to continue now.</p> <p>12 MS. SVENSON: With respect to the search 13 results that we got.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: All right. So let's do one thing 15 at a time.</p> <p>16 MS. SVENSON: Okay. Sure.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: I appreciate, Miss Ritter, that you 18 have produced this. And I think it explains a lot 19 of what was going on during March of 2017 and the 20 second rule to show cause that was filed by the 21 petitioner.</p> <p>22 But, again, my concern is that between 23 March and September of 2017 there was a breakdown 24 of communication. I will put it at that. My court</p> <p style="text-align: right;">10</p>	<p>1 It's going to produce an extraordinary 2 amount of hits. And so now I want to get to that 3 second portion of today's hearing. If I am reading 4 this correctly, the three last sheets here --</p> <p>5 MS. RITTER: Yes.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: -- is what the emails would 7 produce. And this is only on three of the 8 custodians --</p> <p>9 MS. RITTER: Correct.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: -- that were selected for the nine 11 search terms and combination, correct?</p> <p>12 MS. RITTER: That's correct. And if I may, 13 there is one wrinkle that I spoke with counsel 14 about, prior to stepping up, just now that I wanted 15 to make it clear for the record. So the IT person, 16 Melissa Clark, who runs these searches, when we 17 submitted her affidavit in support of our motion -- 18 or our response I should say to the petition for 19 rule to show cause in the affidavit and then also 20 attached as Exhibits 1, 2, and 3, she printed out a 21 screenshot that was dated, you know, 22 October 12th, 2017, that in the bottom -- that's -- 23 as I said, it is attached as Exhibit 1, 2, and 3, 24 one for each of those custodians. So this was to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">12</p>



1 substantiate that each of these custodians has
 2 quite a bit of web traffic or email traffic that
 3 was going to be withheld from these terms.
 4 She realized this week when I had her run
 5 it -- run the same search to provide a hit count
 6 per search term as this court ordered, which is
 7 what these other attachments reflect, that in her
 8 original search, she was quite distressed to
 9 realize this, she made a typo.
 10 So on the bottom of each of these sheets
 11 such as Exhibit 1, which reflects Adam Collins'
 12 emails, it say query. And I can hand this up to
 13 the Court if you don't have this in front of you.
 14 Just to make it clear, this is the
 15 attachment of Melissa Clark's affidavit that we
 16 previously filed in response to the petitioner for
 17 rule to show cause. So as the court can see, and I
 18 will describe it for the record, where it says
 19 query, that she typed out the search terms that she
 20 was asked to search.
 21 The first one, the court can see, it says
 22 releas, R-E-L-E-A-S. And then the wild card figure
 23 which we discussed means --
 24 THE COURT: The asterisk.

13

1 somewhat lower than what she said in her affidavit.
 2 They are still very high I would submit. And I
 3 will explain that.
 4 But, for example, the first of the three
 5 custodians, Lisa Schrader, who was not even
 6 employed with the City during I think some of the
 7 period in question, so her numbers are a little
 8 lower than the others.
 9 But the total hit count for her reflects,
 10 with that corrected search term, 2,136 hits whereas
 11 in her -- this printout for her affidavit she had
 12 said it was 19,557 hits. So it's significantly
 13 less.
 14 Having said that though -- and we can see
 15 here, and I have provided counsel, of course, you
 16 know, as the Court ordered, the hit counts per
 17 search terms. So counsel can look at that and see
 18 if there is anything in that that would be useful
 19 for further narrowing it.
 20 So although these numbers are
 21 significantly lower because of that typo, that the
 22 first search she did for this, they are still quite
 23 high. Miss Schrader had about 2,000 emails.
 24 Miss Rowntree had about 3,700 emails. And

15

1 MS. RITTER: The asterisk which means it
 2 includes release seen or released, releases, or
 3 release. But the first search term should have
 4 read release with that wild card character and
 5 recording.
 6 And then the second one, as the Court can
 7 see, is correct. It says release with the wild
 8 card character and video. So -- and then so on.
 9 But for the first one she failed to type
 10 and recording along with that. So what happened is
 11 that initial search that she did was actually
 12 overbroad, broader than even plaintiff had asked
 13 for because she didn't use the qualifier of -- and
 14 recording for that first term.
 15 She just had release which is going to
 16 capture everything that says release whether or not
 17 it also says recording.
 18 So realizing her error this week when --
 19 or late last week when she was running this new
 20 request for the same search terms but hit count per
 21 term, as I mentioned, she is extraordinarily sorry
 22 about it, but what we have provided to the Court
 23 now is the actual hit term per count.
 24 And you can see that -- so the numbers are

14

1 Mr. Collins had almost 7,000 emails.
 2 So, again, if you take an average say
 3 2 or 3,000 emails per custodian as a conservative
 4 estimate, times 21 custodians, it's still over
 5 60,000 emails if you extrapolate it out to the
 6 custodians, to all 21 custodians.
 7 So our position would be that it is
 8 still -- you know, these terms are still too broad
 9 and too -- elicit too many hits to do all of the
 10 search. In other words, FOIA requires to us do a
 11 reasonable search. And this number of hits would
 12 be outside of the context of what would be
 13 reasonable.
 14 I just want to make it clear to the court
 15 that it is a little bit different than what we had
 16 originally expressed.
 17 THE COURT: So their request for the individual
 18 hits per term actually was fruitful?
 19 MS. SVENSON: Probably. I think so.
 20 MS. RITTER: And I would agree that it is
 21 fruitful. You can actually see that some of these
 22 terms have significantly less hits than others.
 23 And so if those are terms that plaintiff is
 24 interested in, those might be places to start.

