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morning.
Please be seated.
THE CLERK: Calling from the Part 59 calendar, calendar number 1 and 2, SMZ 71762 of ' 24 and SMZ 71764 of '24. Donald Trump.

Appearances.
MR. STEINGLASS: For the People, ADAs Joshua Steinglass, Becky Mangold, Susan Hoffinger, Christopher Conroy, Matthew Colangelo and Katherine Ellis.

MR. BLANCHE: Good morning. I am Todd Blanche. And I am joined by Emil Bove, Susan Necheles and Kendra Wharton.

Good morning.
THE COURT: Good morning.
We have a couple of housekeeping matters first.
I know that both sides wanted to work something out
with the sound system.
It's my understanding that that is going to be worked out?

There is a plan in place?
MR. STEINGLASS: I believe so. Yes, Judge.
MR. BLANCHE: Yes. I think we're working it out, and we will try to be as efficient as we can and make it as smooth as possible.

THE COURT: The second issue.
At the start of the trial, Mr. Blanche, you had requested two days for high school graduations, one for Mr. Trump and one for a colleague.

Can you tell me what those days were?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor.
(Counsel confer.)
MR. BLANCHE: May 17 th and June 3rd.
THE COURT: All right. We got through the jury selection really quickly, I think we are ahead of schedule and I think we have been moving well ahead since, so I don't think that the May 17 th date is a problem.

So Mr. Trump can certainly attend that date -attend his son's graduation.

June 3rd, it's really up to you. I think, at that point, the jury might be deliberating. It could be a challenge.

MS. NECHELES: I understand, your Honor. And, of course, if they are deliberating --

THE COURT: And if they are not deliberating, I think that that will be fine as well.

MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
THE COURT: I believe the clerk of the court called the SMZs into the record.

Let the record reflect that I'm about to hand down
the Court's decisions on the hearing that we had for contempt, on SMZ-71762 of ' 24 , which covered Counts 1 through 3.

The Court finds that the People have met their burden of proof and demonstrated contempt as to the second and third incident, but not as to the first.

Mr. Trump is fined a thousand dollars on each of those two.

As to SMZ-71764 of ' 24 , covering incidents 4 through 10, the Court finds the People have met their burden as to all of those.

And the Court imposes a punishment of $\$ 1,000$ on each of those six.

I am handing down written decision copies for both sides.

The details of the decision are in the written decision.
(Handed.)
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anything else that I need to go over before we get back to the witness?

MR. STEINGLASS: There are a few matters, Judge, but I don't think that they necessarily have to be discussed before the witness.

THE COURT: Okay.


MS. MANGOLD: Thank you, your Honor.

CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. MANGOLD:
Q Good morning, Mr. Farro.
A Good morning.
Q Welcome back.
A Thank you.
Q So before we adjourned on Friday, I think you were talking to the jury about a call from Michael Cohen that you
received on October 26 th, 2016 ; is that right?

A That's correct.
Q And you testified that he was -- he had called to open
a new bank account for an entity called Essential Consultants
LLC; right?

A That's correct.
Q And we discussed a form that you called a KYC form?
A Yes.
Q I think you explained it stands for "Know Your
Customer?"
A Yes.
Q And is that an account opening document required by
First Republic Bank?
A Yes, it is.
Q Is that the only document that a client is required to

```
submit to open a new bank account?
    A No. They need to provide a master signature card,
which shows who the signers are on the account, as well as the
documentation to support, if it's a business account.
    In this case, it was a LLC account, so they have to provide
us with the LLC documentation as well.
    Q Can you remind everyone again what "LLC" stands for?
    A Limited Liability Company.
                            MS. MANGOLD: Can we display People's Exhibit 371,
    which is already in evidence.
        (Displayed.)
            THE COURT: For everyone; right?
            MS. MANGOLD: For everybody, yes.
            Q Can you see that on your screen, Mr. Farro?
            A Yes, I can.
            Q Is this a First Republic Bank email?
            A Yes.
            Q A series of emails?
            A Yes, it is.
            Q Could we focus on the top two emails in the chain,
please?
    A Certainly.
    Q Now, looking at the middle email. Who is that from?
    A That's from Elizabeth Rappaport, who was my assistant.
    Q Your assistant?
```



```
opening documents for Essential Consultants LLC?
    A Yes. This is what I referenced prior.
        MS. MANGOLD: And can we turn now to Page 3 of the
    PDF.
        (Displayed.)
    Q Focus on the top half of the page.
    What is this document?
    A This is the business signature card. This determines
who has the ability to sign on the account.
    Q And it also contains an agreement to open accounts?
    A Yes, it does.
    Q What entity is this for?
    A Essential Consultants LLC.
    Q And if you look at the bottom of the box that we are
looking at, in the lower-most row, where it says "Type of
Business," what type of business is listed?
    A Consulting.
    Q And is that business type something that's provided by
the client in this case?
    A Yes, it is.
    Q And that's Mr. Cohen here?
    A Yes. We asked for the purpose of the account and that
was the answer.
    Q Was the purpose for the account given in this form
consistent with what Mr. Cohen told you on the phone call
```

|  | Page 1585 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | earlier that day? |
| 2 | A Yes, it is. |
| 3 | Q And is it consistent with the purpose of the account |
| 4 | stated in the Know Your Customer form that we looked at on |
| 5 | Friday? |
| 6 | A Yes, it is. |
| 7 | Q And if we scroll down a little bit to the middle |
| 8 | portion of the page. Who is listed as the authorized signers |
| 9 | for the account? |
| 10 | A Michael Cohen. |
| 11 | Q And any other authorized signers? |
| 12 | A No, there is not. |
| 13 | Q All right. |
| 14 | MS. MANGOLD: Can we turn to Page 4 of the PDF. |
| 15 | (Displayed.) |
| 16 | Q Is this another part of the same document that we just |
| 17 | looked at? |
| 18 | A Yes. This is the signature page of that document. |
| 19 | Q Do you recognize the signature near the bottom of the |
| 20 | page? |
| 21 | A Yes. It's Michael Cohen's. |
| 22 | Q And what's the date of that? |
| 23 | A $10 / 26 / 16$. |
| 24 25 | Q And looking now at the box at the bottom of the page, is there an account number provided? |


| Page 1586 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A | Yes, there is. |
| 2 | Q | And what are the last four digits of the account |
| 3 | number? |  |
| 4 | A | 1897. |
| 5 | Q | And in the right-most column it says "open by." Who is |
| 6 | listed th | ere? |
| 7 | A | DeWitt Hutchins. |
| 8 |  | MS. MANGOLD: If we could flip to the following |
| 9 | page, | Page 5 of the PDF. |
| 10 |  | (Displayed.) |
| 11 | Q | Do you recognize this document? |
| 12 | A | Yes. |
| 13 | Q | What is this? |
| 14 | A | This is an addendum to the signature card. This kind |
| 15 | of gives | the information on the authorized signer. |
| 16 | Q | And this is another required document to open a bank |
| 17 | account? |  |
| 18 | A | Yes, it is. |
| 19 | Q | What is the account name listed at the top? |
| 20 | A | Essential Consultants LLC. |
| 21 | Q | And do you see a signature at the bottom? |
| 22 | A | Yes. Michael Cohen's. |
| 23 | Q | And what's the date? |
| 24 | A | 10/26/16. |
| 25 | Q | All right. Now, flipping through the last few pages of |

the PDF.
Are Pages 6 through 9 of the PDF -- well, what are these
documents?

A These are the opening of a LLC's accounts as well as the tax ID number provided by the Internal Revenue Service.

Q Are these documents generated at First Republic Bank or provided by the client?

A No, they are provided by the client. They are generated by the IRS.

Q And turning now to Page 6 of the PDF.
What is this?
(Displayed.)
A This is -- the account was opened in Delaware, as most LLCs are that $I$ do business with.

And it's a Certificate of Formation of Essential Consultants.

Q And what is the date and time that Essential Consultants was formed?

A October 17th, 2016 at 10:21 a.m.
Q And just for -- in the interest of clarity, is this provided by the IRS or some other entity?

A My understanding is it's provided by -- the tax ID is provided by the IRS. And this is provided by the State of Delaware.

MS. MANGOLD: If we could flip to Page 7 of the

```
                                    Page 1588
PDF please.
(Displayed.)
Q What is this?
A This is the State of Delaware's Limited Liability Company formation doc, and it shows Michael Cohen as the authorized person.
MS. MANGOLD: And then, finally, flipping to -- if we can flip through Page 8 to Page 9 of the PDF; and focusing on the bottom of the page. (Displayed.)
Q Is this the document that you referenced earlier was issued by the IRS?
A Yes.
Q And this has an Employer Identification Number?
A Yes.
Q What is that?
A It's essentially -- to equate it to something, it's like the Social Security number for businesses. It's a tax ID for businesses.
Q All right.
MS. MANGOLD: Can we take that down.
Now can we display to everyone what is admitted in
evidence as People's 370.
(Displayed.)
Q Is this another set of First Republic Bank emails?
```



A That's correct.
Q What's the date stamp of this email?
A Oh, the date, excuse me, October 26 th, 2016.
Q I'm sorry, the time stamp of the email?
A Okay. 2:35 p.m.
Q So about how long did it take to open the account
between the time that Mr . Cohen called you and the time that
Mr. Hutchins confirmed that the account was opened?

A Five to six hours or so.
Q Did Mr. Cohen indicate that opening this account was urgent when he called you?

A Yes. Michael Cohen -- everything was urgent with Michael Cohen.

Q So why did it take five or six hours to open the account?

A Michael Cohen's not our only client, so we do have other things that take precedence. Moving in and opening an account in a singular day is considered very quick.

Q Is that because there is some processes that the bank needs to undertake in order for the account to be opened?

A Absolutely.
Q And does that require certain checks by the back office, is -- I think you called it?

A Correct. As well as data entry, getting the paperwork back, et cetera.

```
    Q So we've now looked at the account opening documents
for Essential Consultants in some detail; right?
    A Yes.
    Q Probably more detail than anybody wanted.
    A (Laughter.)
    Q Did any of the account opening paperwork indicate the
account would be used to make a payment on behalf of a political
candidate?
    A No.
    Q Would the bank's process for opening the account be
different if Mr. Cohen had indicated the account would be used
to make a payment on behalf of a political candidate?
    A There would be additional scrutiny.
    Q And what do you mean by that?
    A It would reach the second line of defense.
    Q Would that have delayed the opening of the account?
    A Quite possibly.
    Q Is it possible that the account wouldn't have been
opened at all?
    A It's possible.
    Q Did any of the account opening paperwork indicate that
the account would be used to buy the rights to a media story?
    A No.
    Q Would the bank's process for opening the account be
different if Mr. Cohen had indicated that the account would be
```

```
used to buy the rights to a media story?
    A Not necessarily, but we would certainly ask additional
questions.
    Q Was that consistent with the stated purpose of the
account on the phone call to you, that it was for real estate?
    A That would not be consistent with what it was, and
that's why we would ask additional questions.
    Q Did any of the account opening paperwork indicate the
account would be used to pay an adult film star?
    A No.
    Q Would the bank's process for opening the account be
different if Mr. Cohen had indicated that the account would be
used to pay an adult film star?
    A Absolutely.
    Q How would it be different?
    A Well, we would certainly ask additional questions.
It's not our money to determine where it goes; however, it is an
industry that we do not work with, so there would be a
determination made by the second and third line of defense if it
was something that we would move forward on.
    Q And that would have delayed opening the account?
    A That would certainly have delayed it.
    Q And is it possible that the account wouldn't have been
opened at all?
    A Yes, it is.
```




|  | Page 1595 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A Yes, it is. |
| 2 | Q -- that you discussed with us earlier? |
| 3 | A Yes, it is. |
| 4 | Q And when you say "home equity line of credit," is that |
| 5 | also referred to as a HELOC? |
| 6 | A Yes, it is. |
| 7 | Q What is a HELOC? |
| 8 | A A home equity line of credit is a revolving mortgage |
| 9 | that's put on your home. |
| 10 | What I mean by "revolving" is essentially you can pay down |
| 11 | on it at any time and repay it and then draw down on it again. |
| 12 | It could be considered as a credit card, with your home as |
| 13 | collateral. That's another good way to explain it. |
| 14 | Q Is it fair to say that it's mostly like a second |
| 15 | mortgage? |
| 16 | A It is a second mortgage, but it can be put in first |
| 17 | position as well. For clarification purposes, it is a mortgage |
| 18 | that you are allowed to draw upon. |
| 19 | Q And, in this case, do you know if it was a second |
| 20 | mortgage? |
| 21 | A It was a second mortgage in this scenario, yes. |
| 22 | Q Can you explain what's going on in this email? |
| 23 | A Sure. Obviously, a conversation was -- had taken place |
|  | between Elizabeth and Michael where he had asked to drawdown on |
| 25 | his home equity line of credit to fund the account at Essential |


|  | Page 1596 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Consulta | nts. |
| 2 | Q | What's the next email in the chain? |
| 3 | A | It says "Confirmed." |
| 4 | Q | Is that sent by Michael Cohen? |
| 5 | A | That was sent by Michael Cohen to Lizzie. |
| 6 | Q | And how long after the first email was that sent? |
| 7 | A | One minute. |
| 8 |  | MS. MANGOLD: Can we look at the top email in the |
| 9 | cha | in. |
| 10 | Q | Who is this email to and from? |
| 11 | A | This is from Elizabeth Rappaport to our Client Service |
| 12 | Group. |  |
| 13 | Q | And what is the date and time stamp of the top email? |
| 14 | A | This is 10/26/2016, 11:56 a.m. |
| 15 | Q | And can you explain, again, to the jury how the time |
| 16 | stamps w | Work in the First Republic email? |
| 17 | A | Yes. The very top, when you are pulling the email |
| 18 | system, | is in Pacific Time. Everything below it is stuck in |
| 19 | Eastern | Standard Time. |
| 20 | Q | And does this also have an importance designation? |
| 21 | A | Yes, it does. |
| 22 | Q | And what is it? |
| 23 | A | "High." |
| 24 | Q | Can you read this email to the jury? |
| 25 | A | "Please transfer \$131,000 from HELOC account ending in |



| 1 | transfer out using that account -- Page 1598 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 2 | A | That's correct. |
| 3 | Q | -- later that day? |
| 4 | A | That's correct. |
| 5 | Q | All right. |
| 6 |  | MS. MANGOLD: Can we look at People's Exhibit 373, |
| 7 | which | is already in evidence. |
| 8 |  | (Displayed.) |
| 9 | Q | Do you recognize this? |
| 10 | A | I do. |
| 11 | Q | What is this? |
| 12 | A | This is an advance request for a line of credit. |
| 13 | Q | Do you know what this advance request was for? |
| 14 | A | This was for the home equity line. |
| 15 | Q | That's Mr. Cohen's home equity line? |
| 16 | A | That's correct. |
| 17 | Q | Looking now at the top half of the page? |
| 18 | A | Uh-huh. |
| 19 | Q | What is the request type? |
| 20 | A | Is "advance." |
| 21 | Q | That means he is borrowing money? |
| 22 | A | That means he's drawing down on the line of credit, |
| 23 | yes. |  |
| 24 | Q | What is the amount? |
| 25 | A | \$131,000. |


|  | Page 1599 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q | And who is the borrower? |
| 2 | A | The borrower is Michael Cohen or Laura Cohen. |
| 3 | Q | Do you know who Laura Cohen is? |
| 4 | A | Michael's spouse. |
| 5 | Q | And why are both of their names listed? |
| 6 | A | Both of their names are listed on the home equity line |
| 7 | of credit |  |
| 8 | Q | And where is this transfer from and to? |
| 9 | A | It is from the line of credit and ending in 6194, and |
| 10 | it's bein | g credited to the new account for Essential Consultants |
| 11 | ending in | 1897. |
| 12 | Q | And looking at the effective date on the right, is |
| 13 | that the | same date that Michael Cohen called you to open the |
| 14 | account? |  |
| 15 | A | Yes, 10/26/16. |
| 16 |  | MS. MANGOLD: And can we look at the bottom half of |
| 17 | the p | age, please. |
| 18 |  | (Displayed.) |
| 19 | Q | Does this indicate that this transfer had to be |
| 20 | approved | by people at First Republic Bank? |
| 21 | A | Yes. |
| 22 | Q | And how many people at First Republic Bank had to |
| 23 | approve t | his? |
| 24 | A | In this scenario, two. |
| 25 | Q | And those are their names listed there? |



```
balances. So it goes to the Loan Servicing from our Client
Service Group to drawdown and make the deposit.
    Q All right. And this is the internal bank communication
to get that done?
```

