

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

CIVIL PROCESSING

CURTIS L. CHARLSON (1925-2010) ELAINE CHARLSON BREDEHOFTO PETER C. COHENO CARLA D. BROWNOD ADAM S. NADELHAFTO%

ØALSO ADMITTED IN D.C. D ALSO ADMITTED IN MARYLAND
% ALSO ADMITTED IN NEW YORK O ALSO ADMITTED IN WISCONSIN #ALSO ADMITTED IN COLORADO ONLY ADMITTED IN MARYLAND

2002 DATHINE S. OBBANIERON, CLARISSAK, PINTADON YVONNE A MILLER DAVID E I AURPHYSO CLERK, CIRCUIT COURT FAIRFAX, VA

August 9, 2021

BY MESSENGER

John T. Frey, Clerk Fairfax County Circuit Court 4110 Chain Bridge Road, 3rd Floor Fairfax, VA 22030

Re: Case No. CL-2019-0002911 - John C. Depp, II v. Amber Laura Heard

Dear Mr. Frey:

Enclosed for filing please find the Corrected Transcript from the July 22, 2021 hearing on Defendant Amber Laura Heard's Supplemental Plea in Bar. Also enclosed please find a file copy of the Power Point slides presented in hard copy to the Court and used as a demonstrative exhibit during the hearing on July 22, 2021.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Very truly yours,



Elaine Charlson Bredehoft

Enclosures

cc: Hon. Penney S. Azcarate Benjamin Chew, Esq.



CIVIL PROCESSING

ON JUN 23 9 2:5)

JOHN T. FREY
CLERK, CIRCUIT COURT
FAIRFAX, VA

Transcript of Hearing

Date: July 22, 2021 Case: Depp, II -v- Heard

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email:: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

1	VIRGINIA:
2	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FAIRFAX COUNTY
3	x
4	JOHN C. DEPP, II,
5	Plaintiff,
6	v. Case No. CL2019-0002911
7	AMBER LAURA HEARD,
8	Defendant.
9	x
10	
11	Hearing on Motions
12	Before the HONORABLE PENNEY AZCARATE, Judge
13	Fairfax, Virginia
14	Thursday, July 22, 2021
15	10:56 a.m. EST
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Job No.: 388256
21	Pages: 1 - 141
22	Transcribed by: Bobbi J. Fisher, RPR

1	Hearing on Motions before the HONORABLE PENNEY
2	AZCARATE, Judge, at the Fairfax County Circuit
3	Court.
4	
5	
6	Pursuant to Docketing, before Joshua Tubbs, Digital
7	Court Reporter.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	·
19	
20	
21	
22	

1	APPEARANCES
2	ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF MR. DEPP:
3	BENJAMIN G. CHEW, ESQ.
4	CAMILLE VASQUEZ, ESQ.
5	JESSICA MYERS, ESQ.
6	BROWN RUDNICK, LLP
7	601 Thirteenth Street, NW, Suite 600
8	Washington, DC 20005
9	(202) 536-1700
10	
11	ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT MS. HEARD:
12	ELAINE CHARLSON BREDEHOFT, ESQUIRE
13	CLARISSA PINTADO, ESQUIRE
14	CHARLSON BREDEHOFT COHEN & BROWN, PC
15	11260 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 201
16	Reston, VA 20190
17	
18	J. BENJAMIN ROTTENBORN, ESQUIRE
19	WOODS ROGERS, PLC
20	10 South Jefferson Street, Suite 1400
21	Roanoke, VA 24011-1319
22	

1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
3	Argument by Ms. Bredehoft	11
4	Argument by Mr. Chew	85
5	Further Argument by Ms. Bredehoft	116
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		ļ
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

1	EXHIBITS	
2	(Exhibits retained by the Cour	rt.)
3	EXHIBIT	RECEIVED
4	Defendant's 1	118
5	Defendant's 2	118
6	Defendant's 3	118
7	Defendant's 4	118
8	Defendant's 5	118
9	Defendant's 6	118
10	Defendant's 7	118
11	Defendant's 8	118
12	Defendant's 9	118
13	Defendant's 10	118
14	Defendant's 11	118
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: Good morning.
3	MS. BREDEHOFT: Good morning, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: If I could have the court
5	reporter to be sworn. You got to stand, please.
6	Face her.
7	(The court reporter was duly sworn.)
8	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Are
9	we ready to go forward?
10	MS. BREDEHOFT: Yes, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. Do you have
12	evidence or
13	MS. BREDEHOFT: I will have some
14	exhibits
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MS. BREDEHOFT: but I will not be
17	putting a witness on.
18	THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Did you
19	want to start with your evidence, then, whatever
20	evidence you have?
21	MS. BREDEHOFT: Yes. Thank you, Your
22	Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay. I just I have read
2	all the briefs, and I don't think I need any
3	openings, if that's okay.
4	MR. CHEW: Your Honor, I just with
5	just a point of clarification, may it please the
6	Court, Ben Chew for Plaintiff Johnny Depp. I'm
7	here with Neil Vasquez and Jessica Meyers.
8	Ms. Bredehoft indicated that she might be
9	referencing material that's subject to the
10	protective order.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MR. CHEW: She said she wasn't sure.
12 13	MR. CHEW: She said she wasn't sure. THE COURT: Are you doing that?
13	THE COURT: Are you doing that?
13 14	THE COURT: Are you doing that? MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, in my
13 14 15	THE COURT: Are you doing that? MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, in my opening, I don't have any intention of under the
13 14 15 16	THE COURT: Are you doing that? MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, in my opening, I don't have any intention of under the protective order, we have to notify. And I filed a
13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: Are you doing that? MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, in my opening, I don't have any intention of under the protective order, we have to notify. And I filed a notification with the Court
13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: Are you doing that? MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, in my opening, I don't have any intention of under the protective order, we have to notify. And I filed a notification with the Court THE COURT: Okay. But you didn't
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE COURT: Are you doing that? MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, in my opening, I don't have any intention of under the protective order, we have to notify. And I filed a notification with the Court THE COURT: Okay. But you didn't MS. BREDEHOFT: and with the other

2 that I think does. I have intentionally not	s up
_	
3 included it in my initial arguments. I make or	ne
4 reference to the confidential judgment, nothing	3
5 else.	
6 THE COURT: Okay. And so and the	
7 evidence that you're going to present to the Co	ourt
8 has nothing to do with	
9 MS. BREDEHOFT: It has nothing it	does
10 not include that.	
11 THE COURT: the protective order.	
MS. BREDEHOFT: And I have also told	
and I have told Mr. Chew that, in the event I	
14 determine that I need to mention it substantive	ely,
15 that I will alert the Court and Mr. Chew so the	at we
16 can determine how to handle that.	
17 THE COURT: Okay.	
10	е
18 MR. CHEW: I would greatly appreciate	are
MR. CHEW: I would greatly appreciate that because, as the Court has noticed, there are	
19 that because, as the Court has noticed, there	

1	feels the need to reference that, we would	
2	respectfully ask	
3	THE COURT: We can close the court.	
4	MR. CHEW: close the court. Thank	
5	you, Your Honor.	
6	THE COURT: Sure. No problem. Okay.	
7	All right.	
8	MS. BREDEHOFT: Thank you, Your Honor.	
9	And if it pleases the Court, my name is Elaine	
10	Bredehoft. With me today, Your Honor, is Ben	
11	Rottenborn, co-counsel; Clarissa Pintado; and I	
12	also have our paralegal and my daughter, Michelle	
13	Bredehoft here sitting. We represent Amber Heard.	
14	Before I start, Your Honor, and this is	
15	the question you asked, I have prepared some	
16	exhibits. I have a copy for defense counsel	
17	plaintiff's counsel, sorry, and the Court. And	
18	then I have done something a little unique here.	
19	THE COURT: Do you have something,	
20	Mr. Chew? You're standing so	
21	MR. CHEW: I apologize for interrupting.	
22	I just wanted to note: We haven't seen these	

1	before, but we'll take a look at them.
2	MS. BREDEHOFT: Right.
3	THE COURT: That's fine. I haven't
4	either. We'll see together, I guess.
5	MR. CHEW: Thank you.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	MS. BREDEHOFT: And what I did what
8	I I did something a little unusual, Your Honor.
9	I prepared a PowerPoint but have it in hard copy
10	slide instead of actually doing a PowerPoint. Part
11	of it was we didn't know what courtroom Your Honor
12	would be in. We didn't know what the electronic
13	situation would be, so I ultimately decided this
14	just made more sense.
15	THE COURT: Are these the same copies?
16	MS. BREDEHOFT: Yes. In case Your Honor
17	wanted to write on one and wanted to preserve one,
18	I felt like I should give you two.
19	THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. All
20	right. Thank you.
21	MS. BREDEHOFT: So, with that, if Your
22	Honor is ready

1	THE COURT: Okay. Yes, sir yes,
2	ma'am. Go ahead.
3	ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT
4	MS. BREDEHOFT: Thank you. Thank you.
5	Mr. Depp's complaint should be dismissed
6	because of the following principles of his
7	principles bar his defamation claim: Comity,
8	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition
9	Act, collateral estoppel, which is here, Your
10	Honor, defensive collateral estoppel, which is also
11	known as issue preclusion.
12	It gets a little confusing sometimes in
13	these cases, and I'll try to take Your Honor
14	through these to ensure that we have our
15	distinctions.
16	And the last is res judicata which, in
17	this case, we're referring to as claim preclusion.
18	Now, the UK court has adjudicated on the
19	merits that statements published by a newspaper
20	referring to Mr. Depp as a wife beater and domestic
21	abuser of Ms. Heard are true. The UK court found

1 against Ms. Heard on 12 occasions, causing her, on 2 several occasions, to fear for her life. 3 This decision on the facts by the UK 4 creates a bar to Mr. Depp's recovery because the statements by Amber Heard in "The Washington Post" 5 6 op-ed involve the identical issue and have already 7 been fully and fairly adjudicated by Mr. Depp in 8 his chosen forum in the UK. 9 I'm going to take Your Honor through the 10 procedural chronology of this because it's 11 relevant, I think, in a number of the issues as we 12 go through them. 13 June 13, 2018, Plaintiff Depp sued "The Sun" newspaper and Dan Wootton, the editor, for 14 15 libel in the UK based on the statements that Depp, quote, "beat his wife Amber Heard, causing her to 16 17 suffer significant injury, and, on occasion, 18 leading her to fear for her life -- fearing for her life," end of quote. 19 Depp strategically selected the United 20 21 Kingdom as the forum for his libel suit where the 22 UK is known for its plaintiff-friendly venue in

1	part because the burden of proof is on the
2	defendants to prove the statements are true. In
3	other words, the statements are presumed in the UK
4	to be false. The defendants must then prove them
5	to be true.
6	On March 1, 2019, Depp sued Amber Heard
7	for defamation, claiming the statements published
8	as an op-ed in "The Washington Post" that did not
9	even mention him, nonetheless imply he committed
10	domestic violence against Ms. Heard. The exact
11	same violence claimed in "The Sun" publication.
12	On November 2, 2020, the UK court issued
13	its approved judgment. The UK High Court, in a
14	129, 585-paragraph decision, found that the
15	statements published by "The Sun" were true. The
16	UK High Court found that the defendants proved
17	Mr. Depp committed acts of domestic violence
18	against Ms. Heard at least 12 times, causing her to
19	suffer significant injury and, on several
20	occasions, to fear for her life.
21	Now, discovery in the UK and the U.S.,
22	there were no lack of procedural tools. Your Honor

1	may recall that, in the opposition filed by
2	Mr. Depp, they claim they lacked some of the
3	procedural tools over there, but, in fact, not the
4	case. And, in fact, Depp had the unique advantage
5	of full discovery not only in the UK but also in
6	the U.S. He had two full years in the UK and 16
7	months in the U.S.
3	Your Honor, his and I cited it in my
9	reply brief, but Mr. Sherborne, who was Mr. Depp's
LO	UK counsel, referred to the, quote, "mass
l1	evidence," end of quote, that was before the UK
12	Court. And I have Your Honor, Exhibit 1 that's
L3	in front of Your Honor is the actual core trial
L4	bundle index. This is what was before the Court.
L5 :	This is all of the evidence. This is the core
L6	trial bundle index.
L7	What they do in the UK, Your Honor, is
L8	you don't have plaintiff's exhibits and defendant's
-9	exhibits. You put them all in and it's a core
20	trial bundle. And so it was in fact, it was 11
21	bundles, which we call binders in the United
2	States, but they were bundles there

1	And this is the mass of evidence they
2	had. And Your Honor will see in there that many of
3	the things in this trial core bundle were
4	depositions taken in this case in the U.S. They
5	were evidence that was produced in this case.
6	There was no prohibition whatsoever from being able
7	to use everything that came in the U.S. in the UK.
8	And, in fact, the way they do it there is the full
9	depositions come in. So the depositions were
10	actually exhibits.
11	Now, the second thing is that Depp, in
12	the meantime, was conducting extensive discovery
13	over here. Now, if Your Honor will look at Exhibit
14	No. 2, this is the first of the request for
15	production of documents by Mr. Depp to Ms. Heard.
16	This was July 9, 2019. That's a year a full
17	year before the trial in the UK. Exhibit 3 is the
18	second set of requests for production of documents
19	issued November 4, 2019.
20	Then, if you go to Exhibit 4, you have
21	the first set of interrogatories issued July 9,
22	2019. Then if you go to Exhibit 5, you have the

second set of interrogatories issued November 4, 2019. Then you have, if you go to Exhibit No. 6, the request for admissions. They were issued on November 25, 2019.

Honor, in June of last year, they had already used up all the interrogatories and all of the requests for admissions. Then there also were multiple depositions, and Your Honor could see those in Exhibit 1, too, because they came in to the other side. For reasons unclear to me, Depp chose not to depose Ms. Heard over that 16-month period. There are no notices of deposition, there was no requests to depose her. In fact, they have since asked to depose her twice. I have immediately given them dates. And then, when they got close, they decided not to. But they chose not to. That was a choice, not something they were prevented from doing.

Then Mr. Depp argued they didn't have the expert witness disclosure and discovery has not occurred. But if Your Honor would flip to Exhibit 7, that's plaintiff's designation, identification

1	of expert witnesses that was dated November 4,
2	2019. Again, all of this well before the July 2020
3	trial in the UK.
4	And, significantly, Your Honor, at the
5	time that there was a time when our trial here
6	was scheduled for what is traditionally the case,
7	it was going to be within a year of the filing of
8	the complaint. The complaint was filed on March 1,
9	2019. The trial date was scheduled for February 3,
10	2020. And all the filings everybody was gearing
11	up for that trial. In December, there was a joint
12	request for a continuance. It was bumped back.
13	So, at one time, they still believed that
14	they were going to be trying the case here before
15	the UK.
16	Now, Depp claims that there was no expert
17	discovery in the UK, but that's not true either.
18	Expert discovery is allowed here. What happened in
19	that case and, fortunately, the judge set it
20	out and this is the JN is the judicial
21	notification, the first one. At Attachment A,
22	that's the full 129-page judgment. At pages 561 to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

72, the Court laid out the series of events relating to a question of expert testimony in that Mr. Depp, not even the defendants, Mr. Depp produced a number of the photos, some of which Your Honor will see shortly, produced these in the case over there. Then, as they got almost to the eve of trial, they suddenly said, we're challenging the metadata on these. So defendants went and got an expert who 10 then examined the materials and gave an expert 11 report on the metadata, verifying the metadata. 12 Then Depp's team said, "Well, wait a second, you 13 know, we object to your using that expert." So the judge goes into a careful analysis 14 15 there and says, Look, the only reason this is so 16 late is because of your delay. You're the ones

Then what Depp's team did was turn around and say, Okay, we don't challenge the metadata and we don't challenge the authenticity of this. So the judge said, Well, if you don't challenge it,

that produced this, and it's been sitting here for

a long time, and now you suddenly challenge it.

1	then we don't need the expert witness, so I'll deny
2	the request for the expert witness. And in came
3	all the photos with the metadata, no issues. So it
4	wasn't correct they didn't have the opportunity.
5	It's also significant to note, Your
6	Honor, at those paragraphs, if you read through it,
7	that Ms. Heard had an attorney, David Price, who
8	was representing her in the UK, and David Price
9	even said that he would be willing to work with
10	Depp's team to allow them to examine the actual
11	the actual devices, if necessary, so that they
12	could have their own expert. But, instead, Depp's
13	team said, Look, we're not going to challenge it.
14	Now, Depp told the Court days before
15	I'm sorry; did Your Honor have a question?
16	THE COURT: No, no, go ahead.
17	MS. BREDEHOFT: Oh, okay.
18	Depp told the Court days before the start
19	of the UK within a week before the trial that
20	started on July 7, that he wanted to go to trial in
21	the UK because the decision of the UK court would
22	result in vindication of the prevailing party and

was preferred to, quote, "just a verdict," end of quote, referring to our jury verdicts over here.

Now, surely, his counsel would not have claimed that there was a, quote, "mass amount of evidence" and that they wanted to go to trial in the UK if they felt they were at some disadvantage and weren't prepared to go to trial or had any kind of disadvantage procedurally or didn't have discovery that they wanted.

The second part of that, Your Honor, is -- and I pointed it out on my reply so I don't have it here, but -- in the slides, but they claimed that Ms. Heard didn't give them sufficient discovery. Well, she gave them sufficient discovery for 16 months here, but what they misunderstood or miscomprehended is, when they issued that third-party request to her shortly before trial, they had to have the burden of essentially proving that it would be relevant evidence; that it either would be helpful to them or harmful to the other side. And they didn't meet the burden on any of the four requests that they

issued. And so the judge ruled, You haven't met	
your burden; she's not going to have to produce	
those. But she did produce an enormous amount over	
there, and she produced an enormous amount here	
that went over there.	

.16

Now, the last point that I want to make here, Your Honor, is it was Depp who engaged in significant discovery abuses in the UK, repeatedly resisting producing responsive documents.

Now, I laid out -- I set out in Exhibit A to the reply the witness statement of Louis Charalambous, who was one of the UK counsel for "The Sun" and Mr. Wootton. He set out in a declaration -- he went in great detail over the history of the discovery abuses by Depp over in the UK. Significantly -- and this is really at paragraphs 25 through 41 of his declaration. What happened was that Depp's counsel, who was the same counsel that are here today, Your Honor -- Brown Rudnick used to be Mr. Depp's counsel. There was a shift closer to trial to another team, Shillings (ph), over there. But they inadvertently disclosed

1	70,000 texts of Mr. Depp. They tried to get it
2	back but the rules in the UK say that somebody gets
3	to go through it and determine what might be
4	responsive and then return everything else, which
5	is what they did. In fact, it was Mr. Charalambous
6	who had that task. And it turned out that there
7	were many, many text messages. They were not only
8	relevant but responsive and responsive to court
9	orders over there. And Mr. Charalambous lays out
10	in that declaration a number of examples that are
11	pretty significant, especially about his use of
12	drug and alcohol leading up to and at the time of
13	some of the domestic violence incidents.
14	On November 16, 2020, the UK High Court
15	denied Mr. Depp's permission to appeal.
16	On March 25, 2021, the UK Court of
17	Appeals issued its decision, upholding the UK High
18	Court's ruling against Mr. Depp, denying his
19	application for permission to appeal, and
20	dismissing his application to adduce further
21	evidence.
22	After exhausting his appeals, the

1 judgment against Mr. Depp became final with no 2 further appellate options on April 6, 2021. 3 Your Honor, in the words of the Virginia 4 Supreme Court almost a century ago -- and you'll 5 hear me talk about Eagle Star -- that means the judgment is no longer subject to collateral attack, 6 7 and Mr. Depp must face the logical and legal 8 consequences of his adverse decision. 9 Defendant filed her amended answer and 10 grounds of defense and this supplemental plea in 11 bar, which is before the Court today. We are 12 seeking the dismissal of the complaint because the 13 exact same issue has been fully and fairly 14 adjudicated by Mr. Depp and he lost. 15 Now, just a couple of words about the 16 burden of proof, because I think they're 17 significant in this case, Your Honor. In the UK --18 and it's conceded -- the burden of proof is on the 19 defendants to prove the statements were true. 20 the U.S., the burden of proof is on Depp to prove 21 he did not commit any acts of domestic violence.

Remember, it is just any that can go here.

22

1	Now, we set out pretty well in our briefs
2	and we cited the Jackson and the Kollman cases that
3	the standard is clear and convincing evidence. The
4	opposition takes issue with it, but I think, Your
5	Honor, if you read the cases, you're going to see
6	the mistake that I think opposition made, is they
7	went from a couple of the ones that talked about
8	the public figure and the actual malice and then
9	they shifted over to some that didn't have public
10	figure when they gave their standards.
11	But, as a practical matter, Your Honor,
12	it doesn't matter whether it's clear and convincing
13	or not. It's still much more favorable to Mr. Depp
14	in the UK because the burden is on the defendants.
15	Over here, the burden is on him, whether it's by
16	clear and convincing or by preponderance of the
17	evidence, but the law under the Jackson case in the
18	Virginia Supreme Court is quite clear that it's
19	clear and convincing.
20	Now, the Court found 12 instances of
21	domestic violence by Mr. Depp against Ms. Heard.

And remember, Your Honor, there's one more thing

1	that I think is important to point out. In the UK,
2	the UK defendants put out 14 acts of domestic
3	violence by Amber Heard. She's not restricted to
4	14. Sadly, there are many more. So all she needs
5	to do is establish one act of domestic abuse. One.
6	But, as a matter of law, there's already been 12.
7	Now, Your Honor, I'm going to take you
8	through these, and I'll try to do it relatively
9	quickly, but the reason I'm taking you through
10	these 12 incidents of factual findings is because
11	Your Honor has to make a determination whether
12	these findings are related or the exact same issues
13	and when we go into the privity, when we go into
14	all of the other discussions, this is, I think,
15	
10	quite critical, and I took you
16	quite critical, and I took you THE COURT: Briefly, briefly.
16	THE COURT: Briefly, briefly.
16 17	THE COURT: Briefly, briefly. MS. BREDEHOFT: I will do it as briefly
16 17 18	THE COURT: Briefly, briefly. MS. BREDEHOFT: I will do it as briefly as I can, Your Honor. I will just go through them.
16 17 18 19	THE COURT: Briefly, briefly. MS. BREDEHOFT: I will do it as briefly as I can, Your Honor. I will just go through them. The first one, Your Honor, Los Angeles,

1	knocked her to the ground. Later explained that he
2	snaps sometimes, and he calls himself the monster.
3	That became quite relevant here, Your Honor,
4	because Mr. Depp's overarching theme, when he would
5	get into very extreme alcohol and drug use, is he
6	would become the monster, and that's the one who
7	would domestically abuse her.
8	Second, painting incident. March 2013.
9	Mr. Depp hit Ms. Heard so hard blood ended up in
10	the wall. Grabbed her, shooked her, shoved her in
11	the wall. Lasted into the evening and the
12	following day. He even made in a text message
13	referred to it as a disco blood bath and a hideous
14	moment.
15	And, Your Honor, what I did is, starting
16	at Exhibit 12 of what's in front of you, the
17	pictures that I have in the PowerPoint are the
18	pictures that were actually in evidence in the UK,
19	and so they actually have those pictures, just
20	so out of fairness, I wanted to make sure it was
21	clear.
22	THE COURT: Well, just for the record,

1	the PowerPoint is just demonstrative, so I'm not
2	going to make that as part of the record.
3	MS. BREDEHOFT: Correct.
4	THE COURT: Your exhibits, if you want
5	them in evidence, we can go through them and you
6	can if there's any objection to them coming in,
7	we can do that. Okay?
8	MS. BREDEHOFT: Okay.
9	THE COURT: I just want to make sure you
10	understand.
11	MS. BREDEHOFT: Okay. And perhaps for,
12	you know, convenience, maybe I can just move them
13	in at the end and we can
14	THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.
15	MS. BREDEHOFT: Okay. But I will refer
16	to them as I go. That might be helpful.
17	So Exhibit 12, Your Honor, is a picture
18	from that particular incident, and that was before
19	the Court in the UK. It was in evidence in the UK.
20	The next one is Hicksville, June 2013.
21	Mr. Depp assaulted Ms. Heard, including throwing
22	drinking glasses at her, ripping her dress in a

1	jealous rage, admitted to breaking a wall sconce,
2	and a witness testified that there was broken
3	glass, pieces of fabric strewn everywhere, and he
4	heard screaming and shouting.
5	This was also in a time frame where some
6	of the inadvertently disclosed texts by Depp's
7	counsel came in, and so I have just set out some of
8	these text messages to Paul Bettany, which are,
9	frankly, quite negative and derogatory towards
10	Ms. Heard.
11	The next one, Your Honor, is the factual
12	findings of the UK court of the Boston plane
12 13	findings of the UK court of the Boston plane incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from
13	incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from
13 14	incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from Boston to LA. Mr. Depp kicked Ms. Heard in her
13 14 15	incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from Boston to LA. Mr. Depp kicked Ms. Heard in her back and threw a boot at her, later passed out in
13 14 15 16	incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from Boston to LA. Mr. Depp kicked Ms. Heard in her back and threw a boot at her, later passed out in the bathroom and was ill as a result of consuming
13 14 15 16 17	incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from Boston to LA. Mr. Depp kicked Ms. Heard in her back and threw a boot at her, later passed out in the bathroom and was ill as a result of consuming alcohol and cocaine. And I have cited the judicial
13 14 15 16 17 18	incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from Boston to LA. Mr. Depp kicked Ms. Heard in her back and threw a boot at her, later passed out in the bathroom and was ill as a result of consuming alcohol and cocaine. And I have cited the judicial sections of that.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	incident, which was May 2014. It was a flight from Boston to LA. Mr. Depp kicked Ms. Heard in her back and threw a boot at her, later passed out in the bathroom and was ill as a result of consuming alcohol and cocaine. And I have cited the judicial sections of that. Now, the significance of this, Your

1	Defendant's Exhibit 8, he claimed that he just had
2	a little bit of alcohol, he was sketching at his
3	sketch board, and Ms. Heard started haranguing him.
4	Then he changed his testimony, after being
ō	confronted with the text his counsel had
6	inadvertently produced. And that's at Defendant
7	Exhibit 9 is where the exchange goes with Ms. Wass
3	Sasha Wass, who was the Queen's counsel for the
Э	defendants who cross-examined Mr. Depp.
LO	Now, significantly in this particular
11	case, Your Honor, is that the Court, in making its
12	findings on the Boston plane incident in May of
L3	2014, based everything based on Mr. Depp's
L 4	communications and his bodyguard's communications.
L5	And those I have set some of those out on this
L6	particular PowerPoint.
L7	And here, for example, Mr. Depp admits to
L8	Paul Bettany to having ingested an enormous amount
L9	of drugs and alcohol, far from what he said in his
20	witness statement. And he was confronted with it.
21	And he also, to his bodyguard, apologized was
22	very upset to what he had done to Ms. Heard.

1	Now, the next one is the Bahamas, August
2	2014, Your Honor. Mr. Depp visited the island he
3	owns in the Bahamas to try to rid himself of the
4	addiction to Roxies. Ms. Heard accompanied him, so
5	did a nurse, although she stayed in a different
6	part of the island. The High Court found that Depp
7	assaulted Ms. Heard by pushing her on at least one
8	occasion, and the Court also held his and I have
9	quoted it here because I think it's significant
10	his feelings toward Ms. Heard vacillated wildly.
11	At times he was extremely fond of her and grateful
12	to her; at other times, he imagined that she was
13	the cause of his pain and that her actions
14	increased his torment.
15	I say "imagined" because there's no
16	evidence that Ms. Heard was anything other than
17	solicitous and following strictly the regime
18	prescribed by Nurse Lloyd and/or Dr. Kipper. And I
19	have cited the section of the judgment in which he
20	addresses this.
21	The next one is Tokyo, Your Honor.
22	January 2015. Ms. Heard and Mr. Depp were in a

hotel room in Tokyo. Mr. Depp shoved Ms. Heard, slapped her, grabbed her hair, and when Ms. Heard tried to stand up, muscled her to the ground, standing over her, yelling as she cried on the floor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The next one, Your Honor, and quite a significant one, is Australia, March 2015. And this is one where Mr. Depp had ingested an enormous amount of cocaine and ecstasy, and it was a three-day ordeal. Mr. Depp pushed Ms. Heard, slapped her, shoved her to the ground, continued to slap her, grabbed her by the neck and shoved her against the refrigerator, slapped her face. Later, hit her multiple times, shoving and pushing her to the ground, choked her, spit in her face, threw unopened bottles at her, shoved her into a ping-pong table, threw more glass bottles through the window panels and the glass door, grabbed her and tore her nightgown, grabbed her by the neck, again, choked her against the refrigerator, slammed her against the countertop while strangling and choking her and banging her head against the

countertop, ignoring Ms. Heard saying, "You are hurting and cutting me," and, instead, continued to hit her and slammed a plastic telephone repeatedly against the wall with his hand.

Those assaults left Ms. Heard with a broken lip, swollen nose, and cuts all over her body. And this is also, Your Honor, where the UK High Court had the confidential annex, which is the second judicial notification. And I just make reference to that in the Court of Appeals on the issue.

In addition, the Court rejected -- and this is still Australia -- the Court rejected that Ms. Heard caused Mr. Depp's finger injury or injury to his face and found that it was Mr. Depp who scrawled graffiti in his own blood from his injured finger and then dipped his injured finger in paint and continued to write the messages.

And, Your Honor, I have here -- and it's Defendant's 13, I have these pictures, and they were in evidence in the UK that we're showing here, and we have indicated he's written on a mirror,

1	starring Billy Bob and Easy Amber and good luck and
2	be careful at the top on the lamp shade,
3	combinations of paint and blood at different times.
4	The Court said, "I accept her evidence of
5	the nature of the assaults he committed against
6	her. They must have been terrifying. I accept
7	that Mr. Depp put her in fear of her life."
8	The next one we go to, Your Honor, is Los
9	Angeles, March 2015, which is shortly after they
10	get back from the Australia incident, and it's
11	called the staircase incident. Mr. Depp hit
12	Ms. Heard hard and repeatedly lunged at her to hit
13	her again, shoved Ms. Heard's sister when she tried
14	to stop him, grabbed Ms. Heard by the hair with one
15	hand and hit her repeatedly in the head with the
16	other hand and destroyed personal property.
17	And, Your Honor, these are at Defendant's
18	Exhibit No. 14, clearly showing the amount of rage
19	exhibited by Mr. Depp not only on Ms. Heard but his
20	surrounding areas. And these were also in evidence
21	in the UK.
22	The next one, Southeast Asia, August

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2015. It's called the train incident. Mr. Depp picked a fight with Ms. Heard, hit her, pushed her against a wall by grasping her throat and holding her there, causing her to fear for her life. Court accepted Defendant's account as true, relying on Ms. Heard's contemporaneous diary entry which said, "J" -- that's how she referred to Mr. Depp --"finally at one point found himself with his shirt wrapped around my neck. Amazing to think about the precision and coordination that it required considering the circumstances. He hit me several I don't even know how I wound up with this huge, rather annoying, knot on the back of my head."

The next one, Your Honor, is Los Angeles

December 2015, and, fortunately, we're closing in

on — there's only three left — and this is a very

serious one. Mr. Depp put Ms. Heard in fear of her

life by slapping her, grabbing her by her hair,

dragging her through the apartment, pulling out

chunks of Ms. Heard's hair, following Ms. Heard

upstairs, hitting her in the back of the head,

grabbing her hair again, dragging her by her hair 1 2 up the last few steps, then shoving her at the top 3 of the stairs, repeatedly hitting Ms. Heard, knocking her to the floor, then head-butting her in 4 5 her face when she stood up and bashed her nose. 6 Depp conceded on cross-examination this 7 was true, and the Court rejected that it was accidental, as claimed by Mr. Depp. And these 8 9 pictures, Your Honor, are Defendant's Exhibit No. 1.0 15, again, all in the UK proceedings. The first of 11 those shows the two black eyes given by the 12 head-butting there on Ms. Heard. And then go to the next page, Your Honor. 13 This is a continuation. Then he dragged Ms. Heard 14 1.5 into an upstairs office, grabbed her by the throat, 16 pushed her down to the ground, punching her in the 17 back of her head, and then grabbing her by her 18 hair, slapping her face and screaming "I'll fucking 19 kill you," and continuing to hit Ms. Heard with 20 closed fists, pushing her face into the mattress

And, again, that picture, Your Honor, is

and pulling out chunks of her hair.

21

at Defendant's Exhibit 15 as well and shows the
bloody lip as well.

Then Mr. Depp pushed Ms. Heard, grabbed
her by her hair, dragged from room to room by her

pushed her face into the mattress, and pulled out

hair. Mr. Depp hit Ms. Heard with his closed fit,

7 chunks of her hair. Again, these are at

Defendant's Exhibit 15, the next two also in the UK

9 trial bundle.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Then the next page, Your Honor, which is also Exhibit 15, this is Mr. Depp now scrawling on the kitchen counter another message to her, "Why be such a fraud?", "All is such bullshit." And then you see another picture of Ms. Heard's injuries, particularly the bloody lip, and you can see the black eye.