16



1 THE COURT: So let me ask you some questions,
2 Miss Ritter, so that I understand the manpower
3 that's involved.
4 MS. RITTER: Yes.
5 THE COURT: So let's go with Miss -- is it Adam
6 Collins?
7 MS. RITTER: Yes.
8 THE COURT: which seems to have almost 7,000
9 hits. Let's assume that the request would only be
10 to Mr. Collins' emails, so 7,000 emails. would the
11 City then, the mayor's office then have to go
12 through each individual email and do what they
13 would do if they were going to do redactions for
14 exemptions then?
15 MS. RITTER: Yes, with one caveat making it a
16 little bit less onerous than what your Honor just
17 described because we have expressed, you know, last
18 week when we were here, we have already produced
19 all of Mr. Collins' emails with the terms Laquan,
20 Van Dyke with a space and without a space and LM.
21 So --
22 THE COURT: To this --
23 MS. RITTER: Correct.
24 THE COURT: -- requester.

17

1 MS. RITTER: That's correct. Yes.
2 THE COURT: Okay.
3 MS. RITTER: So to the extent that any of
4 these -- I'm sure quite a few I would just assume
5 that several of these 7,000 emails also say Laquan.
6 For example, hypothetically if there was the
7 statement let's talk about the release of the
8 Laquan video or Laquan McDonald video, they --
9 THE COURT: They already have it.
10 MS. RITTER: Already have that. So these 7,000
11 emails, what I would do to get these ready if we
12 are ordered to produce them just hypothetically is
13 take these 7,000 from the IT department. I have
14 software that I can pull out the ones that have
15 those terms that we already produced, Laquan,
16 Van Dyke, with both spellings, and LM. So the
17 number of hits that we haven't already produced of
18 that 7,000 might be significantly lower, maybe
19 half, maybe, you know, two-thirds. I don't know.
20 I don't know because we haven't done that yet.
21 THE COURT: But then you have to have a
22 manpower then to go in and look -- so let's say
23 from the 7,000 you have already produced 5,000.
24 MS. RITTER: Right.

18

1 THE COURT: The 2,000 that are left, if they do
2 not relate to Laquan McDonald, they would be
3 nonresponsive to the FOIA request.
4 MS. RITTER: That's right.
5 THE COURT: would you agree with that,
6 Miss Svenson?
7 MS. SVENSON: Yes.
8 THE COURT: Okay. There would be no need to go
9 through for redaction or exception?
10 MS. RITTER: Correct. We would just have to
11 review each one on a much briefer scale to review
12 it for context to see if it deemed -- or pertains
13 to this incident.
14 MS. SVENSON: Actually I should clarify, I
15 believe that our FOIA request, I am going to have
16 to double-check this, requested information with
17 respect to the Laquan McDonald dash cam recording.
18 THE COURT: Shooting on October 20.
19 MS. SVENSON: Right.
20 THE COURT: The specific --
21 MS. SVENSON: Right.
22 THE COURT: -- day.
23 MS. SVENSON: Right.
24 MS. RITTER: To further discuss that, as the

19

1 other part of your Honor's order from last week,
2 which we have worked through with counsel, is to
3 come up with other search terms that we had
4 suggested last week that we thought might be more
5 fruitful to getting other emails that may be about
6 this incident but don't have the words Laquan,
7 Van Dyke, the other spelling of Vandyke and LM.
8 So to that end we have agreed, and I have
9 already got the IT folks searching, although we
10 don't have the results yet because they were tied
11 up on this, the additional terms of Laquan spelled
12 incorrectly with an E, L-E, Q-U-A-N because that
13 might be a typo that people make. And I think
14 actually some of the court filings had his name
15 spelled that way.
16 McDonald, his last name, which is -- which
17 my experience has showed is going to elicit a lot
18 of unrelated items about McDonald's restaurant or
19 other things, but we will go through those and
20 check.
21 Pulaski, because that's the name of the
22 street that he was shot on, in case people refer to
23 it especially in the -- just days after the
24 incident as that shooting on Pulaski. I haven't

20



1 seen that, but it is possible.
2 And then the last term is Burger King
3 because -- which is also going to elicit a lot of
4 unrelated hits. But because the video from the
5 Burger King restaurant, the surveillance video was
6 at issue at the time. So we suggest those search
7 terms and plaintiff has agreed that those make
8 sense.
9 THE COURT: You have agreed to those?
10 MS. SVENSON: We did.
11 THE COURT: Do you think that those terms would
12 be more fruitful than the nine terms that you all
13 have agreed to?
14 MS. SVENSON: Well, in speaking with my client,
15 I mean we do note that some of these don't generate
16 a lot of hits. So I'm wondering if I can go back
17 to my client and sort of talk to him about those in
18 more detail.
19 THE COURT: Okay. I don't have any problem. I
20 want to get to the emails.
21 MS. SVENSON: I understand. May I just say
22 and --
23 THE COURT: Yes.
24 MS. SVENSON: -- I completely understand your