    A Yes, it is.
    MS. MANGOLD: Can we now take a look at People's
    Exhibit 375 already in evidence.
        (Displayed.)
    Q Take a look at the bottom two emails on this page. Are
    these First Republic Bank emails?
A Yes, they are.
Q Looking at the bottom-most email on the page. Is this
an email that we've already seen?
A Yes, it is.
Q What's this email at the bottom?
A Pardon me?
Q What is the email at the bottom?
A Oh, this is the requesting the transfer and the
drawdown on the HELOC account and then depositing it into the
Essential Consultants account.
Q Now, looking at the next email in the chain. Who is
this to and from?
A It's from Michael Cohen to Elizabeth Rappaport.
Q Can you read this email?
A "Can you please send me confirmation that the funds

```
were deposited into the other account? Important."
    Q And do you have an understanding of what this means?
    A Yes. This is stating that he's asking if the $131,000
was deposited into Essential Consultants.
    Q Did he explain to you why this was important?
    A He did not explain to me directly why this was
important. I did not speak to him after that initial call.
                    MS. MANGOLD: Can we look at the top email on the
        page, please.
                (Displayed.)
    Q Who is this to and from?
    A From Elizabeth Rappaport to Michael Cohen.
    Q And what's the date and time?
    A The date is 10/26/2016 at 1:15 p.m. Pacific Time.
    Q That's 4:15 Eastern?
    A Yes, it is.
    Q Can you read the email to the jury?
    A "Good afternoon, Mr. Cohen. The funds have been
deposited into your account ending in 1897."
    Q And what does that mean?
    A That means that the drawdown on the home equity line of
credit has been completed and it has been deposited into the now
Essential Consultants account that was established that day.
    Q Does that mean the Essential Consultants account is now
fully funded?
```

|  | Page 1603 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A | Fully funded and live for business. |
| 2 | Q | Officially open? |
| 3 | A | Yes. |
| 4 | Q | All right. Now, let's take a look at what's already in |
| 5 | evidence | as People's Exhibit 376. |
| 6 |  | (Displayed.) |
| 7 | Q | Do you recognize this document? |
| 8 | A | Yes, I do. |
| 9 | Q | What type of document is this? |
| 10 | A | This is a Wire Authorization form. |
| 11 | Q | What is a Wire Authorization form? |
| 12 | A | This gives us the right to send the wire when we are in |
| 13 | person wi | ith the client. |
| 14 | Q | And just in case there is anybody who doesn't know what |
| 15 | a wire is | , what is a wire? |
| 16 | A | A wire is an electronic way of moving funds from one |
| 17 | party to | another party. |
| 18 | Q | Focusing now on the top half of the page. |
| 19 |  | (Displayed.) |
| 20 | Q | Can you see where the wire transfer is coming from? |
| 21 | A | Are you talking about -- who the originator is of the |
| 22 | wire? |  |
| 23 | Q | Yes. |
| 24 | A | It's Essential Consultants LLC. |
| 25 | Q | And on the top right-hand side of the page does it say |

```
who prepared this Wire Transfer Authorization Agreement form?
    A Yes. DeWitt Hutchins.
    Q DeWitt Hutchins. Would he fill that out with input
from the originator?
    A Yes.
        MS. MANGOLD: Can we look now at the bottom box on
        the page.
        (Displayed.)
    Q Can you tell when this Wire Authorization form was
filled out?
    A Yes. 10/27/2016 at 10:01 a.m.
    Q And can you tell whether the client did this remotely
or at the bank?
    A He did it in person.
    Q Is that indicated there on the left?
    A Yes.
    Q And do you recognize the signature or initials in this
box?
    A Which box?
    Q Below the date and time stamp. I'm sorry.
    A Yeah, that is DeWitt Hutchins's signature.
    Q So is this then the following morning after the account
had been opened?
    A This is the following morning, yes.
    Q All right. Let's go back to the top of the page. Can
```



form, below the double line. Do you see that fine print above the signature line?

A I do.
Q What does the first sentence of that say?
A "I/we certify that the information contained herein is true, complete and accurate."

Q And do you recognize the signature?
A Yes. "Michael Cohen."
Q And what's the date?
A $\quad 10 / 27 / 2016$.
Q Are there two more signatures below that?

A Yes.
Q Do you know who those signatures are from?
A Yes. DeWitt Hutchins and Andrea Wang.
Q And are both DeWitt Hutchins and Andrea Wang First Republic Bank personnel?

A Yes. They both worked in the same office.
Q And does this indicate that multiple people from the bank had to approve this wire before it was sent out?

A Yes. Wire approval requires certain levels. Each person has a level of allowance, if you will, on what they are allowed to do as a singular signer; and given that it is over $\$ 100,000$, it requires two signatures.

Q Now, turning to Page 3 of the same PDF. (Displayed.)


A I do not see a number on it; however, this is if -that it has been input. The confirmation would be something different.

Q Okay. What is the date and time of this form?
A This is 7:20 a.m., but that's Pacific Time, so it's 10:20 a.m. And it's on 10/27/2016.

Q And looking now at the amount and customer name at the top, is this the same wire that we just looked at from Essential Consultants?

A Yes, it appears that way.
Q And do you see --
MS. MANGOLD: If we could zoom out.
(Displayed.)
Q There is handwriting on the right side of the page. Do you know what that handwriting is?

A It looks like it has been initialed by Andrea Wang.
Q And that's somebody, again, who works at the bank?
A Yes.
Q All right.
MS. MANGOLD: Let's turn now to what's already in evidence as People's Exhibit 378.
(Displayed.)
Q Can you describe what this is?
A This is an email from DeWitt Hutchins to Michael Cohen with the confirmation that the wire has been executed and is on


Q Now, if you look above that, there is a portion called
"Statement Period."

What are the dates of the statement period?
A October 26th, 2016 to October 31st, 2016.
Q Is it typical to have a statement period that's only five days?

A No, it's usually a 30-day statement.
Q Do you know why this is five days?
A Because the cut-off period is -- we would issue a
statement regardless of what day you opened it during the month
to maintain the schedule of you receiving it the first of every
month.

Q So did the account exist before October 26th, 2016?
A No. That's why it started on October 26 th.
MS. MANGOLD: Can we look at the bottom two-thirds
of the page, please.
(Displayed.)
Q Can you explain what is described under "Account
Activity?"
A Yes. So you will have the deposits and credits and withdrawals and debits.

The first being a deposit from the credit on an advance on the home equity line of credit on 6194 for $\$ 131,000$.

And then on the bottom, a domestic wire transfer to Keith M. Davidson and Associates for $\$ 130,000$. And then a $\$ 35$ fee for

```
that transaction.
    Q And then the date to the left of that $131,000 credit
is the same date that Mr. Cohen called you to open the account;
right?
    A That's correct.
    Q And the wire out is on the subsequent day?
    A That's correct.
    Q So did all of the Essential Consultants transactions
that we just looked at take place in that approximately 24-hour
period?
    A Yes, it did.
    Q And that includes opening the account, funding the
account with the HELOC, and transferring the wire to
Mr. Davidson; right?
    A In fact, it starts from an initial phone call to open
the account, to funding the account, to the wiring out the
money.
    Q Now, is that timing typical for a real estate
transaction?
    A It's not atypical.
    Wires -- you know, real estate transactions for people who
own significant amounts of real estate, they like to move very
quickly because, opportunistically, it locks it up and that way
they can avoid getting other bids; or quickly getting into
attorney review, which, essentially, would take it off the
```

market.

Q Having now looked at the wire transfer paperwork for the amount, timing and description of the wire, are they all consistent with using this account and sending that wire as a
real estate transaction?

A Yes.
Q And that had to be approved by the bank?
A All wires have to be approved by the bank.
Q Did any of the wire transfer paperwork indicate that money was being transferred on behalf of a political candidate?

A No.
Q Would the bank's process for approving the wire transfer be different if Mr. Cohen had indicated that the money was being transferred on behalf of a political candidate?

A We would have additional due diligence.
Q Would that have delayed the transaction?
A It certainly could.
Q Did any of the wire transfer paperwork indicate that money was being transferred to buy the rights to a media story?

A No.
Q Would the bank's process for approving the wire be different if Mr. Cohen had indicated that the payment was being made to buy the rights to a media story?

A Possibly, yeah.
Q Could that have delayed the transaction?

```
    A It would have because additional questions would have
been asked at that time.
    Q Did any of the wire transfer paperwork indicate that
money was being transferred for the payment to an adult film
star?
    A It did not.
    Q Would the bank's process for approving the wire be
different if Mr. Cohen had indicated that the wire transfer was
a payment to an adult film star?
    A Yes, there would definitely be enhanced due diligence
on that.
    Q By "enhanced due diligence," you mean further checks by
the bank?
    A Correct.
    Q Would that have delayed the transaction?
    A It certainly would have.
    Q Is it possible that the wire wouldn't have been
approved at all by the bank?
    A Yes. If we -- if it was something like that, we might
be -- that our reputation is at risk, and we might not have
wanted to send the wire.
    MS. MANGOLD: I have no further questions.
    THE COURT: Thank you.
    Any cross?
        MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, your Honor.
```



| 1 | A | Page 1616 Over the last month or two. I don't know the exact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | dates. |  |
| 3 | Q S | So, recently, you met with them twice. But you also |
| 4 | met with t | them last year; didn't you? |
| 5 | A I | I did not meet with the same people last year. |
| 6 | Q D | Did you meet with other folks who worked for the |
| 7 | Manhattan | District Attorney's office last year? |
| 8 | A I | I did. |
| 9 | Q A | And even if it wasn't the same people that you met with |
| 10 | over the p | past two months, on how many occasions last year did |
| 11 | you meet w | with the Manhattan District Attorney's office? |
| 12 | A I | I believe it was one time. |
| 13 | $\mathrm{Q}$ | Aside from the times you just testified about, so a |
| 14 | couple of | times this year, one time last year, did you meet with |
| 15 | any other | law enforcement about the subject of your testimony |
| 16 | today? |  |
| 17 | A Y | Yes, I did. |
| 18 | Q V | Who? |
| 19 | A | The -- I was in Washington to discuss the same matter. |
| 20 | Q I | In Washington D.C.? |
| 21 | A | Correct. |
| 22 | Q A | And when was that? |
| 23 | A | I believe this -- and I could be wrong on the date, |
| 24 | it's 2018, | , '19. |
| 25 | Q A | And in 2018, '19, on how many occasions did you go to |

D.C. to meet with the prosecutors?

A I believe it was twice.
Q The same trip or two separate occasions?
A No, two separate occasions.
Q During all of the times that you just talked about, so
D.C. on two separate occasions, last year a couple of times --
I'm sorry, last year one time and then this year a couple of
times, you were represented by counsel; correct?
A Yes, I was.
Q And you are not paying for your own lawyers; right?

A I am not.
Q Who is paying for your lawyers, Chase?
A Well, when $I$ went to D.C., it was paid by First
Republic.

And when -- now it's being paid by Flagstone, my new institution.

Q So when -- but Chase took over First Republic after the collapse, I believe you testified; correct?

A That's correct.
Q So prior to the collapse, First Republic was paying for your lawyers?

A That's correct.
Q And that's because this is completely about your professional job; correct?

A Is it what completely about?


I don't do the actual, physical paperwork.
Q But whenever Mr. Cohen was onboarded at First Republic, you were not part of that process?

A Not part of the paperwork process. I would have conversations about the types of accounts and provide advice, but not necessarily on the account opening paperwork.

Q Do you know how long Mr. Cohen had been a First Republic client before you took over the relationship with him?

A I recall 2012 being a possibility of when he established a relationship initially, but I could be wrong.

MR. BLANCHE: Can we put up what has already been
admitted in evidence as People's Exhibit 368, so everybody
can take a look at that.
(Displayed.)
Q If you -- this is one of the documents that you looked at last week.

If we look at, towards the bottom of this document, there is a series of questions at the bottom right.

If you see, it says, "Referral source's length of relationship with the bank."

And it says, "five years?"
And then if we could look at the top of that same document,
I believe this document was updated in October of 2016.
Do you see that?
A Yes, so that would be 2011.


```
                                    Page 1621
    Q That would be not frequently, a few times a year; is
that fair?
    A Yeah, it was an infrequent thing, you know, it would
maybe be three, four times a year.
    Q And the types of conversations you would have with him
had to do with, for example, opening a new account or having a
fee waived or something, some general type of work like that; is
that fair?
    A Yes, that's correct.
    Q You testified that he did a lot of his own business and
one of the reasons was because there was actually a branch right
across from Trump Tower; is that right?
    A Within a short walking distance, yes.
    Q And folks there, the Client Services team could handle
most of the stuff that Mr. Cohen needed; right?
    A That's correct.
    Q Now, you testified that every time you spoke -- well,
that when you spoke with Michael Cohen, everything was urgent;
is that a fair way to describe it?
    A So 90 percent of the time it was an urgent matter,
yes.
    Q You -- is it true that when you first were assigned
Mr. Cohen, your leadership team told you that you were picked
to take over the relationship because you were firm with
clients?
```



```
Q So do you recall meeting -- I think you talked about
not with the prosecutors at this table, but with different
prosecutors at the Manhattan District Attorney's office on
March 6th of last year?
    A Do I remember speaking to -- yes.
    Q And if you could just take a look at the first line of
that, of what's marked for identification as D10.
    A Uh-huh.
    Q Can you see if that refreshes your recollection that
you told the District Attorney that, unfortunately, Mr. Cohen
was still your client?
    A What was -- this is 2016. You just asked me about
2023.
Q So in 2023, when you met with the District Attorney, he was not your client?
A In 2023 he was not -- no longer my client.
Q Do you remember the -- so when was he taken away? When was he no longer your client?
A 2017, at some point, once this information went public.
Q So when you say when "this information went public," at some point when something came out about, in part, the transaction that you testified about on direct --
A That's right.
Q -- you were no longer responsible for that
```


(Continued from the previous page.)
Q But is it your understanding, and I believe you testified to this on Friday, that if a client has a mortgage with the bank, even if the bank decides to no longer have other business with him, the mortgage will often remain, correct?