Then probably the most disturbing one is on the next page, Your Honor, and that is the bed. The claimant got on top of Ms. Heard, placed his knee on her back and the other foot on the bed frame while repeatedly punching her in the head. The claimant screamed "I fucking hate you" over and

1	over again. The bed frame splintered under the
2	weight of the pressure of claimant's boot. And you
3	can see that at Defendant's Exhibit 15, the
4	splinters there, the force with which he was
5	engaging in this horrible conduct to Ms. Heard.
6	Next we go to Los Angeles, April 21.
7	This is April this is Amber Heard's 30th
8	birthday celebration. Mr. Depp threw a
9	magnum-sized bottle of champagne at her, grabbed
10	her by the hair, pushed her to the ground, scraping
11	her knees on broken glass while further pushing and
12	shoving her. Pushed her onto a bed, bumped his
13	excuse me, his chest with hers, causing her to fall
14	back down on the bed, physically prohibited
15	Ms. Heard from leaving the room while he assaulted
16	her. Happy birthday, Amber.
17	The last one, Your Honor, is May 21st,
18	2016. The Court found Mr. Depp ripped the phone
19	from Ms. Heard's hands and threw it at her,
20	striking her cheek and eye, charged at her, pulling
21	her hair, striking and violently grabbing her face,
22	slapping, shaking and yanking her around the room

1	while she screamed.
2	And, Your Honor, this is at Defendant's
3	Exhibit 16. Again, these were exhibits in the UK
4	proceeding, and they show the redness in the face
5	from having the cellphone thrown at her.
6	And then the next set, additional
7	pictures from that.
8	Now, the damages. Depp repeatedly argued
9	that "The Sun's" published statements were, quote,
10	"career-ending," end of quote. The bill of the
11	particulars of claim, which we attached as
12	Attachment 3 to the plea in bar, has, quote, "The
13	very likely intended effect of the articles" and
14	they're talking about "The Sun" articles "was to
15	finish the claimant's career." End of quote.
16	At the UK trial, counsel for Depp
17	argued and this is significant for two different
18	reasons here, Your Honor. As for the defendants,
19	they could have ignored Ms. Heard's claims but they
20	chose not to. They could have reported them
21	alongside Mr. Depp's physician, but they
22	deliberately decided not to do so. They chose

1	instead, as I say, to convict Mr. Depp, and that is
2	what they seek to do in this court, to prove that
3	this reputation-destroying, career-ending
4	allegation is true. That is what your lordship is
5	concerned about, true or not? That's, Your Honor,
6	at Defendant's Exhibit No. 10, and it's page I
7	give the citation there of 2503. And this is
8	Mr. Sherborne, Mr. Depp's counsel.
9	Now, there's two parts that are
10	significant here. First, if those articles were
11	career-ending, career-finishing, then by them being
12	found true, Mr. Depp's career is over and his
13	damages are done. But second and this is even
14	more important in this case, what Your Honor is
15	deciding here today is that he is admitting that
16	the issue before his lordship, which is the High
17	Court in the UK, is whether the allegations about
18	his beating Amber are true, the identical issue
19	that's before this Court in this complaint.
20	Now, because Mr. Depp cannot prove
21	damages in this case after arguing his career was
22	destroyed by "The Sun's" allegations Denn is

1	grasping at yet another shot: Vindication. It was
2	in the opposition's brief. They claim vindication.
3	But Mr. Depp has also suggested this.
4	Now, Depp already chose the UK as his
5	forum of choice to prove vindication, and he used
6	that. And it was vindication for whoever the
7	prevailing party was. And I cited it in my reply
8	brief, Your Honor, but I think it's important to
9	highlight these two quotes in particular.
10	Mr. Sherborne, who was Mr. Depp's counsel
11	at trial in the UK, said, quote, "The U.S.
12	proceedings will not produce a clear and reasoned
13	judgment," which is exactly what EDJ he's citing
14	a case, you know, to the high counsel there to
15	the High Court there, said is so important. "Trial
16	in the proceedings in Virginia will be a jury trial
17	with just a verdict. Here, your lordship will
18	deliver a clear and reasoned judgment, taking into
19	account a mass of evidence, hearing from the
20	parties, and giving your judgment in relation to
21	the 14 different incidents.
22	As I say, EDJ made clear that it is a

1	reasoned judgment that provides the vindication,
2	not just for the claimant but also for the
3	defendant." So, here, Mr. Depp's counsel is
4	conceding he can't get that vindication in our
5	court because we can only give just a verdict, but
6	they can get the vindication there for either side.
7	Then he lost.
8	Now, the other significant part of this,
9	Your Honor, is it's clear what he means by parties.
10	Mr. Sherborne says "hearing from the parties."
11	Well, "The Sun" didn't testify. Mr. Wootton didn't
12	testify. Amber Heard was the key witness in this
13	case, giving testimony for four days and seven
14	witness statements.
15	The UK , and this is at our reply at
16	Attachment 2, Your Honor. The UK High Court, in
17	granting Depp's request for relief, specifically
18	found, "I also see force in Mr. Sherborne's"
19	that's Mr. Depp's counsel "points that a
20	reasoned decision, which I shall have to give after

the trial, will be a vindication for whatever party

is successful of a different order than a bald

21

1	verdict of a jury. Of course I mean no respect
2	[verbatim] to the procedures adopted in Virginia."
3	This is one of the reasons, Your Honor,
4	why we need to end this litigation. They have
5	already sought everything they were choosing and
6	lost. But each time Mr. Depp loses, he will just
7	keep litigating. Mr. Depp, after losing that
8	well-reasoned decision that would have given him
9	vindication now characterizes his entire two-year
10	multi-million-dollar UK litigation as culminating
11	in, quote, one man's opinion, end of quote, and
12	seeks a second try at the vindication if this Court
13	does not put a stop to it and end the litigation.
14	The crusade for vindication will
15	continue, but here's the other ramification of of
16	that, Your Honor. Ms. Heard will have to continue
17	to be the witness every single time Mr. Depp brings
18	a cause of action, and that's one of the reasons
19	that we need to consider this in the privity
20	situation as well. But what was necessary for the
21	defendant's to win in the UK? Ms. Heard's
22	testimony. No one else could testify to Mr. Depp's

1	abuse of her. She had to be there. She was a
2	necessary witness. She was a critical witness.
3	She would be the critical witness here.
4	If we buy what Depp's people are saying,
5	as you always have to have the exact same parties
6	and that privity is measured by whether it's a
7	newspaper over Amber Heard, then, next, they can
8	sue "The Washington Post" and Amber Heard will have
9	to go testify. Any time anybody says that he was a
10	wife-beater or a domestic violence abuser or
11	anything like that, he sues them for defamation
12	anywhere, and she's got to come in and testify.
13	That's the logical sequence of this if that claim
14	is true and that you have the strict interpretation
15	of mutuality that they are asking you to. And I
16	will also be pointing out, Your Honor, that the
17	Virginia Supreme Court doesn't agree with Depp,
18	fortunately.
19	Now, I attached here, Your Honor, in the
20	next two slides and I'm not going to read
21	through all of it for time purposes, but I am going
22	to bring Your Honor's attention to Defendant's

1	Exhibit No. 11, which we have highlighted the
2	sections that are in these next two slides. And
3	what this tells you is that Mr. Depp is never going
4	to stop. It doesn't matter whether it's one man's
5	opinion, whether it's seven people. I asked him,
6	you know, if you go through this jury trial and you
7	lose, is it going to be seven people's opinion?
8	And you'll see him he rambles on quite a bit,
9	which he does, and then, at the end of it, he says,
10	"So if I can help other people by continuing, I
11	certainly will now." In other words, if you get
12	through his convoluted reasoning here, he's going
13	to just keep going and keep going and keep going.
14	And that's exactly what Eagle Star the Virginia
15	Supreme Court in Eagle Star and Bates v. Devers and
16	a whole line of cases say can't happen. You
17	litigate it fully and fairly once; you're done.
18	You live with the logical and legal consequences of
19	it.
20	So then I'm now to slide page 32, Your
21	Honor, if that helps. So I'm going to talk about
22	comity for a couple of minutes. Our position is

that comity should be afforded to the UK judgment. The restatement fourth of the foreign relations law of the U.S. provides a party to a U.S. proceeding may rely on a foreign judgment to preclude relitigation of a claim governed by a foreign judgment, claim preclusion, or to resolve an issue of law or fact addressed in the foreign proceeding, issue preclusion. Now, the seminal U.S. Supreme Court case

Now, the seminal U.S. Supreme Court case on this is Hilton v. Guyot, which articulated that comity is a recognition of one country of a foreign country's legislative, executive, or judicial acts. The rationale behind comity is reciprocity.

Now, if this Court refuses to recognize the UK judgment, the ramifications are significant not only for Fairfax County but -- in Virginia but in the United States throughout, and one of the things that we argue in our briefs is that we would end up with a significant chill because now, after going through that whole litigation there, if Your Honor says, "Nope, we have got to do it all over again," then they don't know what they can say and

1	whether he's going to go after each one of them.
2	Now, there are no Virginia cases refusing
3	to grant comity to the UK judgment, and
4	significantly and that's on the next slide, and
5	we have cited this case, Your Honor, and I think
6	it's an extremely significant case and that's
7	Oehl v. Oehl where they recognized the UK judgment.
8	Significantly in this one and I'm going to read
9	the actual part because I think it's important
10	because I think the Court is governed by the
11	precedence from the Virginia Supreme Court in Oehl
12	v. Oehl in applying the comity to English
13	visitation order, it says, quote, "Virginia's
14	jurisprudence is deeply rooted in the ancient
15	precedence, procedures, and practices of the
16	English system of justice. A substantial portion
17	of the common law of England and the writs,
18	remedial and judicial, given by any statute or act
19	of parliament made in aid of the common law have
20	been legislatively incorporated in the law of this
21	Commonwealth."
22	So the Virginia Supreme Court recognizes

1	we are alike and recognizes that the UK procedures
2	are legitimate and the same as ours.
3	THE COURT: For visitation orders.
4	MS. BREDEHOFT: Well, true, Your Honor,
5	but it's it didn't
6	THE COURT: Not for libel; right?
7	MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm sorry?
8	THE COURT: Not for libel causes but for
9	visitation orders.
10	MS. BREDEHOFT: Well, no. And, you know,
11	the interesting thing is, Your Honor, because the
12	UK is so plaintiff friendly in libel cases, there
13	aren't cases where people lose, except for
14	Mr. Depp. And so you don't have we haven't had
15	that opportunity in Virginia for the Court to
16	recognize a UK libel case because we haven't had
17	the situation. So that's the short of it.
18	But I agree with Your Honor. It was in a
19	visitation order but the significance of this is
20	the language that the Virginia Supreme Court uses
21	when they're analyzing UK versus here.
22	Now, Mr. Depp dismisses Oehl because he

says the parties were in privity. They don't talk about privity here. They're talking about are we the same, do we have the same kind of jurisprudence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now, the factors that were given by the United States Supreme Court in Hilton are whether a full and fair trial abroad before a court of competent jurisdiction, conducting the trial upon regular proceedings, having jurisdiction over -- in that case it was the defendant but it would be the party -- under a system of jurisprudence likely to secure an impartial administration of justice between the citizens of its own country and those of other countries, nothing to show either prejudice in the Court or in the system of laws under which it was sitting or fraud in procuring the judgment or any other special reason why the comity of this nation should not be allowed its full effect.

In those cases where you meet all of these -- and we contend we do meet all of these in this instance with Mr. Depp -- the Hilton -- the

1	U.S. Supreme Court says the merits of the case
2	should not, in an action brought in this country,
3	upon the judgment, be tried afresh. And that's the
4	concept that we're advocating to Your Honor is, if
5	you have had your shot and he had all of this,
6	in fact, and he's admitted it his counsel
7	admitted it in that argument the week before the
8	trial, We are going to get a better decision here,
9	a well-reasoned decision, you have a mass of
10	evidence, they're not complaining claiming any
11	type of prejudice whatsoever.
12	Now, in addition to Virginia and I
13	think this is probably important given Your Honor's
14	question to me other jurisdictions afford comity
15	to the UK judgments. One of these that we cite,
16	Your Honor, is the Pony Express Records v. Bruce
17	Springsteen, and that's in New Jersey where Bruce
18	Springsteen had previously sued Masquerade Music
19	for copyright infringement of his compositions and

sound recordings in the UK, and he had prevailed.

20

21

1	multiple claims, including copyright infringement
2	against Springsteen. Plaintiffs argued that they
3	were prohibited from engaging fully in the UK
4	litigation by Masquerade and had only directly
5	participated in the litigation by sending the Court
6	two letters detailing plaintiff's positions on the
7	copyright issues at stake.
8	The Court applied the factors of the
9	Hilton case and found and these are quite
10	relevant and very similar to the ones here. The UK
11	Court had personal jurisdiction over the parties.
12	Well, clearly they did here. Mr. Depp sued in the
13	UK. The parties of the UK action received adequate
14	notice. Well, clearly, Depp did because he brought
15	the suit. The UK court was a fair and just
16	tribunal that, quote, "carefully and thoroughly
17	considered their respective allegations and proofs,
18	provided Masquerade with ample opportunity to
19	defend itself, and recorded the Court's final
20	decision clearly within the opinion," end of quote.
21	We have got 129 pages, 585 paragraphs
22	with what even Mr Depp's counsel conceded would be

1	a well-reasoned decision and would provide
2	vindication for whoever the prevailing party was.
3	The next one is the issue pending
4	litigation was identical to the issue in the
5	previous litigation. Now, I will talk about this a
6	number of times, Your Honor, but what is the issue
7	here? What Mr. Depp's team is saying is the issue
8	is the publication. No. The issue is whether he
9	committed the domestic violence. And that's the
10	exact same thing in both places.
11	The next one is, there was no privity
12	between plaintiffs and the prior parties. In this
13	instance, there was not any privity, and they still
14	found the comity. Even though there was no privity
15	and plaintiffs had not fully and fairly
16	participated in the litigation, they were still
17	estopped from asserting their claims because,
18	quote, "they had the opportunity to participate but
19	forwent that opportunity." Clearly, Mr. Depp
20	participated.
21	Now, we also cited Apostolou vs. Merrill
22	Lynch, Your Honor, an Eastern District of New York

1	case, which also applied comity to London
2	employment tribunal decision, noting, quote, "The
3	circumstances under which federal courts will
4	disregard foreign proceedings are construed
5	especially narrowly when the alien jurisdiction is
6	a sister common law jurisdiction with procedures
7	akin to ours." In that case also, there was no
8	privity, Your Honor.
9	Your Honor, the comity, like full faith
10	and credit, bars defamation claims contradicted by
11	prior adjudicated facts. We cited Schuler v. Rain
12	Forest Alliance, Your Honor. And this was a
13	situation where there was a Mexican judgment and it
14	was determining what the property ownership was.
15	Ultimately, that got communicated in the United
16	States, and the same party who brought the attempt
17	in Mexico and failed then brought a defamation
18	claim against the person who said, no, they don't
19	own the property. And in this situation, again,
20	there's no privity, and they applied the Mexican
21	judgment.
22	In the Stevens v. Redwing, Your Honor,

1.

1.3

which was an Eighth Circuit case in 1998, the Court afforded full faith and credit to Georgia juvenile court decision, finding that the father had sexually abused his daughter and holding that foreign judgments found the statement to be true, so there was no tort for defamation, which is much more akin to this one, Your Honor, and it's a public policy issue as well. Obviously, that was a sexual abuse of a child, but domestic violence is no fun either, Your Honor, and it's very, very hard on the victim to have to keep testifying to it, and that kind of public policy, I think, is relevant in this case as well.

Now, the cases cited by Mr. Depp are inapplicable in this case. The Gordon v. Breach Science Publishers was a Southern District of New York, 1995 case. The Court examined six factors before declining to grant preclusive effect to German and Swiss judgments there, but those same six factors don't apply the same in this case. There is reciprocity with the UK court, which recognizes collateral estoppel, referred to as an

1	issue estoppel.
2	Your Honor, may I just take a quick
3	break?
4	THE COURT: All right. That's fine.
5	(Pause in the proceedings.)
6	MS. BREDEHOFT: Thank you. Sorry.
7	Depp was a party to the previous
8	litigation and litigated his case on the merits.
9	The third is the UK is a common law
10	jurisdiction from which our legal system is
11	derived.
12	Fourth, the foreign law is ascertainable
13	and undisputed.
14	Fifth, the UK applies collateral estoppel
15	consistently.
16	And, sixth, there are no conflicting
17	foreign judgments.
18	Now, Depp also cites Amica Life Insurance
19	v. Barber at opposition page 6 page 19. The
20	Court there refused to bind a non-party to a prior
21	judgment. Here, Depp should be bound because he

1	Furthermore, the Court did not view that
2	as a comity case and, instead, a collateral
3	estoppel case, and it was not clear from the
4	decision whether the Court thought that the actual
5	issue had been litigated. Notably, though, the
6	four factors for preclusion of factual finding for
7	foreign litigation articulated in the Amica are met
8	in this case. Identical issues, the abuse of Amber
9	Heard by Johnny Depp. Actual litigation of the
10	issues, the finding of the relevant fact was
11	necessary to the foreign court's final decision. I
12	already quoted earlier, Your Honor, Mr. Sherborne's
13	concession that the issue before his lordship was
14	whether they were true.
15	Four, the foreign tribunal's proceeding
16	were fundamentally fair. Again, no mention of
17	mutuality.
18	It is undisputed that the High Court had
19	subject matter jurisdiction and personal
20	jurisdiction over the UK action to make such a
21	ruling. That was one of the factors. It is
22	undisputed that the UK court is a fair and just

tribunal. Mr. Depp even expressed his preference for the UK over the U.S. as a better venue for vindication for both parties. Depp selected the UK for the plaintiff-friendly defamation laws and more favorable burden of proof. Depp failed to provide any evidence that the UK High Court is not fair and a just tribunal.

As Mr. Depp admitted, he was not precluded from calling any witness or submitting any evidence that he wanted to submit in the UK proceedings. Now, this was Mr. Depp's deposition testimony. We attached it as Attachment 1 in the plea in bar, and I asked him in his deposition if there were any witnesses he wanted to call that he was not allowed to call, and I also asked him if there was any evidence. On one of those two questions, his counsel objected, instructed him not to answer on attorney-client privilege. Once you have done that, you can't use it as a shield and then a sword. They can't come back now and say, Oh, no, no, no, we did have some other evidence.

But significantly, Your Honor, even in

their opposition, there is not any witness that they said, Gee, we really needed this person, they were critical to the UK case, and we were prevented from being able to introduce them. And there's not any evidence, you know, the donation, you know, I have already dealt with, I think, quite fully in the reply, and the UK Court had that before it and said it had nothing to do with anything.

Depp had a full and fair opportunity evidentially to litigation Ms. Heard's claims of abuse. Now, I set out here, Your Honor, pretty significantly the issue of the recordings and the material — and the claims of modification. I already went through it earlier, so I'm not going to repeat it, but in this slide, Your Honor, I set out specifically what the Court said, and I have already given Your Honor the page numbers for those. And the Court went through and gave very detailed analysis of that.

But I will go to the second part of the slide to say that the Court did rely on photos in reaching its factual findings. In re-examination,

Į	Ms. Heard denied that she had photographed the
	pictures taken of her on 16 December or had asked
	anyone else to do so. She had worn heavy makeup
	for the James Corden show, only to hide her
	injuries. She had not pulled out her own hair for
	the photos.
	In the situation of the December 15,
	2015, incident, Your Honor, where she had the two
	black eyes, she was scheduled to go on the James
	Corden Show the next night, and there was testimony
	from the makeup artist and the hair people on the
	efforts they went through to cover up all of the
	bruises and the hair and everything else. And
	that's what he's referring to here.
	Mr. Depp also tore clumps of hair from
	Ms. Heard's head. These were photographed later.
	There is a copy of a photograph on the right side
	of Ms. Heard's in the documents, which the
	metadata shows, as I have said, was taken at 2023.
	And so before the plaintiff arrived.
	Further photographs were taken of
	Ms. Heard's face, timed according to the metadata.

And he's referring to the May 16, 2021 -- or May 16 -- May 21, 2016, incident, which was the last one before she went and filed for divorce and for the temporary restraining order.

Now, the UK judgment should be recognized also under the Uniform Foreign-Country Judgments

Recognition Act. And I have cited Virginia Code

Section 8.01-465.13, and the applicability is for any -- any judgment that grants or denies recovery of a sum of money under the law of a foreign country where it's rendered as final, conclusive, and enforceable.

Now, I sent in yesterday, Your Honor, a case that we found, and I sent it to opposing counsel as well. It's — because they argued that this is only where they're the same parties.

There's nothing in the statute that requires this.

And this is a uniform statute. We were able to find a case in New York applying the same uniform statute, and it's difficult to read this case, I have to admit, because they have Plaintiff A, Plaintiff B, and they go through, but at the end of

it, the gist of it is that a party who was not party to the judgment was able to use this to bar the recovery under those circumstances.

Now, the second part of this, Your Honor, I have set out here the subsections B and C because in A of 8.01-465.13, it says, "Except as otherwise provided in subsections B and C, a court of the commonwealth shall recognize a foreign country judgment to which this chapter applies."

And then we have B and we have C. Now, significantly in the opposition, Mr. Depp makes no attempt to even articulate that there's anything in B or C that would put -- that would give them an exception, and then more significantly, if you go to the next slide, Your Honor, is that D says, "A party resisting recognition of a foreign country judgment has the burden of establishing that a ground for nonrecognition is stated in subsection B or C exists." They never even articulated one, much less established it, and it was their burden of proof to do so.

Now, I'm going to go to defensive

1	collateral estoppel, Your Honor. Black's Law
2	Dictionary defines defensive collateral estoppel as
3	estoppel which prevents re-litigation by plaintiff
4	of issues previously lost against another
5	defendant. I'm also citing Lohr v. McCurdy, Your
6	Honor, which is Rockingham County in 2000. And
7	it's exactly the situation here.
8	Now, Eagle Star, Your Honor, was decided
9	almost a century ago, and it is still good law.
10	It's been cited by the U.S. Supreme Court. It's
11	been cited by the Fourth Circuit. It's been cited
12	by other Virginia Supreme Court decisions. It's
13	been cited by the circuit courts. It is still good
14	law. And they permit and Eagle Star permits
15	defensive collateral estoppel and non-mutuality to
16	this day.
17	And the Virginia Supreme Court in Eagle
18	Star held that the trial court erred in denying
19	defendant's pleas of res judicata and estoppel and
20	prohibiting evidence of plaintiff's prior
21	conviction of willfully burning goods in a civil
22	case against the insurer of the same goods. What

1 '	happened, Your Honor, was there was a criminal
2	case
3	THE COURT: I have read the case.
4	MS. BREDEHOFT: Okay.
5	THE COURT: It's a criminal case so it's
6	an arsonist who is trying to get the insurance.
7	MS. BREDEHOFT: Correct. The first one
8	was a criminal case, the second is
9	THE COURT: Don't you think that's
10	distinguished from here?
11	MS. BREDEHOFT: I don't think Your Honor
12	can distinguish it from here. I think that what
13	the judge what the Court says is that was even
14	more favorable circumstances. You have a beyond a
15	reasonable doubt standard. They had to prove
16	beyond a reasonable doubt, and they proved beyond a
17	reasonable doubt that you did this. So you can't
18	turn around and ignore the logical and legal
19	consequences of an adverse determination by coming
20	in here now and trying to capitalize on it and say,
21	Oh, it's a civil standard and it's not privity and
22	it's not mutuality, so I want the insurance money.

So it's very much the same. It's the same concept. And, Your Honor, there's -- I would like to just read a couple of the sections on this because it's so important and it's exactly what we're dealing with here. It said -- and this is what we're talking about here, this rigid adherence when somebody says, "Oh, no, it's only going to be mutuality." If Amber Heard wasn't a party to that one, then tough beans; she gets to get sued and everybody else -- all these news organizations get to be sued and everybody does. That's not right.

In Eagle Star, it says, quote, "This is a case in which a rigid adherence to a general rule," and they're talking about mutuality, "and to some judicial expressions would be a reproach to the administration of justice." The Court held mutuality does not apply to a party, quote, "who once litigated the identical question and had it adversely decided under conditions most favorable to himself," end of quote. That is exactly the situation here. He went into the UK where the burden of proof was on the defendant. He had a

1	much better situation there.
2	Now, Eagle Star, as I indicated, has been
3	cited it's still good law. It's almost a
4	century old. But there are other others that
5	also recognized defense of estoppel, including
6	Virginia court cases. But I want to take Your
7	Honor to the U.S. Supreme Court for a minute
8	because the U.S. Supreme Court and the majority of
9	the jurisdictions in the United States recognized
10	defense of use of non-mutual estoppel. The U.S.
11	Supreme Court in Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, a
12	1971 case, cited Eagle Star and applied defensive
13	collateral estoppel, ruling, quote, "The
14	achievement of substantial justice, rather than
15	symmetry, is the measure of the fairness of the
16	rules of res judicata, not symmetry."
17	Bernard v. Bank of America and it's
18	significant here, Your Honor, because I'm going to
19	go to Bates v. Devers, and Bates v. Devers cites
20	Eagle Star, it cites Blonder-Tongue, it cites
21	Bernard.

It's also cited and it recognized the

1	move away from mutuality by the majority of courts.
2	Quote, "Many courts have abandoned the requirement
3	of mutuality and confined the requirement of
4	privity to the party against whom the plea of res
5	judicata is asserted."
6	Now, in the Bates v. Devers case, Your
7	Honor, they go through and they also cite some
8	people who have gone through and done an
9	examination of the laws throughout the state, and
10	they found that, in fact, a majority no longer
11	require the mutuality.
12	So let me talk about Bates v. Devers,
13	Your Honor, because we're suggesting that Bates v.
14	Devers stands for the proposition that we're asking
15	for today. They carved out an exception for
16	collateral estoppel mutuality and that exception is
17	met here.
18	The Virginia Supreme Court intentionally
19	embedded flexibility in its decisions on collateral
20	estoppel for cases like this one. And I'm going to
21	quote, "Collateral estoppel is the preclusive
22	effect impacting in a subsequent action based upon

collateral and different cause of action. In the subsequent action, the parties to the first action and their privies are precluded from litigating any issue of fact actually litigated and essential to a valid and final personal judgment in the first action." I'm citing Bates v. Devers.

They continue, quote, "The mutuality doctrine should not be mechanistically applied when it is compellingly clear from the prior record that the party in the subsequent civil action against whom collateral estoppel is asserted has fully and fairly litigated and lost an issue of fact which was essential to the prior judgment." That's exactly the situation here, whether Depp abused Heard was essential to the prior judgment.

Now, the Fourth Circuit interpreted

Virginia law as holding that no mutuality or

privity required for the collateral estoppel. And

the significance of that Graves v. Associated

Transport, Your Honor, is that Bates v. Devers

cites Graves with approval and actually takes some

of the language from Graves and also takes language

1 | from Eagle Star.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Fourth Circuit -- and they reviewed a number of Virginia cases -- and, by the way, the Virginia Supreme Court in Bates v. Devers says that Graves reviewed and applied Virginia law.

Graves said, quote, "The mutuality rule was probably never a solid wall. Exceptions were created under the pressure of the public interest in an end to litigation. The fact was that under certain circumstances, once the party against whom the former judgment was asserted, has been afforded a full and fair day in court and a reasonable opportunity to be heard on all relevant issues, even though against a different adversary, a plea of estoppel by judgment ought to be recognized. The rule of mutuality is itself based on policy and practical necessity and justice, as is the whole doctrine of res judicata. And on the same grounds of policy and justice, there would seem to be no objection to departing from it where the party affected has been given one adequate opportunity to be heard, either personally or by representative."

1	Graves, applying the Virginia law, barred
2	Graves' tort claims where the defendant, a
3	non-party to the prior lawsuit, asserted collateral
4	estoppel to bar claims that the plaintiff, a prior
5	party, had brought and lost. After extensive
6	review of the Virginia cases on collateral
7	estoppel, the Court reasoned that Graves had,
8	quote, "already had his day in court," end of
9	quote, and held that the district court erred in
10	rejecting the plea in bar.
11	The Court found, quote, "there is no
12	compelling reason for requiring that the party
13	asserting the plea of res judicata must have been a
14	party or in privity with a party to the earlier
15	litigation."
16	Now, the Eastern District of Virginia and
17	Virginia circuit courts have interpreted Bates v.
18	Devers as recognizing collateral estoppel with no
19	mutuality. We cited, Your Honor, Moore v. Allied
20	Chemical, which was an Eastern District of Virginia
21	case, which permitted defensive collateral
22	estoppel, and they said specifically the Supreme

т	Court of virginia has recognized the doctrine of
2	collateral estoppel even though the previous
3	determination may have involved a different cause
4	of action and different parties. The Court held
5	that the defendant was not precluded from asserting
6	collateral estoppel, although was not a party to
7	the previous administrative proceedings.
8	Virginia circuit courts have also held
9	that mutuality is not required. We cited Leech v.
10	Virginia State Bar, a Richmond case from 2007.
11	Now, in the opposition, Depp claimed that they were
12	identical parties. They were not. Three of the
13	individuals that were in the next one were on a
14	panel but they were not individual defendants. We
15	pointed that out in our reply.
16	Now, Depp's rigid requirement of
17	mutuality rather would invite rather than end

litigation. And I think I have made this argument

already, but if it's true that mutuality of parties

is dispositive; every time he loses, he can just

organization, bring it against another publisher.

bring another one against another news

18

19

20

21

1	And Ms. Heard is going to have to go testify in
2	every one of these; otherwise, they run the risk of
3	losing. And he gets more financing for the next
4	litigation.
5	Obviously, news organizations' speech
6	will be chilled if they can't rely on a three-week
7	UK trial with a well-reasoned decision that even
8	Mr. Depp said would provide vindication from sides.
9	Now, res judicata, the claim preclusion.
10	This action and the UK action arises from the same
11	conduct transaction and occurrence. And, Your
12	Honor, I think this is probably the weakest
13	argument that the opposition made in this case.
14	They just completely avoided and skirted the
15	concept that this is about abuse of Amber Heard by
16	Johnny Depp. Instead, they claim, no, no, no, it's
17	the publication. So it's the publication by "The
18	Sun" and it's the publication of the op-ed. That
19	is not what the courts are talking about with the
20	same conduct, transaction, or occurrence.
21	The actual issue and I have already
22	cited for you Mr. Sherborne's admission that the

issue before the High Court was whether or not it was true that Johnny Depp abused Amber Heard. That was the critical issue.

Now, in Funny Guy, the Virginia Supreme

Court -- and this is a 2017 case -- said, like

collateral estoppel, res judicata protects parties

from the cost and vexation of multiple lawsuits,

conserves judicial resources, and by preventing

inconsistent decisions, encourages reliance on

adjudication. And we're going to ask Your Honor to

adhere to these principles and apply this in this

case.

Now, Rule 1:6 addresses claim and cause of action preclusion, not issue preclusion, I might note. The rule mandates application of res judicata where mutuality exists, but it permits application where there's not mutuality. What Depp's team has missed every time -- and that was both in their opposition to my motion for leave to amend and in their opposition in this case, they just ignore Rule 1:6(d). And I pointed it out at the argument last time, Your Honor. What that

1	says, it expressly preserves the common law
2	governing privity as it relates to the rule,
3	stating, quote, "The law of privity, as heretofore
4	articulated in case law in the Commonwealth of
5	Virginia, is unaffected by the rule and remains
6	intact. For purposes of this rule, party or
7	parties includes all named parties and those in
8	privity."
9	Now, this action and the UK action arise
10	from the same conduct, transaction, and occurrence.
11	And if we apply the factors that were set out by
12	the Virginia Supreme Court in the 2017 Virginia
13	Supreme Court case of Funny Guy, the origin of both
14	actions is Mr. Depp's domestic abuse of Ms. Heard,
15	preceding a 2016 domestic violence restraining
16	order and the filing of the divorce proceeding.
17	Mr. Depp's motivation is to prove the
18	allegations of abuse are false. The facts

underlying the two are also related in time and

abuse of Ms. Heard back at the time of their

relationship and their marriage.

space. Both center around the events of Mr. Depp's

19

20

21

1	Finally, the facts underlying the two
2	form a convenient trial unit and their treatment as
3	such conforms to the reasonable parties'
4	expectations. Evidence presented will be
5	essentially the same here, although we're not
6	restricted to the 14 and we're going to certainly
7	have that evidence but we'll probably have a lot
8	more, but it doesn't matter. That's enough.
9	Reasonable parties would not expect, much
10	less warrant, a dispute over the veracity of the
11	statement to disintegrate into multiple lawsuits,
12	and no one said it better than Mr. Sherborne,
13	Mr. Depp's UK counsel, when he said they would
14	prefer to have that reasoned decision from the UK,
15	that would provide the vindication that a jury
16	verdict could not.
17	Now, Ms. Heard is not required to
18	establish all these factors, according to Funny
19	Guy, but she has in this situation.
20	And, now, my last point, Your Honor, is
21	that Ms. Heard and the UK were in privity. She
22	doesn't have to prove it here, we have gone through

1 the cases, but she absolutely is in privity. 2 Your Honor, I think that the best case to 3 look at here is one that was two years ago from the 4 Virginia Supreme Court in Lane v. Bayview Loan 5 Services. The Virginia Supreme Court talked about 6 privity in that case and said that they really had 7 not applied it much in the past, and they were 8 going into new territory. But I'm going to quote 9 specifically what the Virginia Supreme Court said 10 Quote: "Privity, as used in the context 11 of res judicata or collateral estoppel, does not 12 embrace relationships between persons or entities 13 but, rather, it deals with a person's relationship 14 to the subject matter of the litigation. Whether 15 privity exists is determined on a case-by-case 16 examination of the relationship and the interest of 17 the party." 18 The UK case was about whether Mr. Depp 19 abused Ms. Heard. This case is about whether 20 Mr. Depp abused Ms. Heard. Ms. Heard could not 21 have been a closer person to the subject matter.