21

1 position with respect to moving along. I would
2 like to state that -- just for the record that we
3 believe that an agreement was made on or about
4 March 2nd of 2017 regarding the search terms. And
5 we do believe that the document we just received,
6 you know, backs up our contention that, you know,
7 there was unnecessary delay because we didn't
8 receive a CD until June. It's all spelled out in
9 my motion. I just wanted to state that for the
10 record.
11 THE COURT: I agree. And here is why I
12 struggled with it, I am not happy with the City and
13 the mayor's office. That's just a personal gut
14 reaction.
15 But for purposes of a rule to show cause,
16 you have to show that it is a violation of my court
17 order. And, as I indicated, maybe my court order
18 could have and should have been a little more
19 clear.
20 My court order is only that the parties
21 would agree to the search terms. And they did.
22 There is no contention. They agreed to the search
23 terms.
24 Now, what you did thereafter with the

22

1 search terms, there really is no court order that
2 says anything different. And so for me to hold
3 them in contempt of a court order, I don't think
4 that there is a court order that says produce those
5 now that you have agreed to the terms. Does that
6 make sense?
7 MS. SVENSON: It does make sense.
8 THE COURT: And, as I said, you can tell your
9 client that I am taking the responsibility on this
10 and that my court order probably should have been
11 more clear, that I probably should have said once
12 you agree on the search term, then the City should
13 produce.
14 Now, I think it was a little on the City
15 as well that it's very clear to me even from the
16 emails as well as the log that you have now
17 produced that the City really didn't do much
18 between March and September.
19 MS. RITTER: I understand your position. I
20 disagree, that we did produce several hundred or
21 some thousand emails in June. But I understand --
22 THE COURT: But those are the same emails that
23 were produced from the original production is my
24 understanding.

23

1 MS. RITTER: No, they are not, your Honor.
2 Those emails that we produced in June were -- let
3 me back up.
4 In the original production in December of
5 2015 from the mayor's office we identified, and I'm
6 forgetting the number, but it was something like 17
7 or 19 custodians that were employees of the mayor's
8 office that we thought would constitute having done
9 a reasonable search, meaning these are the people
10 that would know something about this incident.
11 So we searched their emails for the same
12 time period for those terms, Laquan, LM, Van Dyke
13 and then vandyke without a space.
14 So in response to your Honor's order and
15 in response to our conversations with plaintiff, we
16 agreed to expand that search to these other -- to
17 additional custodians. So those additional
18 custodians are the folks that are listed on this
19 log that were part of the -- in other words, these
20 are the -- the members of the 21 custodians that
21 plaintiff has identified that they are interested
22 in, that we did not originally search their emails
23 for anything.
24 THE COURT: For the first five terms?

24



1 MS. RITTER: Correct.
2 THE COURT: All right. So the first production
3 prior to the lawsuit was for only five custodians
4 and --
5 MS. RITTER: I think it was like 17 custodians.
6 THE COURT: Seventeen custodians --
7 MS. RITTER: Yes.
8 THE COURT: -- and five search terms.
9 what was produced in June was
10 21 custodians and 5 search terms.
11 MS. RITTER: Right. And, of course, we had
12 already produced -- so the 21 custodians minus the
13 7 -- I'm not so good at math in my head but minus
14 the 17 I believe that we already produced yields
15 5 new custodians essentially. So we --
16 THE COURT: Got it.
17 MS. RITTER: -- didn't doubly produce what we
18 had already produced in December of 2015. what we
19 produced in June instead was those 5 new custodians
20 that hadn't been named in our initial search using
21 those same four search terms that we initially ran.
22 THE COURT: Okay. So, Miss Svenson, it still
23 doesn't preclude you from eventually saying that
24 they failed to produce at the end of this case --

25

1 MS. SVENSON: Okay.
2 THE COURT: -- if that's the situation.
3 MS. RITTER: And one more piece that we are
4 doing since we last were here a week ago is -- oh,
5 well, we did touch on the fact that we have agreed
6 to those additional search terms that I mentioned,
7 Laquan with an E, McDonald, Burger King, and
8 Pulaski. We will produce those.
9 I mean I am just going based on my
10 experience with these sorts of terms and this
11 subject matter, I don't imagine that it is going to
12 elicit more than a few thousand hits. And so
13 that -- it shouldn't be 100,000 hits based on my --
14 THE COURT: So are we abandoning the 9?
15 MS. RITTER: No. I am saying that's in
16 addition to the 9. Those are what the City would
17 submit when we are trying to work out something
18 that we think is reasonable, would be additional
19 terms that might elicit more emails about this
20 incident as opposed to about other completely
21 unrelated incidents.
22 MS. SVENSON: Right. We'd like to go back to
23 my client and, you know, based on what we received
24 today figure out which of those -- which among