A That is correct.
Q Is that true with Mr. Cohen, as far as you know?
A Yes.
Q Maybe, this is what you were just talking about. Are you familiar with the term de-risk?

A I am not familiar with that term, no.
Q When a bank determines that there is something about a client, or the type of accounts the client wants to have with the banks, they can decide -- the bank can decide to no longer do business with them, correct?

A That's correct.
Q And you testified last week, and a little bit today, that there are any number of types of work or types of clients that First Republic may decide they don't want to do work with, right?

A That's correct.
Q It could be the client himself or herself, correct?
A Yes.
Q It could be the type of business that client is in, correct?

## Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter




Q Do you remember at the time having any concerns about Mr. Cohen's description of this business narrative?

A No, it seemed consistent with what he did on his own activity.

Q And to be clear, the work that Mr. Cohen is describing as a consultant would be separate from the work he was doing, for whatever he was doing, for the Trump Organization, correct?

A Yes.
Q Right. Like, President Donald Trump didn't bank with First Republic, as far as you know, right?

A I wouldn't know. We can only see the clients we do business with.

Q He did not do business with you?
A Correct.
Q And Mr. Cohen, who did do business with you, never told you that a deal he was doing, he was doing with Donald J. Trump or the Trump Organization; that would be separate, correct?

A Yes, it would.
Q Indeed, if he had said, this is a deal $I$ am doing with my employer, you may have asked questions?

A I would have asked questions.
Q And that didn't happen?
A That did not happen.
Q But you understood at the time as you testified, I
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```
believe, that Mr. Cohen did do work, real estate work at least,
and consulting work that was separate and apart from his job at
the Trump Organization, correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q And, by the way, your basis for knowing that is Mr.
Cohen, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q What I mean by that, you don't go out and do an
internal investigation of Mr. Cohen's real estate deals; he
tells you and you accept it, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q And there is nothing wrong with you doing that?
    A I couldn't infringe upon and ask any further questions
on that.
    Q I think you testified you had 1800 clients, is that
right, over the time?
    A Approximately, yes.
    Q Now, I want to focus a little bit more on
October 2016, which you testified about Friday and again this
morning.
    You recall having several phone calls with Mr. Cohen
in those few weeks in October 2016?
    A Thirteen to 26, yes.
    Q And that's different from your relationship with him
the rest of the time?
```
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```
there helping you make things happen?
    A I have several team members, yes.
    Q And, again, if we can put up Exhibit, already in
evidence, 371, if we can go to the second page first, and then
the next page.
    This is, again, the various documentation associated
with the LLC that ultimately was founded, correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q And on page two, there are some questions about
whether, I believe, standard questions about whether he is
acting as an agent for anybody.
            And Mr. Cohen answered, no, to that, right?
    A That's correct.
    Q And if he had answered, yes, that would have
potentially raised more questions?
    A Well, not only would it raise more questions, it would
require more paperwork.
    Q What type of paperwork?
    A We would have to know. We would have to determine
exactly who he was acting as agent for.
    Q And by, know, just have him tell you, or would there
have to be --
    A No.
    Q -- proof, documentation?
    A Documentation.
```

Q So, it's not just a conversation. It is, actually, collecting additional documentation
from Mr. Cohen and the agent?

A We would have to ensure that he is not working with a

```
person of interest.
```

Q And you testified on Friday about -- the prosecutors
asked you about what your understanding of a shell corporation
is. Do you remember those questions?
A I do.
Q And I believe you testified that it is an entity
that's opened up to receive monies and send out wires and
doesn't have an actual business behind it?

A Yes.
Q Correct?
A Yes.
Q You have no reason to believe, or you didn't at the time, that Mr. Cohen was opening up this LLC to be a shell corporation, did you?

A I don't open up shell corporations. I open up LLC accounts that have operating businesses. And if a client had told me that this would be a shell corporation, the account would not have been opened.

Q Why is that?
A Because it's -- shell corporations that have no business behind them would give me pause.
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```
eight, the first page, so we can see it.
    So, you were shown this document on Friday, and then
if we can turn to page eight with the Bates number ending
94230. And then if we can just blow up the middle, please.
    You were asked a question on Friday, and then you were
asked a series of questions today about the boxes that were
checked on forms like this, both this one, and then also the
one that was later completed for the other LLC.
    And you were asked about question 12, is this entity
associated with political fundraising, Political Action
Committees, PACs, and the box is checked no, right?
    Do you remember those questions?
    A I do.
    Q So there is a series of other questions that we are
looking at on the screen now, all of which say, no, for each of
those questions, including the highlighted one.
    If the answer is, yes, it doesn't mean the LLC won't
be opened, does it?
    A It does not.
    Q It just means that there is going to be some sort of
follow-up question from you or from your Compliance Department
or something like that, correct?
    A That's correct. But I do want to clarify one thing,
if I may.
    Q Yes, please, sir.
```

```
    A If the box is checked, yes, referring to,
Persons/Entities Found on the OFAC/SDN List, that would be a
hard no.
    Q Can you -- can you just indicate what you are
referring to, sir?
    A Underneath 16A, to the right, you will see, on the
OFAC/SDN list. I would like to be concise.
    If they were on the OFAC list, we would not open that
account. That would be totally non-optional.
    Q Understood.
    So there are some boxes that could be checked and
would likely be fatal to the LLC opening an account with your
bank?
    A Yes.
    Q Fair. That makes sense.
            You were asked questions this morning about whether
you would have had a different reaction to the accounts if you
had known, or if you were told that the account was going to be
used for some sort of political activity or political
fundraising, correct?
    A Correct.
    Q You weren't told that, were you?
    A No, I was not.
    Q As far as you knew, at the time from your
communications with your team that were communicating with Mr.
```
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Mr. Cohen was still at the Trump Organization or where he was working?

A No.
Q And then, do you recall a series of communications and emails a little bit later in 2017, in March and April, when a new account was being opened for Mr. Cohen's new law firm?

A I do not recall that.
Q If we can just show, and not to the jury, but just to the witness, the Court and the People and us, D13.

A Okay.
Q If you can take a look at D13, and take your time. It

```
is a couple --
```

A This refreshes my memory.
Q So, does that refresh your recollection that around the same time as that errant email was sent --

A Yes.
Q -- you opened an account, or you and your team, opened an account for Mr. Cohen and his new law firm?

A Yes.
Q And I know your memory has just been refreshed, but do you recall, now that it has been refreshed, having any concerns at any time about this new account being opened by Mr. Cohen?

A No, he is a lawyer opening a new law firm account.
Q Now, are you familiar with the term PEP?
A Politically Exposed Person.

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter


Page 1639

Q Now, if you had been aware, or if you had considered that, what's the process, or what was the process when you were working there to identify or look into whether somebody should be identified as a PEP by the bank?

MS. MANGOLD: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You can answer.
A That would bring it up to the second level, BSA/AML.
Q So, the BSA/AML, the second layer that you testified about on Friday, the Compliance Department, would presumably ask questions of you or ask questions of the client?

A They will -- well, they would ask both. They wouldn't go directly to the client. They would come through me, typically. But in some cases they would speak directly to the client to understand how deep of a relationship it is and if that could, potentially, put us at risk in any way.

Q Have you, to the best of your knowledge, ever had a client who was a PEP?

A I have.
Q So what types of safeguards or traps are put around an account or relationship of a PEP?

A The accounts are monitored pretty closely to ensure that activity is not going in any way that would put us at risk.

Q Is the monitoring -- can you explain to the jury what
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```
you mean by that?
    A Transaction activity monitoring, limits are done on
all accounts, but there would be an added layer on this.
    Q So, algorithms and whatnot that are behind the scenes,
and also, of course, the limits of the first line of defense as
well?
    A As well as a second line of defense. We would
continue to monitor that account.
    Q Do you recall an email from Mr. Cohen to you, again,
we are moving a little further along to September of 2017,
saying, on September 1st, where he said that he needed to speak
with you, important, asking when you are free?
    A September 30th?
    Q September 1, 2017?
    A I do not.
    Q Do you have any idea, as you sit here today, whether
you spoke with him on that day?
    A I do not recall.
    Q And you don't recall then, I assume, what any
conversation was about?
    A No.
    Q Do you recall any communications with Mr. Cohen
besides what you testified today about in March 2017?
    Since March, April, 2017, do you recall any other
conversations with Mr. Cohen?
```
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A $\quad$ No.
Q You testified earlier today about the HELOC and the money moving into Mr. Cohen's account, opening the account and it all happening pretty quickly, correct?

A Yes.
Q And I believe you testified that for real estate transactions that's not necessarily unusual?

A It's not unusual. It's not every time, but it's not unusual.

Q But it is not just real estate transactions, right, that would also be true of other types of contracts, such as purchasing a yacht which you testified?

A A yacht, an aircraft, for -- there are many different reasons why clients came to us and why they work with us is our ability to execute transactions quickly.

Q Correct. But I am focused more on the speed and the way that this happened with Mr. Cohen where he calls you, you send him to Mr. Hutchins, and literally within a day, the account is opened, the account is funded and a wire going out.

My question is that, that could be the case for all kinds of contractual transactions between your client and another party, correct?

A Correct.
Q And the safeguards you testified about today, asking the client why the wire is going to be sent, and from the
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paperwork it looks like Mr. Cohen says, retainer?
    A It says, retainer. It is domestic as well so that's
what makes it easier to do.
    Q The location that the wire is being sent, so in this
case, to a law firm, correct, that would also be something that
you would look at?
    A Yes, I mean, it happens a thousand times a day.
    Q And my point is this, my point is, at the time, in
October 2016, nothing about the way this account was opened,
funded or the wire that was sent out, at the time, raised any
red flags to you, correct?
    A Not based upon the answers that I was given for the
questions I asked.
    Q And similarly to your team, if one of them had a red
flag from -- if Ms. Rappaport had a concern from her
communications with Mr. Cohen, she would have raised that to
you?
    A That would have been brought to my attention and the
process would have been delayed.
    Q And that did not happen?
    A That did not happen.
                            MR. BLANCHE: Can I just have one moment, your
    Honor?
```

                                (Whereupon, defense counsel confer.)
    BY MR. BLANCHE:
Q And I think we talked a little bit about this earlier, about Mr. Cohen's relationship working for the Trump Organization and his relationship with you.

You never had any communications with him about Donald Trump himself, did you?

A I did not.
Q And you have never spoken with Donald Trump yourself, have you?

A I have not. MR. BLANCHE: No more questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Any redirect? MS. MANGOLD: Just a little bit, your Honor.

```
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
```

BY MS. MANGOLD:

Q Now, Mr. Farro, you just testified that at a certain point the bank took away the client relationship from you and that Mr. Cohen's accounts were largely closed at First Republic Bank, is that correct?

A The accounts that we could close were closed, yes.
Q Can you describe the circumstances of that to the jury?

A Yes, when -- we have the optionality to close the account at any time we chose not to be attached to what we consider to be negative press. When we saw negative press, we
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chose to close the accounts which we could, which are the
operational bank accounts.
    We cannot close out a mortgage, simply because you
can't expect the client to pay it off in full. So, we
maintained the mortgage accounts and closed out the bank
accounts.
    Q And what is the negative press you are referring to
here?
    A The Stormy Daniels, the one that came out.
    Q And was that the first time that the bank learned the
true nature of those transactions that we discussed?
```

    A Yes.
            MR. BLANCHE: Objection.
            THE COURT: Overruled.
    Q Was Mr. Cohen's accounts, other than his mortgage
    account, closed because the bank learned of the true nature of
those transactions?
A Well, once the client does not be completely honest
with us, we choose not to do business with them going forward.
MS. MANGOLD: No further questions.
THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Blanche?
MR. BLANCHE: Just very brief.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BLANCHE:
Q So, just to understand, were you part of the decision

```
to close the accounts that could be closed with Mr. Cohen?
    A I don't make those decisions.
    Q No, you were not part of those decisions?
    A No.
    Q You were informed that the decision was made?
    A Yes.
    Q And you -- do you have any reason to believe that when
that decision was made, it had anything to do with anything
other than the public pressure reports about what you just
testified?
    A That was my understanding.
    Q And, if true -- and, by the way, you have no personal
knowledge of whether it is true or not, do you?
    A No.
    Q If true, that would have meant, potentially, that
there wasn't appropriate due diligence done by the bank at the
time, right?
                                    MS. MANGOLD: Objection.
                    THE COURT: Overruled.
    A I don't know if that's a fair statement.
    Q Well --
    A Due diligence is done prior to an account being
opened. After a transaction happens, it goes from one lawyer
to another lawyer. I can't be expected to know where it is
going to end up after that.
```
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I am handing up to the Court some proposed redactions as to Exhibit 171. The items that are circled in red, those are items that we have agreed to redact beyond what is already blacked out.

The three tabbed red items are the remaining points of contention. We did reach a lot of progress on this.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. STEINGLASS: So, would you like me to talk about three?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: So, the first item in contention is on line 38909, in which Gina Rodriguez says she stopped it a long time ago because he threatened to sue me.

Then the next one is on October 19th, and this is in the midst of, you can tell from the context here, in the midst of negotiations over the Stormy Daniels deal and kind of delays that were perceived as happening by Michael Cohen, that Ms. Rodriguez tells Dylan Howard, quote, very shady shit is going on.

THE COURT: What line are you on?
MR. STEINGLASS: It's 39540. That's on page 10.
MR. BLANCHE: Second from the bottom.
THE COURT: I see it.
MR. STEINGLASS: And then, finally, on page 11,
and this is -- both of these are within about a week of the execution of the contract between Stormy Daniels and Mr. Trump.

Yes, he is sending what she signed with Trump so he can get the story out with Fox this morning and nobody else would be afraid. Daily Mail is scared of Trump.

This is on 39551 is the line for that and is the third tab.

So, as I believe your Honor has, and will
continue to instruct the jury, the Rodriguez portions of -Ms. Rodriguez is not alleged to be a co-conspirator in this case. So, her texts are only coming in to contextualize Dylan Howard's texts. And Dylan Howard clearly is a co-conspirator in this case.