She is the subject matter. She was the person

1	being abused.
2	The defendants in the U.S. [verbatim]
3	could not have prevailed without Ms. Heard's
4	testimony. She was the key witness. She was on
5	the stand for four days. She gave seven witness
6	statements.
7	THE COURT: Should we focus more on the
8	statements, though? The statements in the UK and
9	"The Sun" versus the statements here for
10	defamation? I mean, we're talking about different
11	occurrences with the statements for defamation,
12	basis on the statements.
13	MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, that's the
14	argument that the opposition makes, but that's not
15	the law at all in these cases. We're not
16	litigating and they didn't litigate in the UK
17	whether they published those statements. That was
18	a given. Nobody refuted that. The statements were
19	there.
20	The issue was whether they were false or
21	true, and that was whether she [verbatim] was a
22	wife-beater and it went in and mentioned her ten

1	times, "The Sun"'s ten times about her bringing
2	the domestic violence temporary restraining order,
3	about bringing the suit, what she had alleged about
4	the violence, particularly the December 2015, the
5	April 2016, and the May 2016. It's not the the
6	occurrence the transaction is not the
7	publication. It's what is the subject of the
8	libel. The subject of the libel, as he said, it's
9	not true that I beat her. He's not saying it's not
10	true that you published or you didn't publish.
11	It's not true that I beat her. No one said that
12	better than Mr. Sherborne, Mr. Depp's own attorney,
13	in saying what's before your lordship is whether
14	it's true.
15	THE COURT: Well, just, in the Lane case,
16	they found that there wasn't privity, right,
17	between the attorney and his client; correct?
18	MS. BREDEHOFT: Yeah, that was
19	THE COURT: Because they had different
20	legal rights. Well, doesn't here "The Sun" have
21	different legal rights than Amber Heard?
22	MS. BREDEHOFT: In the Lane case, Your

1	Honor, that one was an attorney.
2	THE COURT: An attorney, right. And the
3	attorney's client, right. And they didn't have
4	privity, according to the Court.
5	MS. BREDEHOFT: Right. In that
6	situation, in fact, they found that the attorney
7	was mistaken basically
8	THE COURT: Because they didn't have the
9	same legal rights, that's what they found in the
10	case.
11	MS. BREDEHOFT: Right.
12	THE COURT: Right. So how does "The Sun"
13	and Amber Heard have the same legal rights here to
14	be in privity?
15	MS. BREDEHOFT: But Lane wasn't saying
16	that that's that you have to apply that. In
17	fact, Lane was and that's why I quoted the
18	language. You have to look at them on a
19	case-by-case basis. And they say they
20	absolutely say it deals with the person's
21	relationship to the subject matter of the
22	litigation, and the subject matter of that

1	litigation was whether Mr. Depp beat Ms. Heard.
2	That's the relationship.
3	THE COURT: That wasn't a defamation
4	case, so it's
5	MS. BREDEHOFT: No, that one wasn't. It
6	was about all kinds of title rights.
7	THE COURT: But a defamation case is
8	based on statements. Every statement is a separate
9	cause of action; right?
10	MS. BREDEHOFT: But it's what it's the
11	substance of the statement that makes a difference.
12	They could not have defended that they could not
13	have proven their case and prevailed over there
14	without Ms. Heard testifying. The issue was
15	whether he committed domestic violence. That's the
16	subject matter.
17	THE COURT: Go ahead.
18	MS. BREDEHOFT: I think I need to work
19	harder on this one, Your Honor, given Your
20	Honor's
21	THE COURT: You have gone an hour and 12
22	minutes, so let's keep on going.

1	MS. BREDEHOFT: It's a very important
2	very important matter, Your Honor.
3	The I would also say, Your Honor, that
4	Mr. Depp conceded that the effective opponent in
5	that case was Ms. Heard, and that's at the judicial
6	notification attachment A, paragraph 576. The
7	Court actually says that Depp's counsel
8	repeatedly repeatedly referred to her as the
9	effective opponent in the case.
10	Now, the UK court also recognized that
11	Heard was an integral part of the UK proceedings.
12	He said, "Noting the importance of Heard being in
13	the courtroom for the trial, refusing Depp's
14	request to exclude her, conditioning Depp being
15	able to go to trial in the UK, that he would not
16	retaliate against Ms. Heard for providing the
17	Australian drug texts." And that's in the order
18	dated July 2, which was in the reply brief at
19	Attachment 3.
20	The UK case and this case are about
21	Ms. Heard being the victim of domestic abuse at the
22	hands of Mr. Depp. Ms. Heard is the subject

1	matter. I see where Your Honor is coming here,
2	Your Honor, but it can't possibly be that and
3	that interpretation that it's about the articles
4	means that and that goes back to what I was
5	saying earlier, and I know Your Honor was looking
6	at me at that time I think with somewhat of a
7	question here, but if it's true that they don't
8	have the same legal rights, then what stops
9	Mr. Depp from suing "The Washington Post", suing
10	every one of those organizations that have come out
11	and said he was a wife-beater? They have got
12	headlines and everything. What stops him from
13	every single time, bringing another libel or
14	defamation action anywhere in the country, anywhere
15	in the commonwealth, anywhere in the world if you
16	don't ever apply issue preclusion? He had his day
17	in court.
18	THE COURT: So you're saying he is a
19	wife-beater, that that's just the statement
20	forever?
21	MS. BREDEHOFT: Yeah. He had his day
22	that's absolutely right. He had his day in court.

1	He fully and fairly
2	THE COURT: So anybody in the world can
3	call him a wife-beater in print?
4	MS. BREDEHOFT: Absolutely. They should
5	be able to, based on the constructs of the U.S.
6	Supreme Court decision in Blonder-Tongue and based
7	on Eagle Star in the Virginia Supreme Court, based
8	on Bates v. Devers, Graves. All of those cases
9	say, when you have your full day in court, you have
10	to live with the legal and logical consequences.
11	THE COURT: So whenever anybody loses a
12	libel action anywhere, then they can never then
13	they can never sue again for libel for different
14	statements based on that same issue?
15	MS. BREDEHOFT: If it's the exact same
16	statement, I would say that's correct.
17	THE COURT: If it's the same statement, I
18	agree, you know, from the same exact people, okay,
19	but you're that's not what you're saying.
20	You're saying that anybody anywhere in any context
21	can say that he's a wife-beater for any reason.
22	MS. BREDEHOFT: He has been adjudicated

1	as a wife-beater.
2	THE COURT: I just wanted to
3	MS. BREDEHOFT: The Court found that to
4	be true. So, yes, then he is estopped from suing
5	anyone for saying he's a wife-beater now because it
6	has been adjudicated as true, and he cannot and
7	anybody can say that he beat Amber Heard at least
8	12 times, that he committed domestic violence
9	against her and caused her, on occasion, to fear
10	for her life. Absolutely.
11	He litigated that. He lost it. He has
12	to live with, in the words of Bates v. Devers and
13	in the words of Eagle Star, the logical and legal
14	consequences of his actions.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MS. BREDEHOFT: The last thing that I
17	would end on, Your Honor and this is Exhibit 10
18	again is the impact this has on Ms. Heard. She
19	has no choice but to be involved in these, and I
20	think this dovetails right into what Your Honor was
21	just asking. How many times does Mr. Depp get to
22	sue for them saying that he beat Amber Heard? And

1	each time he does, she has to be implicated in it.
2	And what I have here in Exhibit 10, Your
3	Honor, was her testimony in the UK
4	THE COURT: I'm sorry; can I ask you one
5	more question on this?
6	MS. BREDEHOFT: Uh-huh.
7	THE COURT: If it had been different in
8	the UK and he was not found a wife-beater, okay,
9	and they say you are not a wife-beater so now
10	then then anybody could never call him a
11	wife-beater; correct?
12	MS. BREDEHOFT: Well
12 13	MS. BREDEHOFT: Well THE COURT: If the law of that case was
13	THE COURT: If the law of that case was
13 14	THE COURT: If the law of that case was "You're not a wife-beater," so then if anybody
13 14 15	THE COURT: If the law of that case was "You're not a wife-beater," so then if anybody then nobody in the world could ever have any First
13 14 15 16	THE COURT: If the law of that case was "You're not a wife-beater," so then if anybody then nobody in the world could ever have any First Amendment right to say he's a wife-beater anywhere;
13 14 15 16 17	THE COURT: If the law of that case was "You're not a wife-beater," so then if anybody then nobody in the world could ever have any First Amendment right to say he's a wife-beater anywhere; correct?
13 14 15 16 17 18	THE COURT: If the law of that case was "You're not a wife-beater," so then if anybody then nobody in the world could ever have any First Amendment right to say he's a wife-beater anywhere; correct? MS. BREDEHOFT: Well, two answers to
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE COURT: If the law of that case was "You're not a wife-beater," so then if anybody then nobody in the world could ever have any First Amendment right to say he's a wife-beater anywhere; correct? MS. BREDEHOFT: Well, two answers to that. The first is, I absolutely

1	Your Honor asked that. The first thing is you can
2	bet your bottom dollar that Mr. Depp would be up
3	here Mr. Depp's counsel would be up here arguing
4	to apply that to this case and saying that it had
5	been adjudicated and that she was effectively a
6	party. But second of all, we have what's known as
7	the speech act in the United States, which only
8	applies one way, not the other way. It doesn't
9	apply in this one but it applies in the reverse.
10	And so the speech act may implicate that,
11	but, yeah, I would say effectively, if he won, I
12	think he if somebody said it after that, then I
13	think he would have the right to be able to sue
14	them for it. I do think that.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MS. BREDEHOFT: Because he's won. But we
17	have the opposite situation here. He's lost. And
18	so how many times does he get to go back and
19	litigate the exact same issue, which is Amber
20	Heard?
21	If somebody came out and said he beat
22	somebody else, that's a different issue. And that

1	may bring a different result.
2	I think with that, Your Honor, I would
3	just ask that the Court grant the supplemental plea
4	in bar, and I'll reserve the rest of my time for
5	rebuttal.
6	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
7	MS. BREDEHOFT: Thank you.
8	ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF DEPP
9	MR. CHEW: Good morning again, Your
10	Honor. May it please the Court. Ben Chew, Camille
11	Vasquez, and Jessica Meyers for plaintiff, Johnny
12	Depp.
13	The Court should deny Ms. Heard's
14	supplemental plea in bar and impose sanctions on
15	her for filing what she knew to be a false a
16	futile amended pleading before she filed for motion
17	for leave to do so.
18	As to the latter, contrary to Footnote 1
19	of Ms. Heard's opposition to Mr. Depp's motions for
20	sanctions, Mr. Depp's counsel never stated that
21	this case was presented a matter of first
	-

1	opposition, the Supreme Court of Virginia has
2	emphatically rejected the arguments Ms. Heard makes
3	in her opening and reply briefs and made here
4	today, which arguments are neither novel nor are
5	they new. Rather, what Mr. Depp actually stated at
6	page 29, Footnote 9 of his opposition was that
7	Ms. Bredehoft, in a meet-and-confer with
3	Ms. Vasquez and me, after admitting she had no
9	Virginia case supporting her position, that there
LO	was no mutuality requirement, asserted that this
L1	might be a case for first impression, which was an
L2	obvious dodge to avoid sanctions.
L3	But as set forth in our opposition,
L 4	Virginia law is well settled, and Ms. Heard's
L5	supplemental plea in bar is futile, frivolous, and
L 6	should be sanctioned.
L7	Ms. Heard sets up a false premise, which
L8	you have heard throughout her argument today, i.e.,
L9	that Mr. Depp, quote, "cannot escape the fact that
20	the issue decided by the UK court is identical to
21	the issue before this Court, whether he abused
22	Ms. Heard," unquote.

But under controlling black letter

Virginia law, Mr. Depp does not need to escape that

fact, which is insufficient to grant preclusive

effect to the UK judgment under any of the theories

she argues today.

The fact that actually matters -- and it's an undisputed fact -- is that Ms. Heard was not a party to the UK action nor, as the Court has suggested, was she in privity with those UK defendants. This fact alone dooms Ms. Heard's improper invocation of res judicata, collateral estoppel, and comity. Ms. Heard's three law firms scoured the entire legal landscape to harvest any snippet of language or dicta to contradict the same party/privity requirement to no avail. Those citations either do not apply Virginia law at all or they involve facts or exceptions that are not present here.

This case embodies or personifies the rationale for the same party requirement. The UK case in this case focused on what took place during the short marriage between Mr. Depp and Ms. Heard.

1	That can only be adjudicated fully and fairly where
2	both husband and wife are actually parties in the
3	case subject to the same discovery rights and
4	obligations.
5	As described in the opposition, the fact
6	that Ms. Heard was a non-party in the UK precluded
7	full and fair adjudication of the factual issues
8	there. Discovery was incomplete. There were no
9.	depositions in the UK. They didn't allow them.
10	Ms. Heard had not been deposed in the
11	Virginia action yet, and Ms. Bredehoft and this
12	I don't fault her for because she wasn't part of
13	the case, but we did notice her deposition in
14	Virginia, and she didn't appear.
15	The expert testimony, to the extent it
16	occurred at all in England, was very limited to the
17	metadata issue. That Court could not compel
18	Ms. Heard to do anything and accepted at face value
19	of her testimony, for example, about donating the
20	\$7 million of the divorce settlement the entire
21	divorce settlement to charity, which the UK judge

cited as proof that she was not a gold-digger.

1 Well, she was a gold-digger. 2 Under the rules of this court, Ms. Heard, 3 who fought like blazes, as did the ACLU, which 4 continues to fight, ultimately had to cough up the documents, which exposed her perjury. And, in 5 6 fact, she stiffed both the ACLU -- no heartache for 7 them -- but far more egregiously, the Children's 8 Hospital of Los Angeles. What kind of person leaves sick children in the lurch? 9 10 This is the last case in which the Court 11 should create an exception to the Virginia black 12 letter same-party requirement. 13 I know Your Honor has read the cases 14 carefully, so I'll go through them as quickly as 15 possible, but I have to address the false assertion 16 at page 1 of Ms. Heard's reply that Mr. -- and you 17 heard it again today -- that Mr. Depp somehow 18 preferred the UK as a venue to vindicate himself 19 against Ms. Heard's false allegations of abuse. 20 As a threshold matter, Mr. Depp's UK 21 counsel never said that. Rather, he merely stated

that one aspect UK procedure, i.e., that there

would be a written opinion, could, had Mr. Depp
prevailed against "The Sun" defendants, have
provided more explicit vindication than a binary
jury verdict. That's all he said. He never stated
that Mr. Depp preferred the UK action over this one
to adjudicate the factual issue of whether there
was physical abuse. He really had no choice in the
matter.

"The Sun" published the article in London. He had to go to London, just as he came here to Virginia because Ms. Heard published the article, which was printed physically in this county, and it was published in the Virginia version of "The Washington Post".

It's patently untrue that all of the witnesses that will be witnesses here were witnesses in London. For example, Dr. Kipper, who was the psychiatrist for both of them, who has since been deposed; the nurses of Dr. Kipper, who will testify that they did witness abuse. They witnessed abuse by Ms. Heard against Mr. Depp in the waiting room while the two of them were waiting

1	to meet with Dr. Kipper. The ACLU, which has
2	resisted discovery, ironically, for about a year
3	and we finally wrestled them down, and Ms. Myers
4	will be prosecuting that motion to compel when it's
5	scheduled.
6	Elon Musk, the mystery donor, who came up
7	with some partial payments to the ACLU and the
8	Children's Hospital of Los Angeles so that
9	Ms. Heard could cover or try to cover the perjury.
10	Now to the cases. Ms. Heard cannot cite
11	a single case that supports her argument that res
12	judicata or collateral estoppel applies here. In
13	Rawlings versus Virginia, 267 Va. 4, a 2004 case,
14	the Supreme Court of Virginia held that res
15	judicata and collateral estoppel cannot be invoked
16	and do not apply, whereas here, the parties are not
17	the same or in privity. In so doing, the Supreme
18	Court reversed the ruling by the circuit court.
19	Applying Rawlings, this Court should deny
20	Ms. Heard's supplemental plea in bar because she
21	was not a party to the UK action nor in privity
22	with those Sun defendants such that she would have

1	been bound by the UK judgment had they lost. And
2	Your Honor asked Ms. Bredehoft asked that question.
3	She artfully avoided it and gave you two answers,
4	neither of which really answered it, which was of
5	course she wouldn't have been bound by that
6	judgment. We wouldn't have argued that she was.
7	She wasn't a party there.
8	But what's really striking to me I'm
9	not surprised about that, but what's really
10	striking is that Ms. Heard made no attempt
11	whatsoever in her reply brief and did not, in her
12	opening argument today, make any attempt to
13	distinguish Rawlings. She didn't even mention it.
14	This is I was taught in law school that you have
15	to bring to the Court's attention controlling
16	authority in the jurisdiction. You can try to
17	distinguish it, but you better mention it. And
18	that's a fairly recent and relative terms decision
19	by the Supreme Court of Virginia, and it's right on
20	point.
21	Rather, the reply in Ms. Bredehoft's
22	argument today cites factually distinguishable

1	oh, in that regard I'm sorry, Your Honor,
2	this Ms. Bredehoft referred to Mr. Depp's rule
3	of mutuality. It's not Mr. Depp's rule of
4	mutuality. It's the Supreme Court of Virginia's
5	rule of mutuality. But what the reply does, when
6	it did not respond to Rawlings, is it cites
7	factually distinguishable cases which do not apply
8	Virginia law. The few Virginia cases that
9	Ms. Heard does cite are inapposite.
10	First, Eagle Star, which Ms. Bredehoft
11	referred to several times today, 149 Va. 82, 1927.
12	As Your Honor suggested, it involved the preclusive
13	effect of a prior criminal verdict on a subsequent
14	civil action. And as Your Honor pointed out, the
15	Court established an exception to the general rule
16	that records in criminal cases are generally
17	inadmissible because parties to civil cases could
18	not possibly be the same by definition as parties
19	in the prior criminal case.
20	Specifically, the Court admitted the
21	prior conviction that defendant burned the property
22	at issue because that precise fact had been

established beyond a reasonable doubt. Because the

1

14

15

. 16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

2 preponderant standard in a civil case was lower, 3 the Court reasoned that, quote, "The greater 4 includes the less," unquote, and made an exception 5 to the general rule. That exception does not apply 6 here. 7 The UK action indisputably was not a 8 criminal case, and the issue of abuse was not 9 established beyond a reasonable doubt but, rather, 10 by a preponderance of the evidence. In this case, by contrast, Mr. Depp must prove the falsity of 11 12 Ms. Heard's claims by a preponderance of the 13 evidence.

So this is not a situation where, quote, "the greater includes the less," unquote, presented in Eagle Star. In this context, Ms. Heard, with respect erroneously asserted at pages 1 and 12 of her opening brief, that Mr. Depp has to prove falsity by a clear and convincing standard. That's dead wrong, as set forth in pages 9 through 11 of our opposition.

In fact, while Mr. Depp does have to

1	prove actual malice by clear and convincing
2	evidence, he need only prove falsity by a
3.	preponderance of the evidence.
4	Ms. Heard's purported reliance on Leech
5	versus VSB, a circuit court case out of Richmond,
6	is similarly misplaced. In the prior action,
7	Plaintiff Leach was disbarred. He then sued the
8	prosecutor in the disciplinary action and members
9	of a disciplinary board for defamation based on the
10	notice that they posted of his disbarment. The
11	circuit court dismissed Leach's claims on multiple
12	grounds. We respectfully submit that Leach is
13	distinguishable for several reasons.
14	First, despite Ms. Heard's contention in
15	her reply, the parties in the two cases were, in
16	fact, the same or in privity. They were the
17	prosecutor and the members of the board, unlike
18	this case where Ms. Heard and the UK defendants
19	were totally distinct.
20	Second, the allegedly defamatory
21	statement, that is, the notice of disbarment, was
22	merely announcing the outcome of the disciplinary

1	hearing. By contrast, Ms. Heard's defamatory
2	statements in the op-ed related to her own alleged
3	experience, not the mere recitation of the outcome
4	of a proceeding.
5	Third and finally, the circuit court's
6	dismissal appeared to be based primarily on the
7	fact that the allegedly defamatory statement was
8	merely an accurate statement of the outcome of the
9	disciplinary proceeding, not collateral estoppel.
10	Hozie vs. Preston, which we didn't hear
11	about today but it was in his papers, from the
12	Western District of Virginia, does not help
13	Ms. Heard either. Hozie sued the former lawyer for
14	executing authority over a settlement agreement
15	between Hozie and Hart. The Court found that
16	Hozie's suit was barred by an earlier suit by Hart
17	to enforce that settlement agreement, which
18	defendants had defended.
19	Hozie is distinguishable because the
20	initial suit found to have preclusive effect, was
21	litigated in the same U.S. jurisdiction as the

second suit. So Hozie had the same ability to

l	marshal evidence this both actions, most
I	particularly in the first. By contrast, though, as
l	Ms. Bredehoft points out, Mr. Depp was certainly
l	able to marshal some evidence in the UK action. He
l	could not compel complete disclosure from Ms. Heard
	because she was not a party to the UK action or
	subject to that court's jurisdiction or its
	compulsory process.

1.4

So all Mr. Depp had from Ms. Heard is what she selectively fed to counsel for the UK defendants. For example, there were no records of her contributions or lack thereof to the CHLA or to the ACLU or a number of other matters.

Finally, Ms. Heard's citation to Moore versus Allied Chemical Corporation from the Eastern District of Virginia is unavailing. In Moore, the prior case was an OSHA complaint in which the defendant company made specific admissions as to its production of certain toxic materials. The Court recognized the preclusive effect of those admissions by plaintiff in a prior proceeding where he was the defendant.

1 Here, by contrast, Mr. Depp never 2 admitted in the UK that he physically abused 3 Ms. Heard, to the contrary. Thus, the UK opinion 4 was not based on any admission by Mr. Depp but, 5 rather, on an incomplete evidentiary record. 6 And very briefly, I'd just like to 7 address three cases that Ms. Bredehoft mentioned 8 today. Bates v. Devers, I think Your Honor 9 addressed, but this case is distinguishable as one 10 in which the Court found no issue of preclusion 11 because the issue before the Court had not been 12 decided in the prior litigation. She also made reference and did in her 13 14 brief to the Blonder-ongue case. Again, Mr. Depp 15 submits that this is consistent with the exception 16 announced by the Supreme Court. Mr. Depp is not 17 estopped from litigating his defamation claim 18 against Ms. Heard because her status as a non-party 19 in the UK hindered his ability to have a full and 20 fair opportunity, evidentially, to litigate the 21 truth of her claims of abuse in her op-ed. 22 Also, the case is distinguishable as

1	specific to the patent context where the
2	requisition of a determination of patent invalidity
3	has implications for efficient operation and
4	policies underlying the patent system at large.
5	And this was described in our opposition at pages
6	13 and 14.
7	Finally, Ms. Bredehoft mentioned in oral
8	argument the Graves case from the Fourth Circuit.
9	Graves is distinguishable because the parties to
10	the two actions were in privity to each other as
11	employee and employer. So this requisite element
12	of res judicata, which is not present here, was
13	satisfied.
14	And, Your Honor, the UK judgment cannot
15	bar Mr. Depp's claims against Ms. Heard as res
16	judicata for the additional reason that the Court
17	touched upon; that the UK action and this action do
18	not arise out of the same conduct, transaction, or
19	occurrence as required by Virginia Supreme Court
20	Rule 1:6.
21	The Supreme Court of Virginia's decision
22	in Funny Guy versus Lecego makes clear that, in

1	evaluating whether two causes of action arise out
2	of the same conduct, transaction, or occurrence, a
3	Court should examine, quote, "Whether the facts are
4	related in time, space, origin, or motivation;
5	whether they form a convenient trial unit, and
6	whether their treatment as a unit conforms to the
7	parties' expectations or business understanding or
8	usage," at 144.
9	The conduct underlying the UK action does
10	not relate in any way to the cause of action in
11	this matter. As Your Honor suggested, the article
12	at issue in the UK action was published months
13	before Ms. Heard's defamatory op-ed in a different
14	country, in a different publication than the op-ed.
15	Moreover, the publishers of "The Sun"
16	article has no personal knowledge of the truth of
17	what they were publishing and published the article
18	in connection in their professional conduct
19	capacity, unlike Ms. Heard, who published an
20	opinion piece about her own purported experience.
21	Under the factors detailed in Funny Guy,
22	the UK action in this action do not arise from the

same conduct, transaction or occurrence such that the UK action might operate as res judicata.

11.

And addressing briefly Ms. Bredehoft's parade of horribles about other cases against other publications, these other publications prefaced their statements by "as Ms. Heard alleges," so they don't say he's a wife-beater. What happened with "The Sun" is they actually said that, and that's why they got sued, and they had to be sued in London.

English Boiler and Tube, Inc. versus W.C. Rouse and Son, 172 F3d 862, Fourth Circuit 1999 is right on point here, and you didn't hear anything from Ms. Bredehoft about that. Unlike any of the authorities relied upon by Ms. Heard, English Boiler actually analyzed whether defamation claims from separate publications arose from the same conduct, transaction, or occurrence. And the English Boiler court concluded that two separate instances of defamation, even if they involved the same subject matter, did not arise from the same conduct, transaction or occurrence.

1	Ms. Heard's apparent position is that
2	this case should be disregarded because it's
3	unpublished and applies North Carolina law. But
4	English Boiler is the most factual apposite case
5	that we have here, jurisdictionally relevant
6	authority on whether Mr. Depp's defamation claims
7	in the UK and the claims that arose here involve
8	the same conduct, transaction, or occurrence. And
9	they emphatically said that they do not.
10	Ms. Heard also claims at page 7 of her
11	reply that the Supreme Court rejected English
12	Boiler's purportedly narrow view of what
13	constitutes the same conduct, transaction, or
14	occurrence announced in the Fourth Circuit
15	decision; that is, she says that the Virginia
16	Supreme Court has adopted her theory.
17	But, tellingly, she cannot cite any
18	Virginia authority supporting this contention and
19	contradicting English Boiler's common sense
20	analysis.
21	Ms. Heard relies heavily on Funny Guy,
22	but the Supreme Court of Virginia's holding in this

1	case is entirely consistent with the holding in
2	English Boiler. In English Boiler, the Fourth
3	Circuit essentially cited to the same factors
4	announced in Funny Guy, in holding that the
5	separate instances of defamation do not arise from
6	the same conduct, transaction, or occurrence,
7	explicating citing to the fact that the
8	publications were published on different dates at
9	different times by different authors to different
10	recipients. That's English Boiler, 172 F3d at 3.
11	Moreover, Funny Guy and Fox v. Dees, the
12	other Virginia case relied upon by Ms. Heard, were
13	factually distinguishable from the circumstances
14	here. Funny Guy involved two successive actions,
15	which, unlike the UK action in this action, were
16	brought against the same defendant for the same
17	failure to pay money, with the only difference
18	being a different in legal theories.
19	In Fox versus Dees, which evaluated
20	whether there had been a misjoinder of parties and
21	claims, the Supreme Court found that the claims
22	brought by a concert promoter against a city and

certain city officials for conduct that occurred in connection with the plaintiff's dealings with the city to arrange a Mardi Gras concert. The various claims at issue in Fox vs. Dees, unlike those in the UK action in this action, were brought in the same action and arose from plaintiff's continuing interactions with the City and its employees in their official capacities in connection with ongoing efforts to get a concert up and running.

There is indisputably no comparable employer/employee relationship between Ms. Heard and the UK defendants nor any concerted activity between Ms. Heard and the UK defendants that resulted in the publication of Ms. Heard's op-ed in "The Sun" article. Quite simply, the factual circumstances giving rise to the claims in Fox vs. Dees were much more related in time, space, origin and motivation than the conduct of the UK defendants and Ms. Heard.

Because Mr. Depp's claims in the UK action and this action arose from separate conduct transactions and occurrences, the UK judgment

cannot bar Mr. Depp's claims on the grounds of res judicata.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Moving to comity, even had Ms. Heard established all of the requisite elements of res judicata and collateral estoppel with respect to the UK judgment, which she did not, this Court could and should still decline to recognize its preclusive effect. As Your Honor is aware, because the UK judgment is a foreign judgment, the Court has discretion, which it exercised -- which it should exercise to decline comity here. Tellingly, Ms. Heard cited only two Virginia cases applying Virginia law that recognized the preclusive effect of a foreign judgment, and in both of those cases, Oehl vs. Oehl, 221 Va. 618, which, as Your Honor pointed out, was in the context of a visitation order, and Seale vs. Associates vs. Vector Aero Corporation from the Eastern District of Virginia, 2010, the parties in the U.S. and foreign actions were the same.

Ms. Heard and her multiple law firms and the ACLU could not find a single Virginia case

applying comity, whereas here, the parties were different. Rather, Ms. Heard cites two non-Virginia cases, which she mentioned again today: Pony Express from New Jersey and Schuler from the Second Circuit, which, with the Court's leave, I will address in a moment.

But, first, I would like to respectfully correct certain of Ms. Heard's misstatements about the scope and operation of Virginia's Uniform Foreign-Money Judgments Recognition Action, which I will refer to as the statute.

To start, Ms. Heard incorrectly states, at page 14 of her opening brief and page 4 of her reply, that, under the statute, Mr. Depp bears the burden of showing that a foreign judgment should not be recognized. That's wrong. Ms. Heard fails to tell the Court that under Section 8.01-465.13:2, it is she as, quote, "the party seeking recognition of a foreign country judgment," unquote, who bears the threshold burden to first establish that the statute even applies to the judgment sought to be recognized.

Only after a party like Ms. Heard has met that burden would the burden then shift to the party, such as Mr. Depp, resisting recognition to establish a ground for non-recognition. See Section 8.01-465.13:3.

Here, Ms. Heard has not met, because she cannot meet, her threshold burden that the statute applies to those portions of the UK judgment for which she seeks recognition. The statute explicitly does not apply to non-monetary portions of foreign judgments. See Section 8.01-465.13:10.

The commentary by the National Conference of Commissioners on uniform state laws, which drafts the Uniform Foreign-Country Monetary Recognition Act, confirms that the statute was not intended to facilitate recognition of any portion of a foreign judgment other than the grant or denial of monetary recovery. Quote: "If a foreign country judgment both grants or denies recovery of a sum of money and provides for some other form of relief, this act would apply to the portion of the judgment that grants or denies monetary relief but

not the portion that provides some other kind of relief," unquote.

1.6

So the UK defendants could invoke the statute to enforce the UK's denial of monetary recovery to Mr. Depp in the UK action, but neither the UK defendants nor Ms. Heard could invoke the statute with respect to the non-monetary portion of the UK judgment. More fundamentally, Ms. Heard lacks standing to invoke the statute because she was not a party to the UK action.

Ms. Heard cites provides authority for a non-party to a foreign judgment, like Ms. Heard, standing to invoke the statute to bar domestic claims against her or him. Indeed, in the only two cases

Ms. Heard cites in which a foreign judgment was recognized under the statute, the parties in the foreign and domestic actions were the same. If

Ms. Heard had had standing, which she does not, and

Ms. Heard had met her threshold burden under the statute, which she did not, Mr. Depp would then have been able to assert a valid claim — strike

1	that a valid ground for non-recognition under
2	Section 8:01-465.13:3, subsection B(2) as, quote,
3	"the foreign court did not have jurisdiction over
4	the defendant." So that's a specific statutory
5	ground for non-recognition. The defendant,
6	Ms. Heard, was not a party.
7	Again, it's undisputed that Ms. Heard was
8	not a defendant in the UK and the foreign court
9	lacked jurisdiction over her. So Mr. Depp would
10	have had a clear-cut basis for nonrecognition under
11	the statute.
12	Yesterday at 4:07 p.m., Ms. Bredehoft
13	sent the Court breaking news: A new case from New
14	York, which was actually decided back in May 1979,
15	which is before Ms. Vasquez and Ms. Myers were even
16	born. This wasn't anything new and nothing
17	anything that could have couldn't have been
18	cited in the briefing schedule that the Court
19	established months ago.
20	In any event, the Court this Fairchild
21	case is wildly inapposite. Number one, it was
22	decided under New York and not Virginia law. And

in Fairchild, at least one of the defendants in the UK judgment was the same as the parties -- as -- one of the defendants in the UK judgment was also a defendant in the U.S.

1.2

1.9

The remaining comity cases cited by

Ms. Heard are inapposite because they were rendered
in other jurisdictions, applying non-Virginia law,
and they involve different facts. Ms. Heard's
citation to Apostolou from the Eastern District of
Virginia, which was cited at page 11 of her opening
brief, seems to have been a mistake, as that Court
reversed judgment finding for a foreign judgment's
entitled to collateral estoppel.

Pony Express and Schuler do not help
Ms. Heard either. In Pony Express, the federal
court in New Jersey held that plaintiffs were
precluded from suing defendants in the U.S. because
they had a contractual right to participate in a
prior action with defendant in the UK that
litigated the very same factual issue, and
plaintiffs declined to enforce their contractual
right to participate.

The situation here is vastly different.
Mr. Depp did not strategically wait to see what
happened in the UK. Ms. Heard actually did. That
is, she could have submitted herself entirely to
the jurisdiction in the UK, but she chose not to do
that. She made selective submissions, which was
her right.
What she did, as has been pointed out, is

1.

What she did, as has been pointed out, is she fed selective evidence, much of it false, to "The Sun" defendants, resisting any of -- resisted any vetting of such evidence for completeness or accuracy.

Schuler, which is out of the Second
Circuit, is highly distinguishable and has no
precedential or persuasive force here. In Schuler,
the Court dismissed three causes of action, all of
which were premised on Plaintiff's assertion that
they held title to certain real property in Mexico.
But the issue of ownership of Mexican property had
been determined previously by a Mexican court
applying Mexican law. There was little, if any,
factual or legal nexus to the U.S. or anything for

1	an American court to re-examine, as the Court
2	wrote, quote, "Plaintiffs are essentially asking an
3	American court to overrule the Mexican court's
4	judgment that the plaintiffs failed to prove
5	ownership of property located in Mexico," unquote.
6	By contrast, this case involves two
7	Americans, one on either side of the V, and what
8	happened and what did not happen during their
9	marriage here in America. And the previous case
10	took place in a country that had limited nexus to
11	that marriage and lacked jurisdiction over
12	Ms. Heard, who was not a party in that case.
13	Mr. Depp proceeded in London because he
14	had to, because that's where "The Sun" published
15	the article.
16	In her reply, Ms. Heard makes no attempt
17	whatsoever and made no attempt whatsoever today to
18	explain the clear distinction between this case and
19	Schuler, and it's a crucial distinction.
20	Another distinguishing factor of this
21	case and Schuler is that plaintiff's claims in
22	Schuler were barred at least in part because of the

conduct that occurred after the Mexican judgment and reliance on that -- after the determination by the Mexican court, which were cited by the Court in its decision.

1.2

By contrast, Ms. Heard's statements in the op-ed occurred before "The Sun" was published and had no relation to or reliance on the UK decision.

I wanted to mention in this context

Stephens versus Redwing, which Ms. Bredehoft

mentioned. This case does not involve -- this

case, meaning Stephens, did not involve a foreign

judgment or comity but, rather, full faith and

credit afforded to a decree from a court in another

U.S. jurisdiction.