26

1 these search terms we'd like to pursue. Some do
2 have just a much lesser amount of hits.
3 THE COURT: So for purposes of today's order I
4 think what it will reflect is that petitioner --
5 plaintiff's second rule to show cause is going to
6 be denied and that I feel that the court order was
7 that the parties were to agree to search terms.
8 And that's what was done.
9 what they were to do with those agreed
10 search terms is really unclear, and there is no
11 court order that reflects what was to be done with
12 those search terms.
13 And the court is going to take ownership
14 of that. I probably should have been a little
15 clearer in my court order.
16 MS. SVENSON: Should we put that in the order?
17 THE COURT: You don't have to put it in the
18 order, but it is on the record.
19 MS. SVENSON: It is on the record.
20 THE COURT: But for purposes of telling your
21 client, I think -- I'm taking ownership of it.
22 Secondly, the original terms that -- the
23 nine terms that the parties had agreed on in
24 March of 2017 that plaintiff is now going to go

27

1 Look at what has now been produced today on those
2 search terms and determine if they want to continue
3 to pursue those and which ones they do want to
4 pursue, and, secondly, that the parties have now
5 agreed on additional search terms, those being
6 Laquan spelled in different ways, McDonald spelled
7 in different ways, Burger King spelled different
8 ways, and Pulaski and that the parties believe that
9 those search terms will reveal a much more fruitful
10 yield of the emails that plaintiff is actually
11 looking for in this FOIA request. That means that
12 you are going to produce them.
13 MS. RITTER: Yes, with the caveat that if it's
14 something like 100,000 hits, we can revisit this
15 issue.
16 THE COURT: If it is more than 100,000 hits,
17 then the parties will advise the Court.
18 MS. RITTER: Okay. Fair.
19 THE COURT: Fair enough?
20 MS. SVENSON: Yes.
21 THE COURT: That way my new court order is
22 clear.
23 MS. RITTER: Let me -- on the grounds of being
24 clear, your Honor just mentioned McDonald spelled

28



1 different ways. Do you have a suggestion as to how
2 we should spell --
3 THE COURT: I have no idea. You are saying
4 that you have done --
5 MS. RITTER: No, we actually never searched for
6 the word "McDonald" because our experience with the
7 emails, and this pertains to many different
8 searches that we did, nobody -- people weren't
9 referring to the issue as the McDonald issue. They
10 were referring to it either as the Laquan McDonald
11 incident or simply the Laquan incident.
12 So I have done for the purposes of other
13 situations with other clients with the police
14 department a search for the word "McDonald" now to
15 add to our initial search. And we have found that
16 while it elicits thousands of hits, literally none
17 of them are related to this incident that didn't
18 already have the word "Laquan" in the email meaning
19 we already produced it.
20 I'm happy to do it again with these
21 custodians with the mayor's office. I just want to
22 make it clear, we never did search for the word
23 "McDonald" based on our educated reason to think
24 that it wouldn't elicit reasonable hits --

29

1 reasonable results.
2 THE COURT: Do you have a preference,
3 Miss Svenson?
4 MS. SVENSON: Well, I'm thinking out loud. I
5 think some people spell it M-A-C as opposed to M-C.
6 I mean that would be --
7 THE COURT: That's reasonable.
8 MS. SVENSON: Right.
9 MS. RITTER: Sure.
10 MS. SVENSON: And just leave it that.
11 THE COURT: Yes.
12 MS. RITTER: And then your Honor also mentioned
13 different spellings of the phrase "Burger King." I
14 suppose we can make it one word if that's what you
15 are --
16 THE COURT: I'm assuming it is Burger and then
17 capital K, Burger King, small K, Burger and then
18 King, two separate words, that type of thing is
19 what I am referring to.
20 MS. RITTER: It is not case sensitive, but we
21 can run it as one word if --
22 THE COURT: Right.
23 MS. SVENSON: Okay.
24 THE COURT: Did I miss anything?

30

1 MS. SVENSON: I don't think so. I think we are
2 good.
3 THE COURT: Okay.
4 MS. RITTER: Is there a date --
5 THE COURT: When do you want to come back?
6 MS. SVENSON: Gosh, definitely after
7 Thanksgiving.
8 THE COURT: I am on trial in December.
9 MS. SVENSON: Okay.
10 THE COURT: So it is going to be a little
11 hectic in here.
12 MS. SVENSON: Sure. The whole month you are on
13 trial?
14 THE COURT: The first two weeks, yes.
15 MS. RITTER: I can make myself or my colleague
16 available any time.
17 MS. SVENSON: I leave to visit my parents on
18 December 19th. I mean I could come on the 18th.
19 THE COURT: 18th is fine.
20 MS. RITTER: That's fine for me.
21 THE COURT: And that's for status on --
22 MS. SVENSON: Status.
23 THE COURT: -- what we have done today.
24 MS. RITTER: At 9:30?