We have no problem with the limiting instructions. We are not trying to argue the truth of the statements contained in Ms. Rodriguez's texts, but they do contextualize, $A$, what was going on in terms of the transactions and the negotiations at the time, and also Mr. Howard's responses.

Of all of these three, we can, and I actually communicated this with Mr. Blanche, we can live without number one, if they feel so strongly about it. But I do think that the others are very relevant and very timely in terms of that being fact, that they are happening within a
week or so of the transaction being finalized.
So those are the ones we could not agree on.
MR. BLANCHE: We feel very strongly about all
three. I think what we have done to try to appreciate your Honor's ruling, there are two -- and Ms. Rodriguez is not alleged to be an accomplice, and the only reason these are coming in is to provide, as the People just said, context.

And so, with the first one, there is just no -there is just no necessary reason to include that for context. So, it's not being offered for the truth.

The very small potential, you know, benefit of it providing context, in our view, is greatly outweighed by the potential for the jury to have confusion and take it for the wrong reason, even with a limited instruction. That is the exact same reason for the other one as well.

If you read all the texts and with all the
evidence that has been permitted about what's happening in that week, no context is necessary in that situation given the risks that they are going to -- the jury would take, very shady shit is going on, for improper reasons.

Who knows why she said it. We can all guess and speculate, but that's why it shouldn't come in.

And then the last, your Honor, look, we don't think it should come in at all. We certainly do not think the last sentence in the clause of the first sentence


pretrial evidentiary rulings that the Court asked the People to re-raise at an appropriate point. We think now is not that point, but soon is the appropriate point.

This relates to the People's request to introduce evidence regarding the defendant's attempt to dissuade witnesses, including Michael Cohen and Stormy Daniels, through a public pressure campaign, retaliation, harassing comments, including in public remarks and online.

The Court originally held in its Order on the People's motions in limine, reserved the item pending an offer of proof. We made the offer of proof on April 15th.

The Court held at that time that the evidence regarding the intimidation and pressure campaign was probative for multiple purposes, including the defendant's guilty conscious and to explain witnesses changing their position, but the Court excluded that evidence subject to the defense opening the door.

And the Court -- I believe the Court said the issue might well be academic because the defense was likely to open the door.

We believe the defense did, in fact, as your Honor predicted, open the door in opening statements last week, and they did so in the opening statement in several ways.

Counsel stated that the evidence would show that

Mr. Cohen was previously loyal and defended the defendant on television, publicly and privately. And then, after getting caught in 2018, Mr. Cohen made the decision to blame the defendant for his problems, and he is an admitted liar, and that's at pages 899 to 900.

Defense counsel also said the evidence would show that Mr. Cohen's expected testimony can't be believed because his goal is to go on television and social media and his entire financial livelihood depends on attacking the defendant.

The defense made a similar or same assertions as to Stormy Daniels, another expected witness, stating that the evidence would show that she previously denied an improper relationship in writing, and that she was now making a living off of the defendant by talking about her interactions with him, including through a book and a documentary.

All of those assertions that defense counsel made in the opening statement about what the evidence would show regarding the credibility of those witnesses are precisely the kinds of arguments or assertions that your Honor predicted the defense would make and stated, would open the door to the People being allowed to elicit evidence regarding the defendant's efforts to keep them in the fold, keep Mr. Cohen in the fold originally, followed by
subsequent harassment online.
So we ask the Court -- I am sorry.
When the Court made that ruling on April 15th, the Court said the People should bring this back to me if at any point you believe that the defense has opened the door.

So we ask the Court, in light of the opening statements, to hold that the People may introduce evidence to offset the defense claim that these witnesses are somehow benefiting from their willingness to testify to explain why both witnesses initially denied certain facts and now acknowledge those facts and as evidence of the defendant's consciousness of guilt.

Thank you.
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, at the very least, there should be a proffer beyond just we are going to elicit all of this information about a pressure campaign and what the questions will be.

We certainly opened the door that we will expose bias by Mr. Cohen and by other witnesses, for sure, and we intend to cross-examine witnesses about their bias, including their financial motivation in testifying the way they are today. That's different in kind than eliciting -well, depending on what the questions will be, questions about a pressure campaign, because of public tweets or
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Truths by President Trump at the time, and presumably now.
So, before we -- before your Honor rules, we would ask the People to proffer what it is, specifically, they intend to elicit from the witnesses or extrinsically prove regarding this and go from there.

THE COURT: Well, if the door has been opened, I think we will know what they are going to ask when they ask it, and if there is an objection, you can make your objection, unless the People would like to disclose what it is.

MR. COLANGELO: Your Honor, the evidence that we will offer is the evidence that Mr. Steinglass presented during the offer of proof that we made to your Honor on April 15th. That was -- that's recorded in the transcript on April 15th, I believe, starting at page 41 and going through your Honor's ruling at 58.

In that colloquy, the People disclosed and -described broadly and disclosed half a dozen or more exhibits that we intend to elicit as part of the pressure campaign and the intimidation effort. We also described it at length in our February 22 nd motion in limine describing the Molineux information that we intended to bring out.

So, we are happy to bring those exhibits up again to the extent your Honor wishes to see them again. It's the evidence and the discussion of that evidence that we
presented on April 15th.
THE COURT: Could you go over that one more time, the three purposes you want to elicit this?

MR. COLANGELO: Yes. First, is to offset the defense claim that the witnesses are benefiting from their willingness to testify. And by showing, to rebut that claim, that, in fact, their cooperation with law enforcement has harmed them more than it has helped them.

Your Honor will remember that in explaining the allowable use of this evidence for that purpose, my colleague mentioned the People versus Edwards case and handed it up on April 15th to the Court.

The second purpose is to explain why both witnesses initially denied certain facts and have now acknowledged those facts.

And the third purpose is as evidence of the defendant's consciousness of guilt.

And if $I$ can just direct your Honor's attention to the transcript -- to the transcript of the April 15th proceeding, starting at page 56.

Your Honor already observed following the People's proffer of that evidence, quote, you can't dispute that virtually everything that you put up is probative of something to some degree, whether it is consciousness of guilt to explain Mr. Cohen's turnaround to offset

unlike other people who will flip if the government puts them under pressure.

So that's evidence of a coordinated effort to bolster the witness and to prevent him from cooperating by saying nice things about him publicly, and as soon as he began cooperating, attacking him, which is classic evidence of consciousness of guilt by intimidating and attacking a witness.

THE COURT: Go on.
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, consciousness of guilt is much different than what the People just described.

Consciousness of guilt would allow the People to say, how do you know that he is guilty, Ladies and Gentlemen? Well, look what he did on this day which shows consciousness of guilt.

The idea that President Trump was somehow feeling guilty or consciousness of guilt about the indictment in this case, when he was speaking about Michael Cohen and pleading guilty in the Southern District of New York to crimes that Presidents Trump isn't charged with and never was charged with, doesn't work, right.

Meaning that there are 34 counts here of falsifying business records.

There is -- the statements that President Trump made at the time of leading up to, and at the time of
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Michael Cohen's guilty plea were not consciousness of guilt |
| 2 | of anything happening in this courtroom. And the risk that |
| 3 | the jury will hear that and use it for an improper purpose |
| 4 | is huge, right. |
| 5 | Is it frustrating to have your lawyer plead |
| 6 | guilty and publicly say he is going to cooperate and |
| 7 | testify against you? Of course. And similarly, statements |
| 8 | along the way encouraging his lawyer not to is not |
| 9 | surprising either. |
| 10 | Consciousness of guilt is of a different order. |
| 11 | Consciousness of guilt would be President Trump |
| 12 | doing something as it relates to the charges in this case |
| 13 | that would show his motivation for doing it was to cover |
| 14 | something up that would show that he is guilty. |
| 15 | So, with respect to the other proffered reasons |
| 16 | for some of this testimony to counter financial benefits to |
| 17 | Mr. Cohen and Ms. Daniels and to explain why they changed |
| 18 | their story, that makes sense. And I think they are going |
| 19 | to talk about that on direct, but consciousness of guilt is |
| 20 | of a different order, in our view. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Do you need a ruling on this? |
| 22 | MR. COLANGELO: We don't need a ruling today, but |
| 23 | understanding your Honor's view by Thursday will help us |
| 24 | plan the presentation of the rest of the case. |
| 25 | THE COURT: Thank you. See you in a few minutes. |
|  | Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter |
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | COURT OFFICER: All rise. |
| 2 | (Whereupon, the Court exited the courtroom.) |
| 3 | (Short recess is taken.) |
| 4 | THE CLERK: Case on trial continued. |
| 5 | All parties are present. |
| 6 | THE COURT: Mr. Blanche, I will ask you again, |
| 7 | let's try to keep it very short because we took a lot of |
| 8 | time deciding issues, and I don't want to keep the jury |
| 9 | waiting. Let's do better. |
| 10 | I am prepared to rule on a couple of issues |
| 11 | raised beforehand. |
| 12 | Are you ready to argue Sandoval? |
| 13 | MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, can we argue that at |
| 14 | another time? |
| 15 | THE COURT: Sure. |
| 16 | With regard to the transcripts, I agree with the |
| 17 | defense that these are exchanges between a co-conspirator |
| 18 | and someone who is not a co-conspirator saying pretty |
| 19 | prejudicial things, and I don't really think they serve a |
| 20 | purpose. |
| 21 | So, I am going to rule with the defense, that |
| 22 | those must stay out. |
| 23 | Regarding the defense opening the door, I think |
| 24 | going through the words by the defense, they mostly concede |
| 25 | they opened the door. The question is as to what, what can |
|  | Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter |


(The following proceedings are continued from previous page:)
***
THE COURT: There was one issue that was raised on the break.

One of the jurors, I believe it was Juror Number 9, asked the sergeant if we were going to be working Friday before Memorial Day. Apparently, she has a flight at 11 o'clock in the morning. That is May 24 th.

Is there any objection from either side to not working that day so that this juror can remain with us? MR. STEINGLASS: No objection. Mr. BlANCHE: No objection. THE COURT: Okay.
(Jury entering courtroom.)
***
THE CLERK: Continued case on trial, People versus Donald J. Trump. All parties and all jurors are present.

THE COURT: Before we call the next witness, I did want to go over two scheduling matters.

I was informed by the sergeant that one of the jurors was asking whether we're going to work on the Friday before Memorial Day. Apparently, that juror has travel plans and they have a flight at 11. I was intending to





A. Yes, in the video library, the C-Span archives.
Q. Can you tell the jurors a little bit about the video

```
library at the C-Span archives?
```

A. The video library is an online collection of everything that is telecast on C-Span. That's 278,000 digital hours a day.
Q. And that is everything that is ever aired on $C$-Span?
A. That's correct.
Q. It's still being maintained by C-Span?
A. That's right.
Q. Are you able to retrieve videos that were previously recorded?
A. Yes, we can search by a person's name or location or anything, even a word about the video.
Q. Does $C-S p a n$ routinely record and save videos this way in the regular course of its business?
A. Yes, it's the nature of our business.
Q. Does C-Span rely on these videos to conduct their business?
A. We might re-air a program or search a program, as well as let the public use the program.
Q. Is it the regular course of business for C-Span to record and save these videos?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Now, at some point did C-Span receive a document subpoena from the Manhattan District Attorney's office requiring

```
the company to turn over video recordings of events featuring
Donald Trump?
    A. Yes, it did.
    Q. Did C-Span comply with its legal obligations to turn
over those subpoenaed videos?
    A. Yes, we did.
    Q. Were you the one that retrieved the videos in response
to the subpoena?
    A. Yes, I was.
    Q. Can you tell the jury how you identified those videos?
    A. Well, the subpoena indicated the videos that were
requested, including what we call the URL of the video. But we
would verify what each video -- that it matched the subpoena --
what the subpoena was.
    Q. Did you confirm that the videos were, in fact, events
featuring Donald Trump as identified in the subpoena?
    A. Yes, we did.
    Q. Did you transmit exact copies of videos to the
Manhattan District Attorney's office without making any
alterations, deletions or changes?
    A. Yes, I did.
    Q. Before testifying today, did you have the opportunity
to review files marked for identification as People's Exhibit
409A through 409D?
```

    A. Yes, I did.
    ```
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    Q. Are all of those files video clips of videos that
C-Span produced to the Manhattan District Attorney's office?
    A. Yes, they were.
    Q. Are exhibits 409A and 409B for identification clips
from a video recording dated October 14, 2016, entitled
"Presidential Candidate Donald Trump rally in Greensboro, North
Carolina?"
    A. Yes.
    Q. Is Exhibit 409C for identification a clip from a video
recording dated October 22, 2016, entitled "Presidential
Candidate Donald Trump Remarks in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania?"
    A. That's correct.
    Q. Is Exhibit 409D for identification a clip from a video
recording dated January 11, 2017, entitled "President Elect
Donald Trump News Conference?"
    A. Correct.
    Q. For each of those clips, did you review both the full
video and the video clip and confirm that the clip is an exact
copy of a portion of the longer video?
    A. Yes, I did.
    MS. MANGOLD: The People now offer People's
    Exhibits 409A through 409D into evidence.
        MR. BLANCHE: No objection.
        THE COURT: People's 409A through 409D are
        accepted into evidence.
```
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(Whereupon, People's Exhibit 409A through 409D was received into evidence.)

MS. MANGOLD: Can we now play for the jury what is in evidence as People's Exhibit 409A.
(Whereupon, audio recording played in open court.)
Q. Dr. Browning, is that a portion of the video recording that was produced by C-Span?
A. Yes, it is.

MS. MANGOLD: Can we now play for the jury what is
in evidence as People's 409B.
(Whereupon, audio recording played in open court.)
Q. Dr. Browning, is that a portion of the video recording produced by C-Span?
A. Yes, it was -- is.

MS. MANGOLD: Can we now play for the record what is in evidence as People's Exhibit 409C.
(Whereupon, audio recording was played in open court.)
Q. Dr. Browning, is that portion of the video recording produced by C-Span?
A. Yes, it is.

MS. MANGOLD: Finally, can we play People's Exhibit 409D for the jury.
(Whereupon, audio recording played in open court.)
Q. Is that also a portion of the video clip from a video