In short, Ms. Heard cannot identify a single authority that dictates that this Court should recognize the preclusive effect of a factual finding by a foreign court with respect to an issue that is uniquely within the knowledge of two parties in this domestic action where one of the parties, Ms. Heard, was not a party or subject to

discovery or the foreign court's authority on that 1 2 issue. 3 And, in this context, I believe 4 Ms. Bredehoft referred to, on the privity point, 5 which I think has been pretty much exploded, but 6 she referred to the Lane versus Bayview case. This . 7 case actually undermines Ms. Heard's position. The 8 law firm had been a stranger to the foreclosure sale and had no direct legal rights at stake other 10 than its representation of the client, and, 11 therefore, was not in privity per the Court's 12 decision with the foreclosing party, despite having effectively defended its interest in the preceding 13 14 action. So this actually hurts Ms. Heard's 15 argument on privity. 16 Your Honor, Ms. Heard knew before filing 17 her third attempt to avoid a deposition, an 18 exposure of her deceit and defamation. She knew 1.9 this before she filed that it was futile. 20 her counsel so, and Ms. Bredehoft all but admitted 21 it before she filed her motion for leave. 22

Your Honor then cautioned her about

1	futility on May 28th at the hearing on the motion
2	for leave, stating that, if it turned out to be
3	futile, it would be sanctionable. But Ms. Heard
4	ignored the flashing red lights and filed anyway,
5	expending vast judicial resources and costing
6	Mr. Depp a substantial amount of money. Mr. Depp
7	most respectfully requests that the Court deny
8	Ms. Heard's supplement plea in bar in its entirety,
9	strike paragraph 13 of Ms. Heard's amended
10	affirmative defenses, which are based on comity,
11	collateral estoppel, issue and claim preclusion and
12	res judicata, and impose sanctions against
13	Ms. Heard such as she reimburses Mr. Depp for the
14	cost of responding to both the motion for leave to
15	amend and to this supplemental plea in bar. And
16	the preparations were massive.
17	Your Honor, what I would specifically
18	request is that the Court give us seven days in
19	which to present our affidavit and our underlying
20	billing records, give Ms. Bredehoft a week to
21	respond, and then, to the extent that the Court
22	makes an adjudication of the appropriate costs

1	reasonable costs and attorney's fees, that
2	Ms. Heard pay within one week. Thank you, Your
3	Honor.
4	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
5	Ms. Bredehoft, response? You have got
6	about 15 minutes left on your hour and a half, just
7	to let you know.
8	FURTHER ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT
9	MS. BREDEHOFT: Your Honor, I want to
10	cover a few specific items that were covered in his
11	argument. I recognize I have a limited amount of
12	time, so let me choose carefully here.
13	The first thing that I want to do is move
14	the admission of my exhibits, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Any objection to the
16	exhibits?
17	MR. CHEW: Your Honor, we have no
18	objection to Exhibits 1 through 11.
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. CHEW: We do, respectfully, object to
21	Exhibits 12 through 16, which are the alleged
22	photographs, on three grounds: Hearsay, lack of

1	foundation, and authenticity. And not to cut into
2	Ms. Bredehoft's remaining time but Officer Saenz
3	and Hadden (ph), who were called to the scene on
4	May 21, 2016, testified emphatically that they saw
5	no marks on Ms. Heard, and they saw no damage at
6	all to the penthouse.
7	So that so what Ms. Heard is
8	purportedly showing us on Exhibit 16 is something
9	that the police emphatically rejected. And
10	Ms. Heard's response is that those police officers
11	committed perjury and all that, which is nonsense.
12	It's the same thing she said when she was arrested
13	for beating up Ms. Van Ree.
14	THE COURT: So 12 through 17 is a
15	foundation objection.
16	MR. CHEW: Yes, please, Your Honor.
17	MS. BREDEHOFT: These are not offered to
18	prove the truth of the matter asserted. They are
19	all exhibits that were introduced in the UK and
20	that were relied upon by the UK judge. And if you
21	look at Exhibit 1, which they're not objecting to,
22	all of them are listed as exhibits.

1	THE COURT: I understand they're listed,
2	but I'm going to sustain the objection to 12
3	through 17. So we have 1 through 11 in evidence.
4	Any objection to 17?
5	MS. BREDEHOFT: 17, I haven't put in yet,
6	Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.
8	MS. BREDEHOFT: And I'll be mentioning
9	that shortly.
10	THE COURT: Okay. So we have 1 through
11	11 then. All right. Yes, ma'am.
12	(Defendant's Exhibits 1 through 11 were received
13	into evidence.)
14	MS. BREDEHOFT: Thank you, Your Honor.
15	Then the next thing I'd like to do is I
16	would like to have a clarification here.
17	Ms. Heard's deposition was never noticed in this
18	-
	case. I think that Mr. Chew misspoke and
19	case. I think that Mr. Chew misspoke and THE COURT: He said that her deposition
19 20	·
	THE COURT: He said that her deposition

1	Just to clarify. There were no depositions in the
2	UK. Before Ms. Bredehoft was involved
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. CHEW: we did notice her
5	deposition to occur in Virginia. She did not
6	appear.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MS. BREDEHOFT: And I think he's wrong on
9	that. Mr. Rottenborn has been in the case much
10	longer than I have. He says no, I don't have a
11	Notice of Deposition, and I think he's
12	misremembering. In the divorce proceeding
13	MR. CHEW: No, no, no.
14	MS. BREDEHOFT: there was a Notice of
15	Deposition.
16	MR. CHEW: No, I'm not misremembering.
17	Mr. Rottenborn Ms. Heard has been through many
18	lawyers. Mr. Rottenborn is a fine lawyer, but he
19	was not counsel at the time. Mr. McAvoy, another
20	fine lawyer, was the lawyer, I believe, when we
21	I know, because I wrote it propounded the Notice
22	of Deposition, and she did not appear. Anyway, I'm

1 not sure it's a material point. 2 That's fine. Go ahead. THE COURT: 3 MS. BREDEHOFT: I agree it's still not 4 material because they could have and they could 5 have moved to compel if she didn't appear, and 6 there was no motion to compel. There was nine 7 motions, Your Honor, argued in this case prior to 8 the UK trial, and there was no motion to compel her 9 for a deposition. 10 Significantly, Mr. Chew does not address 11 at all my arguments in my Exhibits 1 through 11, 12 Your Honor, which show there was an extensive 13 amount of discovery, an extensive amount of 14 documentation in this case as well as what was put 15 in front of the UK and that the UK had the benefit 16 of the extensive discovery in the U.S. 17 what he tries to do is say, "Gee, we didn't have as 18 much -- she got to selectively decide what." 19 No, she didn't get to selectively. They 20 propounded discovery for 14, 16 months on her. 21 This is in this court. So he can't claim that she 22 was selective. She had to produce that in response to this Court, and then it was turned over to the UK court. So that's just flat out wrong.

But the more important thing here, Your Honor, and what is not addressed here is she had — they had the full benefit of two courts, two years of discovery in the UK. He doesn't respond to my argument about Louis Charalambous, who went extensively into what Depp's discovery abuses were and the 70,000 texts, doesn't respond to any of that.

He had the full opportunity to fully and fairly litigate his claims in the UK. That's what Eagle Star talked about. That's what Bates v.

Devers talks about. That's what Blonder-Tongue, the U.S. Supreme Court talks about in this case.

He had the full opportunity, and, again, they don't respond to what did Mr. Sherborne say? He said, we want to be in this court, Your Honor. We want the well-reasoned decision. We can't get that kind of vindication in the other. We can get the vindication here.

There was no complaint at the time they

1	tried that case that they had any kind of
2	deficiency or hadn't been able to depose anyone.
3	And, again, Mr. Chew also does not address, Your
4	Honor, the arguments that Mr. Depp admitted there
5	was no witness he wanted to call that he could not.
6	There was no document that he wanted to introduce
7	that he was unable to. And, in fact, they haven't
8	said that even today.
9	And I will address the next one. The
10	next one is he claims and, Your Honor, this has
11	come back again, back in I think it was
12	September of 2020, Mr. Chew represented to the
13	Court that Dr. Kipper was going to testify that
14	Amber Heard abused Mr. Depp and had done so in his
15	offices.
16	When Dr. Kipper's deposition was taken,
17	guess what? He denied that. He said I have never
18	heard that from anyone. No one has ever testified
19	to that. That's in Mr. Chew's imagination.
20	But what the most important thing is
21	here, Your Honor, he had all the due process. He
22	 had a full opportunity to litigate. He admitted he

had a full opportunity to litigate. His counsel admitted that it was a full and fair opportunity and that he preferred the UK court and the well-reasoned decision and that they had a mass of evidence. That's significant.

I'm going to touch on the donations, Your Honor, and that will also implicate Exhibit 17. So in the UK, the issues of the donations did come up, Your Honor, and I specifically cited, Your Honor, in the reply brief the decisions by both — both from the underlying UK Court of Appeals as well as — I mean, UK High Court as well as the Court of Appeals.

But let me just give the whole big story here. So we go through a divorce. It's a no-fault state. It is a 50 percent community property.

Mr. Depp is making hundreds of millions of dollars.

Ms. Heard would have been entitled to much, much, much than 7 million, and, in fact, we attached, as part of our -- in our reply brief, the email from her lawyer saying "I want you to sign this because you're entitled to a lot more money."

She took seven and she said her intention
was to donate that. Half to the ACLU and half to
the Children's Hospital. And I attached the
business manager this is Mr. Depp's business
manager, enclosing the first 100,000 he sent on
Ms. Heard's behalf 100,000 to the ACLU, 100,000 to
Children's Hospital and said she has pledged these
amounts, and it is undetermined what those payment
schedules will be, but this is the first payment
towards the pledges. That's what the issue was.
Then Ms. Heard gave quite a bit more to
both. Then she got sued by Mr. Depp. Then she had
to spend millions of dollars defending against
Mr. Depp's lawsuit. That's what happened here.
She was also responsible for more than a
million being donated to ACLU and more than a
million being donated to Children's Hospital. They
deposed Children's Hospital. They told how many
amounts she had given. ACLU we produced the
documents from the ACLU on how much she has. She
has always said she fully intends to continue to
give the full 7 million, but she can't do it yet.

She will do it when she can. But she has given a significant amount to both.

Mr. Depp has given zero. And he's the one that made \$650 million and has not given a dime to either of them.

Now, let me tell you as well, they're incorrect that this was not fully and fairly aired in the UK. He's simply unhappy that the courts of appeal found that the donation issue to be, at best, a minor collateral attack of no significance on whether he abused Amber Heard. Mr. Depp has not alleged in this case, Your Honor, that Amber Heard said that she was abused for any kind of financial gain. The complaint does not allege it anywhere, and we cite that in the rebuttal.

Instead, he's alleged that she did it to advance her career. We have cited and we attached as part of our exhibits to the reply that, in fact, when I asked Mr. Depp for proof of that -- and it's in these exhibits as well, Your Honor -- proof of -- what proof he had that she had advanced her career, he said, "I have no proof." "What roles

did she get?" "I have no proof." "What commercial opportunities did she get as a result of saying he was a victim of domestic abuse?" "I have no proof." And that's because he has no proof. And that's what he alleged in this case. He did not allege that she said that for financial gain or for the 7 million.

Now, the next thing is that they
misstated what the UK Court of Appeals said. The
UK Court of Appeals said whether she intended the
word "donation" or "pledge" or whether they were
interchangeable was not something the Court needed
to reach because, quote, "We need not decide
whether that was, in fact, a fair reading of what
Ms. Heard said." These JN Attachment C at
paragraph 40.

The Court further noted in paragraph 42 that the issue of donations had only come up fairly peripherally. The Court further noted the insignificance of the donations says the judge did not refer to her charitable donation at all in the context of his central findings. On the contrary,

1	he only mentioned it in a very particular context,
2	as explained above, and after he had already
3	reached the conclusions in relation to the 14
4	incidents. So this was fully in front of them.
5	Now, the Court also pointed out that
6	Depp's legal team made a strategic decision not to
7	examine Heard on the donations. It was there in
8	fact, it was there in fact, there were
9	exhibits and you'll see in Exhibit 1 here, Your
10	Honor that there were exhibits on the donation,
11	including what she meant by donation and including
12	what she meant by pledge. And he said that might
13	have resolved the issue completely.
14	Now, the last thing is on that
15	donations and this is Exhibit 17, Your Honor.
16	The reason that I had moved motion in limine on
17	this is because of something that Judge White held,
18	and that's at Exhibit 17. It's a transcript from a
19	hearing on September 18, 2020. It's an excerpt.
20	And, in that situation, it was a motion to compel,
21	and it said, "As to the documents" and it's 17
22	on the highlighted section "As to the documents

1	that I guess I have got sort of categorized here,
2	basically, the information related to the divorce
3	case, request is denied as to those documents. It
4	is denied under the doctrine of enough is enough.
5	You-all have been going through the divorce
6	already. We're not going to retry that divorce in
7	this case, and that's what I deem this to be aimed
8	at."
9	So he was saying enough is enough, we're
10	not going back into the divorce, we're not going
11	into the divorce settlement, we're not going into
12	the 7 million payments, and so that's why I said
13	enough is enough, let's get this out of this case.
14	And then he said I just can't make those decisions
15	yet in this case. But the donations issue has
16	absolutely nothing to do with whether Mr. Depp beat
17	Ms. Heard.
18	Your Honor, with my limited time, let me
19	just make sure that I cover a few very important
20	points. The sanctions, I am passionately of the
21	belief that the Virginia Supreme Court has carved

out beautifully in Eagle Star and Bates v. Devers

1	and even in its statements in Lane about privity, I
2	am passionately of the belief that the defensive
3	collateral estoppel applies here and the Virginia
4	Supreme Court will agree with us. I passionately
5	believe that. There is no way that sanctions can
6	be awarded or even considered by a Court, in my
7	view, when you are taking the law that they have
8	been setting out and saying it cannot be
9	mechanic I can't say that word
10	mechanistically applied. You have to have
11	flexibility. You have to look at the
12	circumstances. And there are going to be
13	circumstances that I quote from Bates v. Devers.
14	Mutuality doctrine should not be mechanistically
15	applied when it is compellingly clear from the
16	prior record that the party in the subsequent civil
17	action against whom collateral estoppel is asserted
18	has fully and fairly litigated and lost an issue of
19	fact that was essential to the prior judgment.
20	It can't get any clearer than that, Your
21	Honor. This is the case. This is the case that
22	the Virginia Supreme Court was saying is the exact

one from Bates v. Devers. This is the case that

Lane said is the one that you would apply and look

at the privity and look at the nature of the

relationship to the subject matter. That's the

difference there.

This is the case that Eagle Star, a century ago, said we need to look at these and look and stop vexatious litigation. That's exactly the case. Not only are sanctions not warranted; we believe fervently, passionately that the Virginia Supreme Court will say this is the case they were talking about, this is exactly the set of circumstances.

Now, counsel for Depp spends an awful lot of time going into what the holdings are in the case, but as Your Honor well knows, there's a reason why you have a fault opinion. It's because you're giving all of the analysis as you go through and you're talking about what is important, what to look at, why are we deciding this way, what is the law.

What we have done is gone in and said

this is what the law is. This is how they're saying to do it. They're saying doing it on a case-by-case basis.

1.

1.0

1.5

We're talking about defensive collateral estoppel, and Your Honor asked me earlier about the hypothetical of what Mr. Depp could do with the decision had he won. That's offensive collateral estoppel, Your Honor, which is not what we have been talking about in any of these cases, by the way, today, so I'm not sure we can answer that one fully anyway.

But, here, it's defensive collateral estoppel, and the Virginia Supreme Court is dead on with us on those. And we believe fervently and passionately that they will come out in our favor on that.

I do want to address in Lane, Your

Honor -- I already cited for you how Lane sets out
the importance of "does not embrace relationships
between persons or entities but, rather, it deals
with the person's relationship to the subject
matter of the litigation."

They went on to apply to the attorney			
here because the attorney was representing. They			
said there's ethical issues with us saying that			
they are legally aligned. There's a lot of other			
reasons. But, remember, they say right before that			
"does not embrace relationships between persons or			
entities." That's not what you look at. You look			
at the relationship to the subject matter. Then			
they say we have got to do this on a case-by-case			
examination of the relationship and of the interest			
of the parties. The interest of Amber Heard on her			
truth are very important.			
Now, I'm going to go back, Your Honor, to			
, gog co go bac., _can, co			
Exhibit 10. And this was a question that was asked			
Exhibit 10. And this was a question that was asked			
Exhibit 10. And this was a question that was asked of Ms. Heard, if we can go to the first page.			
Exhibit 10. And this was a question that was asked of Ms. Heard, if we can go to the first page. You'll see where I have the highlighting. And			
Exhibit 10. And this was a question that was asked of Ms. Heard, if we can go to the first page. You'll see where I have the highlighting. And Sasha Wass, the Queen's counsel, is asking her to			
Exhibit 10. And this was a question that was asked of Ms. Heard, if we can go to the first page. You'll see where I have the highlighting. And Sasha Wass, the Queen's counsel, is asking her to explain what she means by "I didn't want to be			
Exhibit 10. And this was a question that was asked of Ms. Heard, if we can go to the first page. You'll see where I have the highlighting. And Sasha Wass, the Queen's counsel, is asking her to explain what she means by "I didn't want to be here. I wanted to save the embarrassment," and all			

1	accusing me of being a liar and was forcing me in a				
2	position where I would be increasingly aware I				
3	would have to come out and speak to prove and speak				
4	out against it. I did not want to do this. I did				
5	not want to expose this. I did not want to expose				
6	the totality of what really happened to me. I did				
7	not want to talk about everything that we that				
8	happened in our marriage and in our relationship.				
9	I did not want to put Johnny in a situation where				
10	the world or his kids would know fully what he was				
11	or what he could do. It is embarrassing."				
12	The Court then said, "Did you want to				
13	involve yourself in court proceedings in relation				
14	to your domestic history?"				
15	The answer was no. "No. I just wanted				
16	to be left alone. I just wanted him to leave me				
17	alone."				
18	In that same section, Your Honor and				
19	this goes to the ability of, you know, what is the				
20	suggestion of whether she was trying to benefit her				
21	career, she said, "What woman has ever benefitted				
22	from being the victim of domestic violence,				

especially accusing a powerful member or entity or 1 2 one of them of her own industry?" 3 And I think that really answers the question of privity. I think defensive collateral 4 5 estoppel does not have to be mutual, does not have 6 to be privity, and we meet every one of the tests, 7 and I don't think they have adequately responded. 8 I do want to respond to just a couple 9 more things, and I know my time's almost up. He 10 said we didn't talk about English Boiler. That's a 11 Fourth Circuit decision that explicitly based its 12 decision on the fact that the first letter had a 13 different author and the recipient. That's why 14 they said they were not the same acts or of the 15 same transactions. And that was North Carolina, 16 Your Honor. 17 And then with the Rawlings, that was also 18 distinguishable. That was the driver and a 19 passenger. Very, very different interests. were not related and there was -- the ruling also 20 21 limited to res judicata claim preclusion, not

collateral estoppel. We're saying defensive

1	collateral estoppel operates here.			
2	The final thing is just the actual			
3	malice, Your Honor, just to be clear. The clear			
4	and convincing, we are right on this. They have			
5	to Mr. Depp would have to prove, with knowledge,			
6	that they were false and with reckless disregard or			
7	whether it was false or not, and that's the Jackson			
8	decision, Virginia Supreme Court decision. And it			
9	cited the other actual malice cases.			
10	The subject matter, Your Honor, we can't			
11	get around here, and I know Your Honor asked me			
12	some questions about the publication, but the			
13	subject matter of what is true or not,			
14	Mr. Sherborne said it best and he was the			
15	attorney for Mr. Depp. The issue was whether it			
16	was true or not that Johnny Depp beat his wife and			
17	domestically abused her.			
18	This is a case about domestic violence			
19	between intimate partners. As Amber Heard has			
20	expressed, it's embarrassing and humiliating to			
21	testify about the abuse by one's mate.			

Amber Heard was essential to proving the

allegations of abuse were true in the UK. There's no way they could have done it without her. The High Court found that she was the primary witness and that they had proven -- and the defendants had proven 12 instances of domestic violence.

Mr. Depp fully and fairly litigated the truth or falsity of those allegations in his choice of forum. They can say he had to go there. He didn't have to do anything. And "The Sun" publishes all over the world. There's no evidence in front of Your Honor that he was required to go there. And, in fact, Your Honor knows from this case, he didn't have to sue Amber Heard in Virginia either. He chose to do that because we have a different anti-SLAP law than California. And even though all the witnesses or most of them are there.

At the end of the day, Your Honor, I go back to the first page of the reply brief where I cite Mr. Sherborne and I cite the High Court. They said that was the choice. That's where they wanted to be. That's where they could get their vindication for either party. They wanted to be

1	there. There's a mass of evidence, and he lost.			
2	He has had his day in court. I think we have cited			
3	a significant number of cases.			
4	It's not about the holdings, Your Honor.			
5	It's about the explanations and the dicta and what			
6	the Court is reserving, and what they reserved			
7	THE COURT: Well, it is about the			
8	holdings also.			
9	MS. BREDEHOFT: But, Your Honor, the			
10	holdings are all just every single one of them			
11	is distinguishable. There is not one that's			
12	anywhere close on point on this one, but the			
13	rationale in Bates v. Devers and the rationale in			
14	Eagle Bank and the rationale in Lane all point to			
15	this is the case, the Virginia Supreme Court will			
16	say, should end. This is the case that all of			
17	these principals should apply to, and we ask you to			
18	do it, Your Honor.			
19	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.			
20	Obviously, after argument, I want to take			
21	this case under advisement. I do have 11 more			
22	documents to review as well, so I'll take it under			

1	advisement. I hope to have a letter opinion to you			
2	hopefully within the next three weeks, definitely			
3	by August 20th. That will be the drop-down date.			
4	I hope to have it before then. Okay?			
5	But, obviously, discovery continues.			
6	Everything keeps going on course, and I'm sure we			
7	have another motion coming before that, so we'll			
8	take care of that too. Okay?			
9	MR. CHEW: Thank you very much, Your			
10	0 Honor. For the record, we object to Exhibit 17,			
11	1 which is			
12	THE COURT: I don't think it was offered			
13	into evidence.			
14	MR. CHEW: Oh, okay.			
15	MS. BREDEHOFT: I may (indiscernible)			
16	with the addition of (indiscernible).			
17	MR. CHEW: I shouldn't have said			
18	anything. But we would object. It's a snippet			
19	it's actually where Judge White is denying			
20	Ms. Heard's motion to compel all the documents in			
21	the divorce case. He subsequently ruled that she			
22	had to turn over the charitable donations and he			

1	subsequently de-designated them because
2	THE COURT: All right. All right. You
3	used it in your argument. I allowed it. They're
4	not going to put it into evidence. Okay?
5	MR. CHEW: Thank you, Your Honor.
6	MS. BREDEHOFT: Thank you very much, Your
7	Honor.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Have
9	a good day.
10	(At 1:17 p.m., the above hearing
11	concluded.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC
2	
3	I, Joshua Tubbs, the officer before whom
4	the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby
5	certify that said proceedings were electronically
6	recorded by me; and that I am neither counsel for,
7	related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
8	this case and have no interest, financial or
9	otherwise, in its outcome.
10	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
11	hand and affixed my notarial seal this 22nd day of
12	July, 2021.
13	
14	
15	
16	Joshua Tubbs, Notary Public
17	for the Commonwealth of Virginia
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
2	
3	I, Bobbi J. Fisher, do hereby certify that
4	the foregoing transcript is a true and correct
5	record of the recorded proceedings; that said
6	proceedings were transcribed to the best of my
7	ability from the audio recording and supporting
8	information; and that I am neither counsel for,
9	related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
10	this case, and I have no interest, financial or
11	otherwise, in its outcome.
12	
13	·
14	
15	Bobbi J. Fisher, RPR
16	NCRA Registered Professional Reporter (RPR)
17	Prepared: July 23, 2021
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

Conducted on July 22, 2021

A	82:10, 83:19,	91:1, 91:7,	46:9, 55:4,
abandoned	128:16	97:13, 105:22,	55:9, 70:21,
65:2	abuse	124:2, 124:6,	95:1, 135:2,
ability	25:5, 26:7,	124:16, 124:19,	135:9
96:22, 98:19,	43:1, 53:9,	124:20	actually
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	55:8, 57:11,	act	10:10, 15:10,
133:19, 141:7	70:15, 72:14,	11:9, 25:5,	26:18, 26:19,
able	72:18, 72:21,	46:18, 59:7,	66:4, 66:21,
15:6, 57:4,	79:21, 89:19,	84:7, 84:10,	79:7, 86:5,
59:18, 60:2,	90:7, 90:20,	107:15, 107:21	87:6, 88:2,
79:15, 81:5,	90:21, 94:8,	action	101:8, 101:16,
84:13, 97:4,	98:21, 126:3,	42:18, 49:2,	109:14, 111:3,
108:22, 122:2	135:21, 136:1	•	
about	abused	49:22, 50:13,	114:7, 114:14,
22:11, 23:5,		55:20, 65:22,	138:19
23:15, 24:7,	53:4, 66:14,	66:1, 66:2,	addiction
34:9, 38:14,	71:2, 74:19,	66:6, 66:10,	30:4
39:5, 39:17,	74:20, 75:1,	69:4, 70:10,	addition
44:21, 48:2,	86:21, 98:2,	71:14, 72:9,	32:12, 49:12,
51:5, 63:6,	122:14, 125:11,	78:9, 80:14,	138:16
63:14, 65:12,	125:13, 135:17	81:12, 87:8,	additional
70:15, 70:19,	abuser	88:11, 90:5,	38:6, 99:16
74:5, 74:18,	11:21, 43:10	91:21, 93:14,	address
74:19, 75:10,	abuses	94:7, 95:6,	89:15, 98:7,
76:1, 76:3,	21:8, 21:15,	95:8, 97:4,	106:6, 120:10,
78:6, 79:20,	121:8	97:6, 99:17,	122:3, 122:9,
80:3, 88:19,	accept	100:1, 100:9,	131:17
91:2, 92:9,	33:4, 33:6	100:10, 100:12,	addressed
96:11, 100:20,	accepted	100:22, 101:2,	45:7, 98:9,
•	34:5, 88:18	103:15, 104:5,	121:4
101:4, 101:14,	accidental	104:6, 104:21,	addresses
106:8, 114:22,	35:8	106:10, 108:5,	30:20, 71:13
116:6, 121:7,	accompanied	108:10, 110:19,	addressing
121:13, 121:14,	30:4	111:16, 113:21,	101:3
121:15, 129:1,		114:14, 129:17	·
130:12, 130:19,	according	actions	adduce
131:4, 131:5,	58:22, 73:18,	30:13, 72:14,	22:20
131:9, 133:7,	77:4	82:14, 97:1,	adequate
134:10, 135:12,	account	99:10, 103:14,	50:13, 67:21
135:18, 135:21,	34:5, 40:19	105:19, 108:18	adequately
137:4, 137:5,	accuracy	activity	134:7
137:7	111:12	_	adhere
above	accurate	104:12	71:11
127:2, 139:10	96:8	acts	adherence
abroad	accusing	11:22, 13:17,	63:6, 63:13
48:7	133:1, 134:1	23:21, 25:2,	adjudicate
absolutely	achievement	45:12, 134:14	90:6
74:1, 77:20,	64:14	actual	adjudicated
80:22, 81:4,	aclu	14:13, 19:10,	11:18, 12:7,
1	89:3, 89:6,	19:11, 24:8,	23:14, 52:11,
			, ,
1			

81:22, 82:6,	affidavit	90:2, 90:21,	36:13, 43:21,
84:5, 88:1	115:19	98:18, 99:15,	45:21, 48:20,
adjudication	affirmative	101:4, 103:16,	48:21, 49:5,
71:10, 88:7,	115:10	103:22, 108:14,	54:4, 58:12,
115:22	affixed	115:12, 124:13,	63:10, 67:13,
administration	140:11	129:17, 132:22,	72:7, 73:18,
48:12, 63:16	afford	133:4	75:15, 78:6,
administrative	49:14	ago	81:8, 84:6,
69:7	afforded	23:4, 61:9,	85:6, 87:16,
admission	45:1, 53:2,	74:3, 109:19,	88:16, 90:4,
70:22, 98:4,	67:11, 113:14	130:7	90:15, 97:9,
116:14	afresh	agree	105:4, 111:16,
admissions	49:3	43:17, 47:18,	114:20, 116:4,
16:3, 16:8,	after	81:18, 120:3,	117:6, 117:11,
97:18, 97:21	22:22, 29:4,	129:4	117:19, 117:22,
admit	33:9, 39:21,	agreement	118:11, 120:11,
59:21	41:20, 42:7,	96:14, 96:17	122:21, 126:21,
admits	45:19, 46:1,	ahead	130:18, 132:19,
29:17	68:5, 84:12,	11:2, 19:16,	136:10, 136:16,
admitted	86:8, 107:1,	78:17, 120:2	137:10, 137:14,
28:1, 49:6,	113:1, 113:2,	aid	137:16, 137:19,
49:7, 56:8,	127:2, 137:20	46:19	138:20, 139:2,
93:20, 98:2,	again	aimed	139:8
114:20, 122:4,	17:2, 31:20,	128:7	allegation
122:22, 123:2	33:13, 35:1,	aired	39:4
admitting	35:10, 35:22,	125:7	allegations
39:15, 86:8	36:7, 37:1,	akin	39:17, 39:22,
adopted	38:3, 45:22,	52:7, 53:7	50:17, 72:18,
42:2, 102:16	52:19, 55:16,	alcohol	89:19, 136:1,
advance	81:13, 82:18,	22:12, 26:5,	136:7
125:17	85:9, 89:17,	28:17, 29:2,	allege
advanced	98:14, 106:3,	29:19	125:14, 126:6
125:21	109:7, 121:16,	alert	alleged
advantage	122:3, 122:11	8:15	76:3, 96:2,
14:4	against	alien	116:21, 125:12,
adversary	12:1, 13:10,	52:5	125:16, 126:5
67:14	13:18, 22:18,	aligned	allegedly
adverse	23:1, 24:21,	132:4	95:20, 96:7
23:8, 62:19	31:13, 31:20,	alike	alleges
adversely	31:21, 31:22,	47:1	101:6
63:19	32:4, 33:5,	all	alliance
advisement	34:3, 50:2,	6:8, 6:11, 7:2,	52:12
137:21, 138:1	52:18, 61:4,	9:7, 10:19,	allied
advocating	61:22, 65:4,	14:15, 14:19,	68:19, 97:15
49:4	66:10, 67:10,	16:7, 17:2,	allow
aero	67:14, 69:21,	17:10, 19:3,	19:10, 88:9
105:17	69:22, 79:16,	25:4, 25:14,	allowed
affected	82:9, 89:19,	32:6, 35:10,	17:18, 48:18,
67:21		1	
0,.21			
2000			

	Conducted on s	T	·
56:15, 139:3	amber	ancient	102:17, 104:12,
almost	1:7, 9:13,	46:14	107:16, 109:20,
18:6, 23:4,	12:5, 12:16,	angeles	111:10, 111:11,
61:9, 64:3,	13:6, 25:3,	25:19, 33:9,	111:21, 116:15,
134:9	33:1, 37:7,	34:15, 37:6,	118:4, 121:9,
alone	37:16, 39:18,	89:8, 91:8	122:1, 125:13,
87:10, 133:16,	41:12, 43:7,	annex	129:20, 131:9,
133:17	43:8, 55:8,	32:8	140:7, 141:9
alongside	63:8, 70:15,	announced	anybody
38:21	71:2, 76:21,	98:16, 102:14,	43:9, 81:2,
already	77:13, 82:7,	103:4	81:11, 81:20,
12:6, 16:6,	82:22, 84:19,	announcing	82:7, 83:10,
25:6, 40:4,	122:14, 125:11,	95:22	83:14
42:5, 55:12,	125:12, 132:11,	annoying	anyone
57:6, 57:14,	132:21, 135:19,	34:13	58:3, 82:5,
57:17, 68:8,	135:22, 136:13	another	122:2, 122:18
69:19, 70:21,	amend	21:21, 36:12,	anything
127:2, 128:6,	71:20, 115:15	36:14, 40:1,	30:16, 43:11,
131:18	amended	61:4, 69:21,	57:8, 60:12,
also	23:9, 85:16,	69:22, 80:13,	88:18, 101:13,
8:12, 9:12,	115:9	112:20, 113:14,	109:16, 109:17,
11:10, 14:5,	amendment	119:19, 138:7	111:22, 136:9,
16:8, 19:5,	83:16	answer	138:18
28:5, 29:21,	america	23:9, 56:18,	anyway
30:8, 32:7,	64:17, 112:9	131:10, 133:15	115:4, 119:22,
33:20, 36:8,	american	answered	131:11
36:11, 40:3,	112:1, 112:3	92:4	anywhere
41:2, 41:18,	americans	answers	43:12, 80:14,
43:16, 51:21,	112:7	83:18, 92:3,	80:15, 81:12,
52:1, 52:7,	amica	134:3	81:20, 83:16,
54:18, 56:15,	54:18, 55:7	anti-slap	125:14, 137:12
58:15, 59:6,	amount	136:15	apartment
61:5, 64:5,	20:4, 21:3,	any	34:20
64:22, 65:7,	21:4, 29:18,	7:2, 7:15,	apologize
66:22, 69:8,	31:9, 33:18,	20:7, 20:22,	9:21
72:19, 79:3,	115:6, 116:11,	23:21, 23:22,	apologized
79:10, 98:13,	120:13, 125:2	27:6, 43:9,	29:21
98:22, 102:10,	amounts	46:18, 48:17,	apostolou
110:3, 122:3,	124:8, 124:19	49:10, 51:13,	51:21, 110:9
123:7, 124:15,	ample	56:6, 56:9,	apparent
127:5, 134:17,	50:18	56:10, 56:14,	102:1
134:20, 137:8	analysis	56:16, 57:1,	appeal
although	18:14, 57:19,	57:5, 59:9,	22:15, 22:19,
30:5, 69:6,	102:20, 130:18	66:3, 81:20,	125:9
73:5	analyzed	81:21, 83:15,	appeals
always	101:16	87:4, 87:13,	22:17, 22:22,
43:5, 124:21	analyzing	92:12, 98:4,	32:10, 123:11,
amazing	47:21	100:10, 101:14,	123:13, 126:9,
34:9		·	, , , ,
<u> </u>			<u></u>