31


1 THE COURT: Yes.
2 MS. SVENSON: Great.
3 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks all.
4 MS. SVENSON: Thanks, Judge.
5 THE COURT: Actually let's do it at
6 10:00 o'clock. That way we don't have to hold up
7 the 9:30 call because I know that you all are going
8 to want to talk.
9 (Whereupon, further
10 proceedings in said cause
11 were adjourned to
12 December 18, 2017, at the hour
13 of 10:00 a.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

32



1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS:
3 COUNTY OF COOK)
4 Patricia L. Wangler, as an Officer of the
5 Court, says that she is a shorthand reporter doing
6 business in the State of Illinois, that she
7 reported in shorthand the proceedings of said
8 hearing, and that the foregoing is a true and
9 correct transcript of her shorthand notes so taken
10 as aforesaid, and contains the proceedings given at
11 said hearing.

12 IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF: I have hereunto set
13 my verified digital signature this
14 16th day of November, 2017.

15
16 
17

18 Patricia L. Wangler, CSR
19 Lic. No. 084-002417
20
21
22
23
24



	10,13,18,23	bottom 12:22 13:10	conservative 16:3	days 20:23	essentially 25:15
1	8	breakdown 10:23	constitute 24:8	December 24:4 25:18	estimate 16:4
1 12:20,23 13:11	8th 9:11	brief 19:11	contained 7:10	deemed 19:12	eventually 25:23
100,000 4:16,20 26:13	9	bring 11:14	contempt 23:3	defendant 8:19	exact 5:13
12th 12:22	9 26:14,16	bringing 11:13	contention 22:6,22	defendants 3:9	exception 19:9
17 24:6 25:5,14	A	broad 16:8	context 16:12 19:12	delay 22:7	exchanged 6:1
19 24:7	abandoning 26:14	broader 14:12	continue 10:11	department 4:5 5:2 9:13 10:2	exclamation 5:22
19,557 15:12	actual 14:23	Burger 21:2,5 26:7	continued 3:12	describe 13:18	exemptions 17:14
2	Adam 13:11 17:5	business 4:9	conversation 5:12,24	detail 4:23 21:18	Exhibit 12:23 13:11
2 12:20,23 16:3	addition 26:16	C	conversations 24:15	diligent 11:15	Exhibits 12:20
2,000 15:23 19:1	additional 20:11 24:17 26:6,18	call 7:18	copy 6:8	disagree 23:20	expand 24:16
2,136 15:10	adjudicate 7:21	cam 19:17	corporation 3:9	disclosed 9:19	experience 20:17 26:10
20 19:18	affidavit 12:17,19 13:15 15:1, 11	capture 14:16	correct 5:4 10:6 12:9,11,12	discuss 19:24	explain 3:18 7:10 15:3
2015 24:5 25:18	afraid 5:16 6:8	card 13:22 14:4,8	corrected 15:10	discussed 5:10,20 6:9 9:4,14, 21,22,23 13:23	explains 10:18
2016 9:8	agree 11:2 16:20 19:5	case 20:22 25:24	correctly 12:4	discussing 9:5	expressed 4:2,16 16:16 17:17
2017 4:11 5:14 6:13 9:15	agreed 22:11,21 23:12	cases 7:18	counsel 3:9 5:10,17,18 6:10	distressed 13:8	extent 18:3
10:19,23 12:22 22:4	agreement 9:18 11:4,6 22:3	caveat 17:15	10:8 12:13 15:15,17	document 8:22 22:5	extra 6:24
21 4:1,12 16:4,6 24:20	ahead 3:15 6:6 10:7	CD 22:8	20:2	documentation 9:12 10:4	extraordinarily 14:21
25:10,12	Amber 3:6 8:19	chance 9:1	count 13:5 14:20,23 15:9	documents 11:9	extraordinary 12:1
21st 6:13	amount 12:2	character 14:4,8	counts 15:16	double-check 19:16	extrapolate 16:5
28th 4:11	approximately 4:16	check 20:20	couple 3:13	doubly 25:17	F
2nd 22:4	assume 17:9 18:4	Christine 3:10 8:17	court 3:3,4,12,15,18,19,24	Dyke 7:1 17:20 18:16 20:7	fact 26:5
3	asterisk 13:24 14:1	City 3:7 15:6 17:11 22:12	4:22 5:5 6:3,6,12	24:12	failed 14:9 25:24
3 12:20,23	attached 12:20,23	23:12,14,17 26:16	7:5,8,13,15,17,23		fault 11:13
3,000 16:3	attachment 13:15	clarify 6:10 19:14	8:1,4,8,14,15,20,23	E	February 4:11 5:9,13 6:1
3,700 15:24	attachments 13:7	Clark 12:16	14,17,24 11:11 12:6, 10 13:6,13,17,21,24	earlier 6:22	figure 13:22 26:24
399,000 4:15	attention 11:13,14	Clark's 13:15	14:6,22 15:16 16:14, 17 17:1,5,8,22,24	early 7:24	file 7:3
3rd 6:18 7:4	average 16:2	clear 9:4 11:11 12:15	18:2,9,21 19:1,5,8, 18,20,22 20:14 21:9, 11,19,23 22:11,16, 17,20 23:1,3,4,8,10, 22 24:24 25:2,6,8, 16,22 26:2,14	Ehrlich's 7:21	filed 10:20 13:16
4		13:14 16:14 22:19	16,22 26:2,14	elicit 16:9 20:17 21:3	filings 20:14
400,000 4:20		23:11,15	court's 9:7	26:12,19	FOIA 16:10 19:3,15
5		client 10:10 21:14,17 23:9	courtroom 7:21	email 13:2 17:12	folks 6:22 7:2,16,18 20:9
5 25:10,15,19		26:23	custodian 4:1,13 16:3	emails 4:7,18,20 5:9,16 6:1, 9,20 7:4 9:23 11:4, 16,22 12:6 13:12	24:18
5,000 18:23	B	Collins 16:1 17:6	custodians 4:12 6:20,23 12:8,24	15:23,24 16:1,3,5	forgetting 24:6
6	back 3:17 4:22 6:18 7:18	13:11 17:10,19	13:1 15:5 16:4,6	17:10,19 18:5,11	forward 7:11
60,000 16:5	11:20 21:16 24:3	column 4:13	24:7,17,18,20 25:3, 5,6,10,12,15,19	20:5 21:20 23:16,21, 22 24:2,11,22 26:19	front 13:13
7	26:22	combination 12:11		employed 15:6	fruitful 16:18,21 20:5 21:12
7 25:13	backs 22:6	communication 10:24 11:19	D	employees 24:7	full 11:21
7,000 16:1 17:8,10 18:5,	based 9:18 26:9,13,23	completely 21:24 26:20	dash 19:17	end 20:8 25:24	G
	began 5:2	concern 10:22	date 4:10 9:5,10,19	entry 4:4,10	gave 7:2,4
	behalf 3:7,9,10 8:18	conduct 4:6	dated 12:21	error 11:10 14:18	
	bit 4:15 13:2 16:15	confer 9:16	day 6:14,15,16 19:22		