```
produced by C-Span?
    A. Yes, it is.
    MS. MANGOLD: No further questions.
        THE COURT: Thank you.
        THE COURT: Your witness.
        MR. BLANCHE: We have no questions.
        THE COURT: Thank you, Doctor.
        You can step down.
        (Witness excused.)
        ***
        THE COURT: People, your next witness.
        MS. MANGOLD: People call Philip Thompson.
        (Witness entering courtroom.)
        ***
        COURT OFFICER: Remain standing.
        THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that
        the testimony that you are going to give before this Court
        and jury shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing
        but the truth, do you so swear or affirm?
        THE WITNESS: I do.
P-H-I-L-I-P T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N, called as a witness on behalf
of the People, was duly sworn by the Clerk of the Court, upon
being examined, testified as follows:
    COURT OFFICER: Have a seat.
    Name and county of residence.
```
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Q. Did TSG have its own processes and procedures at that
time?
    A. Yes, they did.
    Q. As a Regional Director at Esquire, are you familiar
with the recordkeeping practices of Esquire and its divisions
including TSG?
    A. Yes, I am.
    Q. Do you understand that you're testifying today as a
custodian of records for Esquire Deposition Solutions?
    A. I do.
    Q. Did you come from Texas for the purpose of testifying
today?
    A. I did.
    Q. Is Esquire Deposition Solutions testifying voluntarily
or in response to a subpoena?
    A. In response to a subpoena.
    Q. Does Esquire Deposition Solutions have counsel?
    A. We do.
    Q. Is counsel present in the courtroom today?
    A. Yes.
    Q. All right. For the folks who may not know, what is a
deposition?
    A. A deposition is a method to capture sworn testimony,
    typically in the discovery period of a civil suit.
    Q. When you say "the discovery period in a civil suit,"
```

```
can you explain a little bit more what that is?
    A. Sure.
        So the discovery process, it helps gather information
when a lawsuit is filed.
    A deposition is the process of getting sworn testimony
before typically going into court.
    Q. That's sworn testimony from a witness?
    A. It is.
    Q. And what do you mean by "sworn testimony?"
    A. The witness is testifying under oath.
    Q. Is a deposition recorded?
    A. It is.
    Q. Is it recorded sometimes in multiple ways?
    A. Yes, ma'am.
    Q. And what are those ways?
    A. It is taken down by a court reporter, who is taking
down shorthand with the stenography machine.
        And then it's also taken by a videographer, so they are
recording it live.
    Q. And with respect to court reporters, is that similar to
what the court reporters here are doing, taking down testimony
in realtime?
    A. Yes, ma'am.
    Q. Is it still called a court reporter even if they're not
sitting in a courtroom?
```


Q. Is the videographer's job to accurately record the witness' testimony?
A. It is, yes.
Q. Are video depositions also certified?
A. No.
Q. Just the transcripts?
A. Just the transcript.
Q. Now, directing you specifically to TGS Reporting's recordkeeping practices in October 2022, I think you said TSG
was a division of Esquire at that time?
A. That is correct.
Q. It had its own policies and practices?
A. That is correct.
Q. So for transcripts, after a deposition, did a court reporter send the transcript directly to the lawyers that were present in the deposition?
A. No.
Q. Where did they send them?
A. The court reporter would have sent it into TSG to do the production and send it out to all parties.
Q. Did TSG then save those transcripts?
A. They did.
Q. How were they saved?
A. The transcripts would have been saved in their share file account.
Q. What is a share file account in case people don't know?
A. It's similar -- it's more popularly known as dropbox or Box.com. It is a secure way to store large or voluminous files.
Q. In what ways was it secured?
A. The share file is encrypted, to my knowledge. I don't know how they encrypt it, but $I$ do know it's encrypted.
Q. Is it also password protected?
A. It is.
Q. How about the videos produced by TSG in October 2022?
A. Yes, the videos.
Q. Were they transmitted also to TSG after each deposition?
A. Yes, they would have been sent to TSG's share file account as well.
Q. They were saved in that share file?
A. Yes.
Q. And the company took the same steps to make sure the videos were unaltered, including encryption and password protection?
A. That is correct.
Q. Does a witness have an opportunity to comment on any errors they think are in the transcript after it's done?
A. They do.


```
video recording and transcript from an October 2022 deposition
of Donald Trump in a case captioned "E. Jean Carroll versus
Donald Trump," with the Case Number 20CV7311?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Did Esquire comply with its obligations to turn over
that video transcript?
    A. Yes, we did.
    Q. Was the deposition transcript in that case certified?
    A. It was.
    Q. Did Esquire produce more than one version of the
transcript?
```

    A. Yes.
    Q. Is the substance of Mr. Trump's testimony identical in
    every version of the transcript produced?
A. To my knowledge, yes.
Q. Is it unusual to have more than one version of the
deposition transcript?
A. No.
Q. Did Esquire have a record of the witness admitting any
connections to that transcript?
A. We do not have a record of that.
Q. Did Esquire confirm that the transcripts produced to
the Manhattan District Attorney's office -- did you confirm they
were exact copies of the originals?
A. Yes.
Q. And they were produced without alterations, modifications or deletions?
A. That is correct.
Q. Did Esquire also produce the video of that same deposition to the Manhattan District Attorney's office?
A. We did.
Q. And Esquire produced an exact copy of the original deposition video?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And that also was produced without alterations, modifications or deletions?
A. That is correct.
Q. Did Esquire make and keep their deposition transcripts and this video in the regular course of its business?
A. We did.
Q. Was it the regular course of business for Esquire to make and keep this deposition transcript and this video?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Was this transcript and video made at the time of the deposition?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. And did the court reporter and videographer have a business duty to record this deposition accurately?
A. Yes, they did. Absolutely.
Q. Before testifying today, did you have an opportunity to
review files marked for identification as People's Exhibits 403
and 404?
A. I did.
Q. Did that include what's been marked for identification
as People's Exhibits 403A and 403B?
A. Yes.
Q. Are those video clips from the October 2022 deposition
of Donald Trump?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Are they exact copies of a portion of the full
deposition video?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you also review what's been marked for
identification as People's Exhibit 404 and 404A through C?
A. I did.
Q. Did those contain -- were those portions of the
transcript from the same deposition?
A. They were.
Q. Did those contain redactions?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. Other than the redactions, are they exact copies of
those portions of the October 2022 deposition of Mr. Trump?
A. That is correct.
MS. MANGOLD: We now offer People's Exhibit 403A,
403B, 404 and 404A through C into evidence.


Q. Looking toward the bottom of the page, does it indicate the date when the deposition was taken?
A. It does.
Q. What was the date?
A. Wednesday, October 19, 2022.
Q. Does it also show a location for the deposition?
A. It does.
Q. You don't need to read the whole address.
A. The Mar-a-Lago Club.
Q. In looking at the bottom left-hand portion of the page, without reading the name, does it designate there was a court
reporter present at the deposition?
A. It does.
Q. Turning now to Page 2 of the PDF. Does this page indicate there was a videographer for the deposition?
A. It does.
Q. Turning to Page 3 of the PDF. What page number is indicated in the top right-hand corner?
A. Page 219 .
Q. That's Page 219 of that transcript?
A. Yes.
Q. What is this?
A. This is a Certificate of Oath certification page.
Q. This makes it a certified transcript?
A. This certifies that the deponent was sworn before the

```
deposition.
    Q. Can you read the substance of this for the jury.
    A. Sure.
        "I, the undersigned authority, certify that Donald J.
Trump personally appeared before me and was duly sworn. Dated
this 19th day of October, 2022."
    Q. Is that signed?
    A. It is.
                            MS. MANGOLD: Can we now show the jury what is in
    evidence as People's Exhibit 403A.
                            (Whereupon, audio recording was played in open
        court.)
                            MS. MANGOLD: Can we now display for the jury what
        is in evidence as People's Exhibit 404A.
        (Displayed.)
    Q. Mr. Thompson, do you see that there are -- well, what
is this?
    A. This appears to be pages from the deposition that have
been redacted.
    Q. And what pages are they?
    A. Page 125 and Page 126.
    Q. Can you read just the unredacted portion of this from,
Page 125, line 2 through Page 126, line 3?
    A. Yes.
    "QUESTION: What is Truth Social?
```

"ANSWER: It's a platform that's been open by me as an alternative to Twitter.
"QUESTION: And your handle on Truth Social is 'At Real Donald Trump?'
"ANSWER: I believe so, yes."
Is this the official written record of the portion of the deposition video that we just saw?
A. It is.

MS. MANGOLD: Can we now show the jury what is in evidence as People's Exhibit 403B.
(Displayed.)
MS. MANGOLD: Can we now show the jury what is in evidence as People's Exhibit 404B.
(Displayed.)
Q. Is this Page 44 of the same deposition transcript?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you read the unredacted portions from lines 3 to 9.
A. Sure.
"QUESTION: Your current wife is Melania Trump?
"ANSWER: That is correct, yes.
"QUESTION: And you married her, according to my
records, in 2005?
"ANSWER: Yes.
"QUESTION: And you're still married to her today?
"ANSWER: Yes."

A. It denotes an action that happened that is not a verbal response.
Q. And is this the official written record of that portion of Mr. Trump's deposition?
A. Yes, it is.

MS. MANGOLD: No further questions.
THE COURT: Your witness.
MR. BLANCHE: Two seconds.
(Brief pause.)
MR. BLANCHE: We don't have any questions.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
You can step down.
(Witness excused.)
***

THE COURT: People, your next witness.
MR. STEINGLASS: The People call Keith Davidson.
(Witness entering courtroom.)
***

COURT OFFICER: Remain standing. Raise your right hand and face the clerk.

THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are going to give before this Court and jury shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, do you so swear or affirm?

THE WITNESS: I do.

Q. School age, college age, adult children?
A. College age.
Q. Can you please describe for the jury your educational
background?
A. I graduated from Boston College, my undergraduate
degree. I went to Whittier Law School.
Q. Where is Whittier Law School?
A. It's in Los Angles, California.
Q. Are you currently employed?
A. Yes.
Q. By whom?
A. My law firm that I own.
Q. What is the name of the law firm that you own?
A. Davidson \& Associates.
Q. Where, very generally, is that law firm located?
A. Los Angeles, California.
Q. Do you have a speciality?
A. Civil litigation.
Q. Any particular types of civil litigation?
A. A lot of injury cases, mediation cases.
Q. Any sexual abuse cases?
A. Yes.
Q. During the period from 2015 to 2017, did you have a
particular speciality?
A. At that time my practice was heavily involved with

| 1 | media cases. $\quad$ Page 1692 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. You said media cases? |
| 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | Q. Did you frequently work on, as part of those media |
| 5 | cases, nondisclosure agreements? |
| 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | Q. And can you briefly describe for the jury what is a |
| 8 | nondisclosure agreement? |
| 9 | A. It's an agreement between two people or entities where |
| 10 | certain subjects are agreed, or there is an agreement between |
| 11 | the parties not to discuss certain subjects. |
| 12 | Q. And during that period from 2015 to 2017, were some of |
| 13 | your clients in those cases individuals who often appeared in |
| 14 | tabloid magazines? |
| 15 | A. On occasion, yes. |
| 16 | Q. During that same period, from 2015 to 2017, I am only |
| 17 | asking for the last four digits, please, of your work cell phone |
| 18 | number? |
| 19 | A. 5361. |
| 20 | Q. The last four digits of your office phone number? |
| 21 | A. 5444. |
| 22 | Q. Is that a landline? |
| 23 | A. Yes. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | Q. During that same period, what was your business email address domain? |
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    A. Dylan Howard was the former Content Editor, I believe,
or the Chief Content Officer of American Media Inc.
    Q. How do you know him?
    A. I knew him in my professional dealings.
    Q. About how long would you say you have known Dylan
Howard?
    A. Well over ten years.
    Q. Now, directing your attention specifically to the
period around 2015 to 2017, can you describe a little bit the
nature of your relationship with Dylan Howard?
    A. We were professional acquaintances and friends.
    Q. And when you say a portion of your relationship
involved a professional acquaintance, what kind of business
dealings did you have with Dylan Howard at that time?
    A. On occasion my clients would end up in tabloid media
and they would call me for comment, or my clients would
regrettably end up in tabloid media and they would call me to
address their presence in the tabloids.
    Q. And did you ever, at your client's request, negotiate
the sale of certain stories to tabloids?
    A. Rarely.
    Q. That was rarely, you said?
    A. Rarely, yes.
    Q. During that period, again, from 2015 to 2017,
approximately how often did you and Mr. Howard speak either on a
```


and I had the occasion to have a conversation with Michael Cohen relating to that blog posting.
Q. We'll get back to that.

Who was your client at the time that led you to
interact with Michael Cohen on behalf of Donald Trump?
A. Stephanie Clifford, otherwise known as Stormy Daniels.
Q. Now, during that period from 2015 to 2017, did you at times use encrypted apps, encrypted phone apps to communicate with Michael Cohen?
A. Ultimately, on occasion, yes.
Q. Do you remember which apps you used?
A. Not particularly.
Q. Okay.

I'm going to ask you please to take a look at a thumb drive.

I am going to ask you if you recognize it?
A. I do.
Q. How do you recognize it?
A. My initials are on it.
Q. Is the date that you examined it also on there?
A. Yes.
Q. What date is that?
A. Today's April -- April 30th.
Q. Did you briefly have the opportunity to examine the contents of that drive?
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. I am. |
| 2 | Q. Did you produce each of the records, I am speaking |
| 3 | specifically of People's Exhibits 276 through 286 -- are each of |
| 4 | those records produced by you pursuant to a subpoena by the New |
| 5 | York County District Attorney's office? |
| 6 | A. They were produced pursuant to a subpoena. |
| 7 | Q. Did you also get a chance to review Exhibits 62 through |
| 8 | 63 on that same thumb drive? |
| 9 | A. Yes, I did. |
| 10 | Q. Are those also a series of emails and attachments |
| 11 | between yourself and Michael Cohen? |
| 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. Are those emails sent and received in the ordinary |
| 14 | course of your firm's business? |
| 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | Q. Do these exhibits, 62 through 65 range, are they exact |
| 17 | copies of emails and attachments that you sent and received back |
| 18 | and forth with Michael Cohen back in 2016 ? |
| 19 | A. They are. |
| 20 | Q. And has the substance of those emails been altered in |
| 21 | any way? |
| 22 | A. No. |
| 23 | Q. Do the date and timestamps contained on those emails |
|  | accurately reflect the times the text messages were sent and |
| 25 | received? |
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Q. And do you know, approximately, when it was that she became your client?
A. Not offhand.
Q. And do you know how it was that she became your client?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us, please?
A. Her former brother-in-law was a client of mine and her former brother-in-law, by the name of Jay Grdina, made the
introduction or the re-introduction between Karen and I.
                (Displayed.)
Q. So I am now showing you People's 279 in evidence.
It's in evidence. It can be displayed to everyone.
    I am going to ask you when it pops up, if you recognize
```

this document?
A. I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is an email from me to Karen McDougal with the cc to Jay Grdina thanking her for the conversation of that day, 6/15/2016.
Q. And does the email also contain an attachment?
A. It does, yes. The attachment is a retainer agreement between me and my law firm and Karen.
Q. Is it fair to say you are sending her a blank retainer agreement?
A. I am sending her a signature ready retainer agreement
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | for her signature. |
| 2 | Q. Got it. |
| 3 | When I say "blank," I mean her signature line was |
| 4 | blank, you were sending it to her for that purpose; is that |
| 5 | right? |
| 6 | A. For execution. |
| 7 | Q. Got it. |
| 8 | I believe you told us the date of the email was |
| 9 | June 15, 2016? |
| 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | Q. So I want to show you Page 2 of this exhibit. Is this |
| 12 | the first page of your retainer agreement? |
| 13 | A. Yes. |
| 14 | Q. I am going to ask that we blow up Paragraph 2. I am |
| 15 | going to ask you to read that for us. |
| 16 | A. Paragraph 2: Scope of Services: |
| 17 | Client is hiring attorney to represent client in the |
| 18 | matter of client's claims against Donald Trump, and/or assisting |
| 19 | client in negotiating a confidential agreement and other live |
| 20 | rights related to actions with Donald Trump, and/or negotiating |
|  | an assignment with exclusive press opportunities regarding the |
| 22 | same. |
| 23 | Q. Can you translate that for us? |
|  | A. I was to provide legal services to Karen McDougal and |
| 25 | provide advice and counsel to her surrounding a personal |

(Whereupon, Theresa Magniccari, Senior Court Reporter was Relieved by Laurie Eisenberg, as Senior Court Reporter.)