Conducted on July 22, 2021				
126:10	approved	arrange	asserted	
appear	13:13	104:3	65:5, 66:11,	
88:14, 119:6,	april	arrested	67:11, 68:3,	
119:22, 120:5	23:2, 37:6,	117:12	86:10, 94:17,	
appeared	37:7, 76:5	arrived	117:18, 129:17	
96:6, 118:21	areas	58:20	asserting	
appellate	33:20	arsonist	51:17, 68:13,	
23:2	aren't	62:6	69:5	
applicability	47:13	artfully	assertion	
59:8	arque	92:3	89:15, 111:17	
application	45:18	article	associated	
22:19, 22:20,	arqued	90:9, 90:12,	66:19	
71:15, 71:17	16:19, 38:8,	100:11, 100:16,	associates	
applied	38:17, 50:2,	100:17, 104:15,	105:17	
50:8, 52:1,	59:15, 92:6,	112:15	attached	
52:20, 64:12,	120:7	articles	28:21, 38:11,	
66:8, 67:5,	argues	38:13, 38:14,	43:19, 56:12,	
74:7, 129:10,	87:5	39:10, 80:3	123:19, 124:3,	
129:15	arquing	articulate	125:17	
applies	39:21, 84:3	60:12	attachment	
54:14, 60:9,	argument	articulated	17:21, 38:12,	
84:8, 84:9,	4:3, 4:4, 4:5,	45:10, 55:7,	41:16, 56:12,	
91:12, 102:3,	11:3, 49:7,	60:19, 72:4	79:6, 79:19,	
106:21, 107:8,	69:18, 70:13,	artist	126:15	
129:3	71:22, 75:14,	58:11	attack	
apply	85:8, 86:18,	ascertainable	23:6, 125:10	
53:20, 63:17,	91:11, 92:12,	54:12	attacks	
71:11, 72:11,	92:22, 99:8,	asia	132:22	
77:16, 80:16,	114:15, 116:8,	33:22	attempt	
84:4, 84:9,	116:11, 121:7,	asked	52:16, 60:12,	
87:16, 91:16,	137:20, 139:3	9:15, 16:14,	92:10, 92:12,	
93:7, 94:5,	arguments	44:5, 56:13,	112:16, 112:17,	
107:10, 107:21,	8:3, 86:2,	56:15, 58:2,	114:17	
130:2, 132:1,	86:4, 120:11,	84:1, 92:2,	attention	
137:17	122:4	125:19, 131:5,	43:22, 92:15	
applying	arise	132:14, 135:11	attorney	
46:12, 59:19,	72:9, 99:18,	asking	19:7, 76:12,	
68:1, 91:19,	100:1, 100:22,	43:15, 65:14,	76:17, 77:1,	
105:12, 106:1,	101:21, 103:5	82:21, 112:2,	77:2, 77:6,	
110:7, 111:21	arises	132:17	132:1, 132:2,	
apposite	70:10	aspect	135:15	
102:4	arose	89:22	attorney's	
appreciate	101:17, 102:7,	assaulted	77:3, 116:1	
8:18	104:6, 104:21	27:21, 30:7,	attorney-client	
appropriate	around	37:15	56:18	
115:22	18:19, 34:9,	assaults	audio	
approval	37:22, 62:18,	32:5, 33:5	141:7	
66:21	72:20, 135:11	assert	august	
	,	108:22	30:1, 33:22,	
		100.22		
	Na San Water Street			

	Conducted on July 22, 2021				
138:3	132:13, 136:18	68:17, 81:8,	84:16, 88:12,		
australia	bacon	82:12, 98:8,	90:11, 91:20,		
31:7, 32:13,	3:15	121:13, 128:22,	93:17, 93:22,		
33:10	bahamas	129:13, 130:1,	94:1, 96:19,		
australian	30:1, 30:3	137:13	97:6, 98:11,		
79:17	bald	bath	98:18, 99:9,		
authenticity	41:22	26:13	102:2, 104:20,		
18:21, 117:1	banging	bathroom	105:8, 107:6,		
author	31:22	28:16	108:9, 110:6,		
134:13	bank	bayview	110:17, 112:13,		
authorities	64:17, 137:14	74:4, 114:6	112:14, 112:22,		
101:15	bar	beans	119:21, 120:4,		
authority	11:7, 12:4,	63:9	123:21, 126:4,		
92:16, 96:14,	23:11, 38:12,	bears	126:13, 127:17,		
102:6, 102:18,	56:13, 60:2,	106:14, 106:19	130:17, 132:2,		
108:12, 113:17,	68:4, 68:10,	beat	136:14, 139:1		
114:1	69:10, 85:4,	12:16, 76:9,	become		
authors	85:14, 86:15,	76:11, 78:1,	26:6		
103:9	91:20, 99:15,	82:7, 82:22,	bed		
avail	105:1, 108:14,	84:21, 128:16,	36:18, 36:20,		
87:15	115:8, 115:15	135:16	37:1, 37:12,		
avoid	barber	beater	37:14		
	54:19	11:20	been		
86:12, 114:17	barred	beating	12:7, 18:17,		
avoided	68:1, 96:16,	39:18, 117:13	23:13, 25:6,		
70:14, 92:3	112:22	•	33:6, 46:20,		
awarded	bars	beautifully	55:5, 61:10,		
129:6	52:10	128:22	61:11, 61:13,		
aware		became	64:2, 67:11,		
105:8, 133:2	based	23:1, 26:3	67:21, 68:13,		
away	12:15, 29:13,	because	74:21, 81:22,		
65:1	65:22, 67:16,	8:19, 11:6,	82:6, 83:7,		
awful	78:8, 81:5,	12:4, 12:10,	84:5, 88:10,		
130:14	81:6, 81:7,	13:1, 16:10,	90:19, 92:1,		
azcarate	81:14, 95:9,	18:16, 19:21,	92:5, 93:22,		
1:12, 2:2	96:6, 98:4,	23:12, 23:16,	98:11, 103:20,		
В	115:10, 134:11	24:14, 25:10,	108:22, 109:17,		
b(2	bashed	26:4, 30:9,	110:11, 111:8,		
109:2	35:5	30:15, 39:20,	111:20, 114:5,		
back	basically	41:5, 45:19,	114:8, 119:9,		
17:12, 22:2,	77:7, 128:2	46:9, 46:10,	119:17, 122:2,		
28:15, 33:10,	basis	47:11, 47:16,	123:18, 128:5,		
34:13, 34:22,	75:12, 77:19,	47:22, 50:14,	129:8, 131:9		
35:17, 36:20,	109:10, 131:3	51:17, 54:21,	before		
37:14, 56:20,	bates	59:15, 59:21,	1:12, 2:1, 2:6,		
72:21, 80:4,	44:15, 64:19,	60:5, 63:4,	9:14, 10:1,		
84:18, 109:14,	65:6, 65:12,	64:8, 64:18,	14:11, 14:14,		
122:11, 128:10,	65:13, 66:6,	65:13, 76:19,	15:17, 17:2,		
1	66:20, 67:4,	77:8, 82:5,	,		
1					
1					
I <u> </u>	<u> </u>				

	Conducted on J	uly 22, 2021	14/
17:14, 19:14,	bernard	blazes	125:2
19:18, 19:19,	64:17, 64:21	89:3	bottle
20:18, 23:11,	best	blonder-ongue	37:9
27:18, 39:16,	74:2, 125:10,	98:14	bottles
39:19, 48:7,	135:14, 141:6	blonder-tongue	31:16, 31:17
49:7, 53:18,	bet	64:11, 64:20,	bottom
55:13, 57:7,	84:2	81:6, 121:14	84:2
58:20, 59:3,	bettany	blood	bound
71:1, 76:13,	28:8, 29:18	26:9, 26:13,	54:21, 92:1,
85:16, 86:21,	better	32:16, 33:3	92:5
98:11, 100:13,	49:8, 56:2,	bloody	breach
109:15, 113:6,	64:1, 73:12,	36:2, 36:15	53:15
114:16, 114:19,	76:12, 92:17	board	break
114:21, 119:2,	between		54:3
132:5, 138:4,	48:13, 51:12,	29:3, 95:9, 95:17	,
138:7, 140:3	74:12, 76:17,	pop	breaking 28:1, 109:13
behalf	87:22, 96:15,		
3:2, 3:11,	104:11, 104:13,	33:1 bobbi	bredehoft
11:3, 85:8,	112:18, 131:20,		3:12, 3:14,
116:8, 124:6		1:22, 141:3,	4:3, 4:5, 6:3,
behind	132:6, 135:19 beyond	141:15	6:10, 6:13,
45:13		body	6:16, 6:21, 7:8,
being	62:14, 62:16,	32:7	7:14, 7:19, 8:1,
15:6, 29:4,	94:1, 94:9	bodyguard	8:9, 8:12, 9:8,
39:11, 57:4,	big	29:21	9:10, 9:13,
75:1, 79:12,	123:14	bodyguard's	10:2, 10:7,
79:14, 79:21,	bill	29:14	10:16, 10:21,
103:18, 124:16,	38:10	boiler	11:4, 19:17,
124:17, 133:1,	billing	101:11, 101:16,	25:17, 27:3,
133:22	115:20	101:19, 102:4,	27:8, 27:11,
belief	billy	103:2, 103:10,	27:15, 47:4,
128:21, 129:2	33:1	134:10	47:7, 47:10,
believe	binary	boiler's	54:6, 62:4,
	90:3	102:12, 102:19	62:7, 62:11,
114:3, 119:20,	bind	boot	75:13, 76:18,
129:5, 130:10,	54:20	28:15, 37:2	76:22, 77:5,
131:14	binders	born	77:11, 77:15,
believed	14:21	109:16	78:5, 78:10,
17:13	birthday	boston	78:18, 79:1,
ben 7.6 0.10	37:8, 37:16	28:12, 28:14,	80:21, 81:4,
7:6, 9:10,	bit	29:12	81:15, 81:22,
85:10	29:2, 44:8,	both	82:3, 82:16,
benefit	124:11	51:10, 56:3,	83:6, 83:12,
120:15, 121:5,	black	71:19, 72:13,	83:18, 83:22,
133:20	35:11, 36:16,	72:20, 88:2,	84:16, 85:7,
benefitted	58:9, 87:1,	89:6, 90:18,	86:7, 88:11,
133:21	89:11	97:1, 105:14,	92:2, 93:2,
benjamin	black's	107:19, 115:14,	93:10, 97:3,
3:3, 3:18	61:1	123:10, 124:12,	98:7, 99:7,
1			

p	Conducted on J		,
101:14, 109:12,	bruce	19:2, 28:7,	131:3, 132:9
113:10, 114:4,	49:16, 49:17	84:21, 90:10,	cases
114:20, 115:20,	bruises	91:6	11:13, 24:2,
116:5, 116:9,	58:13	camille	24:5, 44:16,
117:17, 118:5,	bullshit	3:4, 85:10	46:2, 47:12,
118:8, 118:14,	36:13	can't	47:13, 48:20,
119:2, 119:8,	bumped	41:4, 44:16,	53:14, 64:6,
119:14, 120:3,	17:12, 37:12	56:19, 56:20,	65:20, 67:3,
137:9, 138:15,	bundle	62:17, 70:6,	68:6, 74:1,
139:6	14:14, 14:16,	80:2, 120:21,	75:15, 81:8,
bredehoft's	14:20, 15:3,	121:19, 124:22,	89:13, 91:10,
92:21, 101:3,	36:9	128:14, 129:9,	93:7, 93:8,
117:2	bundles	129:20, 135:10	93:16, 93:17,
brief	14:21, 14:22	cannot	95:15, 98:7,
14:9, 40:2,	burden	39:20, 82:6,	101:4, 105:12,
40:8, 79:18,	13:1, 20:18,	86:19, 91:10,	105:14, 106:3,
92:11, 94:18,	20:22, 21:2,	91:15, 99:14,	108:11, 108:15,
98:14, 106:13,	23:16, 23:18,	102:17, 105:1,	110:5, 131:9,
110:11, 123:10,	23:20, 24:14,	107:7, 113:16,	135:9, 137:3
123:20, 136:18	24:15, 56:5,	129:8	categorized
briefing	60:17, 60:20,	capacities	128:1
109:18	63:22, 106:15,	104:8	cause
briefly	106:20, 107:2,	capacity	30:13, 42:18,
25:16, 25:17,	107:7, 108:20	100:19	66:1, 69:3,
98:6, 101:3	burned	capitalize	71:13, 78:9,
briefs	93:21	62:20	100:10
7:2, 24:1,	burning	care	caused
45:18, 86:3	61:21	138:8	32:14, 82:9
bring	business	career	causes
43:22, 69:21,	100:7, 124:4	38:15, 39:12,	47:8, 100:1,
69:22, 85:1,	buy	39:21, 125:17,	111:16
92:15	43:4	125:22, 133:21	causing
bringing	C	career-ending	12:1, 12:16,
76:1, 76:3,	<u> </u>	38:10, 39:3,	13:18, 34:4,
80:13	california	39:11	37:13
brings	136:15	career-finishing	cautioned
42:17	call	39:11	114:22
broken	14:21, 56:14,	careful	celebration
28:2, 32:6,	56:15, 81:3,	18:14, 33:2	37:8
37:11	83:10, 122:5 called	carefully	cellphone
brought		50:16, 89:14,	38:5
49:2, 50:14,	33:11, 34:1, 117:3	116:12	center
52:16, 52:17,	calling	carolina	72:20
68:5, 103:16,	56:9	102:3, 134:15	central
103:22, 104:5	calls	carved	126:22
brown	26:2	65:15, 128:21	century
3:6, 3:14,	came	case-by-case	23:4, 61:9,
21:19	15:7, 16:10,	74:15, 77:19,	64:4, 130:7
	15.7, 10.10,		
1			

	Conducted on J	diy 22, 2021	149
certain	85:9, 85:10,	36:7	92:22, 93:6,
67:10, 97:19,	116:17, 116:20,	circuit	106:2, 108:12,
104:1, 106:8,	117:16, 118:18,	1:2, 2:2, 53:1,	108:16
111:18	118:22, 119:4,	61:11, 61:13,	citing
certainly	119:13, 119:16,	66:16, 67:2,	40:13, 61:5,
44:11, 73:6,	120:10, 122:3,	68:17, 69:8,	66:6, 103:7
97:3	122:12, 138:9,	91:18, 95:5,	citizens
certificate	138:14, 138:17,	95:11, 96:5,	48:13
140:1, 141:1	139:5	99:8, 101:12,	city
certify	chew's	102:14, 103:3,	_
_	122:19	106:5, 111:14,	103:22, 104:1,
140:5, 141:3	child	134:11	104:3, 104:7
challenge	53:9	circumstances	civil
18:18, 18:20,	children	L.	61:21, 62:21,
18:21, 18:22,		34:11, 52:3,	66:10, 93:14,
19:13	89:9	60:3, 62:14,	93:17, 94:2,
challenging	children's	67:10, 103:13,	129:16
18:7	89:7, 91:8,	104:16, 129:12,	c1
champagne	124:3, 124:7,	129:13, 130:13	1:6
37:9	124:17, 124:18	citation	claim
changed	chill	39:7, 97:14,	11:7, 11:17,
29:4	45:19	110:9	14:2, 38:11,
chapter	chilled	citations	40:2, 43:13,
60:9	70:6	87:16	45:5, 45:6,
characterizes	chla	cite	52:18, 70:9,
42:9	97:12	49:15, 65:7,	70:16, 71:13,
charalambous	choice	91:10, 93:9,	98:17, 108:22,
21:12, 22:5,	16:17, 40:5,	102:17, 125:15,	115:11, 120:21,
22:9, 121:7	82:19, 90:7,	136:19	134:21
charged	136:7, 136:20	cited	claimant
37:20	choked	14:8, 24:2,	36:19, 36:22,
charitable	31:15, 31:20	28:17, 30:19,	41:2
126:21, 138:22	choking	40:7, 46:5,	claimant's
charity	31:22	51:21, 52:11,	37:2, 38:15
88:21	choose	53:14, 59:7,	claimed
charlson	116:12	61:10, 61:11,	13:11, 20:4,
3:12, 3:14	choosing	61:13, 64:3,	20:13, 29:1,
cheek	42:5	64:12, 64:22,	35:8, 69:11
37:20	chose	68:19, 69:9,	claiming
chemical	16:11, 16:17,	70:22, 88:22,	13:7, 49:10
68:20, 97:15	38:20, 38:22,	103:3, 105:12,	claims
chest	40:4, 111:5,	109:18, 110:5,	17:16, 38:19,
37:13	136:14	110:10, 113:3,	50:1, 51:17,
chew	chosen	123:9, 125:17,	52:10, 57:10,
3:3, 4:4, 7:4,	12:8	131:18, 135:9,	57:13, 68:2,
7:6, 7:12, 8:13,	chronology	137:2	68:4, 94:12,
8:15, 8:18,	12:10	cites	95:11, 98:21,
8:22, 9:4, 9:20,	chunks	54:18, 64:19,	99:15, 101:16,
9:21, 10:5,	34:21, 35:21,	64:20, 66:21,	102:6, 102:7,
·			
]			

	Conducted on 5		
102:10, 103:21,	cohen	commentary	125:14
104:4, 104:16,	3:14	107:12	complete
104:20, 105:1,	collateral	commercial	97:5
108:14, 112:21,	11:9, 11:10,	126:1	completely
121:12, 122:10	23:6, 53:22,	commissioners	70:14, 127:13
clarification	54:14, 55:2,	107:13	completeness
7:5, 118:16	61:1, 61:2,	commit	111:11
clarify	61:15, 64:13,	23:21	compositions
119:1	65:16, 65:19,	committed	49:19
clarissa	65:21, 66:1,	11:22, 13:9,	compulsory
3:13, 9:11	66:11, 66:18,	13:17, 33:5,	97:8
clear	68:3, 68:6,	51:9, 78:15,	conceded
24:3, 24:12,	68:18, 68:21,	82:8, 117:11	23:18, 35:6,
24:16, 24:18,	69:2, 69:6,	common	50:22, 79:4
24:19, 26:21,	71:6, 74:11,	46:17, 46:19,	conceding
40:12, 40:18,	87:11, 91:12,	52:6, 54:9,	41:4
40:22, 41:9,	91:15, 96:9,	72:1, 102:19	concept
55:3, 66:9,	105:5, 110:13,	commonwealth	49:4, 63:2,
94:19, 95:1,	115:11, 125:10,	46:21, 60:8,	70:15
99:22, 112:18,	129:3, 129:17,	72:4, 80:15,	concerned
129:15, 135:3	131:4, 131:7,	140:17	39:5
clear-cut	131:12, 134:4,	communicated	concert
109:10	134:22, 135:1	52:15	103:22, 104:3,
clearer	combinations	communications	103:22, 104:3,
129:20	33:3	29:14	concerted
clearly	come	community	104:12
33:18, 50:12,	15:9, 43:12,	123:16	concession
50:14, 50:20,	56:20, 80:10,	company	55:13
51:19	122:11, 123:8,	97:18	concluded
client	126:18, 131:15,	comparable	101:19, 139:11
76:17, 77:3,	133:3	104:10	conclusions
114:10	comes	compel	127:3
close	7:20, 8:1	88:17, 91:4,	conclusive
9:3, 9:4,	coming	97:5, 120:5,	59:11
16:16, 137:12	27:6, 62:19,	120:6, 120:8,	conditioning
closed	80:1, 132:22,	127:20, 138:20	_
35:20, 36:5	138:7	compelling	79:14
closer	comity	68:12	conditions 63:19
21:21, 74:21	11:7, 44:22,	compellingly	conduct
closing	45:1, 45:11,	66:9, 129:15	
34:16	45:13, 46:3,	competent	37:5, 70:11,
clumps	46:12, 48:18,	48:8	70:20, 72:10,
58:15	49:14, 51:14,	complaining	99:18, 100:2,
co-counsel	52:1, 52:9,	49:10	100:9, 100:18,
9:11	55:2, 87:12,	complaint	101:1, 101:18, 101:22, 102:8,
cocaine	105:3, 105:11,	11:5, 17:8,	102:13, 103:6,
28:17, 31:9	106:1, 110:5,	23:12, 39:19,	104:1, 104:18,
code	113:13, 115:10	97:17, 121:22,	104:1, 104:18,
59:7		J , LC1 . CC,	107.21, 110.1
1			
	·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

		<u> </u>	
conducting	contention	conviction	91:9, 93:17,
15:12, 48:8	95:14, 102:18	61:21, 93:21	97:5, 105:7,
conference	context	convincing	105:22, 108:3,
107:12	74:10, 81:20,	24:3, 24:12,	108:6, 109:17,
confidential	94:16, 99:1,	24:16, 24:19,	111:4, 120:4,
8:4, 32:8	105:16, 113:9,	94:19, 95:1,	122:5, 131:6,
confined	114:3, 126:22,	135:4	133:11, 136:2,
65:3	127:1	convoluted	136:21
confirms	continuance	44:12	couldn't
107:15	17:12	coordination	109:17
conflicting	continuation	34:10	counsel
54:16	35:14	copies	9:16, 9:17,
conforms	continue	10:15	14:10, 20:3,
73:3, 100:6	42:15, 42:16,	copy	21:12, 21:18,
confronted	66:7, 124:21	9:16, 10:9,	21:19, 21:20,
29:5, 29:20	continued	58:17	28:7, 29:5,
confusing	31:11, 32:2,	copyright	29:8, 38:16,
11:12	32:18	49:19, 50:1,	39:8, 40:10,
connection	continues	50:7	40:14, 41:3,
100:18, 104:2,	89:4, 138:5	corden	41:19, 49:6,
104:8	continuing	58:4, 58:10	50:22, 56:17,
consequences	35:19, 44:10,	core	59:15, 73:13,
23:8, 44:18,	104:6	14:13, 14:15,	79:7, 84:3,
62:19, 81:10,	contractual	14:19, 15:3	85:20, 89:21,
82:14	110:18, 110:21	corporation	97:10, 114:20,
conserves	contradict	97:15, 105:18	119:19, 123:1,
71:8	87:14	correct	130:14, 132:17,
consider	contradicted	19:4, 27:3,	140:6, 141:8
42:19	52:10	62:7, 76:17,	counter
considered	contradicting	81:16, 83:11,	36:12
50:17, 129:6	102:19	83:17, 106:8,	countertop
considering	contrary	141:4	31:21, 32:1
34:11	85:18, 98:3,	cost	countries
consistent	126:22	71:7, 115:14	48:14
98:15, 103:1	contrast	costing	country
consistently	94:11, 96:1,	115:5	45:11, 48:13,
54:15	97:2, 98:1,	costs	49:2, 59:11,
constitutes	112:6, 113:5	115:22, 116:1	60:8, 60:16,
102:13	contributions	cough	80:14, 100:14,
constructs	97:12	89:4	106:19, 107:19,
81:5	controlling	could	112:10
construed	87:1, 92:15	6:4, 16:9,	country's
52:4	convenience	19:12, 38:19,	45:12
52:4 consuming	27:12	38:20, 42:22,	county
28:16	convenient	73:16, 74:20,	1:2, 2:2,
1	73:2, 100:5	75:3, 78:12,	45:16, 61:6,
contemporaneous	convict	83:10, 83:15,	90:13
34:6	39:1	88:17, 90:1,	couple
contend	٠,٠١	00.17, 00.17	23:15, 24:7,
48:21			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

		T	
44:22, 63:3,	crucial	dealing	decline
134:8	112:19	63:5	105:7, 105:11
course	crusade	dealings	declined
42:1, 92:5,	42:14	104:2	110:21
138:6	culminating	deals	declining
court's	42:10	74:13, 77:20,	53:18
22:18, 50:19,	cut	131:20	decree
55:11, 92:15,	117:1	dealt	113:14
96:5, 97:7,	cuts	57:6	deem
106:5, 112:3,	32:6	deceit	128:7
114:1, 114:11	cutting	114:18	deeply
courtroom	32:2	december	46:14
8:20, 10:11,	D	17:11, 34:16,	dees
79:13		58:2, 58:7, 76:4	103:11, 103:19,
courts	damage	decide	104:4, 104:17
52:3, 61:13,	117:5	120:18, 126:13	defamation
65:1, 65:2,	damages	decided	11:7, 13:7,
68:17, 69:8,	38:8, 39:13,	10:13, 16:16,	43:11, 52:10,
70:19, 121:5,	39:21	38:22, 61:8,	52:17, 53:6,
125:8	dan	63:19, 86:20,	56:4, 75:10,
cover	12:14	98:12, 109:14,	75:11, 78:3,
58:12, 91:9,	date	109:22	78:7, 80:14,
116:10, 128:19	17:9, 138:3	deciding	95:9, 98:17,
covered	dated	39:15, 130:20	101:16, 101:20,
116:10	17:1, 79:18	decision	102:6, 103:5,
create	dates	12:3, 13:14,	114:18
89:11	16:16, 103:8	19:21, 22:17,	defamatory
created	daughter	23:8, 41:20,	95:20, 96:1,
67:8	9:12, 53:4	42:8, 49:8,	96:7, 100:13
creates	david	49:9, 50:20,	defend
12:4	19:7, 19:8	51:1, 52:2,	50:19
credit	day	53:3, 55:4,	defendant
52:10, 53:2,	26:12, 61:16,	55:11, 70:7,	1:8, 3:11,
113:14	67:12, 68:8,		11:3, 23:9,
cried	80:16, 80:21,	92:18, 99:21,	29:6, 41:3,
31:4	80:22, 81:9,	102:15, 113:4,	, ,
criminal	132:21, 136:17,	113:8, 114:12,	48:10, 61:5, 63:22, 68:2,
62:1, 62:5,	137:2, 139:9,	121:19, 123:4,	69:5, 93:21,
62:1, 62:3, 62:8, 93:13,	140:11	127:6, 131:7,	97:18, 97:22,
93:16, 93:19,	days	134:11, 134:12,	103:16, 109:4,
94:8	19:14, 19:18,	135:8	109:5, 109:8,
critical	41:13, 75:5,	decisions	110:4, 110:19,
25:15, 43:2,	115:18	61:12, 65:19,	116:4, 110:13,
43:3, 57:3, 71:3	dc	71:9, 123:10,	defendant's
cross-examination	3:8	128:14	5:4, 5:5, 5:6,
35:6	de-designated	declaration	5:7, 5:8, 5:9,
cross-examined	139:1	21:14, 21:17,	5:10, 5:11,
29:9	dead	22:10	5:12, 5:13,
	94:20, 131:13		
<u> </u>			

21:20, 22:15, 5:14, 14:18, delay determining 29:1, 32:20, 26:4, 28:6, 52:14 18:16 33:17, 34:5, deliberately 28:20, 29:13, devers 32:14, 38:21, 35:9, 36:1, 44:15, 64:19, 38:22 36:8, 37:3, 39:8, 39:12, deliver 65:6, 65:12, 40:10, 41:3, 38:2, 39:6, 65:14, 66:6, 40:18 41:17, 41:19, 42:21, 43:22, 66:20, 67:4, demonstrative 61:19, 118:12 42:22, 43:4, 68:18, 81:8, 27:1 defendants 50:22, 51:7, 82:12, 98:8, denial 56:11, 69:16, 13:2, 13:4, 121:14, 128:22, 107:18, 108:4 71:18, 72:14, 13:16, 18:3, 129:13, 130:1, denied 18:9, 23:19, 72:17, 72:20, 137:13 22:15, 58:1, 73:13, 76:12, 79:7, 79:13, 24:14, 25:2, devices 122:17, 128:3, 29:9, 38:18, 19:11 128:4 69:14, 75:2, 84:3, 85:19, diary denies 87:10, 90:2, 85:20, 89:20, 34:6 59:9, 107:19, 91:22, 95:18, 93:2, 93:3, dicta 107:22 96:18, 97:11, 99:15, 102:6, 87:14, 137:5 deny 104:12, 104:13, 104:20, 105:1, dictates 19:1, 85:13, 104:19, 108:3, 121:8, 124:4, 91:19, 115:7 113:17 108:6, 110:1, 124:14, 127:6 dictionary denying 110:3, 110:17, derived 61:2 22:18, 61:18, 111:10, 136:4 54:11 difference 138:19 defended derogatory 78:11, 103:17, departing 78:12, 96:18, 28:9 130:5 67:20 114:13 described different depose defending 88:5, 99:5 30:5, 33:3, 16:12, 16:14, 124:13 designation 38:17, 40:21, 16:15, 122:2 defense 16:22 41:22, 66:1, deposed 9:16, 23:10, despite 88:10, 90:19, 67:14, 69:3, 64:5, 64:10 95:14, 114:12 69:4, 75:10, 124:18 defenses destroyed 76:19, 76:21, deposition 115:10 33:16, 39:22 81:13, 83:7, 16:13, 56:11, defensive detail 84:22, 85:1, 56:13, 88:13, 11:10, 60:22, 21:14 100:13, 100:14, 114:17, 118:17, 61:2, 61:15, detailed 103:8, 103:9, 118:19, 119:5, 64:12, 68:21, 57:19, 100:21 119:11, 119:15, 103:18, 106:2, 129:2, 131:4, detailing 110:8, 111:1, 119:22, 120:9, 131:12, 134:4, 50:6 134:13, 134:19, 122:16, 140:4 134:22 determination 136:15 depositions deficiency difficult 25:11, 62:19, 15:4, 15:9, 122:2 69:3, 99:2, 59:20 16:9, 88:9, defines 113:2 digital 119:1 61:2 determine 2:6 depp's definitely 8:14, 8:16, dime 11:5, 12:4, 138:2 22:3 125:4 14:9, 18:12, definition determined dipped 18:19, 19:10, 93:18 74:15, 111:20 32:17 19:12, 21:18,

	Conducted on July 22, 2021				
direct	dispute	documentation	127:7, 127:15,		
114:9	73:10	120:14	128:15, 138:22		
directly	disregard	documents	done		
50:4	52:4, 135:6	15:15, 15:18,	9:18, 29:22,		
disadvantage	disregarded	21:9, 58:18,	39:13, 44:17,		
20:6, 20:8	102:2	89:5, 124:20,	56:19, 65:8,		
disbarment	distinct	127:21, 127:22,	122:14, 130:22,	Ï	
95:10, 95:21	95:19	128:3, 137:22,	136:2		
disbarred	distinction	138:20	donor		
95:7	112:18, 112:19	dodge	91:6		
disciplinary	distinctions	86:12	dooms		
95:8, 95:9,	11:15	doing	87:10		
95:22, 96:9	distinguish	7:13, 10:10,	door		
disclosed	62:12, 92:13,	16:18, 91:17,	31:18		
21:22, 28:6	92:17	131:2	doubt		
disclosure	distinguishable	dollar	62:15, 62:16,		
16:20, 97:5	92:22, 93:7,	84:2	62:17, 94:1,		
disco	95:13, 96:19,	dollars	94:9		
26:13		123:17, 124:13	dovetails		
4	98:9, 98:22, 99:9, 103:13,	domestic	82:20		
discovery	· ·	11:20, 11:22,	down		
13:21, 14:5,	111:14, 134:18, 137:11	13:10, 13:17,	35:16, 37:14,		
15:12, 16:20,	distinguished	22:13, 23:21,	91:3		
17:17, 17:18,	62:10	24:21, 25:2,	dr		
20:9, 20:14,		25:5, 43:10,			
20:15, 21:8,	distinguishing	51:9, 53:9,	30:18, 90:17,		
21:15, 88:3,	112:20	72:14, 72:15,	90:19, 91:1, 122:13, 122:16		
88:8, 91:2,	district	76:2, 78:15,	drafts		
114:1, 120:13,	51:22, 53:16,	79:21, 82:8,	107:14		
120:16, 120:20,	68:9, 68:16,	108:14, 108:18,			
121:6, 121:8, 138:5	68:20, 96:12,	113:21, 126:3,	dragged		
discretion	97:16, 105:18,	133:14, 133:22,	35:14, 36:4		
105:10	110:9	135:14, 136:5	dragging		
discussions	disturbing	domestically	34:20, 35:1		
	36:17	26:7, 135:17	dress		
25:14	divorce	donate	27:22		
disintegrate	59:3, 72:16,	124:2	drinking		
73:11	88:20, 88:21,	donated	27:22		
dismissal	119:12, 123:15,	124:16, 124:17	drive'		
23:12, 96:6	128:2, 128:5,	donating	3:15		
dismissed	128:6, 128:10,	88:19	driver		
11:5, 95:11,	128:11, 138:21	donation	134:18		
111:16	docketing	57:5, 125:9,	drop-down		
dismisses	2:6		138:3		
47:22	doctrine	126:11, 126:21,	drug		
dismissing	66:8, 67:18,	127:10, 127:11	22:12, 26:5,		
22:20	69:1, 128:4,	donations	79:17		
dispositive	129:14	123:6, 123:8,	drugs		
69:20	document	126:18, 126:20,	29:19		
	122:6				
			<u> </u>		

_			
due	effectively	132:6	134:10
122:21	84:5, 84:11,	emphatically	enormous
duly	114:13	86:2, 102:9,	21:3, 21:4,
6:7	efficient	117:4, 117:9	29:18, 31:8
during	99:3	employed	enough
87:21, 112:8	efforts	140:7, 141:9	73:8, 128:4,
E	58:12, 104:9	employee	128:9, 128:13
each	egregiously	99:11, 104:11	ensure
42:6, 46:1,	89:7	employees	11:14
83:1, 99:10	eighth	104:7	entire
eagle	53:1	employer	42:9, 87:13,
23:5, 44:14,	either	99:11, 104:11	88:20
	10:4, 17:17,	employment	entirely
44:15, 61:8,	20:20, 41:6,	52:2	103:1, 111:4
61:14, 61:17,	48:14, 53:10,	enclosing	entirety
63:12, 64:2,	67:22, 87:16,	124:5	115:8
64:12, 64:20,	96:13, 110:15,	encourages	entities
67:1, 81:7,	112:7, 125:5,	71:9	74:12, 131:20,
82:13, 93:10,	136:14, 136:22	end	132:7
94:16, 121:13,	elaine	12:19, 14:11,	entitled
128:22, 130:6,	3:12, 9:9	20:1, 27:13,	110:13, 123:18,
137:14	electronic	38:10, 38:15,	123:22
earlier	10:12	42:4, 42:11,	entity
55:12, 57:14,	electronically	42:13, 44:9,	134:1
68:14, 80:5,	140:5	45:19, 50:20,	entry
96:16, 131:5	element	59:22, 63:20,	_
early	99:11	67:9, 68:8,	34:6 erred
25:20	elements	69:17, 82:17,	
eastern	105:4	136:17, 137:16	61:18, 68:9
51:22, 68:16,	elon	ended	erroneously
68:20, 97:15,	I	26:9	94:17
105:18, 110:9	91:6	enforce	escape
easy	else		86:19, 87:2
33:1	8:5, 22:4,	96:17, 108:4,	especially
ecstasy	42:22, 58:3,	110:21	22:11, 52:5,
31:9	58:13, 63:10,	enforceable	134:1
editor	84:22	59:12	esq
12:14	email	engaged	3:3, 3:4, 3:5
edj	123:20	21:7	esquire
40:13, 40:22	embarrassing	engaging	3:12, 3:13,
effect	133:11, 135:20	37:5, 50:3	3:18
38:13, 48:19,	embarrassment	england	essential
53:18, 65:22,	132:19	46:17, 88:16	66:4, 66:13,
87:4, 93:13,	embedded	english	66:15, 129:19,
96:20, 97:20,	65:19	46:12, 46:16,	135:22
105:8, 105:13,	embodies	101:11, 101:15,	essentially
113:18	87:19	101:19, 102:4,	20:19, 73:5,
effective	embrace	102:11, 102:19,	103:3, 112:2
79:4, 79:9	74:12, 131:19,	103:2, 103:10,	est
			1:15
	<u> </u>		