<p>generate 21:15</p> <p>give 3:19 6:3</p> <p>good 3:4,5,6 25:13</p> <p>greater 4:23</p> <p>gut 22:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>half 18:19</p> <p>hallway 10:9</p> <p>hand 11:16 13:12</p> <p>handle 7:17</p> <p>happened 14:10</p> <p>happy 10:11 22:12</p> <p>head 25:13</p> <p>hearing 9:11 11:21 12:3</p> <p>held 3:2 8:13</p> <p>helpful 7:12,13</p> <p>high 15:2,23</p> <p>hit 13:5 14:20,23 15:9, 16</p> <p>hits 4:17 11:7 12:2 15:10,12 16:9,11,18, 22 17:9 18:17 21:4, 16 26:12,13</p> <p>hold 23:2</p> <p>Honor 3:17,23 6:7 7:20 17:16 24:1</p> <p>Honor's 20:1 24:14</p> <p>huge 4:19</p> <p>hundred 23:20</p> <p>hypothetically 18:6,12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>identified 24:5,21</p> <p>identify 8:15</p> <p>imagine 26:11</p> <p>incident 19:13 20:6,24 24:10 26:20</p> <p>incidents 26:21</p> <p>includes 4:17 14:2</p> <p>incorrectly 20:12</p> <p>individual 16:17 17:12</p> <p>individuals 6:21</p> <p>information 19:16</p>	<p>initial 14:11 25:20</p> <p>initially 25:21</p> <p>interested 16:24 24:21</p> <p>involved 17:3</p> <p>issue 21:6</p> <p>issues 3:13</p> <p>items 4:14,21 20:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>Judge 3:6 7:21</p> <p>Judicial 9:6</p> <p>June 22:8 23:21 24:2 25:9,19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>kind 11:3</p> <p>King 21:2,5 26:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>L-E 20:12</p> <p>Laquan 6:24 17:19 18:5,8,15 19:2,17 20:6,11 24:12 26:7</p> <p>larger 4:15</p> <p>late 14:19</p> <p>lawsuit 25:3</p> <p>left 8:10 19:1</p> <p>lien 7:21</p> <p>Lisa 15:5</p> <p>listed 24:18</p> <p>LM 6:24 17:20 18:16 20:7 24:12</p> <p>log 4:5,8 6:17 23:16 24:19</p> <p>lot 10:18 20:17 21:3,16</p> <p>lower 15:1,8,21 18:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <hr/> <p>made 10:1 13:9 22:3</p> <p>maintain 4:9</p> <p>maintains 4:5</p> <p>make 9:3 12:15 13:14 16:14 20:13 21:7 23:6,7</p> <p>making 5:2 17:15</p>	<p>manpower 17:2 18:22</p> <p>March 6:13,18 7:4 9:15,23 10:19,23 22:4 23:18</p> <p>materials 3:20</p> <p>math 25:13</p> <p>matter 26:11</p> <p>mayor's 9:9 10:1 11:17 17:11 22:13 24:5,7</p> <p>mayoral 4:1</p> <p>Mcdonald 18:8 19:2,17 20:16 26:7</p> <p>Mcdonald's 20:18</p> <p>meaning 24:9</p> <p>means 13:23 14:1</p> <p>meet 8:21</p> <p>Melissa 12:16 13:15</p> <p>members 24:20</p> <p>mentioned 14:21 26:6</p> <p>merits 11:23</p> <p>minus 25:12,13</p> <p>minute 6:4</p> <p>morning 3:4,5,6 7:7</p> <p>motion 7:20 12:17 22:9</p> <p>moving 22:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>named 25:20</p> <p>narrowing 15:19</p> <p>nonresponsive 19:3</p> <p>normal 4:9</p> <p>note 21:15</p> <p>November 9:11</p> <p>number 4:14,16,19 16:11 18:17 24:6</p> <p>numbers 14:24 15:7,20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <hr/> <p>October 12:22 19:18</p> <p>office 9:10 10:1 11:17 17:11 22:13 24:5,8</p> <p>onerous 17:16</p> <p>open 3:2 8:13</p> <p>opportunity 7:8 8:21</p>	<p>opposed 4:17 26:20</p> <p>order 9:7 11:1,11 20:1 22:17,20 23:1,3,4,10 24:14</p> <p>ordered 11:1 13:6 