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```
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```
    Q And is one of the ways in which -- withdrawn.
    This paragraph is entitled Scope of Services; correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Does one of the contemplated services include,
potentially, negotiating the assignment of exclusive press
opportunities regarding her interaction with Mr. Trump?
    A That's true.
    Q What does that mean, "negotiating the assignment of
exclusive press opportunities"?
    A (Pause) At that time, in mid-Two-Thousand-Teens or so,
media outlets, both traditional and tabloid, would, often
times, enter into exclusive arrangements where someone would
provide an exclusive content to that media outlet in exchange
for money.
    Q And did you -- you wrote this Retainer Agreement;
correct?
    A I believe so.
    Q And did you contemplate -- withdrawn.
    Did you discuss with Ms. McDougal the fact that you were
authorized to negotiate on her behalf in dealing with various
media outlets?
    A I can't and won't discuss what I discussed with
Ms. McDougal.
    I think that the paragraph speaks for itself.
    Q Okay.
```
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Page 1712

Trump.
Q Given the presence of others at this meeting, do you believe that the contents of what Ms. McDougal said was privileged?

A $\quad$ No.
Q So, can you tell us the substance of what Ms. McDougal said about the nature of her interactions with Mr. Trump during this meeting?

A I can summarize it.
Q That's fine.
A Ms. McDougal alleged that she had had a -- a romantic affair with Donald Trump some years prior.

Q And -- withdrawn.
When you say "romantic", does that include sexual?
A That's what she expressed.
Q And do you know how long that romantic and sexual affair lasted -- withdrawn.

As a result of what Ms. McDougal said in that meeting, which was non-privileged, do you know how long that affair lasted for or how long she said it lasted for?

A I can't recall, specifically.
It was several weeks to months, if not more.
I can't recall, specifically.
Q Okay.
Now, generally speaking, Mr. Davidson, what was the purpose

```
of this meeting between your client and Dylan Howard?
    A It was sort of a proffer session where -- where
Ms. McDougal would -- under agreement that nothing was to be
published, where Ms. McDougal would tell her story to Dylan
Howard on behalf of AMI, so that Dylan could gauge interest in
the story, whether or not AMI did or did not have interest in
this story.
    Q Now, did the meeting result in an immediate deal with
AMI?
    A No, it did not.
    Q How did you leave it with Dylan Howard?
    A Um, Dylan wanted to -- to return to New York, um, run
it up the flagpole, and stated that he would get back to me.
    Q When you say "run it up the flagpole", who, to your
knowledge, was higher at AMI, higher than Dylan Howard?
    A It's my understanding that the only one higher than
Dylan Howard at AMI was David Pecker.
    Q So, very generally speaking, in the weeks that
followed, what happened after that?
    A I think Dylan -- the first entree, if you will, was
that Dylan stated that AMI was not interested at that time
because Karen lacked -- excuse me -- Karen, Karen McDougal
lacked documentary evidence of the interaction.
    Q So, how did you leave it?
    A Um, I think we just said we would keep in touch.
```
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Howard emailed?
    A Perhaps, David Pecker.
    Q Okay.
    So, directing your attention to the last blown-up line on
Page 4, is this another exchange between you and Dylan Howard?
    A Yes.
    Q And who wrote this?
    A This is from Dylan Howard -- no.
    This is from me.
    Q On what day?
    A July 22nd.
    Q And what's the body of the email or -- sorry -- the
body of the text?
    A "Don't forget about Cohen. Time is of the essence. The
girl is being cornered" -- this is -- "the girl is being
cornered by the estrogen mafia."
    Q So, who is "Cohen" in this email?
    A Michael Cohen.
    Q And what did you mean by "time is of the essence"? The
same as the "better be quick" email or text from earlier?
    A Yeah.
    I think, at the time, Karen was sort of teetering. She was
about to enter into a deal with ABC.
    Q And what did you mean by "The girl is being cornered
by the estrogen mafia"?
```
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| 1 | not actually have to tell that story, or she wouldn't have to 1721 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | tell her story? |
| 3 | A Well, that was one of her stated goals, and that would |
| 4 | be in alignment with one of her very important stated goals. |
| 5 | Q So, Mr. Howard says: "Get me a price. All in," |
| 6 | et cetera. |
| 7 | How do you respond? |
| 8 | A It's a negotiation, and so I started high and threw |
| 9 | out a million dollars. |
| 10 | I said: "How about one million now and 75,000 a year for |
| 11 | the next two years as a fitness correspondent for AMI and your |
| 12 | related publications?" |
| 13 | Q So, you -- you almost translated that text a little |
| 14 | bit as you read it; right? |
| 15 | The number "1M" you read as "one million"; is that correct? |
| 16 | A Would you like me to read it? |
| 17 | Q That's fine. |
| 18 | A "1M" is one million, yes. |
| 19 | Q And "75K" is "75,000"? |
| 20 | A Yes. |
| 21 | Q I know this sounds silly, but "ur" is shorthand for |
| 22 | the words "you are"? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q And "pubs" is short for "publications"? |
| 25 | A Yes. |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |
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Q Can you just explain that a little bit more?
A That, somehow, if Karen did this deal with AMI, that it would help Donald Trump's candidacy.

Q And at the time that you sent that text in jest, did you understand that AMI was working with then-candidate Trump regarding your client?

A I don't know about that. I don't know that $I$ had specific information that they were or not working with him.

I knew that they had announced their support for Mr. Trump, but $I$ don't know that they were working with him.

Q Okay.
Is it safe to assume from your joke that you had an understanding that if you were to close your deal, this would somehow benefit the candidate, Donald Trump?

A Yes.
Q So, I want to turn your attention to Page 6, the next few lines, 292 to 293.

I'll ask you, what is the date of these texts?
A July 28th.
Q Yes. I'm sorry. July 28th. That's right.
Go ahead.
A This was from Dylan Howard: "She'll get more out of a deal with AMI than ABC. And I'm happy to sign some sort of agreement that alleviates some fears about jurisdiction/meeting only with AMI."

```
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                                    Page 1725
    Q That's a text from Dylan. That means Dylan Howard;
correct?
    A Yes.
    Q What did you understand that to mean?
    A I -- I understand the first part, the first sentence.
    I'm not so sure I understand the second sentence.
    Q Okay.
    Well, tell us about the part you do understand.
    A "She'll get more out of a deal with AMI than ABC," I
think that's self-explanatory.
    And Dylan was making his case why they were the right
avenue for Karen to choose.
    Q Okay.
    How did you respond?
    A "I need this to happen."
    Q Now, Mr. Davidson, based on non-privileged
communications to which you were privy, why did you need this
to happen?
    Why did Karen McDougal prefer the AMI deal to the ABC deal?
    A Because she -- at that time -- at that time, based on
non-privileged information, she had announced her desire to not
tell the story about her interaction with Donald Trump.
    Q So that -- withdrawn.
    Part of the allure of the AMI deal was that she wouldn't
have to; is that your understanding?
```
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| 1 | Page 1727 <br> Keep an open mind as to the defendant's guilt or |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | innocence. |
| 3 | Please do not express or form an opinion as to |
| 4 | the defendant's guilt or innocence. |
| 5 | Please remember all of my other admonitions. |
| 6 | Just put the case out of your mind. |
| 7 | Enjoy your lunch. |
| 8 | COURT OFFICER: All rise. |
| 9 | (Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors |
| 10 | are excused.) |
| 11 | THE COURT: Thank you, sir. |
| 12 | You can step down. |
| 13 | (Whereupon, the witness is excused.) |
| 14 | THE COURT: See you at 2:15. |
| 15 | (Whereupon, a luncheon recess is taken.) |
| 16 | ******************************************** |
| 17 | (Whereupon, the case is recalled in the afternoon |
| 18 | session.) |
| 19 | THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People v. |
| 20 | Donald J. Trump. |
| 21 | All parties are present. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Good afternoon. |
| 23 | Should we get the witness? |
| 24 | MR. STEINGLASS: Sure. |
| 25 | THE COURT: Let's get the witness, please. |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |


|  | Page 1728 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | COURT OFFICER: Witness entering. |
| 2 | (Whereupon, the witness, Keith Davidson, having |
| 3 | been previously duly sworn and/or affirmed, resumes the |
| 4 | witness stand and testifies as follows:) |
| 5 | THE COURT: I remind you, you're under oath. |
| 6 | Let's get the jury, please. |
| 7 | COURT OFFICER: All rise. Jury entering. |
| 8 | (Whereupon, the jurors and the alternate jurors |
| 9 | are present and properly seated.). |
| 10 | THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial. People v. |
| 11 | Donald J. Trump. |
| 12 | All parties and all jurors are present. |
| 13 | MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you, Judge. |
| 14 | CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 15 | BY MR. STEINGLASS: |
| 16 | Q Good afternoon, Mr. Howard [sic]. |
| 17 | I just want to put -- that's the second time. |
| 18 | Good afternoon, Mr. Davidson. |
| 19 | I want to show you part of a text exchange we were looking |
| 20 | at before lunch. This is from People's 176A, Lines -- Page 6, |
| 21 | Lines 292 to 293. |
| 22 | (Whereupon, exhibits are shown on the screens |
| 23 | throughout the following testimony.) |
| 24 | Q So, that last text that's sent on July 29th at 2:24 AM |
| 25 | UTC time, is that text to you from Dylan Howard or the other |


|  | Page 1729 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | way around? |
| 2 | A It's from Dylan Howard to me. |
| 3 | Q And, so, when Dylan Howard said, "I need this to |
| 4 | happen," how did you interpret that? |
| 5 | A I don't know. I suppose I interpreted it that he |
| 6 | wanted it to happen. |
| 7 | Q You mean, "it" being the deal with Karen McDougal and |
| 8 | AMI? |
| 9 | A Yes, sir. |
| 10 | Q Okay. |
| 11 | Continuing on with this exhibit to the next page, Page 7, |
| 12 | I'm going to blow up Lines 314 to 319. |
| 13 | Again, I'll ask you to give us the date, the to and the |
| 14 | from, and the substance of these emails -- texts. |
| 15 | A You want me to read right through all of them? |
| 16 | Q Sure. |
| 17 | Start with the date and time of the first one, please. |
| 18 | A This is August 2nd, from me to Dylan Howard: "I can't |
| 19 | believe they are asking me to go back to you for another 25 but |
| 20 | they are. He deal is accepted at 150. Can you do that?" |
| 21 | Q A couple of questions about that. |
| 22 | First of all, does "25" mean "25,000"? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q And "he deal", should that read "the deal"? |
| 25 | A Yes. |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```

```
                                    Page 1730
    Q Who was asking you to go back for another $25,000?
    A It would be Mr. Grdina and Karen McDougal.
    Q And how did Dylan Howard respond?
    A "He just called me. 'F' it. Not my money. I'll ask."
    Q When you said, "F it," is the full "F" word written
out in the text?
    A Yes.
    Q What did you understand that to mean?
    A Um, that someone just called him, and that he didn't
care about money because it wasn't his; he would run it up the
flagpole.
    Q "He didn't care about money; he would run it up the
flagpole;" you're referring to Dylan Howard?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay.
    The next text please, who is that from?
    A From me, to Dylan: "Let's try and wrap up Karen's
deal. She is getting repeated phone calls from Rhonda
Schwartz."
    Q What did you mean by that?
    A That the deal was getting stale. It had been left on
the counter for a bit. And if he wanted to close it up, now was
the time.
    Q Who is Rhonda Schwartz?
    A Rhonda was with the Investigation Department at ABC
```

```
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```

```
News. She works or worked for Brian Ross.
    Q Okay.
    How did he respond?
    A Dylan responded: "We are figuring out the mechanics
of the deal already."
    Q What did you understand that to mean?
    A Just, that they were figuring out how to paper the
deal.
    Q Paper the deal between Karen McDougal and AMI?
    A Yes.
    Q Did he add something after that?
    A "Right now I mean."
    Q Did you respond?
    A I responded: "Got it."
    Q Okay.
    Also, on Page 7, Lines 320 and 321, what is the date of
this exchange?
    A August 5, 2016.
    Q And who sent the first text in this blown-up portion
of these -- this exchange?
    A Dylan Howard to me.
    "Cameron's" -- excuse me.
    This is August 5, 2016. It's from me to Dylan.
    Q Okay.
    What did you say?
```

```
Page 1732
A "Cameron's agreement wasn't really even close to what we were expecting. Please review the red-line I just sent. Need to handle this quickly."
Q First of all, who is "Cameron"?
A Cameron Stracher is General Counsel for AMI.
Q What is a "red-line"?
A A "red-line" is just modifications or corrections to an editable document that's like -- it's a step along the way in modifying a document.
Q So, what did you mean when you said that his agreement wasn't close to what you were expecting?
A We had come to terms by this point with AMI on the deal points. And there was a Short-Form Agreement or at least deal points. And that that was negotiated between Dylan and I. And then Dylan, as a content editor, handed it off to the Legal Department at AMI, Cameron. And when the Short-Form Agreement or the deal points morphed into the Long-Form Agreement with Cameron, they didn't jive.
Q So, do I understand you correctly to be saying that Cameron had sent you a contract, and it did not match your understanding of what you thought the deal was that had been negotiated between yourself and Mr. Howard?
```

A Correct.
Q So, when you refer to "the red-line", does that mean you made proposed changes to the contract they had sent over
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Karen.

Q This seems like a good opportunity to just tell us about the conversation you had with Michael Cohen.

A I seem to recall that after the deal closed with
Michael Cohen -- excuse me.

After the deal closed with AMI, I called Michael Cohen. And I can't recall specifically whether -- maybe Dylan asked me to or something, but $I$ called him and let him know, as a professional courtesy, that the deal involving his client had closed.

And I told him, as I stated to you and Dylan Howard, that: "This deal wouldn't have happened without Dylan."

Q Now, you said that you called Michael Cohen as a professional courtesy because the deal involving his client closed.

What client is that?
A Donald Trump.
Q Was Donald Trump a party to this agreement, a named party to this agreement between yourself or between, I should say, Karen McDougal and AMI?

A No.
Q Did you recognize the extent to which the deal could benefit Mr. Cohen's client, Donald Trump?

A Yes.
Q What was Michael Cohen's reaction when you told him