	Conducted on 3		
establish	56:1, 56:22,	57:5, 61:20,	exchange
25:5, 73:18,	60:12, 60:19,	73:4, 73:7,	29:7
106:20, 107:4	62:13, 67:14,	94:10, 94:13,	exclude
established	69:2, 70:7,	95:2, 95:3,	79:14
60:20, 93:15,	92:13, 101:20,	97:1, 97:4,	excuse
94:1, 94:9,	105:3, 106:21,	111:9, 111:11,	37:13
105:4, 109:19	109:15, 122:8,	118:3, 118:13,	executing
establishing	129:1, 129:6,	123:5, 136:10,	96:14
60:17	136:15	137:1, 138:13,	executive
estopped	evening	139:4	45:12
51:17, 82:4,	26:11	evidentially	exercise
98:17	event	57:10, 98:20	105:11
estoppel	8:13, 109:20	evidentiary	exercised
11:9, 11:10,	events	98:5	105:10
53:22, 54:1,	18:1, 72:20	exact	exhausting
54:14, 55:3,	ever	13:10, 23:13,	22:22
61:1, 61:2,	80:16, 83:15,	25:12, 43:5,	exhibit
61:3, 61:15,	122:18, 133:21	51:10, 81:15,	5:3, 14:12,
61:19, 64:5,	every	81:18, 84:19,	15:13, 15:17,
64:10, 64:13,	42:17, 69:20,	129:22	15:20, 15:22,
65:16, 65:20,	70:2, 71:18,	exactly	16:2, 16:10,
65:21, 66:11,	78:8, 80:10,	40:13, 44:14,	16:21, 21:10,
66:18, 67:15,	80:13, 132:21,	61:7, 63:4,	26:16, 27:17,
68:4, 68:7,	134:6, 137:10	63:20, 66:14,	28:21, 29:1,
68:18, 68:22,	everybody	130:8, 130:12	29:7, 33:18,
69:2, 69:6,	17:10, 63:10,	examination	35:9, 36:1,
71:6, 74:11,	63:11	65:9, 74:16,	36:8, 36:11,
87:12, 91:12,	everything	132:10	37:3, 38:3,
91:15, 96:9,	15:7, 22:4,	examine	39:6, 44:1,
105:5, 110:13,	29:13, 42:5,	19:10, 100:3,	82:17, 83:2,
115:11, 129:3,	58:13, 80:12,	127:7	117:8, 117:21,
129:17, 131:5,	133:7, 138:6	examined	123:7, 127:9,
131:8, 131:13,	everywhere	18:10, 53:17	127:15, 127:18,
134:5, 134:22,	28:3	example	132:14, 138:10
135:1	evidence	29:17, 88:19,	exhibited
ethical	6:12, 6:19,	90:17, 97:11	33:19
132:3	6:20, 8:7,	examples	exhibits
evaluated	14:11, 14:15,	22:10	5:2, 6:14,
103:19	15:1, 15:5,	except	9:16, 14:18,
evaluating	20:5, 20:20,	47:13, 60:6	14:19, 15:10,
100:1	22:21, 24:3,	exception	27:4, 38:3,
eve	24:17, 26:18,	60:14, 65:15,	116:14, 116:16,
18:6	27:5, 27:19,	65:16, 89:11,	116:18, 116:21,
even	30:16, 32:21,	93:15, 94:4,	117:19, 117:22,
13:9, 18:3,	33:4, 33:20,	94:5, 98:15	118:12, 120:11,
19:9, 26:12,	40:19, 49:10,	exceptions	125:18, 125:20,
34:12, 39:13,	56:6, 56:10,	67:7, 87:17	127:9, 127:10
50:22, 51:14,	56:16, 56:21,	excerpt	exists
		127:19	60:19, 71:16,

	Conducted on 3	——————————————————————————————————————	
74:15	120:16	136:12	121:12, 125:7,
expect	extensively	factor	126:18, 129:18,
73:9	121:8	112:20	136:6
expectations	extent	factors	fairness
73:4, 100:7	8:22, 88:15,	48:5, 50:8,	26:20, 64:15
expending	115:21	53:17, 53:20,	faith
115:5	extreme	55:6, 55:21,	52:9, 53:2,
experience	26:5	72:11, 73:18,	113:13
96:3, 100:20	extremely	100:21, 103:3	fall
1	_	facts	37:13
expert	30:11, 46:6		false
16:20, 17:1,	eye	12:3, 52:11,	
17:16, 17:18,	36:16, 37:20	72:18, 73:1,	13:4, 72:18,
18:2, 18:9,	eyes	87:17, 100:3,	75:20, 85:15,
18:10, 18:13,	35:11, 58:9	110:8	86:17, 89:15,
19:1, 19:2,	F	factual	89:19, 111:9,
19:12, 88:15	f3d	25:10, 28:11,	135:6, 135:7
explain	101:12, 103:10	55:6, 57:22,	falsity
112:18, 132:18	fabric	88:7, 90:6,	94:11, 94:19,
explained	28:3	102:4, 104:15,	95:2, 136:7
26:1, 127:2	face	110:20, 111:22, 113:18	far
explanations	6:6, 23:7,	factually	29:19, 89:7
137:5	31:13, 31:15,	-	father
explicating	32:15, 35:5,	92:22, 93:7,	53:3
103:7	35:18, 35:20,	103:13 failed	fault
explicit	36:6, 37:21,		88:12, 130:17
90:3	38:4, 58:22,	52:17, 56:5,	favor
explicitly	88:18	112:4 fails	131:15
107:10, 134:11	facilitate		favorable
exploded	107:16	106:16	24:13, 56:5,
114:5	fact	failure	62:14, 63:19
expose	14:3, 14:4,	103:17	fear
133:5	14:20, 15:8,	fair	12:2, 12:18,
exposed	16:14, 22:5,	48:7, 50:15,	13:20, 33:7,
89:5	45:7, 49:6,	55:16, 55:22,	34:4, 34:18,
exposure	55:10, 65:10,	56:6, 57:9,	82:9
114:18	66:4, 66:12,	67:12, 88:7,	fearing
express	67:9, 77:6,	98:20, 123:2,	12:18
49:16, 106:4,	77:17, 86:19,	126:14 fairchild	february
110:14, 110:15	87:3, 87:6,		17:9
expressed	87:7, 87:10,	109:20, 110:1 fairfax	fed
56:1, 135:20	88:5, 89:6,		97:10, 111:9
expressions	93:22, 94:22,	1:2, 1:13, 2:2, 45:16	federal
63:15	95:16, 96:7,		52:3, 110:15
expressly	103:7, 122:7,	fairly	feelings
72:1	123:19, 125:18,	12:7, 23:13,	30:10
extensive	126:14, 127:8,	44:17, 51:15, 66:12, 81:1,	feels
15:12, 68:5,	129:19, 134:12,	88:1, 92:18,	9:1
120:12, 120:13,		55.1, 52.10,	fees
			116:1
<u> </u>			<u> </u>

	Conducted on 3	22, 2021	
felt	10:19, 27:14,	following	107:20
10:18, 20:6	54:4, 119:18,	11:6, 26:12,	former
fervently	119:20, 120:2	30:17, 34:21,	67:11, 96:13
130:10, 131:14	finger	83:20	forth
few	32:14, 32:17	fond	85:22, 86:13,
35:2, 93:8,	finish	30:11	94:20
116:10, 128:19	38:15	foot	fortunately
fifth	firm	36:20	17:19, 34:16,
54:14	114:8	footnote	43:18
fight	firms	85:18, 86:6	forum
34:2, 89:4	87:12, 105:21	force	12:8, 12:21,
figure	first	37:4, 41:18,	40:5, 136:8
24:8, 24:10	15:14, 15:21,	111:15	forward
filed	17:21, 25:19,	forcing	6:9
	35:10, 39:10,	133:1	forwent
7:16, 14:1,	62:7, 66:2,		
17:8, 23:9,	66:5, 83:15,	foreclosing	51:19
49:22, 59:3,	83:19, 84:1,	114:12	fought
85:16, 114:19,	85:21, 86:11,	foreclosure	89:3
114:21, 115:4	93:10, 95:14,	114:8	found
filing	97:2, 106:7,	foregoing	11:21, 13:14,
17:7, 72:16,	106:20, 116:13,	140:4, 141:4	13:16, 24:20,
85:15, 114:16	124:5, 124:9,	foreign	30:6, 32:15,
filings	132:15, 134:12,	45:2, 45:4,	34:8, 37:18,
17:10	136:18	45:5, 45:7,	39:12, 41:18,
final	fisher	45:11, 52:4,	50:9, 51:14,
23:1, 50:19,	1	53:5, 54:12,	53:5, 59:14,
55:11, 59:11,	1:22, 141:3, 141:15	54:17, 55:7,	65:10, 68:11,
66:5, 135:2	fists	55:11, 55:15,	76:16, 77:6,
finally	•	59:10, 60:8,	77:9, 82:3,
34:8, 73:1,	35:20	60:16, 105:9,	83:8, 96:15,
91:3, 96:5,	fit	105:14, 105:19,	96:20, 98:10,
97:14, 99:7	36:5	106:15, 106:19,	103:21, 125:9,
financial	flashing	107:11, 107:17,	136:3
125:13, 126:6,	115:4	107:18, 108:13,	foundation
140:8, 141:10	flat	108:16, 108:18,	117:1, 117:15
financing	121:2	109:3, 109:8,	four
70:3	flexibility	110:12, 113:12,	20:22, 41:13,
find	65:19, 129:11	113:19, 114:1	55:6, 55:15,
59:19, 105:22	flight	foreign-country	75:5
finding	28:13	11:8, 59:6,	fourth
53:3, 55:6,	flip	107:14	45:2, 54:12,
55:10, 110:12,	16:21	foreign-money	61:11, 66:16,
113:19	floor	106:10	67:2, 99:8,
findings	31:5, 35:4	forest	101:12, 102:14,
25:10, 25:12,	focus	52:12	103:2, 134:11
28:12, 29:12,	75:7	forever	fox
57:22, 126:22	focused	80:20	103:11, 103:19,
fine	87:21	form	104:4, 104:16
6:18, 10:3,		73:2, 100:5,	
	<u> </u>		

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
frame	103:14	75:18, 78:19,	45:20, 46:1,
28:5, 36:21,	further	124:19, 125:1,	46:8, 49:8,
37:1	4:5, 22:20,	125:3, 125:4	57:14, 60:22,
frankly	23:2, 37:11,	giving	63:7, 64:18,
28:9	58:21, 116:8,	40:20, 41:13,	65:20, 70:1,
fraud	126:17, 126:19	104:16, 130:18	71:10, 73:6,
36:13, 48:16	furthermore	glad	74:8, 78:22,
friendly	55:1	83:22	118:2, 122:13,
47:12	futile	glass	123:6, 128:5,
frivolous	85:16, 86:15,	28:3, 31:17,	128:6, 128:10,
86:15	114:19, 115:3	31:18, 37:11	128:11, 129:12,
front	futility	glasses	130:15, 132:13,
14:13, 26:16,	115:1	27:22	138:6, 139:4
120:15, 127:4,	G	go	gold-digger
136:11		6:9, 11:2,	88:22, 89:1
fucking	gain	12:12, 15:20,	gone
35:18, 36:22	125:14, 126:6	15:22, 16:2,	65:8, 73:22,
full	gave	19:16, 19:20,	78:21, 130:22
14:5, 14:6,	18:10, 20:14,	20:5, 20:7,	good
15:8, 15:16,	24:10, 57:18,	22:3, 23:22,	6:2, 6:3, 33:1,
17:22, 48:7,	75:5, 92:3,	25:13, 25:18,	61:9, 61:13,
48:19, 52:9,	124:11	27:5, 27:16,	64:3, 85:9,
53:2, 57:9,	gearing	33:8, 35:13,	139:9
67:12, 81:9,	17:10	37:6, 43:9,	goods
88:7, 98:19,	gee	44:6, 46:1,	61:21, 61:22
113:13, 121:5,	57:2, 120:17	57:20, 58:9,	gordon
121:11, 121:16,	general	59:22, 60:14,	53:15
122:22, 123:1,	63:13, 93:15,	60:22, 64:19,	governed
123:2, 124:22	94:5	65:7, 70:1,	45:5,:46:10
fully	generally	78:17, 79:15,	governing
12:7, 23:13,	93:16	84:18, 89:14,	72:2
44:17, 50:3,	georgia	90:10, 120:2,	grabbed
51:15, 57:6,	53:2	123:15, 130:18,	26:10, 31:2,
66:11, 81:1,	german	132:13, 132:15,	31:12, 31:18,
88:1, 121:11,	53:19	136:8, 136:11,	31:19, 33:14,
124:21, 125:7,	gist	136:17	35:15, 36:3,
127:4, 129:18,	60:1	goes	37:9
131:11, 133:10,	give	18:14, 29:7,	grabbing
136:6	10:18, 20:13,	80:4, 133:19	34:19, 35:1,
fun	39:7, 41:5,	going	35:17, 37:21
53:10	41:20, 60:13,	8:7, 12:9,	graffiti
fundamentally	115:18, 115:20,	17:7, 17:14,	32:16
55:16, 108:8	123:14, 124:22	19:13, 21:2,	grant
funny	given	24:5, 25:7,	46:3, 53:18,
71:4, 72:13,	16:15, 35:11,	27:2, 43:20,	85:3, 87:3,
73:18, 99:22,	42:8, 46:18,	43:21, 44:3,	107:17
100:21, 102:21,	48:5, 49:13,	44:7, 44:12,	granting
103:4, 103:11,	57:17, 67:21,	44:13, 44:21,	41:17
	<u>-</u>	,	- A
L		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	L		
grants	34:19, 34:21,	headlines	helpful
59:9, 107:19,	35:1, 35:18,	80:12	20:20, 27:16
107:22	35:21, 36:4,	hear	helps
gras	36:5, 36:7,	23:5, 96:10,	44:21
104:3	37:10, 37:21,	101:13	here
grasping	58:5, 58:11,	heard's	7:7, 9:13,
34:3, 40:1	58:13, 58:15	33:13, 34:6,	9:18, 11:9,
grateful	half	34:21, 36:14,	15:13, 17:5,
30:11	116:6, 124:2	37:7, 37:19,	17:14, 17:18,
graves	hand	38:19, 42:21,	18:17, 20:2,
66:19, 66:21,	32:4, 33:15,	57:10, 58:16,	20:12, 20:15,
66:22, 67:5,	33:16, 140:11	58:18, 58:22,	21:4, 21:7,
67:6, 68:1,	handle	75:3, 85:13,	21:19, 23:22,
68:2, 68:7,	8:16	85:19, 86:14,	24:15, 26:3,
81:8, 99:8, 99:9	hands	87:10, 87:12,	28:22, 29:17,
great	37:19, 79:22	89:16, 89:19,	30:9, 32:19,
21:14	happen	91:20, 94:12,	32:21, 38:18,
greater	44:16, 112:8	95:4, 95:14,	39:10, 39:15,
94:3, 94:15	happened	96:1, 97:14,	40:17, 41:3,
greatly	17:18, 21:18,	100:13, 102:1,	43:3, 43:19,
8:18	62:1, 101:7,	104:14, 106:8,	44:12, 47:21,
ground	111:3, 112:8,	110:8, 113:5,	48:2, 49:8,
26:1, 31:3,	124:14, 133:6,	114:7, 114:14,	50:10, 50:12,
31:11, 31:15,	133:8	115:8, 115:9,	51:7, 54:21,
35:16, 37:10,	happy	117:10, 118:17,	57:11, 58:14,
60:18, 107:4,	37:16	124:6, 138:20	60:5, 61:7,
109:1, 109:5	haranguing	hearing	62:10, 62:12,
grounds	29:3	1:11, 2:1,	62:20, 63:5,
23:10, 67:18,	hard	40:19, 41:10,	63:6, 63:21,
95:12, 105:1,	10:9, 26:9,	96:1, 115:1,	64:18, 65:17,
116:22	33:12, 53:10	127:19, 139:10	66:14, 73:5,
guess	harder	hearsay	73:22, 74:3,
10:4, 122:17,	78:19	116:22	75:9, 76:20,
128:1	harmful	heartache	77:13, 80:1,
dah	20:21	89:6	80:7, 83:2,
71:4, 72:13,	hart	heavily	84:3, 84:17,
73:19, 99:22,	96:15, 96:16	102:21	86:3, 87:18,
100:21, 102:21,	harvest	heavy	90:11, 90:16,
103:4, 103:11,	87:13	58:3	91:12, 91:16,
103:14	hate	held .	94:6, 98:1,
guyot	36:22	30:8, 61:18,	99:12, 101:13,
45:10	head	63:16, 68:9,	102:5, 102:7,
H	31:22, 33:15,	69:4, 69:8,	103:14, 105:11,
hadden	34:14, 34:22,	91:14, 110:16,	106:1, 107:6,
	35:17, 36:21,	111:18, 127:17	111:1, 111:15,
117:3	58:16	help	112:9, 116:12,
hair	head-butting	44:10, 96:12,	118:16, 121:3,
31:2, 33:14,	35:4, 35:12	110:14	121:4, 121:21,
	,		
·			

	Conducted on J	ury 22, 2021	101
122:21, 123:15,	history	hundreds	imply
124:14, 127:9,	21:15, 133:14	123:17	13:9
128:1, 129:3,	hit	hurting	importance
131:12, 132:2,	26:9, 31:14,	32:2	79:12, 131:19
132:19, 135:1,	32:3, 33:11,	hurts	important
135:11	33:12, 33:15,	114:14	25:1, 39:14,
here's	34:2, 34:11,	husband	40:8, 40:15,
42:15	35:19, 36:5	88:2	46:9, 49:13,
hereby	hitting	hypothetical	63:4, 79:1,
140:4, 141:3	34:22, 35:3	131:6	79:2, 121:3,
heretofore	holding	<u> </u>	122:20, 128:19,
72:3	34:3, 53:4,	i ——-—	130:19, 132:12
hereunto	66:17, 102:22,	identical	impose
140:10	103:1, 103:4	12:6, 39:18,	85:14, 115:12
herself	holdings	51:4, 55:8,	impression
111:4	130:15, 137:4,	63:18, 69:12,	85:22, 86:11
hicksville	137:8, 137:10	86:20	improper
27:20	honor's	identification	87:11
hide	43:22, 49:13,	16:22	inadmissible
58:4	78:20	identify	93:17
hideous	honorable	113:16	
26:13	1:12, 2:1	ignore	inadvertently
high	·	62:18, 71:21	21:22, 28:6,
1 -	hope	ignored	29:6
13:13, 13:16,	138:1, 138:4	38:19, 115:4	inapplicable
22:14, 22:17,	hopefully	ignoring	53:15
30:6, 32:8,	138:2	32:1	inapposite
39:16, 40:14,	horrible	ii	93:9, 109:21,
40:15, 41:16,	37:5	1:4	110:6
55:18, 56:6,	horribles	ill	inc
71:1, 123:12,	101:4	28:16	101:11
136:3, 136:19	hospital	imagination	incident
highlight	89:8, 91:8,	122:19	25:20, 26:8,
40:9	124:3, 124:7,	imagined	27:18, 28:13,
highlighted	124:17, 124:18	30:12, 30:15	29:12, 33:10,
44:1, 127:22	hotel	immediately	33:11, 34:1,
highlighting	31:1	16:15	58:8, 59:2
132:16	hour	impact	incidents
highly	78:21, 116:6	82:18	22:13, 25:10,
111:14	hozie	impacting	40:21, 127:4
hilton	96:10, 96:13,	65:22	include
45:10, 48:6,	96:15, 96:19,	impartial	8:10
48:22, 50:9	96:22	48:12	included
himself	hozie's	implicate	8:3
26:2, 30:3,	96:16	84:10, 123:7	includes
34:8, 63:20,	huge	implicated	72:7, 94:4,
89:18	34:13		94:15
hindered	humiliating	83:1	including
98:19	135:20	implications	27:21, 50:1,
		99:3	
L			

	Conducted on 3		
64:5, 127:11	instances	16:7	71:14, 75:20,
incomplete	24:20, 101:20,	interrupting	78:14, 80:16,
88:8, 98:5	103:5, 136:5	9:21	81:14, 84:19,
inconsistent	instead	intimate	84:22, 86:20,
71:9	10:10, 19:12,	135:19	86:21, 88:17,
incorporated	32:2, 39:1,	introduce	90:6, 93:22,
46:20	55:2, 70:16,	57:4, 122:6	94:8, 98:10,
incorrect	120:16, 125:16	introduced	98:11, 100:12,
125:7	instructed	117:19	104:4, 110:20,
incorrectly	56:17	invalidity	111:19, 113:19,
106:12	insufficient	99:2	114:2, 115:11,
increased	87:3	invite	124:10, 125:9,
30:14	insurance	69:17	126:18, 127:13,
increasingly	54:18, 62:6,	invocation	128:15, 129:18,
133:2	62:22	87:11	135:15
indeed	insurer	invoke	issued
85:22, 108:15	61:22	108:3, 108:6,	13:12, 15:19,
index	intact	108:9, 108:14	15:21, 16:1,
14:14, 14:16	72:6	invoked	16:3, 20:17,
indicated	integral	91:15	21:1, 22:17
7:8, 32:22,	79:11	involve	issues
64:2	intended	12:6, 87:17,	12:11, 19:3,
indisputably	38:13, 107:16,	102:7, 110:8,	25:12, 50:7,
94:7, 104:10	126:10	113:11, 113:12,	55:8, 55:10,
individual	intends	133:13	61:4, 67:13,
69:14	124:21	involved	88:7, 123:8,
individuals	intention	69:3, 82:19,	132:3
69:13	7:15, 124:1	93:12, 101:20,	items
industry	intentionally	103:14, 119:2	116:10
134:2	8:2, 65:18	involves	itself
information	interactions	112:6	50:19, 67:16
128:2, 141:8	104:7	ironically	J
infringement	interchangeable	91:2	j
49:19, 50:1	126:12	island	34:7
ingested	interest	30:2, 30:6	jackson
29:18, 31:8	67:8, 74:16,	issue	24:2, 24:17,
initial	114:13, 132:10,	11:11, 12:6,	135:7
8:3, 96:20	132:11, 140:8,	23:13, 24:4,	james
injured	141:10	32:11, 39:16,	58:4, 58:9
32:16, 32:17	interesting	39:18, 45:6,	january
injuries	47:11	45:8, 51:3,	30:22
36:14, 58:5	interests	51:4, 51:6,	jealous
injury	134:19	51:7, 51:8,	28:1
12:17, 13:19,	interpretation	53:8, 54:1,	jefferson
32:14	43:14, 80:3	55:5, 55:13,	3:20 ·
insignificance	interpreted	57:12, 66:4,	jersey
126:20	66:16, 68:17	66:12, 70:21,	49:17, 106:4,
instance	interrogatories	71:1, 71:3,	_
48:22, 51:13	15:21, 16:1,		
	-		
		<u> </u>	

	Conducted on 3	ury 22, 2021	
110:16	105:14, 106:15,	109:9, 111:5,	kipper's
jessica	106:19, 106:21,	112:11, 113:15	122:16
3:5, 7:7, 85:11	107:8, 107:17,	jurisdictionally	kitchen
jn	107:19, 107:22,	102:5	36:12
17:20, 126:15	108:8, 108:13,	jurisdictions	knee
job	108:16, 110:2,	49:14, 64:9,	36:20
1:20	110:3, 110:12,	110:7	knees
	112:4, 113:1,	jurisprudence	37:11
john	113:13, 129:19	46:14, 48:4,	knew
1:4	judgment's	48:11	l .
johnny	110:12		85:15, 114:16,
7:6, 55:9,	judgments	jury	114:18
70:16, 71:2,	. . -	20:2, 40:16,	knocked
85:11, 133:9,	11:8, 49:15,	42:1, 44:6,	26:1
135:16	53:5, 53:19,	73:15, 90:4	knocking
joint	54:17, 59:6,	justice	35:4
17:11	106:10, 107:11	46:16, 48:12,	knot
joke	judicata	63:16, 64:14,	34:13
25:22	11:16, 61:19,	67:17, 67:19	know
joshua	64:16, 65:5,	juvenile	10:11, 10:12,
2:6, 140:3,	67:18, 68:13,	53:2	18:13, 27:12,
140:16	70:9, 71:6,	к	34:12, 40:14,
judge	71:16, 74:11,	keep	44:6, 45:22,
1:12, 2:2,	87:11, 91:12,	42:7, 44:13,	47:10, 57:5,
17:19, 18:14,	91:15, 99:12,	53:11, 78:22	80:5, 81:18,
18:22, 21:1,	99:16, 101:2,	keeps	89:13, 116:7,
62:13, 88:21,	105:2, 105:5,	138:6	119:21, 133:10,
117:20, 126:20,	115:12, 134:21	key	133:19, 134:9,
127:17, 138:19	judicial		135:11
judgment	17:20, 28:17,	41:12, 75:4	knowledge
8:4, 13:13,	32:9, 45:12,	kicked	100:16, 113:20,
17:22, 23:1,	46:18, 63:15,	28:14	135:5
23:6, 30:19,	71:8, 79:5,	kids	known
40:13, 40:18,	115:5	133:10	11:11, 12:22,
40:20, 41:1,	july	kill	84:6
45:1, 45:4,	1:14, 15:16,	35:19	knows
45:6, 45:15,	15:21, 17:2,	kind	130:16, 136:12
46:3, 46:7,	19:20, 79:18,	20:7, 48:3,	kollman
48:17, 49:3,	140:12, 141:17	53:12, 89:8,	24:2
52:13, 52:21,	june	108:1, 121:19,	
54:21, 59:5,	12:13, 16:6,	122:1, 125:13	L
59:9, 60:2,	27:20	kinds	la
60:9, 60:17,	jurisdiction	78:6	28:14
66:5, 66:13,	48:8, 48:9,	kingdom	laboratories
•	50:11, 52:5,	12:21	64:11
66:15, 67:11,	52:6, 54:10,	kipper	lack
67:15, 87:4,	55:19, 55:20,	30:18, 90:17,	13:22, 97:12,
92:1, 92:6,	92:16, 96:21,	90:19, 91:1,	116:22
99:14, 104:22,	97:7, 109:3,	122:13	lacked
105:6, 105:9,	5.1.7, 105.0,		14:2, 109:9,
1			

	Conducted on 3		
112:11	61:9, 61:14,	leech	likely
lacks	64:3, 66:17,	69:9, 95:4	7:21, 38:13,
108:9	67:5, 68:1,	left	48:11
laid	72:1, 72:3,	32:5, 34:17,	limine
18:1, 21:10	72:4, 75:15,	116:6, 133:16	127:16
lamp	83:13, 86:14,	legal	limited
33:2	87:2, 87:12,	23:7, 44:18,	88:16, 112:10,
landscape	87:16, 92:14,	54:10, 62:18,	116:11, 128:18,
87:13	93:8, 102:3,	76:20, 76:21,	134:21
lane	105:13, 105:21,	77:9, 77:13,	line
74:4, 74:10,	109:22, 110:7,	80:8, 81:10,	44:16
76:15, 76:22,	111:21, 114:8,	82:13, 87:13,	lip
77:15, 77:17,	129:7, 130:21,	103:18, 111:22,	32:6, 36:2,
114:6, 129:1,	131:1, 136:15	114:9, 127:6	36:15
130:2, 131:17,	laws	legally	listed
131:18, 137:14	48:15, 56:4,	132:4	117:22, 118:1
language	65:9, 107:13	legislative	litigate
47:20, 66:22,	lawsuit	45:12	44:17, 75:16,
77:18, 87:14	68:3, 124:14	legislatively	84:19, 98:20,
large	lawsuits	46:20	121:12, 122:22,
99:4	71:7, 73:11	legitimate	123:1
last	lawyer	47:2	litigated
11:16, 16:6,	96:13, 119:18,	less	54:8, 55:5,
21:6, 35:2,	119:20, 123:21	60:20, 73:10,	63:18, 66:4,
37:17, 59:2,	lawyers	94:4, 94:15	66:12, 82:11,
71:22, 73:20,	119:18	let's	96:21, 110:20,
82:16, 89:10,	lays	78:22, 128:13	129:18, 136:6
127:14	22:9	letter	litigating
lasted	leach	87:1, 89:12,	42:7, 66:3,
26:11	95:7, 95:12	134:12, 138:1	75:16, 98:17
late	leach's	letters	litigation
18:16	95:11	50:6	42:4, 42:10,
later	leading	liar	42:13, 45:20,
26:1, 28:15,	12:18, 22:12	133:1	49:22, 50:4,
31:13, 58:16	least	libel	50:5, 51:4,
latter	13:18, 30:7,	12:15, 12:21,	51:5, 51:16,
85:18	82:7, 110:1,	47:6, 47:8,	54:8, 55:7,
laughed	112:22	47:12, 47:16,	55:9, 57:10,
25:22	leave	76:8, 80:13,	67:9, 68:15,
laura	71:19, 85:17,	81:12, 81:13	69:18, 70:4,
1:7	106:6, 114:21,	life	74:14, 77:22,
law	115:2, 115:14,	12:2, 12:18,	78:1, 98:12,
24:17, 25:6,	133:16	12:19, 13:20,	130:8, 131:22
45:2, 45:7,	leaves	33:7, 34:4,	little
46:17, 46:19,	89:9	34:19, 54:18,	9:18, 10:8,
46:20, 52:6,	leaving	82:10	11:12, 29:2,
54:9, 54:12,	37:15	lights	111:21
59:10, 61:1,	lecego	115:4	live
	99:22		44:18, 81:10,
			1

	Conducted on J	ury 22, 2021	
82:12	81:11	92:12, 128:14,	massive
lloyd	losing	128:19	115:16
30:18	42:7, 70:3	makes	mate
11p	lost	60:11, 75:14,	135:21
_	23:14, 41:7,	78:11, 86:2,	material
3:6	42:6, 61:4,	99:22, 112:16,	7:9, 57:13,
loan		115:22	120:1, 120:4
74:4	66:12, 68:5, 82:11, 84:17,	makeup	materials
located	•	58:3, 58:11	18:10, 97:19
112:5	92:1, 129:18,	making	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
logic	137:1	, -	matter
83:21	lot	25:21, 29:11,	24:11, 24:12,
logical	73:7, 123:22,	123:17	25:6, 44:4,
23:7, 43:13,	130:14, 132:4	malice	55:19, 73:8,
44:18, 62:18,	louis		74:14, 74:21,
81:10, 82:13	21:11, 121:7	135:3, 135:9	74:22, 77:21,
lohr	lower	man's	77:22, 78:16,
61:5	94:2	42:11, 44:4	79:2, 80:1,
london	luck	manager	85:21, 89:20,
52:1, 90:10,	33:1	124:4, 124:5	90:8, 100:11,
90:17, 101:10,	lunged	mandates	101:21, 117:18,
112:13	33:12	71:15	130:4, 131:22,
long	lurch	many	132:8, 135:10,
18:18	89:9	15:2, 22:7,	135:13
longer	lynch	25:4, 65:2,	matters
23:6, 65:10,	51:22	82:21, 84:18,	87:6, 97:13
119:10		119:17, 124:18	mattress
look	ma'am	march	35:20, 36:6
10:1, 15:13,	11:2, 118:11	13:6, 17:8,	maybe
18:15, 19:13,	made	22:16, 26:8,	27:12
74:3, 77:18,	10:14, 24:6,	31:7, 33:9	mcavoy
117:21, 129:11,	26:12, 40:22,	mardi	119:19
130:2, 130:3,	46:19, 69:18,	104:3	mccurdy
130:7, 130:20,	70:13, 86:3,	marks	61:5
132:7	92:10, 94:4,	117:5	mean
looking	97:18, 98:13,	marriage	42:1, 75:10,
80:5	111:6, 112:17,	72:22, 87:22,	123:12
lordship	125:4, 127:6	112:9, 112:11,	meaning
39:4, 39:16,	magnum-sized	133:8	113:12
40:17, 55:13,	37:9	marshal	means
76:13	majority	97:1, 97:4	23:5, 41:9,
los		masquerade	80:4, 132:18
25:19, 33:8,	64:8, 65:1, 65:10	49:18, 50:4,	meant
34:15, 37:6,	make	50:18	127:11, 127:12
89:8, 91:8	8:3, 21:6,	mass	meantime
·lose	25:11, 26:20,	14:10, 15:1,	15:12
44:7, 47:13	27:2, 27:9,	20:4, 40:19,	measure
loses	32:9, 55:20,	49:9, 123:4,	64:15
42:6, 69:20,	32.3, 33.20,	137:1	measured
1			43:6
1			