15:16 18:12</p> <p>original 13:8 23:23 24:4</p> <p>originally 16:16 24:22</p> <p>overbroad 14:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <hr/> <p>packet 3:20,22</p> <p>part 20:1 24:19</p> <p>parties 9:15,16 11:1 22:20</p> <p>parties' 11:12</p> <p>pending 9:6</p> <p>people 3:24 20:13,22 24:9</p> <p>period 15:7 24:12</p> <p>person 12:15</p> <p>personal 22:13</p> <p>personally 6:19</p> <p>pertains 19:12</p> <p>petition 4:24 12:18</p> <p>petitioner 10:21 13:16</p> <p>Phillip 3:8</p> <p>piece 26:3</p> <p>places 16:24</p> <p>plaintiff 3:11 4:2 8:18 11:14 14:12 16:23 21:7 24:15,21</p> <p>plaintiff's 4:24</p> <p>point 5:22</p> <p>portion 12:3</p> <p>position 16:7 22:1 23:19</p> <p>preclude 25:23</p> <p>previously 13:16</p> <p>printed 12:20</p> <p>printout 4:7,8 7:6 15:11</p> <p>prior 12:14 25:3</p> <p>problem 21:19</p> <p>proceeding 8:11</p> <p>proceedings 3:2 8:13</p> <p>produce 9:11 11:8,23 12:1,7</p>	<p>18:12 23:4,13,20 25:17,24 26:8</p> <p>produced 6:15 7:3 10:4,18 17:18 18:15,17,23 23:17,23 24:2 25:9, 12,14,18,19</p> <p>production 23:23 24:4 25:2</p> <p>provide 13:5</p> <p>provided 8:22 14:22 15:15</p> <p>Pulaski 20:21,24 26:8</p> <p>pull 5:9 18:14</p> <p>pulling 5:11</p> <p>purposes 22:15</p> <p>put 10:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <hr/> <p>Q-U-A-N 20:12</p> <p>qualifier 14:13</p> <p>query 13:12,19</p> <p>question 15:7</p> <p>questions 17:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/> <p>R-E-L-E-A-S 13:22</p> <p>ran 25:21</p> <p>reaction 22:14</p> <p>read 14:4</p> <p>reading 12:3</p> <p>ready 18:11</p> <p>realize 13:9</p> <p>realized 13:4</p> <p>realizing 14:18</p> <p>reasonable 16:11,13 24:9 26:18</p> <p>recall 5:12,23,24</p> <p>receive 22:8</p> <p>received 4:11 22:5 26:23</p> <p>recess 7:16 8:9</p> <p>record 8:16 9:3 12:15 13:18 22:2,10</p> <p>recording 14:5,10,14,17 19:17</p> <p>redaction 19:9</p> <p>redactions 17:13</p> <p>refer 20:22</p> <p>reflect 13:7</p>	<p>reflects 4:11 13:11 15:9</p> <p>relate 19:2</p> <p>relates 5:1 9:7 10:1</p> <p>releas 13:22</p> <p>release 5:21 14:2,3,4,7,15, 16 18:7</p> <p>released 14:2</p> <p>releases 14:2</p> <p>reporter 7:17</p> <p>request 5:2,14 10:2 14:20 16:17 17:9 19:3,15</p> <p>requested 19:16</p> <p>requester 17:24</p> <p>requires 16:10</p> <p>respect 10:12 19:17 22:1</p> <p>response 4:24 12:18 13:16 24:14,15</p> <p>responsibility 23:9</p> <p>restaurant 20:18 21:5</p> <p>result 5:14 6:2</p> <p>results 7:3 10:13 20:10</p> <p>reveal 9:20</p> <p>review 19:11</p> <p>Ritter 3:6,14,15,16 5:4,7 6:5,7,14 7:9,14 8:19, 21 10:5,6,8,17 11:18 12:5,9,12 14:1 16:20 17:2,4,7,15,23 18:1, 3,10,24 19:4,10,24 23:19 24:1 25:1,5,7, 11,17 26:3,15</p> <p>Rowntree 15:24</p> <p>rule 4:24 9:6 10:20 12:19 13:17 22:15</p> <p>run 5:14 6:2 9:13 10:2, 10 11:6,7,8 13:4,5</p> <p>running 14:19</p> <p>runs 12:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S-A-N-T-E-L-L 3:8</p> <p>said/she 11:22</p> <p>Santell 3:8 8:10</p> <p>scale 19:11</p> <p>Schrader 15:5,23</p> <p>screenshot 4:7 12:21</p>
---	---	--	--	---	---