```
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```
that the deal was closed?
    A He was pleased.
    Q Now, that deal between AMI and Karen McDougal, did
that eventually -- did the contract eventually get signed?
    A Yes.
    Q And, generally speaking, what were the terms?
    A There was a financial aspect of the deal. I think it
was $150,000. It involved certain personal services that Karen
would render to AMI, which included, um, magazine covers,
weekly or monthly columns where she could write on subject
matters that interested her, um, and I believe that was it.
    Q As part of that deal, did AMI acquire Karen McDougal's
limited life story rights to any romantic, personal and/or
physical relationship with any then-married man?
    A Yes.
    Q Just to be clear, who negotiated these terms on behalf
of AMI?
```

    A Mainly, Dylan Howard, and then Cameron got involved at
    some point.
Q And on behalf of Karen McDougal?
A I did.
Q I am now showing you what's in evidence already as
People's Exhibit 156.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you show them to everyone?
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
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then-married man to AMI.
So that became, in effect, their intellectual property,
their exclusive intellectual property.
Q Now, based on non-privileged communications to which
you were privy, was there a particular then-married man with
whom you understood this to apply?

A Yes.
Q Who?
A Donald Trump.
Q I'm going to move to Paragraphs 4 and 5 and ask you, first of all, does Paragraph 4 contain the amount that AMI was
compensating Karen McDougal for her Limited Life Rights, as
well as some of the other services that you mentioned?

A Yes.
Q How much was she being paid?
A $\quad 150,000$.
Q How much of that went to you?
A Somewhere between -- I think 45 percent.
Q And Paragraph 5, can you read that paragraph out loud?
A Paragraph 5: "Nothing herein shall obligate AMI to use the Life Rights in connection with any media. AMI's obligations to McDougal shall be the payment to McDougal of the sum set forth in Paragraph 4 and the obligations set forth in Paragraph 1, 2.1 and 2.2.

Q Those paragraphs, 1, 2.1, 2.2, does that set out the

```
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other services that you mentioned?
    A Yes.
    Q What does this paragraph mean, Paragraph 5?
    A It means that it was really AMI's option as to whether
or not they ever wanted to run the story of Karen's interaction
with any then-married man or not. It was their option to either
run it or not.
    Q Now, at the time this agreement was executed, did you
believe AMI intended to publish the story?
    A No.
    Q Why did you believe that?
    A I believe it was stated.
    Q Stated by whom, if you remember?
    A AMI.
    Q Did you have an understanding as to why AMI would be
purchasing a story that they didn't intend to print?
    A I think there were two.
    I think one was -- one explanation that was given was that
they were trying to build Karen into a brand and didn't want to
diminish her reputation.
    And the second was more of an unspoken understanding that
there was a close affiliation between David Pecker and Donald
Trump, and that AMI would not run this story or any story
related to Karen and Donald Trump as it would tend to hurt
Donald Trump.
```


## K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass

Q When you say "hurt Donald Trump", you mean hurt Donald Trump's campaign?

A Yes.
Q Thank you.
I want to show you Page 2, Paragraph 7.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q Again, I'm not going to ask you to read this whole paragraph out loud.

You can just read it to yourself, and when you're done, maybe you can tell us what it means.
(Whereupon, the witness reviews the exhibit on
his screen.)
A This is really an Exclusivity paragraph. It means the rights that Karen was transferring to AMI were Exclusive, and she could not -- she could not -- she retained no intellectual property rights in the story for herself; and that's one.

And, two, that she cannot transfer them, subsequently, to anybody else.

Q She no longer owned her own story?
A The limited story.
Q The portion of the story that dealt with her affair with Donald Trump?

A Fair.
Q Is that true?
A True.
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Page 1744
Q What would happen, according to this paragraph, if Karen McDougal did take her story elsewhere?

A The last sentence is a liquidated damages provision. She would owe back, basically, the 150.

Q Would she owe back the entire $\$ 150,000$, even though she was doing magazine covers and columns?

A Pardon?
Q Would she owe back the entire 150,000, even though she was still doing the columns and magazine covers?

A Yes.
Q Going back to that signature on Page 3, did Karen McDougal sign this document?
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
A Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you blow up the bottom, please?

A Yes. Yes.
Q And --
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you blow up a little more of the bottom?

Q I would like to know what date she signed it
(Whereupon, the witness reviews the exhibit on
his screen.)
A Yeah.
This is Johnny Crawford that we mentioned earlier, which is

```
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a notary.
August 6, 2016.
Q And who, if anyone, signed the Agreement on behalf of
AMI?
A I don't -- it looks to be Chief Content Officer, which
would be Dylan Howard.
Q So, Dylan Howard's title is listed.
Do you recognize whether or not that's his signature?
A Not particularly.
Q Okay.
Let's go back to People's 176A in evidence. Specifically,
Page 9, Lines 357 to 61.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q I'm going to ask you, this is this another text
exchange between you and Dylan Howard from August 5, 2016?
A Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Let me double-check one moment.
I think I misspoke.
Q Is this a text exchange between you and Dylan Howard
from August 8th of 2016?
A Yes.
What was the date of that AMI? The 5th? That last exhibit?
Q I don't want to testify.
We can pull that back up.
I believe you told us it was signed on August 6th.

## K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass

| 1 | Page 1746 <br> Let me show you the first page in terms of the Effective |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Date. |
| 3 | (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.) |
| 4 | A Fair enough. |
| 5 | Thank you. |
| 6 | Q So, just for the record, what is the Effective Date of |
| 7 | the contract? |
| 8 | A August 5, 2016. |
| 9 | Q Okay. |
| 10 | Going back now to what we were showing you before, some |
| 11 | texts on Page 9 of 176A. |
| 12 | (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.) |
| 13 | Q Lines 357 to 61. |
| 14 | And were these texts back and forth sent on August 8th, and |
| 15 | at the very bottom August 9th, of 2016? |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q And what do the texts say, please? |
| 18 | A This is from me to Dylan: "I am going to let ABC know |
| 19 | that Karen has decided to keep her story quiet. I'm going to |
| 20 | let them know that the family has begged and pleaded with her |
|  | to not come out and that she has promised her family she |
| 22 | wouldn't. I will have Karen ignore all of their calls. Any |
| 23 | objection?" |
| 24 | Q What did you mean by that? |
| 25 | A I stated before we had parallel negotiations with AMI |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |

```
and ABC, and I needed to, sort of, off-board ABC. And I'll
leave it at that.
    Q How did Dylan Howard respond?
    A "Yep, that's fine."
    Q And what did you say after that?
    A (Laughs) Um, "By the way, they promised her a role on
Dancing With the Stars, season 578568655."
    Q Was the number of the season another joke?
    A Yes.
    Q Does "BTW" stand for "by the way"?
    I know that is a silly question.
    A Yes.
    Q Had a potential role on Dancing With the Stars been
part of the package that you were negotiating with ABC on
behalf of Ms. McDougal?
```

    A It was discussed a lot. Um, and it was -- there was an
    inference that best efforts would be made to make that happen,
but it was never guaranteed, and it was never part of the deal.
But -- best -- best efforts were discussed.
Q Okay.
And how did Dylan respond?
A "Ha." A laugh.
Q Did he send you another text?
A Yes.
"Payment will be made this week. FYI -- sooner rather than
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Daniels?

A Yes.
Q In 2011, did you ever speak to Stormy Daniels, or did you deal exclusively with Gina Rodriguez, or someone else?

A I think I had a brief conversation with Stormy and Gina.

Q In 2011?
A Yeah.

But, most of my conversations, I believe, were with Gina.
Q What, if anything, did you do on behalf of Stormy Daniels in 2011?

A Sent a Cease-and-Desist Letter to the blog that we mentioned earlier, The Dirty.com.

Q So, the name of the blog is The Dirty.com?
A Yes.
Q What was the nature of the story that was on the blog that caused you to send the Cease-and-Desist Letter?

A There was a blog post or a story posted on the website that stated that Stormy Daniels and Donald Trump had -- had some sort of a physical or romantic, um, interaction.

Q So, you said that in connection with this effort on your part, that you had a conversation with Michael Cohen?

A Yes.
Q Can you tell us how that came about and how that conversation went?

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```



```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```



```
representation of Stormy Daniels in the matter of her liaison
with Mr. Trump?
```

    A In the Summer of 2016?
    Q Yes.
    The Summer -- actually, I think the question was, Summer
    and Fall.
You can clarify.
A I -- no, I don't believe so. I don't think it was
until the Fall.
Q Okay.
So, let me show you what's in evidence as People's 176A.
This is that same set of text messages. I want to go back to
Page 4; specifically, Lines 175 to 177.
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
Q Again, I'll ask you, is this another text exchange
between you and Dylan Howard?
A Yes.
Q What is the date of this exchange?
A June 30, 2016.
Q What do the texts say?
A This is from Dylan to me: "FYI Gina trying to hawk
Stormy again."
Q What did you understand that to mean?
A Part of Gina's role and responsibility or services
that she provided was to monetize stories in the press. She was

```
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|  | Page 1753 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | like a story broker. |
| 2 | And Dylan, obviously, was a purchaser of stories. |
| 3 | So, I interpreted from this text that Dylan had been |
| 4 | approached by Gina, who was trying to sell the story regarding |
| 5 | Stormy and Donald Trump again. |
| 6 | Q And did you respond in some way? |
| 7 | A I responded: "LOL -- she's trying to sell a story to |
| 8 | you?", question mark. |
| 9 | Q "LOL", is that texting lingo for "laugh out loud"? |
| 10 | A It is. |
| 11 | Q How did Dylan respond? |
| 12 | A "Yep." |
| 13 | Q How did you interpret that whole exchange? What did |
| 14 | you interpret that to mean? |
| 15 | A As I previously stated, that Gina was trying to -- was |
| 16 | bringing this story back to market. |
| 17 | Q And that she had contacted Dylan Howard about it? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | Q Now, did there come a point in time in which interest |
| 20 | in the Stormy Daniels story increased? |
| 21 | A Yes. |
| 22 | Q Can you explain that a little bit? |
| 23 | A Um, well, in 2011, we know that The Dirty published |
|  | their story. And I think I later learned that there was some |
| 25 | other interest in 2011 from In Touch Magazine. |
|  | Laurie Eisenberg, CSR, RPR Senior Court Reporter |

```
                                    Page 1754
    Years went by. At least five years went by until that last
text message with Dylan.
    Um, and, really, there was very little -- to Gina's
dissatisfaction, very little interest in the story publishing
or in the marketability of the story.
    Um, this -- this continued through the Summer from what I
understand. I was not involved. But, through the Summer into
the Fall, where there was still being very little interest,
despite the fact that Mr. Trump's notoriety was gaining.
    Q Directing your attention to October 7th -- excuse
me -- of 2016.
    Did you come to learn about the release of something that's
known as the Access Hollywood tape?
    A Yes.
    Q And, briefly, for the jury, what is the Access
Hollywood tape?
A The Access Hollywood tape, from what I understand, was -- was what's called a hot mic, which is a microphone that's recording. Um, and I think the insinuation when you say "hot mic" is it's live and recording, but perhaps unknown to the person who is mic'd.
So, this was an incident where Donald Trump and Billy Bush was in the van. They were on the set of Access Hollywood, or it was released by Access Hollywood. I don't even know.
There was an allegation that -- at least a record -- the
```

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```

```
hot mic recorded some statements by both men, um, that were
troublesome.
```

    Q What impact, if any, did the release of the Access
    Hollywood tape have on interest in Stormy Daniels' story, so
far as you were aware?
A So far as I'm aware, it had tremendous influence.
Q Can you explain that a little bit to the jury, please?
A Before -- yes.
Before Access Hollywood tape, there was very little, if any
interest, from what $I$ understand, and Gina was trying to sell
the Stormy Daniels/Donald Trump story.
It wasn't until Access Hollywood that interest sort of
reached a crescendo.
Q So, going back to People's 176A in evidence,
specifically on Page 1761, Lines 482 to 494 . Is this another
text exchange between you and Dylan Howard on October 8th and
October 9th of 2016?
(Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
A Yes.
Q Who sent the first text in this chain?
A It's from me.
Q And what did you say?
A "Trump is F'd."
Q You wrote the whole word out, "F'd", in the text?
A I did.

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```



```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```



```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```

Page 1758

```
directly to Dylan and negotiated a deal with Dylan, outside of
me. I had nothing to do with that deal.
    And I believe they came to terms.
    Q I'm sorry?
    A I believe they came to terms.
    Q Did there come a time when you spoke with Dylan Howard
about the Stormy Daniels story?
    A Yes.
    Q And how did that conversation go?
    A I don't -- I don't recall. Other than what has already
been displayed.
```

    Q Okay.
    So, let me show you People's 178A in evidence.
            MR. STEINGLASS: So everyone can see it.
    Q I'm going to ask you, do you recognize this?
                            (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
    A Yes.
    Q And is this a record of texts among yourself, Michael
    Cohen and Dylan Howard?
A Yes.
Q Did you answer that?
A Yes. It is a record of texts between the three of us.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can we just un-blow it up for
one second?
Q How many texts are in this chain?