.1	Conducted off 3	misstatements	morning
mechanic	88:17 mexican		6:2, 6:3, 85:9
129:9	•	106:8	
mechanistically	52:13, 52:20,	mistake	most
66:8, 129:10,	111:19, 111:20,	24:6, 110:11	36:17, 63:19,
129:14	111:21, 112:3,	mistaken	97:1, 102:4,
meet	113:1, 113:3	77:7	115:7, 122:20,
20:21, 48:20,	mexico	misunderstood	136:16
48:21, 91:1,	52:17, 111:18,	20:16, 25:21	motion
107:7, 134:6	112:5	modification	71:19, 85:16,
meet-and-confer	meyers	57:13	91:4, 114:21,
86:7	7:7, 85:11	moment	115:1, 115:14,
member	michelle	26:14, 106:6	120:6, 120:8,
134:1	9:12	monetary	127:16, 127:20,
members	might	107:14, 107:18,	138:7, 138:20
95:8, 95:17	7:8, 22:3,	107:22, 108:4	motions
mention	27:16, 71:14,	money	1:11, 2:1,
8:14, 13:9,	86:11, 101:2,	11:8, 59:10,	85:19, 120:7
55:16, 92:13,	127:12	62:22, 103:17,	motivation
92:17, 113:9	million	107:20, 115:6,	72:17, 100:4,
mentioned	88:20, 123:19,	123:22	104:18
75:22, 98:7,	124:16, 124:17,	monster	move
99:7, 106:3,	124:22, 125:4,	26:2, 26:6	27:12, 65:1,
113:11, 127:1	126:7, 128:12	month	116:13
mentioning	millions	16:12	moved
118:8	123:17, 124:13	months	120:5, 127:16
mere	minor	14:7, 20:15,	moving
96:3	125:10	100:12, 109:19,	105:3
merely	minute	120:20	much
89:21, 95:22,	64:7	moore	24:13, 53:6,
96:8	minutes	68:19, 97:14,	60:20, 63:1,
merits	44:22, 78:22,	97:16	64:1, 73:9,
11:19, 49:1,	116:6	more	74:7, 104:17, 111:9, 114:5,
54:8	mirror	7:21, 10:14,	119:9, 120:18,
merrill	32:22	24:13, 24:22,	123:18, 123:19,
51:21	miscomprehended	25:4, 31:17,	124:20, 138:9,
message	20:16	39:14, 53:7,	139:6
26:12, 36:12	misjoinder 103:20	56:4, 60:14,	multi-million-do-
messages	misplaced	62:14, 70:3, 73:8, 75:7,	llar
22:7, 28:8,	95:6	83:5, 89:7,	42:10
32:18	misremembering	90:3, 104:17,	multiple
met	119:12, 119:16	108:8, 121:3,	16:8, 31:14,
21:1, 55:7,	missed	123:22, 124:11,	50:1, 71:7,
65:17, 107:1,		124:15, 124:16,	73:11, 95:11,
107:6, 108:20 metadata	71:18 misspoke	132:21, 132:22,	105:21
18:8, 18:11,	118:18	134:9, 137:21	muscled
18:8, 18:11, 18:20, 19:3,	misstated	moreover	31:3
58:19, 58:22,	126:9	100:15, 103:11	music
J0.13, J0.22,	120.9		49:18
	1		

	Conducted on J	ury 22, 2021		107
musk	43:2, 55:11	31:6, 33:8,	nope	· — — —
91:6	necessity	33:22, 34:15,	45:21	
must	67:17	35:13, 36:8,	north	
13:4, 23:7,	neck	36:10, 36:18,	102:3, 134:15	
33:6, 68:13,	31:12, 31:19,	37:6, 38:6,	nose	
94:11	34:9	43:7, 43:20,	32:6, 35:5	
mutual	need	44:2, 46:4,	notably	
134:5	7:2, 8:14, 9:1,	51:3, 51:11,	55:5	
mutuality	19:1, 42:4,	58:10, 60:15,	notarial	
43:15, 55:17,	42:19, 78:18,	69:13, 70:3,	140:11	
62:22, 63:8,	87:2, 95:2,	118:15, 122:9,	notary	
63:14, 63:17,	126:13, 130:7	122:10, 126:8,	140:1, 140:16	
65:1, 65:3,	needed	138:2	note	
65:11, 65:16,	57:2, 126:12	nexus	9:22, 19:5,	
66:7, 66:17,	needs	111:22, 112:10	71:15	
67:6, 67:16,	25:4	night	noted	
68:19, 69:9,	negative	58:10		
69:17, 69:19,	28:9	nightgown	126:17, 126:19 nothing	
71:16, 71:17,	neil	31:19		
86:10, 93:3,	7:7	nine	8:4, 8:8, 8:9,	
93:4, 93:5,	neither	120:6	48:14, 57:8, 59:17, 109:16,	
129:14	86:4, 92:4,	no-fault	128:16	
myers	108:5, 140:6,	123:15	notice	
3:5, 91:3,	141:8	nobody	50:14, 88:13,	
109:15	never	75:18, 83:15	95:10, 95:21,	
mystery	44:3, 60:19,	non-monetary	119:4, 119:11,	
91:6	67:7, 81:12,	107:10, 108:7	119:14, 119:21	
N N	81:13, 83:10,	non-mutual	noticed	
	85:20, 89:21,	64:10	8:19, 118:17,	
name	90:4, 98:1,	non-mutuality	118:20	
9:9	118:17, 118:21,	61:15	notices	
named	122:17	non-party	16:13	
72:7	new	54:20, 68:3,	notification	
narrow	49:17, 51:22,	88:6, 98:18,	7:17, 17:21,	
102:12	53:16, 59:19,	108:12	32:9, 79:6	
narrowly.	74:8, 86:5,	non-recognition	notify	
52:5	106:4, 109:13,	107:4, 109:1,	7:16	i
nation	109:16, 109:22,	109:5	noting	
48:18	110:16	non-virginia	52:2, 79:12	
national	news	106:3, 110:7	novel	
107:12	63:10, 69:21,	none	86:4	
nature	70:5, 109:13	108:11	november	
33:5, 130:3	newspaper	nonetheless	13:12, 15:19,	
ncra	11:19, 12:14,	13:9	16:1, 16:4,	
141:16	43:7	nonrecognition	17:1, 22:14	
nd	next	60:18, 109:10	number	
140:11	27:20, 28:11,	nonsense	12:11, 18:4,	
necessary	30:1, 30:21,	117:11	22:10, 51:6,	
19:11, 42:20,				

40 0 00 40			
67:3, 97:13,	101:22, 102:8,	once	50:10
109:21, 137:3	102:14, 103:6	44:17, 56:18,	ongoing
numbers	occurrences	63:18, 67:10	104:9
57:17	75:11, 104:22	one	only
nurse	oehl	8:3, 10:17,	14:5, 18:15,
30:5, 30:18	46:7, 46:11,	17:13, 17:21,	22:7, 33:19,
nurses	46:12, 47:22,	21:12, 24:22,	34:17, 41:5,
90:19	105:15	25:5, 25:19,	45:16, 50:4,
nw	offensive	26:6, 27:20,	58:4, 59:16,
3:7	131:7	28:11, 30:1,	63:7, 84:7,
	offered	30:7, 30:21,	88:1, 95:2,
0	117:17, 138:12	31:6, 31:7,	103:17, 105:12,
object	office	31:8, 33:8,	107:1, 108:15,
18:13, 116:20,		33:14, 33:22,	126:18, 127:1,
138:10, 138:18	35:15	34:8, 34:15,	130:9
objected	officer	34:18, 36:17,	op-ed
56:17	117:2, 140:3	37:17, 42:3,	12:6, 13:8,
objecting	officers	42:11, 42:18,	70:18, 96:2,
117:21	117:10	42:22, 44:4,	98:21, 100:13,
objection	offices	45:11, 45:17,	100:14, 104:14,
27:6, 67:20,	122:15	46:1, 46:8,	113:6
116:15, 116:18,	official	49:15, 51:3,	opening
117:15, 118:2,	104:8	51:11, 53:7,	7:15, 86:3,
118:4	officials	55:21, 56:16,	
obligations	104:1	59:3, 60:19,	92:12, 94:18,
88:4	oh	62:7, 63:9,	106:13, 110:10
obvious	19:17, 56:21,	65:20, 67:21,	openings
86:12	62:21, 63:7,	69:13, 69:21,	7:3
obviously	93:1, 118:7,		operate
53:8, 70:5,	118:22, 138:14	70:2, 73:12, 74:3, 76:11,	101:2
137:20, 138:5	okay		operates
occasion	6:15, 6:18,	77:1, 78:5,	135:1
12:17, 30:8,	7:1, 7:3, 7:11,	78:19, 80:10,	operation
82:9	7:18, 7:22, 8:6,	83:4, 84:8,	99:3, 106:9
occasions	8:17, 8:21, 9:6,	84:9, 89:22,	opinion
	10:6, 10:19,	90:5, 98:9,	42:11, 44:5,
12:1, 12:2,	11:1, 18:20,	109:21, 110:1,	44:7, 50:20,
13:20	19:17, 27:7,	110:3, 112:7,	90:1, 98:3,
occur	27:8, 27:11,	113:21, 116:2,	100:20, 130:17,
119:5	27:14, 27:15,	122:9, 122:10,	138:1
occurred	62:4, 81:18,	122:18, 125:4,	opponent
16:21, 88:16,	82:15, 83:8,	130:1, 130:2,	79:4, 79:9
104:1, 113:1,	84:15, 116:19,	131:10, 134:2,	opportunities
113:6	118:10, 119:3,	134:6, 137:10,	126:2
occurrence	119:7, 138:4,	137:11, 137:12	opportunity
70:11, 70:20,	138:8, 138:14,	one's	19:4, 47:15,
72:10, 76:6,	139:4	135:21	50:18, 51:18,
99:19, 100:2,	old	ones	51:19, 57:9,
101:1, 101:18,	64:4	18:16, 24:7,	67:13, 67:21,
]

	Conducted on J	uly 22, 2021	169
98:20, 121:11,	25:14, 30:12,	96:8, 140:9,	pages
121:16, 122:22,	30:16, 33:16,	141:11	1:21, 17:22,
123:1, 123:2	36:20, 41:8,	over .	28:22, 50:21,
opposing	42:15, 44:10,	14:3, 15:13,	94:17, 94:20,
59:14	44:11, 48:14,	16:12, 18:6,	99:5
opposite	48:17, 49:14,	20:2, 21:3,	pain
84:17	56:21, 61:12,	21:5, 21:14,	30:13
opposition	64:4, 84:8,	21:15, 21:22,	paint
	97:13, 99:10,	22:9, 24:9,	32:17, 33:3
14:1, 24:4,	101:4, 101:5,	24:15, 31:4,	painting
24:6, 54:19,	103:12, 107:17,	32:6, 36:22,	26:8
57:1, 60:11,	107:20, 108:1,	37:1, 39:12,	
69:11, 70:13,	110:7, 114:9,	43:7, 45:21,	panel
71:19, 71:20,	121:20, 132:4,	48:9, 50:11,	69:14
75:14, 85:19,			panels
86:1, 86:6,	135:9	55:20, 56:2,	31:18
86:13, 88:5,	others	73:10, 78:13,	papers
94:21, 99:5	64:4	90:5, 96:14,	96:11
opposition's	otherwise	109:3, 109:9,	parade
40:2	60:6, 70:2,	112:11, 121:1,	101:4
options	140:9, 141:11	136:10, 138:22	paragraph
23:2	ought	overarching	13:14, 79:6,
oral	67:15	26:4	115:9, 126:16,
99:7	out	overdo	126:17
ordeal	17:20, 18:1,	28:22	paragraphs
31:10	20:11, 21:10,	overrule	19:6, 21:17,
order	21:13, 22:6,	112:3	50:21
7:10, 7:16,	22:9, 24:1,	own	paralegal
8:11, 41:22,	25:1, 25:2,	19:12, 32:16,	9:12
46:13, 47:19,	26:20, 28:7,	48:13, 52:19,	parliament
59:4, 72:16,	28:15, 29:15,	58:5, 76:12,	46:19
76:2, 79:17,	34:20, 35:21,	96:2, 100:20,	part
105:17	36:6, 43:16,	134:2	10:10, 13:1,
orders	57:11, 57:16,	ownership	20:10, 27:2,
22:9, 47:3,	58:5, 60:5,	52:14, 111:19,	30:6, 41:8,
47:9	65:15, 69:15,	112:5	46:9, 57:20,
organization	71:21, 72:11,	owns	60:4, 79:11,
69:22	80:10, 84:21,	30:3	88:12, 112:22,
organizations	93:14, 95:5,	P	123:20, 125:18
63:10, 70:5,	97:3, 99:18,	page	partial
80:10	100:1, 105:16,	4:2, 17:22,	91:7
origin	111:8, 111:13,	35:13, 36:10,	participate
72:13, 100:4,	115:2, 121:2,	36:18, 39:6,	51:18, 110:18,
104:17	127:5, 128:13,	44:20, 54:19,	110:22
osha	128:22, 129:8,	57:17, 86:6,	participated
97:17	131:15, 131:18,	89:16, 102:10,	50:5, 51:16,
other	132:22, 133:3,	106:13, 110:10,	51:20
	133:4	132:15, 136:18	particular
7:19, 13:3,	outcome	132.13, 130:10	, ~
16:10, 20:21,	95:22, 96:3,		27:18, 29:10,
1	<u> </u>		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

1_		Conducted on 3	, 22, 2021	
\prod	29:16, 40:9,	108:10, 109:6,	period	physical
	127:1	112:12, 113:22,	16:12	90:7
	particularly	114:12, 129:16,	peripherally	physically
П	36:15, 76:4,	136:22	126:19	37:14, 90:12,
	97:2	passed	perjury	98:2
	particulars	28:15	89:5, 91:9,	physician
	38:11	passenger	117:11	38:21
	parties	134:19	permission	picked
	40:20, 41:9,	passionately	22:15, 22:19	34:2
	41:10, 43:5,	128:20, 129:2,	permit	picture
Ш	48:1, 49:21,	129:4, 130:10,	61:14	27:17, 35:22,
	50:11, 50:13,	131:15	permits	36:14
	51:12, 56:3,	past	61:14, 71:16	pictures
	59:16, 66:2,	74:7	permitted	26:17, 26:18,
H	69:4, 69:12,	patent	68:21	26:19, 32:20,
H	69:19, 71:6,	99:1, 99:2,	person	35:9, 38:7, 58:2
	72:7, 73:3,	99:4	52:18, 57:2,	piece
	73:9, 88:2,	patently	,	100:20
H	91:16, 93:17,	90:15	74:21, 74:22,	pieces.
	93:18, 95:15,	paul	89:8	28:3
	99:9, 100:7,	[*	person's	
	103:20, 105:19,	28:8, 29:18	74:13, 77:20,	ping-pong
	106:1, 108:17,	pause	131:21	31:17
	110:2, 113:21,	54:5	personal	pintado
	113:22, 132:11,	pay	33:16, 50:11,	3:13, 9:11
	140:7, 141:9	103:17, 116:2	55:19, 66:5,	place
	partners	payment	100:16	87:21, 112:10
	135:19	124:8, 124:9	personally	placed
	parts	payments	67:22	36:19
	39:9	91:7, 128:12	personifies	places
		pc	87:19	51:10
	party	3:14	persons	plaintiff
	19:22, 40:7,	pending	74:12, 131:20,	1:5, 3:2, 7:6,
	41:21, 45:3,	51:3	132:6	12:13, 47:12,
	48:11, 51:2,	penney	persuasive	58:20, 59:21,
	52:16, 54:7,	1:12, 2:1	111:15	59:22, 61:3,
	54:22, 60:1,	penthouse	ph	68:4, 85:8,
	60:2, 60:16,	117:6	21:22, 117:3	85:11, 95:7,
	63:8, 63:17,	people	phone	97:21
	65:4, 66:10,	8:20, 43:4,	37:18	plaintiff's
	67:10, 67:20,	44:5, 44:10,	photograph	9:17, 14:18,
	68:5, 68:12,	47:13, 58:11,	58:17	16:22, 50:6,
	68:14, 69:6,	65:8, 81:18	photographed	61:20, 104:2,
	72:6, 74:17,	people's	58:1, 58:16	104:6, 111:17,
	84:6, 87:8, 87:15, 87:20,	44:7	photographs	112:21
	91:21, 92:7,	percent	58:21, 116:22	plaintiff-friend-
	97:6, 106:18,	123:16	photos	1 _y
	107:1, 107:3,	perhaps	18:4, 19:3,	12:22, 56:4
	107.1, 107.5,	27:11	57:21, 58:6	plaintiffs
				49:21, 50:2,

51:12, 51:15,	128:20	precise	prescribed
	police	93:22	30:18
112:2, 112:4	117:9, 117:10	precision	present
plane	policies	34:10	8:7, 87:18,
28:12, 29:12	99:4	preclude	99:12, 115:19
plastic	policy	45:4	presented
32:3	53:8, 53:12,	precluded	73:4, 85:21,
plc	67:16, 67:19	56:9, 66:3,	94:15
3:19	pony	69:5, 88:6,	preserve
plea	49:16, 106:4,	110:17	10:17
23:10, 38:12,	110:14, 110:15	preclusion	preserves
56:13, 65:4,	portion	11:11, 11:17,	72:1
67:14, 68:10,	46:16, 107:16,	45:6, 45:8,	pressure
68:13, 85:3,	107:21, 108:1,	55:6, 70:9,	37:2, 67:8
85:14, 86:15,	108:7	71:14, 80:16,	preston
91:20, 115:8,	portions	98:10, 115:11,	96:10
115:15	107:8, 107:10	134:21	presumed
pleading	position	preclusive	13:3
85:16	44:22, 86:9,	53:18, 65:21,	pretty
pleas	102:1, 114:7,	87:3, 93:12,	22:11, 24:1,
61:19	133:2	96:20, 97:20,	57:11, 114:5
please	positions	105:8, 105:13,	prevailed
6:5, 7:5,	50:6	113:18	49:20, 75:3,
85:10, 117:16	possible	prefaced	78:13, 90:2
pleases	89:15	101:5	prevailing
9:9	possibly	prefer	19:22, 40:7,
pledge	80:2, 93:18	73:14	51:2
126:11, 127:12	post	preference	prevented
pledged	12:5, 13:8,	56:1	16:18, 57:3
124:7	43:8, 80:9,	preferred	preventing
pledges	90:14	20:1, 89:18,	71:8
124:10	posted	90:5, 123:3	prevents
point	95:10	prejudice	61:3
7:5, 21:6,	powerful	48:15, 49:11	previous
25:1, 34:8,	134:1	premise	51:5, 54:7,
73:20, 92:20,	powerpoint	86:17	69:2, 69:7,
101:13, 114:4,	10:9, 10:10,	premised	112:9
120:1, 137:12,	26:17, 27:1,	111:17	previously
137:14	29:16	preparations	49:18, 61:4,
pointed	practical	115:16	111:20
20:11, 69:15,	24:11, 67:17	prepared	price
71:21, 93:14,	practices	9:15, 10:9,	19:7, 19:8
105:16, 111:8, 127:5	46:15	20:7, 141:17	primarily
pointing	precedence	preponderance	96:6
43:16	46:11, 46:15	24:16, 94:10,	primary
points	precedential	94:12, 95:3 preponderant	136:3
41:19, 97:3,	111:15	94:2	principals
71:19, 9/:3,	preceding	J4 ≟ Z	137:17
	72:15, 114:13		
	ab d core	GO. IS A MINISTER OF THE PARTY	

principles	procedural	prohibition	70:8, 73:15
11:6, 11:7,	12:10, 13:22,	15:6	provided
71:11	14:3	promoter	50:18, 60:7,
print	procedurally	103:22	90:3
81:3	20:8	proof	provides
printed	procedure	13:1, 23:16,	41:1, 45:3,
90:12	89:22	23:18, 23:20,	107:20, 108:1,
prior	procedures	56:5, 60:21,	108:12
49:21, 51:12,	42:2, 46:15,	63:22, 88:22,	providing
52:11, 54:20,	47:1, 52:6	125:19, 125:20,	79:16
61:20, 66:9,	proceeded	125:21, 125:22,	proving
66:13, 66:15,	112:13	126:1, 126:4	20:19, 135:22
68:3, 68:4,	proceeding	proofs	provisions
93:13, 93:19,	38:4, 45:3,	50:17	108:11
93:21, 95:6,	45:7, 55:15,	property	psychiatrist
97:17, 97:21,	72:16, 96:4,	33:16, 52:14,	90:18
98:12, 110:19,	96:9, 97:21,	52:19, 93:21,	public
120:7, 129:16,	119:12	111:18, 111:19,	24:8, 24:9,
129:19	proceedings	112:5, 123:16	53:8, 53:12,
privies	35:10, 40:12,	proposition	67:8, 140:1,
66:3	40:16, 48:9,	65:14	140:16
privilege	52:4, 54:5,	propounded	publication
56:18	56:11, 69:7,	119:21, 120:20	13:11, 51:8,
privity	79:11, 133:13,	prosecuting	70:17, 70:18,
25:13, 42:19,	140:5, 141:5,	91:4	76:7, 100:14,
43:6, 48:1,	141:6	prosecutor	104:14, 135:12
48:2, 51:11,	process	95:8, 95:17	publications
51:13, 51:14,	97:8, 122:21	protective	101:5, 101:17,
52:8, 52:20,	procuring	7:10, 7:16,	103:8
62:21, 65:4,	48:16	8:11	publish
66:18, 68:14,	produce	protects	76:10 ⁻
72:2, 72:3,	21:2, 21:3,	71:6	published
72:8, 73:21,	40:12, 120:22	prove	11:19, 13:7,
74:1, 74:6,	produced	13:2, 13:4,	13:15, 38:9,
74:10, 74:15,	15:5, 18:4,	23:19, 23:20,	75:17, 76:10,
76:16, 77:4,	18:5, 18:17,	39:2, 39:20,	90:9, 90:11,
77:14, 87:9,	21:4, 29:6,	40:5, 62:15,	90:13, 100:12,
87:15, 91:17,	124:19	72:17, 73:22,	100:17, 100:19,
91:21, 95:16,	producing	94:11, 94:18,	103:8, 112:14,
99:10, 114:4,	21:9	95:1, 95:2,	113:6
114:11, 114:15,	production	112:4, 117:18,	publisher
129:1, 130:3,	15:15, 15:18,	133:3, 135:5	69:22
134:4, 134:6	97:19	proved	publishers
probably	professional	13:16, 62:16	53:16, 100:15
7:20, 36:17,	100:18, 141:16	proven	publishes
49:13, 67:7,	prohibited	78:13, 136:4,	136:10
70:12, 73:7	37:14, 50:3	136:5	publishing
problem	prohibiting	provide	100:17
9:6	61:20	51:1, 56:5,	
·			<u></u>

	Conducted on 3	ury 22, 2021	
pulled	26:3, 28:9,	98:5, 106:2,	94:1, 94:9,
36:6, 58:5	31:6, 44:8,	113:13, 131:20	116:1
pulling	50:9, 57:6,	rationale	reasoned
34:20, 35:21,	104:15, 124:11	45:13, 87:20,	40:12, 40:18,
37:20	quote	137:13, 137:14	41:1, 41:20,
punching	12:16, 12:19,	rawlings	68:7, 73:14,
35:16, 36:21	14:10, 14:11,	91:13, 91:19,	94:3
purported	20:1, 20:2,	92:13, 93:6,	reasoning
95:4, 100:20	20:4, 38:9,	134:17	44:12
purportedly	38:10, 38:12,	re-examination	reasons
	38:15, 40:11,	57:22	16:11, 38:18,
102:12, 117:8	42:11, 46:13,	re-examine	42:3, 42:18,
purposes	50:16, 50:20,	112:1	95:13, 132:5
43:21, 72:6	51:18, 52:2,	re-litigation	rebuttal
pursuant	63:12, 63:17,	61:3	7:21, 85:5,
2:6	63:20, 64:13,	reach	125:15
pushed	65:2, 65:21,		recall
31:10, 34:2,	66:7, 67:6,	126:13	14:1
35:16, 36:3,	68:8, 68:9,	reached	received
36:6, 37:10,	68:11, 72:3,	127:3	5:3, 50:13,
37:12	74:8, 74:10,	reaching	118:12
pushing	86:19, 94:3,	57:22	recent
30:7, 31:14,	94:14, 100:3,	read	92:18
35:20, 37:11	106:18, 107:18,	7:1, 19:6,	
put	109:2, 112:2,	24:5, 43:20,	recipient
14:19, 25:2,	126:13, 129:13	46:8, 59:20,	134:13
33:7, 34:18,	quoted	62:3, 63:3,	recipients 103:10
42:13, 60:13,	30:9, 55:12,	89:13	
118:5, 120:14,	77:17	reading	reciprocity
133:9, 139:4	quotes	126:14	45:13, 53:21
putting	40:9	ready	recitation
6:17	R -	6:9, 10:22	96:3
<u>Q</u>		real	reckless
queen's	rage	111:18	135:6
29:8, 132:17	28:1, 33:18	really	recognition
question	rain	21:16, 57:2,	11:8, 45:11,
9:15, 18:2,	52:11	74:6, 90:7,	59:7,. 60:16,
19:15, 49:14,	rambles	92:4, 92:8,	106:10, 106:18,
63:18, 80:7,	44:8	92:9, 133:6,	107:3, 107:9,
83:5, 92:2,	ramification	134:3	107:15, 107:16
132:14, 134:4	42:15	reason	recognize
questions	ramifications	18:15, 25:9,	45:14, 47:16,
56:17, 135:12	45:15	48:17, 68:12,	60:8, 105:7,
quick	rather	81:21, 99:16,	113:18, 116:11
54:2	34:13, 64:14,	127:16, 130:17	recognized
quickly	69:17, 74:13,	reasonable	46:7, 59:5,
25:9, 89:14	86:5, 89:21,	62:15, 62:16,	64:5, 64:9,
quite	92:21, 94:9,	62:17, 67:12,	64:22, 67:15,
24:18, 25:15,	1	73:3, 73:9,	69:1, 79:10,
Į.			
L	Prints 2 - A W		

			<u>,</u>
97:20, 105:13,	114:6	relationship	repeat
106:16, 106:22,	referring	72:22, 74:13,	57:15
108:17	11:17, 11:20,	74:16, 77:21,	repeatedly
recognizes	20:2, 58:14,	78:2, 104:11,	21:8, 25:22,
46:22, 47:1,	59:1	130:4, 131:21,	32:3, 33:12,
53:22	refrigerator	132:8, 132:10,	33:15, 35:3,
recognizing	31:13, 31:20	133:8	36:21, 38:8,
68:18	refused	relationships	79:8
record	54:20	74:12, 131:19,	reply
26:22, 27:2,	refuses	132:6	14:9, 20:11,
66:9, 98:5,	45:14	relative	21:11, 40:7,
129:16, 138:10,	refusing	92:18	41:15, 57:7,
141:5	46:2, 79:13	relatively	69:15, 79:18,
recorded	refuted	25:8	86:3, 89:16,
50:19, 140:6,	75:18	relevant	92:11, 92:21,
141:5	regard	12:11, 20:19,	93:5, 95:15,
recording	93:1	22:8, 26:3,	102:11, 106:14,
141:7	regime	28:21, 50:10,	112:16, 123:10,
recordings	30:17	53:12, 55:10,	123:20, 125:18,
49:20, 57:12	registered	67:13, 102:5	136:18
records	141:16	reliance	report
49:16, 93:16,	regular	71:9, 95:4,	18:11
97:11, 115:20	48:9	113:2, 113:7	reported
recovery	reimburses	relied	38:20
12:4, 59:9,	115:13	101:15, 103:12,	reporter
60:3, 107:18,	rejected	117:20	2:7, 6:5, 6:7,
107:19, 108:5	32:12, 32:13,	relief	140:1, 141:16
red	35:7, 86:2,	41:17, 107:21,	represent
115:4	102:11, 117:9	107:22, 108:2	9:13
redness	rejecting	relies	representation
38:4	68:10	102:21	114:10
redwing	relate	relitigation	representative
52:22, 113:10	100:10	45:5	67:22
ree	related	rely	represented
117:13	25:12, 72:19,	45:4, 57:21,	122:12
refer	96:2, 100:4,	70:6	representing
27:15, 106:11,	104:17, 128:2,	relying	19:8, 132:2
126:21	134:20, 140:7,	34:5	reproach
reference	141:9	remaining	63:15
8:4, 9:1,	relates	110:5, 117:2	reputation-destr-
32:10, 98:13	72:2	remains	oying
referencing	relating	72:5	39:3
7:9	18:2	remedial	request
referred	relation	46:18	15:14, 16:3,
14:10, 26:13,	40:20, 113:7,	remember	17:12, 19:2,
34:7, 53:22,	127:3, 133:13	23:22, 24:22,	20:17, 41:17,
79:8, 93:2,	relations	132:5	79:14, 115:18,
93:11, 114:4,	45:2	rendered	128:3
		59:11, 110:6	
		The rest of the second	

	Conducted on s		
requests	resources	retry	roanoke
15:18, 16:7,	71:8, 115:5	128:6	3:21
16:13, 20:22,	respect	return	rockingham
115:7	42:1, 94:17,	22:4	61:6
require	105:5, 108:7,	reverse	roger
65:11	113:19	84:9	3:15
required	respectfully	reversed	rogers
34:10, 66:18,	9:2, 95:12,	91:18, 110:12	3:19
69:9, 73:17,	106:7, 115:7,	review	roles
99:19, 136:11	116:20	68:6, 137:22	125:22
requirement	respective	reviewed	room
65:2, 65:3,	50:17	67:2, 67:5	31:1, 36:4,
69:16, 86:10,	respond	richmond	37:15, 37:22,
87:15, 87:20,	93:6, 115:21,	69:10, 95:5	90:22
89:12	121:6, 121:9,	rid	rooted
requires	121:17, 134:8	30:3	46:14
59:17	responded	right	rottenborn
requiring	134:7	6:8, 6:11, 9:7,	3:18, 9:11,
68:12	responding	10:2, 10:20,	119:9, 119:17,
requisite	115:14	47:6, 54:4,	119:18
99:11, 105:4	response	58:17, 63:11,	rouse
requisition	116:5, 117:10,	76:16, 77:2,	101:12
99:2	120:22	77:3, 77:5,	roxies
res	responsible	77:11, 77:12,	30:4
11:16, 61:19,	124:15	78:9, 80:22,	rpr
64:16, 65:4,	responsive	82:20, 83:16,	1:22, 141:15,
67:18, 68:13,	21:9, 22:4,	84:13, 85:6,	141:16
70:9, 71:6,	22:8	92:19, 101:13,	rudnick
71:15, 74:11,	rest	110:18, 110:22,	3:6, 21:20
87:11, 91:11,	85:4	111:7, 116:4,	rule
91:14, 99:12,	restatement	118:11, 132:5,	63:13, 67:6,
99:15, 101:2,	45:2	135:4, 137:19,	67:16, 71:13,
105:1, 105:4,	reston	139:2, 139:8	71:15, 71:21,
115:12, 134:21	3:16	rights	72:2, 72:5,
reserve	restraining	76:20, 76:21,	72:6, 93:2,
85:4	59:4, 72:15,	77:9, 77:13,	93:3, 93:5,
reserved	76:2	78:6, 80:8,	93:15, 94:5,
137:6	restricted	88:3, 114:9	99:20
reserving	25:3, 73:6	rigid	ruled
137:6	result	63:6, 63:13,	21:1, 138:21
resisted	19:22, 28:16,	69:16	rules
91:2, 111:10	85:1, 126:2	ripped	22:2, 64:16,
resisting	resulted	37:18	89:2
21:9, 60:16,	104:14	ripping	ruling
107:3, 111:10	retained	27:22	22:18, 55:21,
resolve	5:2	rise	64:13, 91:18,
45:6	retaliate	104:16	134:20
resolved	79:16	risk	run
127:13	[/ 5 . 1 . 5	70:2	70:2
1	Difference State of the State o	The state of the s	். இ. அன்ற நடித்த நடித்த நடித்த நடித்த நடித்த

running	25:12, 43:5,	30:15, 39:1,	schuler
_	47:2, 48:3,	40:22, 44:16,	52:11, 106:4,
104:9	51:10, 52:16,	45:22, 56:20,	110:14, 111:13,
S	-	57:21, 62:20,	111:15, 112:19,
sadly	53:19, 53:20,	77:19, 77:20,	112:21, 112:22
25:4	59:16, 59:19,		science
saenz	61:22, 63:1,	79:3, 81:9,	
117:2	63:2, 67:18,	81:16, 81:21,	53:16
said	70:10, 70:20,	82:7, 83:9,	sconce
7:12, 18:7,	72:10, 73:5,	83:16, 84:11,	28:1
18:12, 18:22,	77:9, 77:13,	101:7, 120:17,	scope
19:9, 19:13,	80:8, 81:14,	121:17, 129:9,	106:9
29:19, 33:4,	81:15, 81:17,	130:11, 132:5,	scoured
34:7, 40:11,	81:18, 84:19,	132:9, 136:8,	87:13
40:15, 52:18,	87:14, 87:20,	137:16	scraping
57:2, 57:8,	88:3, 91:17,	saying	37:10
57:16, 58:19,	93:18, 95:16,	32:1, 43:4,	scrawled
63:5, 67:6,	96:21, 96:22,	51:7, 76:9,	32:16
68:22, 70:8,	99:18, 100:2,	76:13, 77:15,	scrawling
71:5, 73:12,	101:1, 101:17,	80:5, 80:18,	36:11
73:13, 74:6,	101:21, 102:8,	.81:19, 81:20,	screamed
74:9, 76:8,	102:13, 103:3,	82:5, 82:22,	36:22, 38:1
		84:4, 123:21,	screaming
76:11, 79:12,	104:6, 105:20,	126:2, 128:9,	28:4, 35:18
80:11, 84:12,	108:18, 110:2,	129:8, 129:22,	seal
84:21, 89:21,	110:20, 117:12,	131:2, 132:3,	140:11
90:4, 101:8,	133:18, 134:14,	134:22	seale
102:9, 117:12,	134:15	says	105:17
118:19, 121:17,	same-party	18:15, 41:10,	
122:8, 122:17,	89:12	43:9, 44:9,	second
124:1, 124:7,	sanctionable	45:21, 46:13,	15:11, 15:18,
124:21, 125:13,	115:3	48:1, 49:1,	16:1, 18:12,
125:22, 126:6,	sanctioned	60:6, 60:15,	20:10, 26:8,
126:9, 126:10,	86:16	62:13, 63:7,	32:9, 39:13,
126:15, 127:12,	sanctions	63:12, 67:4,	42:12, 57:20,
127:21, 128:12,	85:14, 85:20,	72:1, 79:7,	60:4, 62:8,
128:14, 130:2,	86:12, 115:12,	102:15, 119:10,	84:6, 95:20,
130:7, 130:22,	128:20, 129:5,	126:20	96:22, 106:5,
132:3, 132:21,	130:9	scene	111:13
133:12, 133:21,	sasha	117:3	section
134:10, 134:14,	29:8, 132:17	schedule	30:19, 59:8,
135:14, 136:20,	satisfied	109:18	106:17, 107:5,
138:17, 140:5,	99:13	scheduled	107:11, 109:2,
141:5	save	17:6, 17:9,	127:22, 133:18
sale	132:19	58:9, 91:5	sections
114:9		schedules	28:18, 44:2,
same	Saw 117.6	124:9	63:3
10:15, 13:11,	117:4, 117:5	school	secure
21:18, 23:13,	say	92:14	48:12
	18:20, 22:2,	72:14	see
			10:4, 15:2,
	ĺ		1