<p>search 4:1,3 5:3,5,6,15,18, 21 6:2,23,24 9:14,20 10:12 11:2,5,7 12:11 13:5,6,8,19,20 14:3, 11,20 15:10,17,22 16:10,11 20:3 21:6 22:4,21,22 23:1,12 24:9,16,22 25:8,10, 20,21 26:6</p> <p>searched 6:16,22 9:18 24:11</p> <p>searches 4:6 10:3 12:16</p> <p>searching 20:9</p> <p>selected 12:10</p> <p>sense 21:8 23:6,7</p> <p>September 9:8 10:23 11:1 23:18</p> <p>Seventeen 25:6</p> <p>sheets 12:4 13:10</p> <p>shooting 19:18 20:24</p> <p>short 7:15</p> <p>shot 20:22</p> <p>show 3:24 4:5 5:1 9:7,12 10:20 12:19 13:17 22:15,16</p> <p>showed 20:17</p> <p>shows 6:17</p> <p>significantly 15:12,21 16:22 18:18</p> <p>sit 11:1</p> <p>situation 26:2</p> <p>software 6:20 18:14</p> <p>sort 21:17</p> <p>sorts 26:10</p> <p>space 7:1 17:20 24:13</p> <p>speak 10:8,9</p> <p>speaking 21:14</p> <p>specific 19:20</p> <p>spelled 7:1 20:11,15 22:8</p> <p>spelling 20:7</p> <p>spellings 18:16</p> <p>spoke 12:13</p> <p>start 16:24</p> <p>state 22:2,9</p> <p>statement 18:7</p> <p>stay 7:17</p> <p>step 7:22</p>	<p>stepping 12:14</p> <p>street 20:22</p> <p>struggled 22:12</p> <p>subject 26:11</p> <p>submit 15:2 26:17</p> <p>submitted 12:17</p> <p>substantiate 13:1</p> <p>suggest 21:6</p> <p>suggested 20:4</p> <p>support 12:17</p> <p>surveillance 21:5</p> <p>Svenson 3:5,10,19 6:11 7:5,7, 12,19,24 8:2,6,17, 20,24 10:12,16 16:19 19:6,7,14,19, 21,23 21:10,14,21, 24 23:7 25:22 26:1, 22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>taking 23:9</p> <p>talk 18:7 21:17</p> <p>talking 4:12 5:19</p> <p>tech 3:24 4:5</p> <p>tentatively 9:21,22</p> <p>term 13:6 14:3,14,21,23 15:10 16:18 21:2 23:12</p> <p>terms 5:3,5,6,19,21 6:24 9:14,18,21,22 11:2, 5,7,9 12:11 13:3,19 14:20 15:17 16:8,22, 23 17:19 18:15 20:3, 11 21:7,11,12 22:4, 21,23 23:1,5 24:12, 24 25:8,10,21 26:6, 10,19</p> <p>thing 9:24 10:14</p> <p>things 3:17 20:19</p> <p>thought 20:4 24:8</p> <p>thousand 23:21 26:12</p> <p>tied 20:10</p> <p>time 3:16 5:13 10:15 21:6 24:12</p> <p>times 16:4</p> <p>today 5:17 9:5 10:4 26:24</p> <p>today's 9:11 12:3</p> <p>told 4:18</p> <p>total 15:9</p>	<p>touch 26:5</p> <p>traffic 13:2</p> <p>translates 4:20</p> <p>turn 11:9</p> <p>turned 11:6</p> <p>turns 8:3</p> <p>two-thirds 18:19</p> <p>type 14:9</p> <p>typed 13:19</p> <p>typo 13:9 15:21 20:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>unclear 11:3</p> <p>uncontested 8:2</p> <p>understand 9:2 17:2 21:21,24 23:19,21</p> <p>understanding 23:24</p> <p>unnecessary 22:7</p> <p>unrelated 20:18 21:4 26:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>Van 7:1 17:20 18:16 20:7 24:12</p> <p>Vandyke 7:1 20:7 24:13</p> <p>verbal 11:19</p> <p>verify 3:24</p> <p>video 14:8 18:8 21:4,5</p> <p>violation 22:16</p> <p>voluminous 4:3 9:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> <p>wanted 10:10 12:14 22:9</p> <p>Watch's 9:6</p> <p>web 13:2</p> <p>week 3:13,16 5:10,13,20, 24 6:9 13:4 14:18,19 17:18 20:1,4 26:4</p> <p>wild 13:22 14:4,7</p> <p>withheld 13:3</p> <p>wondering 21:16</p> <p>words 4:18 5:22 16:10 20:6 24:19</p> <p>work 26:17</p> <p>worked 20:2</p>	<p>wrinkle 12:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>yields 25:14</p>	
---	--	--	--	--