	Conducted on 5		,
16:9, 18:5,	services	70:22	120:12
24:5, 36:14,	74:5	shield	showing
36:15, 37:3,	set	56:19	32:21, 33:18,
41:18, 44:8,	15:18, 15:21,	shift	106:15, 117:8
80:1, 107:4,	16:1, 17:19,	21:21, 107:2	shows
107:11, 111:2,	21:10, 21:13,	shifted	35:11, 36:1,
127:9, 132:16	24:1, 28:7,	24:9	58:19
seek	29:15, 38:6,	shillings	sick
39:2	57:11, 57:15,	21:21	89:9
seeking	60:5, 72:11,	shirt	side
23:12, 106:18	85:22, 86:13,	34:8	7:20, 16:11,
seeks	94:20, 130:12,	shooked	20:21, 41:6,
42:12, 107:9	140:10	26:10	58:17, 112:7
seem	sets	short	sides
67:19	86:17, 131:18	47:17, 87:22,	70:8
seems	setting	113:16	sign
110:11	129:8	shortly	123:21
seen	settled	18:5, 20:17,	signature-mig2k
9:22	86:14	33:9, 118:9	141:13
selected	settlement	shot	signature-plkal
12:20, 56:3	88:20, 88:21,	40:1, 49:5	140:14
selective	96:14, 96:17,	should	significance
111:6, 111:9,	128:11	10:18, 11:5,	28:19, 47:19,
120:22	seven	45:1, 48:18,	66:19, 125:10
selectively	41:13, 44:5,	49:2, 54:21,	significant
97:10, 120:18,	44:7, 75:5,	59:5, 66:8,	12:17, 13:19,
120:19	115:18, 124:1	75:7, 81:4,	19:5, 21:8,
seminal	several	85:13, 86:16,	22:11, 23:17,
45:9	12:2, 13:19,	89:11, 91:19,	30:9, 31:7,
sending	34:11, 93:11,	100:3, 102:2,	38:17, 39:10,
50:5	95:13	105:7, 105:11,	41:8, 45:15,
sense	sexual	106:15, 113:18,	45:19, 46:6,
10:14, 102:19	53:9	129:14, 137:16,	64:18, 123:5,
sent	sexually	137:17	125:2, 137:3
59:13, 59:14,	53:4	shouldn't	significantly
109:13, 124:5	shade	138:17	17:4, 21:16,
separate	33:2	shouting	29:10, 46:4,
78:8, 101:17,	shaking	28:4	46:8, 56:22,
101:19, 103:5,	37:22	shoved	57:12, 60:11,
104:21	shall	26:10, 31:1,	60:14, 120:10
september	41:20, 60:8	31:11, 31:12,	similar
122:12, 127:19	sherborne	31:16, 33:13	50:10
sequence	14:9, 39:8,	shoving	similarly
43:13	40:10, 41:10,	31:14, 35:2,	95:6
series	73:12, 76:12,	37:12	simply
18:1	121:17, 135:14,	show	104:15, 125:8
serious	136:19	38:4, 48:14,	since
34:18	sherborne's	58:4, 58:10,	16:14, 90:19
	41:18, 55:12,	!	
	1	l	

single	snaps	southeast	94:19
42:17, 80:13,	26:2	33:22	standards
91:11, 105:22,	snippet	southern	24:10
113:17, 137:10	87:14, 138:18	53:16	standing
sir	solicitous	space	9:20, 31:4,
11:1	30:17	72:20, 100:4,	108:9, 108:13,
sister	solid	104:17	108:19
33:13, 52:6	67:7	speak	stands
sitting	some	133:3	65:14
9:13, 18:17,	6:13, 9:15,	special	star
48:16	14:2, 18:4,	48:17	23:5, 44:14,
situation	20:6, 22:13,	specific	44:15, 61:8,
10:13, 42:20,	24:9, 28:5,	97:18, 99:1,	61:14, 61:18,
47:17, 52:13,	28:7, 29:15,	109:4, 116:10	63:12, 64:2,
52:19, 58:7,	56:21, 63:14,	specifically	64:12, 64:20,
61:7, 63:21,	65:7, 66:21,	41:17, 57:16,	67:1, 81:7,
64:1, 66:14,	91:7, 97:4,	68:22, 74:9,	82:13, 93:10,
73:19, 77:6,	107:20, 108:1,	93:20, 115:17,	94:16, 121:13,
84:17, 94:14,	135:12	123:9	128:22, 130:6
111:1, 127:20,	somebody	speech	starring
133:9	22:2, 63:7,	70:5, 84:7,	33:1
six	84:12, 84:21,	84:10	start
53:17, 53:20	84:22	spend	6:19, 9:14,
sixth	somehow	124:13	19:18, 106:12
54:16	89:17	spends	started
sketch	something	130:14	19:20, 29:3
29:3	8:1, 9:18,	spit	starting
sketching	9:19, 10:8,	31:15	26:15
29:2	16:18, 117:8,	splintered	state
skirted	126:12, 127:17	37:1	65:9, 69:10,
70:14	sometimes	splinters	107:13, 123:16
slammed	11:12, 26:2	37:4	stated
31:20, 32:3	somewhat	springsteen	60:18, 85:20,
slap	80:6	49:17, 49:18,	86:5, 89:21,
31:12	son	50:2	90:4
slapped	101:12	st	statement
25:22, 31:2,	sorry	37:17	21:11, 28:20,
31:11, 31:13	9:17, 19:15,	staircase	29:20, 53:5,
slapping	47:7, 54:6,	33:11	73:11, 78:8,
34:19, 35:18,	83:4, 93:1,	stairs	78:11, 80:19,
37:22	118:7, 118:22	35:3	81:16, 81:17,
slide	sort	stake	95:21, 96:7,
10:10, 44:20,	128:1	50:7, 114:9	96:8
46:4, 57:15,	sought	stand	statements
57:21, 60:15	42:5, 106:21	6:5, 31:3, 75:5	11:19, 12:5,
slides	sound	standard	12:15, 13:2,
20:12, 43:20,	49:20	24:3, 62:15,	13:3, 13:7,
44:2	south	62:21, 94:2,	13:15, 23:19,
	3:20	}, <i></i> ,	
1			
	,		

	Conducted on 1		
38:9, 41:14,	44:4, 130:8	subsection	110:17
75:6, 75:8,	stops	60:18, 109:2	suit
75:9, 75:11,	80:8, 80:12	subsections	12:21, 50:15,
75:12, 75:17,	story	60:5, 60:7	76:3, 96:16,
75:18, 78:8,	123:14	subsequent	96:20, 96:22
81:14, 96:2,	stranger	65:22, 66:2,	suite
101:6, 113:5,	114:8	66:10, 93:13,	3:7, 3:15, 3:20
129:1	strangling	129:16	sum
states	31:21	subsequently	59:10, 107:20
14:22, 45:17,	strategic	138:21, 139:1	sun
48:6, 52:16,	127:6	substance	12:14, 13:11,
64:9, 84:7,	strategically	78:11	13:15, 21:13,
106:12	12:20, 111:2	substantial	38:14, 41:11,
stating	street	46:16, 64:14,	70:18, 75:9,
72:3, 115:2	3:7, 3:20	115:6	76:20, 77:12,
status	strewn	substantively	90:2, 90:9,
98:18	28:3	8:14	91:22, 100:15,
statute	strict	successful	101:8, 104:15,
46:18, 59:17,	43:14	41:22	111:10, 112:14,
59:18, 59:20,	strictly	successive	113:6, 136:9
106:11, 106:14,	30:17	103:14	sun"'ş
106:21, 107:7,	strike	suddenly	76:1
107:9, 107:15,	108:22, 115:9	18:7, 18:18	sun's
108:4, 108:7,	striking	sue	38:9, 39:22
108:9, 108:14,	37:20, 37:21,	43:8, 81:13,	supplement
108:17, 108:21,	92:8, 92:10	82:22, 84:13,	115:8
109:11	subject	136:13	supplemental
statutory	7:9, 23:6,	sued	23:10, 85:3,
108:11, 109:4	55:19, 74:14,	12:13, 13:6,	85:14, 86:15,
stayed	74:21, 74:22,	49:18, 50:12,	91:20, 115:15
30:5	76:7, 76:8,	63:9, 63:11,	supporting
stephens	77:21, 77:22,	95:7, 96:13,	86:9, 102:18,
113:10, 113:12	78:16, 79:22,	101:9, 124:12	141:7
steps	88:3, 97:7,	sues	supports
35:2	101:21, 113:22,	43:11	91:11
stevens	130:4, 131:21,	suffer	supreme
52:22	132:8, 135:10,	12:17, 13:19	23:4, 24:18,
stiffed	135:13	sufficient	43:17, 44:15,
89:6	submissions	20:13, 20:14	45:9, 46:11,
still	111:6	suggested	46:22, 47:20,
17:13, 24:13,	submit	40:3, 87:9,	48:6, 49:1,
32:13, 51:13,	56:10, 95:12	93:12, 100:11	61:10, 61:12,
51:16, 61:9,	submits	suggesting	61:17, 64:7,
61:13, 64:3,	98:15	65:13	64:8, 64:11,
105:7, 120:3	submitted	suggestion	65:18, 67:4,
stood	111:4	133:20	68:22, 71:4,
35:5	submitting	suing	72:12, 72:13,
stop	56:9	80:9, 82:4,	74:4, 74:5,
33:14, 42:13,		· '	
Land to the second seco	5-A-5-AST/AST/AST/AS-3	1. 2.5703 (10.500)	

_	Conducted on J	ury 22, 2021	
74:9, 81:6,	138:8	ten	theories
81:7, 86:1,	taken	75:22, 76:1	87:4, 103:18
91:14, 91:17,	15:4, 58:2,	terms	theory
92:19, 93:4,	58:19, 58:21,	92:18	102:16
98:16, 99:19,	122:16, 140:4	terrifying	therefore
99:21, 102:11,	takes	33:6	114:11
102:16, 102:22,	24:4, 66:21,	territory	thereof
103:21, 121:15,	66:22	74:8	97:12
128:21, 129:4,	taking	testified	thing
129:22, 130:11,	_		, -
131:13, 135:8,	25:9, 40:18, 129:7	28:2, 117:4,	15:11, 24:22,
137:15	talk	122:18	47:11, 51:10,
sure		testify	82:16, 84:1,
	23:5, 44:21,	41:11, 41:12,	116:13, 117:12,
7:12, 9:6,	48:1, 51:5,	42:22, 43:9,	118:15, 121:3,
26:20, 27:9,	65:12, 133:7,	43:12, 70:1,	122:20, 126:8,
120:1, 128:19,	134:10	90:20, 122:13,	127:14, 135:2
131:10, 138:6	talked	135:21	things
surely	24:7, 74:5,	testifying	15:3, 45:18,
20:3	121:13	53:11, 78:14	134:9
surprised	talking	testimony	think
92:9	38:14, 48:2,	18:2, 29:4,	7:2, 8:2,
surrounding	63:6, 63:14,	41:13, 42:22,	12:11, 23:16,
33:20	70:19, 75:10,	56:12, 58:10,	24:4, 24:6,
sustain	130:12, 130:19,	75:4, 83:3,	25:1, 25:14,
118:2	131:4, 131:9	88:15, 88:19	30:9, 34:9,
swiss	talks	tests	40:8, 46:5,
53:19	121:14, 121:15	134:6	46:9, 46:10,
swollen	task	text	49:13, 53:12,
32:6	22:6	22:7, 26:12,	57:6, 62:9,
sword	tattoo	28:8, 29:5	62:11, 62:12,
56:20	25:20	texts	69:18, 70:12,
sworn	taught	22:1, 28:6,	74:2, 78:18,
6:5, 6:7	92:14	79:17, 121:9	80:6, 82:20,
symmetry	team	th	84:12, 84:13,
64:15, 64:16	18:12, 18:19,	37:7, 115:1,	84:14, 85:2,
system	19:10, 19:13,	138:3	98:8, 114:5,
46:16, 48:11,	21:21, 51:7,	thank	118:18, 119:8,
48:15, 54:10,	71:18, 127:6	6:8, 6:21, 9:4,	119:11, 122:11,
99:4	telephone	9:8, 10:5,	134:3, 134:4,
T	32:3	10:20, 11:4,	134:7, 137:2,
table	tell	54:6, 85:6,	138:12
31:17	106:17, 125:6	85:7, 116:2,	third'
take	tellingly	116:4, 118:14,	54:9, 96:5,
10:1, 11:13,	102:17, 105:11	137:19, 138:9,	114:17
12:9, 25:7,	tells	139:5, 139:6,	third-party
54:2, 64:6,	44:3	139:8	20:17
137:20, 137:22,	temporary	theme	thirteenth
101.20, 101.22,	59:4, 76:2	26:4	3:7
			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Conducted on July 22, 2021				
thoroughly	thursday	114:19, 124:18	transcript	
50:16	1:14	took	127:18, 141:4	
thought	time	25:15, 87:21,	transport	
25:21, 55:4	16:5, 17:5,	112:10, 124:1	66:20	
three	17:13, 18:18,	tools	treatment	
34:17, 69:12,	22:12, 28:5,	13:22, 14:3	73:2, 100:6	
87:12, 98:7,	42:6, 42:17,	top	trial	
111:16, 116:22,	43:9, 43:21,	33:2, 35:2,	14:13, 14:16,	
138:2	69:20, 71:18,	36:19	14:20, 15:3,	
three-day	71:22, 72:19,	tore	15:17, 17:3,	
31:10	72:21, 80:6,	31:19, 58:15	17:5, 17:9,	
three-week	80:13, 83:1,	torment	17:11, 18:7,	
70:6	85:4, 100:4,	30:14	19:19, 19:20,	
threshold	104:17, 116:12,	tort	20:5, 20:7,	
89:20, 106:20,	117:2, 119:19,	53:6, 68:2	20:18, 21:21,	
107:7, 108:20	121:22, 128:18,	totality	36:9, 38:16,	
threw	130:15	133:6	40:11, 40:15,	
28:15, 31:15,	time's	totally	40:16, 41:21,	
31:17, 37:8,	134:9	95:19	44:6, 48:7,	
37:19	timed	touch	48:8, 49:8,	
throat	58:22	123:6	61:18, 70:7,	
34:3, 35:15	times	touched	73:2, 79:13,	
through	13:18, 30:11,	99:17	79:15, 100:5,	
11:14, 12:9,	30:12, 31:14,	tough	120:8	
	33:3, 34:12,	. ~	tribunal	
12:12, 19:6, 21:17, 22:3,	51:6, 76:1,	63:9	50:16, 52:2,	
25:8, 25:9,	82:8, 82:21,	toward	56:1, 56:7	
25:18, 27:5,	84:18, 93:11,	30:10	tribunal's	
31:17, 34:20,	103:9	towards	55:15	
43:21, 44:6,	title	28:9, 124:10	tried	
44:12, 45:20,	78:6, 111:18	toxic	22:1, 31:3,	
57:14, 57:18,	today	97:19	33:13, 49:3,	
58:12, 59:22,	9:10, 21:19,	traditionally	122:1	
65:7, 65:8,	23:11, 39:15,	17:6	tries	
73:22, 89:14,	65:15, 86:4,	train	120:17	
94:20, 116:18,	86:18, 87:5,	34:1	true	
116:21, 117:14,	89:17, 92:12,	transaction	11:21, 13:2,	
118:3, 118:10,	92:22, 93:11,	70:11, 70:20,	13:5, 13:15,	
118:12, 119:17,	96:11, 98:8,	72:10, 76:6,	17:17, 23:19,	
120:11, 123:15,	106:4, 112:17,	99:18, 100:2,	34:5, 35:7,	
128:5, 130:18	122:8, 131:10	101:1, 101:18,	39:4, 39:5,	
throughout	together	101:22, 102:8,	39:12, 39:18,	
45:17, 65:9,	10:4	102:13, 103:6	43:14, 47:4,	
86:18	tokyo	transactions	53:5, 55:14,	
throwing	30:21, 31:1	104:22, 134:15	69:19, 71:2,	
27:21	told	transcribed	75:21, 76:9,	
thrown	8:12, 8:13,	1:22, 141:6	76:10, 76:11,	
38:5	19:14, 19:18,	transcriber	76:14, 80:7,	
1	·	141:1		
			,	
L		and the first with a solution state of the second	<u> </u>	

	Conducted on 5		I
82:4, 82:6,	uk's	106:9, 107:13,	91:13, 93:11,
135:13, 135:16,	108:4	107:14	105:15
136:1, 141:4	ultimately	unique	vacillated
truth	10:13, 52:15,	9:18, 14:4	30:10
98:21, 100:16,	89:4	uniquely	valid
117:18, 132:12,	unable	113:20	66:5, 108:22,
136:7	122:7	unit	109:1
try	unaffected	73:2, 100:5,	value
11:13, 25:8,	72:5	100:6	88:18
30:3, 42:12,	unavailing	united	van
91:9, 92:16	97:16	12:20, 14:21,	117:13
trying	unclear	45:17, 48:6,	various
17:14, 62:6,	16:11	52:15, 64:9,	104:3
62:20, 133:20	under	84:7	vasquez
tubbs	7:15, 24:17,	unlike	3:4, 7:7,
2:6, 140:3,	37:1, 48:11,	95:17, 100:19,	85:11, 86:8,
140:16	48:16, 52:3,	101:14, 103:15,	109:15
tube	59:6, 59:10,	104:4	vast
101:11	60:3, 63:19,	unopened	115:5
turn	67:8, 67:9,	31:16	vastly
18:19, 62:18,	87:1, 87:4,	unpublished	111:1
138:22	89:2, 100:21,	102:3	vector
turned	106:14, 106:17,	unquote	105:17
22:6, 115:2,	108:17, 108:20,	86:22, 94:4,	venue
121:1	109:1, 109:10,	94:15, 106:19,	12:22, 56:2,
twice	109:22, 128:4,	108:2, 112:5	89:18
16:15	137:21, 137:22	untrue	veracity
two	underlying	90:15	73:10
10:18, 14:6,	72:19, 73:1,	unusual	verbatim
35:11, 36:8,	99:4, 100:9,	10:8	42:2, 75:2,
38:17, 39:9,	115:19, 123:11	upholding	75:21
40:9, 43:20,	undermines	22:17	verdict
44:2, 50:6,	114:7	upset	20:1, 40:17,
56:16, 58:8,	understand	29:22	41:5, 42:1,
72:19, 73:1,	27:10, 118:1	upstairs	73:16, 90:4,
74:3, 83:18,	understanding	34:22, 35:15	93:13
90:22, 92:3,	100:7	usage	verdicts
95:15, 99:10,	undetermined	100:8	20:2
100:1, 101:19,	124:8	use	verifying
103:14, 105:12,	undisputed	15:7, 22:11,	18:11
106:2, 108:15,	54:13, 55:18,	26:5, 56:19,	version
112:6, 113:20,	55:22, 87:7,	60:2, 64:10	90:14
121:5	109:7	uses	versus
two-year	unhappy	47:20	47:21, 75:9,
42:9	125:8	using	91:13, 95:5,
type	uniform	18:13	97:15, 99:22,
49:11	11:8, 59:6,	v	101:11, 103:19,
<u> </u>	59:18, 59:19,	va	113:10, 114:6
uh-huh		3:16, 3:21,	
83:6			
İ	<u> </u>		

	,	1	
vetting	65:18, 66:17,	waiting	19:13, 32:21,
111:11	67:3, 67:4,	90:22	34:16, 49:4,
vexation	67:5, 68:1,	wall	63:5, 63:6,
71:7	68:6, 68:16,	26:10, 26:11,	65:13, 65:14,
vexatious	68:17, 68:20,	28:1, 32:4,	71:10, 73:5,
130:8	69:1, 69:8,	34:3, 67:7	73:6, 75:10,
victim	69:10, 71:4,	want	75:15, 128:6,
53:11, 79:21,	72:5, 72:12,	6:19, 21:6,	128:9, 128:10,
126:3, 133:22	74:4, 74:5,	27:4, 27:9,	128:11, 131:4,
view	74:9, 81:7,	28:22, 62:22,	134:22
ľ	86:1, 86:9,	64:6, 116:9,	weakest
55:1, 102:12,	86:14, 87:2,	116:13, 121:18,	70:12
129:7	87:16, 88:11,	123:21, 131:17,	week
vindicate	88:14, 89:11,	132:18, 133:4,	19:19, 49:7,
89:18	90:11, 90:13,	133:5, 133:7,	115:20, 116:2
vindication	91:13, 91:14,		weeks
19:22, 40:1,	92:19, 93:8,	133:9, 133:12,	138:2
40:2, 40:5,	96:12, 97:16,	134:8, 137:20 wanted	
40:6, 41:1,	99:19, 102:15,	•	weight
41:4, 41:6,	102:18, 103:12,	9:22, 10:17,	37:2
41:21, 42:9,	105:12, 105:13,	19:20, 20:5,	well-reasoned
42:12, 42:14,	105:12, 105:13,	20:9, 26:20,	42:8, 49:9,
51:2, 56:3,	109:22, 110:10,	56:10, 56:14,	51:1, 70:7,
70:8, 73:15,	118:20, 119:5,	82:2, 113:9,	121:19, 123:4
90:3, 121:20,	128:21, 129:3,	122:5, 122:6,	went
121:21, 136:22	129:22, 130:10,	132:19, 133:15,	18:9, 21:5,
violence	131:13, 135:8,	133:16, 136:20,	21:14, 24:7,
11:22, 13:10,	136:13, 137:15,	136:22	57:14, 57:18,
13:11, 13:17,	140:17	warrant	58:12, 59:3,
22:13, 23:21,	virginia's	73:10	63:21, 75:22,
24:21, 25:3,	1 -	warranted	121:7, 132:1
43:10, 51:9,	46:13, 93:4,	130:9	weren't
53:9, 72:15,	99:21, 102:22,	washington	20:7
76:2, 76:4,	106:9	3:8, 12:5,	western
78:15, 82:8,	visitation	13:8, 43:8,	96:12
133:22, 135:18,	46:13, 47:3,	80:9, 90:14	whatever .
136:5	47:9, 47:19,	wass	6:19, 41:21
violently	105:16	29:7, 29:8,	whatsoever
37:21	visited	132:17	15:6, 49:11,
virginia	30:2	way	92:11, 112:17
1:13, 23:3,	vs	15:8, 67:3,	whenever
24:18, 40:16,	51:21, 96:10,	84:8, 100:10,	81:11
42:2, 43:17,	104:4, 104:16,	129:5, 130:20,	whereas
44:14, 45:16,	105:15, 105:17	131:10, 136:2	91:16, 106:1
46:2, 46:11,	vsb	we'll	whereof
46:22, 47:15,	95:5	10:1, 10:4,	140:10
47:20, 49:12,	W	73:7, 138:7	whether
59:7, 61:12,	wait	we're	24:12, 24:15,
61:17, 64:6,	18:12, 111:2	11:17, 18:7,	25:11, 39:17,
	<u> </u>		
]
L	The state of the content of the state of the	# 1000 CH IN 1000 C C 15 45 150	The second of th

43:6, 44:4, 50:20, 113:20, 113:20, 44:5, 46:1, 116:2, 138:2 34:12 wrapped 0 55:4, 55:14, 75:3, 78:14, 34:9 wrestled 1:6 74:14, 74:18, 75:17, 6:17, 16:20, 75:20, 75:21, 19:1, 19:2, 10:17, 32:18 restled 109:2 76:13, 78:1, 21:11, 28:2, 28:20, 29:20, 46:17 restled 109:12 restled 100:10 restled
48:6, 51:8, without wrapped 0 55:4, 55:14, 75:3, 78:14, 34:9 0002911 66:14, 71:1, 136:2 wrestled 1:6 74:14, 74:18, witness 91:3 01 74:19, 75:17, 6:17, 16:20, write 109:2 75:20, 75:21, 19:1, 19:2, 10:17, 32:18 07 76:13, 78:1, 21:11, 28:2, writs 109:12 78:15, 86:21, 28:20, 29:20, 46:17 109:12 90:6, 100:1, 41:12, 41:14, written 1 100:3, 100:5, 42:17, 43:2, 32:22, 90:1 139:10 102:6, 103:20, 57:1, 75:4, 94:20, 106:16, 139:10 102:6, 103:20, 57:1, 75:4, 94:20, 106:16, 10 125:11, 126:10, 75:5, 90:20, 119:8, 121:2 5:13, 39:6, 128:16, 133:20, 140:10 112:2, 119:21 5:13, 39:6, 135:7, 135:15 witnessed 112:2, 119:21 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
55:4, 55:14, 66:14, 71:1, 74:14, 74:18, 74:19, 75:17, 76:13, 78:1, 78:15, 86:21, 90:6, 100:1, 100:3, 100:5, 100:6, 101:16, 125:11, 126:10, 125:11, 126:14, 128:16, 133:20, 138:19 100002911 1:6 01 1:6 01 109:2 07 109:2 07 109:12 109:12 11 109:12 11 109:12 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
66:14, 71:1, 74:18, 74:18, witness 91:3 91:3 91:3 91:3 91:3 91:3 91:3 91:3
66:14, 71:1, 74:14, 74:18, witness 74:19, 75:17, 75:20, 75:21, 76:13, 78:1, 78:15, 86:21, 90:6, 100:1, 100:3, 100:5, 102:6, 103:20, 125:11, 126:10, 125:11, 126:14, 128:16, 133:20, 138:19 136:2 witness 91:3 write 109:2 07 109:12 119:11 110 120:11 120:11 120:11 120:11 120:11 120:12 121:12 121:12 122:11 122:11 122:11 122:11 123:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
74:14, 74:18, 74:19, 75:17, 75:20, 75:21, 76:13, 78:1, 78:15, 86:21, 90:6, 100:1, 100:3, 100:5, 102:6, 103:20, 125:11, 126:10, 125:11, 126:14, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 191:3 write 109:2 07 109:2 07 109:12 46:17 written 32:22, 90:1 wrong 94:20, 106:16, 119:8, 121:2 wrote 112:2, 119:21 109:12 109:12 109:12 1139:10 109:12 1139:10 109:12 1139:10 109:12 1139:10 10 10 1139:10 1139:10 10 10 1139:10 113
74:19, 75:17, 75:20, 75:21, 76:13, 78:1, 78:15, 86:21, 90:6, 100:1, 100:3, 100:5, 100:6, 101:16, 102:6, 103:20, 125:11, 126:10, 125:11, 126:14, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 16:17, 16:20, 19:1, 19:2, 10:17, 32:18 writs 46:17 written 32:22, 90:1 wrong 94:20, 106:16, 19:8, 121:2 wrote 112:2, 119:21 109:2 07 109:12 1139:10 10 139:10 10 115, 3:20, 5:13, 39:6, 82:17, 83:2, 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
75:20, 75:21, 76:13, 78:1, 78:15, 86:21, 90:6, 100:1, 100:3, 100:5, 100:6, 101:16, 102:6, 103:20, 125:11, 126:10, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 19:1, 19:2, 21:11, 28:2, 28:20, 29:20, 46:17 written 32:22, 90:1 wrong 94:20, 106:16, 119:8, 121:2 wrote 112:2, 119:21 witnessed 90:21 witnesses 100:17, 32:18 writs 109:12 109:12 11 11 109:12 11 109:12 11 109:12 120:17, 43:2, 139:10 10 1:15, 3:20, 5:13, 39:6, 82:17, 83:2, 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
76:13, 78:1, 78:15, 86:21, 90:6, 100:1, 100:3, 100:5, 100:6, 101:16, 102:6, 103:20, 125:11, 126:10, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 121:11, 28:2, 28:20, 29:20, 46:17 written 32:22, 90:1 wrong 94:20, 106:16, 119:8, 121:2 wrote 112:2, 119:21 yanking 109:12 1 1 139:10 10 1:15, 3:20, 5:13, 39:6, 82:17, 83:2, 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
78:15, 86:21, 90:6, 100:1, 100:3, 100:5, 100:6, 101:16, 125:11, 126:10, 126:11, 126:14, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 28:20, 29:20, 41:12, 41:14, 42:17, 43:2, 43:3, 56:9, 57:1, 75:4, 122:5, 136:3, 140:10 139:10 10 139:10 10 119:8, 121:2 wrote 112:2, 119:21 139:10 10 1:15, 3:20, 5:13, 39:6, 82:17, 83:2, 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
100:6, 100:1, 41:12, 41:14, written 32:22, 90:1 139:10 10:6, 103:20, 57:1, 75:4, 125:11, 126:10, 122:5, 136:3, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 127:17, 138:19 witnesses witnesse
100:3, 10
102:6, 103:20, 57:1, 75:4, 75:5, 90:20, 126:11, 126:14, 122:5, 136:3, 140:10
102:0, 103:20, 125:11, 126:10, 126:11, 126:14, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 127:17, 138:19 17:17, 138:19 18:20, 106:16, 119:8, 121:2 wrote 112:2, 119:21 11:15, 3:20, 5:13, 39:6, 82:17, 83:2, 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
125:11, 126:10, 75:5, 90:20, 119:8, 121:2 5:13, 39:6, 128:16, 133:20, 140:10 witnessed 127:17, 138:19 witnesses yanking 124:5, 124:6
126:11, 126:14, 128:16, 133:20, 135:7, 135:15 white 122:5, 136:3, 140:10 witnessed 90:21 yanking wrote 112:2, 119:21 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
135:7, 135:15 witnessed 90:21 127:17, 138:19 witnesses yanking 112:2, 119:21 107:11, 132:14 100,000 124:5, 124:6
135:7, 135:15 witnessed Y 100,000 127:17, 138:19 witnesses Y 124:5, 124:6
white 90:21 yanking 124:5, 124:6
1 //: /: 30: 3 WITHESSES
127.22
whoever 17:1, 56:14, yeah 37:22
140:0, 51:2
Whole (136:10
44:16, 45:20, woman
67:17, 123:14 133:21 Year 116:18, 118:3,
wife won 15:17, 118:11, 118:12,
11:20, 12:16, 84:11, 84:16, 16:6, 17:7, 91:2 120:11, 137:21
88:2, 135:16 131:7 years 11260
wife-beater woods 14:6, 74:3, 3:15
143:10, /5:22, 13:19 12-9
80:11, 80:19, wootton yelling 31:4
81:3, 81:21, 12:14, 21:13,
82:1, 82:5, 41:11 yesterday 5:4, 5:5, 5:6,
83:8, 83:9, word 59:13, 109:12 5:7, 5:8, 5:9, vork 5:10, 5:11.
103:11, 03:14, 120:11, 129:9
83:16, 101:7 words 51:22, 53:17, 5:12, 5:13, 5:14
wildly 13:3, 23:3, 59:19, 109:14, 12
30:10, 109:21 23:15, 44:11, 109:22 12:1, 13:18, 24:20, 25:6.
82:12, 82:13
WOLK TOWNSOLE TO SEE TO
13:9, /8:18
World 116.21 117.14
win 80:15, 81:2, 22 116:21, 117:14, 118:2, 136:5
83:13, 133:10, 2013
WINDOW 136:10 125:3 13:14 17:22
S1.10 WOLII 50.21
\\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
17:7, 19:19, wouldn't 125:4
92:5, 92:6

	- Conducted on a	, • · ·	
13	1979	15:16, 15:19,	40
12:13, 32:20,	109:14	15:22, 16:2,	126:16
99:6, 115:9	1995	16:4, 17:2, 17:9	41
1319	53:17	20190	21:17
3:21	1998	3:16	42
14	53:1	202	126:17
25:2, 25:4,	1999	3:9	465.13
33:18, 40:21,	101:12	2020	59:8, 60:6,
73:6, 99:6,	1:6	13:12, 17:2,	106:17, 107:5,
106:13, 120:20,	71:13, 99:20	17:10, 22:14,	107:11, 109:2
127:3	1:6(d	122:12, 127:19	5
1400	71:21	2021	
3:20		1:14, 22:16,	50
141	2	23:2, 59:1,	123:16
1:21	20	140:12, 141:17	536
144	59:2, 138:3	2023	3:9
	2000	58:19	56
100:8	61:6		1:15
149	20005	21	561
93:11	3:8	37:6, 37:17,	17:22
15	2004	59:2, 117:4	576
35:10, 36:1,	91:13	22	79:6
36:8, 36:11,	2007	1:14, 140:11	585
37:3, 58:7,	69:10	221	13:14, 50:21
116:6	201	105:15	6
16	3:15	23	
14:6, 16:12,	2010	141:17	600
20:15, 22:14,	105:19	24011	3:7
38:3, 58:2,	2013	3:21	601
59:1, 59:2,	25:20, 26:8,	25	3:7
116:21, 117:8,	27:20	16:4, 21:17,	618
120:20	2014	22:16	105:15
17		2503	7
117:14, 118:3,	28:13, 29:13,	39:7	70,000
118:4, 118:5,	30:2	267	22:1, 121:9
123:7, 127:15,	2015	91:13	72
127:18, 127:21,	30:22, 31:7,	28	18:1
138:10, 139:10	33:9, 34:1,	115:1	8
1700	34:16, 58:8,	29	
3:9	76:4	86:6	8.01
172	2016	3	59:8, 60:6,
101:12, 103:10	37:18, 59:2,		106:17, 107:5,
18	72:15, 76:5,	30	107:11
127:19	117:4	37:7	82
19	2017	32	93:11
54:19	71:5, 72:12	44:20	85
1927	2018	388256	4:4
93:11	12:13	1:20	
1971	2019	4	
64:12	1:6, 13:6,	4	
(7.12		109:12	