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
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Page 1761

```
you understand Dylan to be saying when he said: "Spoke to the
client this AM and they're confirmed to proceed with the
opportunity"?
    A That he spoke to either Gina or Gina and Stormy, and
that they were confirmed to proceed.
    He -- Dylan was washing his hands of the deal and sort of
handing the deal over to -- first, Gina to close; and then she
didn't want to do that; and, ultimately, me to close with
Cohen.
    Q What was your understanding of Michael Cohen's
interest in the matter?
    A I believe that -- I believe that Michael Cohen was
personal attorney or general counsel for Donald Trump, and that
this story involved his client, and that was his interest in
the story.
    Q Was it it unusual -- withdrawn.
    You said you had known Dylan Howard for years?
    A Yes.
    Q And you had other business interactions with Dylan
Howard?
    A Yes.
    Q Was it unusual for Dylan Howard to connect you to
someone outside of AMI to purchase a story?
    A I think this is the only time that ever happened.
    Q So, did there come a time, after this, that you spoke
```

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```

```
with Michael Cohen about the Stormy Daniels story?
    A Yes.
    Q And do you remember -- withdrawn.
    Tell us how that conversation went.
    A Well, it was different than 2011. Um. And, it was
fairly conciliatory.
    The deal had already been cut at $120,000.
    And -- then, um, we -- we needed to pad the deal, um, to
compensate me now, because I was added to the deal, and Stormy
and Gina weren't gonna take a discount for involving me. So,
that 120 became 130.
    Q So, when you say the deal is already cut at $120,000,
it was cut between Stormy Daniels and AMI; right?
    A Yes.
    Q Was this the same deal in your mind, a different deal?
How --
    A It was the same deal.
    They were going to acquire the intellectual property rights
in this story, exclusive rights.
    Q But, instead of AMI purchasing it, it was now Michael
Cohen, on behalf of Donald Trump?
    A Well, after AMI washed their hands of the deal and
then they handed it -- handed it -- AMI handed it off to Cohen,
they -- in essence, Michael Cohen stepped into AMI's shoes.
    Q And at the time that you got involved, had Michael
```

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```

Cohen already stepped into AMI's shoes?
A I believe so.
Q Did you negotiate -- withdrawn.
Did you -- you said you had to "pad the deal" so that you
could get compensated; is that right?
A Yes.
Q How did you "pad the deal" so you could get
compensated?
A Gina approached me. She said, "Hey, can we have this
deal?" She said, "It's going to be the easiest deal you've
ever done in your entire life." (Laughs). "It's already been
negotiated. It's already done. All you need to do is paper it
and talk to that asshole Cohen."
Q That's what Gina said?
A Yes.
Q And did you know when you were dealing with Michael
Cohen that you were dealing with Donald Trump?
A Yes.
I never thought otherwise.
Q And how did you change the terms of the deal that had
previously been negotiated between Gina and Dylan Howard so
that you would be compensated now that the deal was between
Stormy Daniels and Michael Cohen?

A I think a little of that happened even before my involvement, and there was a -- when Dylan washed his hands of

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```

```
it, um, he and Gina had a conversation.
    And -- and Gina said, "Well, look, we already have a deal
of 120. If I need to bring a lawyer into this, our net is going
to be reduced."
    And Dylan said, "Don't worry about it. We'll make the deal
or Cohen will make the deal 150,000."
    And then Gina called me, engaged me.
    I called Cohen and picked it up.
    Q And what was the price that you agreed on with Michael
Cohen?
    A So, the }150\mathrm{ wasn't really true. Um, it turned out to
be 130. So, it was the original 120, plus 10,000.
    Q I am now showing you People's Exhibit 63 in evidence.
I'm going to display Page 1.
                            MR. STEINGLASS: This is in evidence. Everyone can
        see it.
            (Whereupon, an exhibit is shown on the screens.)
            Q Do you recognize this?
            A Yes.
            Q What is it?
            A This is an email from me to Michael Cohen.
            Q And what is the date of this email from you to Michael
Cohen?
    A October 11, 2016.
    Q Did the email contain attachments?
```

```
K. Davidson - Direct/Steinglass
```
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```
                                    Page 1767
            (The following proceedings are continued from
        previous page.)
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
    Q. And is what was the purpose of using a side letter
agreement with this particular deal?
    A. The Side Letter Agreement -- the purpose for using a
Side Letter Agreement, it uses like code words that are used in
a military-like operation, so it ensures the further
confidentiality in case a fully executed contract was lost or
stolen. So even if that occurred, you wouldn't lose the
confidential nature of the document.
    So the Side Letter Agreement is typically used in these
cases to identify the identity of the true parties involved.
And it's really for attorneys' eyes only.
Q. Okay.
So, just to be clear, who were the two parties to this agreement, whose names, whose identities were being protected?
A. Stormy Daniels and Donald Trump.
Q. One of the attachments also to this email -- withdrawn. What did you say in the body of the email in which you transmitted these documents?
    Let's start with Paragraph 1.
    A. Paragraph 1?
    Q. Yes.
```






|  | Page 1772 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | October 17, 2016. |
| 2 | Q. And what is the subject line? |
| 3 | A. "PP versus DD. Important." |
| 4 | Q. And what does "PP" and "DD" refer to? |
| 5 | A. The pseudonyms that we used in the Settlement |
| 6 | Agreement. |
| 7 | Q. Peggy Peterson and David Dennison? |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. You told us, I think, the date of the email was what? |
| 10 | A. October 17, 2016. |
| 11 | Q. And what was the domain of the email address that you |
| 12 | used for Michael Cohen when you sent this email? |
| 13 | A. TrumpOrg.com. |
| 14 | Q. Can you please read the email? |
| 15 | A. "Michael, I have been charged by my client with |
| 16 | forwarding the below message. We have a written Settlement |
| 17 | Agreement which calls for settlement payment to be made by the |
| 18 | end of business this past Friday, October 14, 2016. No payment |
| 19 | was received." |
| 20 | Next paragraph: "We spoke on Friday October 14, you |
| 21 | stated that the funds would be wired today, October 17, 2016. |
| 22 | No funds have been received as of the sending of this email." |
| 23 | Next paragraph: "My client informs me that she intends |
|  | to cancel the settlement contract if no funds are received by |
| 25 | 5 p.m. Pacific Time today. Please call me if you have any |



```
The Secret Service is in here. They have so many goddamn fire
walls. I can't get shit. It's not my fault. You're going to
have to resend the agreements again. I never got your emails."
Even though he previously told me he received them and the
wiring instructions.
    I think that's it for this period of time that I can
recall.
```

    Q. Did he ever make reference to Mr. Trump's whereabouts?
    A. Yes.
    Q. What do you remember him saying about that?
    A. I called him and said: Michael, this is a very bad
    situation. I have a client and her rep Gina who is very upset.
It's making me look bad. And I don't believe really a word that
you are saying.
And then he said: Well, goddamn it, what do you expect
me to do? My guy is in five fucking states today or three or
four or five different states today. There is nothing I can do.
I am doing everything I can.
Q. When he said that "his guy" was in a certain number of
states, who did you understand "his guy" to be making reference
to?
A. Donald Trump.
Q. And what was the relevance based on your conversation with Michael Cohen about -- what was the relevance of the fact that Mr. Trump was in three or four or five different states?
A. What did that mean to me?
Q. What did it mean to you?
A. To me it was similar -- it's a situation $I$ run into all the time. It was similar to like someone who doesn't have the purse strings. It's like an attorney has to go call an insurance adjuster. Like that. Michael Cohen didn't have the authority to actually spend money despite the fact there has been so many excuses and funding deadlines that have already been missed.
Q. You believe that Michael Cohen didn't have the authority to spend the money?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he at some point say something to you about what he would do to get the money?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he say?
A. Well, I think you can tell by these emails that $I$ was sending him there was a great level of frustration by me and my client -- clients and her rep. I let him know that the level of dissatisfaction was quite high. And he stated, "Goddamn it, I'll just do it myself."
Q. What did you understand him to mean when he said, "I'll just do it myself?"
A. That he would not seek authority to consummate the deal -- excuse me -- fund the deal. It was consummated with a

Page 1776

```
signature. He would waive the authority in order to fund.
    Q. Did you ever believe that Michael Cohen was going to be
the ultimate source of the funds?
    A. Never, never prior to funding, no.
    Q. Even after he said, "I'll just do it myself," where did
you understand the money would be coming from?
            MR. BOVE: Objection.
            THE COURT: Overruled.
    A. From Donald Trump or some corporate affiliation
thereof.
    Q. Okay.
    So I am going to show you People's 282 in evidence.
Is this another email from you to Michael Cohen?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And what is the date and subject line?
    A. October 17, 2016.
    Q. And the subject?
    A. "PP versus DD. Important."
    Q. And the body of the email?
    A. "Please be advised that my client deems her Settlement
Agreement cancelled and void Ab initio."
    Q. And who did you mean by "my client?"
    A. Stormy Daniels.
    Q. And what does "Ab initio" mean?
    A. It's a Latin term used in the law for void, I believe.
```

```
Void from the beginning of time, as if it never occurred at all.
    Q. Why did you tell Michael Cohen that you no longer
represented Stormy Daniels in this deal or any other matter?
    A. It was two-fold.
        One: Because I divested myself of the case.
        And, two: Because I didn't want to keep -- I didn't
want to receive a million frustrating phone calls from Michael.
He created this drama and this situation.
    Q. Did you communicate with Stormy Daniels and/or Gina
```

Rodriguez around this time?
A. Yes.
Q. Which one?
A. Both.
Q. And what was the nature of that conversation?
A. I let them know that -- well, even leading up to this,
I let them know that -- well, they wanted frequent updates.
I would like to start over.
Q. Go ahead.
A. They wanted frequent updates and they received frequent
updates. The only updates I could give them were the repeated
excuses that $I$ was hearing. That was a great source of
frustration.
And then when push came to shove, this is really --
this email that's displayed is the straw that broke the camel's
back. This is where push came to shove. This is when I said,

```
hey, this deal is over. And I said to both Cohen and to my
client, "I'm out. Go in peace."
    Q. During either that conversation, or another
conversation with Stormy Daniels and/or Gina Rodriguez, did they
express to you any views about what was happening here?
    A. I'm not going to answer that question based on
attorney/client privilege.
    Q. Fair enough.
        Let me ask you this: Do you believe that you
represented Gina in this matter as well?
    A. I don't mean to parse words, but I viewed Gina's role
in this situation as that of a manager, which would make her a
legal agent to my client Stormy Daniels. So if I was talking to
Gina, it was if I was talking to my client and the privilege
would exist.
    Q. All right.
        Did there come a time when you resumed your
involvement, notwithstanding this email, in the deal between
Stormy Daniels and Donald Trump?
    A. Yes.
    Q. How did that come about?
    A. I don't have a specific recollection.
    Q. Do you remember talking with Dylan Howard at any point
during this period of where you believed you were getting
excuses from Michael Cohen?
```






I think, continuing this exchange, how did Dylan
respond?
A. "I bet."
Q. And -- withdrawn.

Did he then send a follow up?
A. He did.
Q. And what did he say?
A. I am quoting Dylan, he said: "All because Trump is
tight."
Q. What did you understand that to mean?
A. That Mr. Trump was frugal.
Q. What relevance did this have to the conversation that you were having with Dylan, Mr. Trump's frugality?
A. That they had this deal on a silver platter. It was there for the taking. It didn't close. The only way it doesn't close is because it didn't fund. The only reason it didn't fund is because they didn't want to spend the money.
Q. During your dealings with Michael Cohen, did he tell you who he was representing in these negotiations?
A. I don't think -- every single time I talked to Michael Cohen, he leaned on his close affiliation with Donald Trump. I don't know if it was ever explicitly said, "I am negotiating this matter on behalf of Donald Trump," it was part of his identity and he let me know it every opportunity he could, that he was working for Donald Trump.
Q. And when you were negotiating the settlement agreement with Michael Cohen, did you have an understanding of who was ultimately going to be responsible for paying Ms. Daniels?
A. No.
Q. Let me show you privately Grand Jury Page 525. I believe that's People's Exhibit 508A.

I am going to ask you, just yourself and the parties and the Judge --

MR. BOVE: I object to this.
THE COURT: Approach.
(Whereupon, proceedings were held at sidebar:)
MR. BOVE: The last question was: Do you have an understanding of who was going to be ultimately
responsible? I am summarizing. The answer is no.
The witness didn't indicate there was any lack of recollection.

Now we're basically -- the People's witness --
impeaching their testimony.
Either way, it should not be put in front of him right now. The answer is the answer. It should stand.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: I am deliberately not violating Penal Law 60.35 by not asking him the substance of the previous communication. I am showing it to him to refresh his recollection without disclosing the content.

THE COURT: He hasn't stated he needs his recollection refreshed. You haven't asked him.

So your objection is sustained.
MR. BOVE: He's been precise about refreshing his recollection. He did not have such an understanding. It would be improper to go back and say --

THE COURT: Let's see if it does.
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court:)

THE COURT: Your objection is sustained.
Can you please read back the last question.
(Whereupon, the Official Court Reporter read back the referred-to-question.)

CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q. Mr. Davidson, have you previously testified about this
point in the Grand Jury in this case?

MR. BOVE: Objection.
A. Yes.
Q. Would reviewing that testimony help refresh your

```
recollection about your answer to that question?
```

MR. BOVE: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
Please approach.
(Whereupon, proceedings were held at sidebar:)

| 1 | Page 1786 <br> MR. BOVE: This is what $I$ was concerned about at |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the end of the last sidebar. The witness has not indicated |
| 3 | that he has a lack of recollection. To ask a leading |
| 4 | question to try to drive him to say, yes, I do have an |
| 5 | absence of recollection so it could be refreshed, that is |
| 6 | improper. The answer should stand. |
| 7 | MR. STEINGLASS: The whole point, how should I |
| 8 | find out if he needs his recollection refreshed or ask |
| 9 | him? |
| 10 | THE COURT: He hasn't said he could have his |
| 11 | recollection refreshed. He gave an answer. That's his |
| 12 | answer. |
| 13 | MR. STEINGLASS: I don't know if this is |
| 14 | appropriate, but, you know, the fact that there was a very |
| 15 | long pause between the answer that he gave and the question |
| 16 | that I asked, that is part of why I am seeing if something |
| 17 | could refresh his recollection. I could acknowledge that |
| 18 | he gave the answer. |
| 19 | THE COURT: You could go back and ask. |
| 20 | MR. STEINGLASS: I can do that. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Just in fairness, Mr. Bove, you might |
| 22 | have a few times yourself -- |
| 23 | MR. BOVE: In the context where I get to lead the |
| 24 | witness. |
| 25 | THE COURT: That's true. |

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court:)

THE COURT: Okay.
The objection is sustained.
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEINGLASS:
Q. Mr. Davidson, I notice when I asked you that last question about what your understanding was about who was going to be ultimately responsible, you paused before you gave your answer; is that true?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that pause -- is that pause any indication that you might want to have your recollection refreshed?

MR. BOVE: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained to form.
Q. As you sit here --
A. Can $I$ have the question read back?
Q. Which question? It was sustained. I don't think it can be read back.

Let me ask a different question.
Is there a question that I asked that you are unclear about what $I$ was asking?
A. I believe so.
Q. So a few questions ago I asked the question: When you were negotiating the Settlement Agreement with Michael Cohen,
did you have an understanding of who was ultimately going to be responsible for paying Ms. Daniels. Is that the question that you wanted to be read back?
A. Yes.
Q. That one, you could answer that, there is no objection.

How would you answer that?
A. I find that question confusing.
Q. Sorry. Let me see if I could clarify.

Who were you negotiating with -- withdrawn.
Is your problem my use of the word "negotiating;" is that a big problem?
A. No.
Q. When you were dealing with Michael Cohen --
A. Yes.
Q. -- did you have an understanding of how this deal was going to be funded?

MR. BOVE: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
A. I had an assumption.

MR. BOVE: Objection.
Move to strike.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. Did Michael Cohen say anything to you during the negotiations that led you to believe that there was someone

```
other than Michael Cohen who was funding this transaction?
    MR. BOVE: Objection.
    THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q. What pauses your uncertainty on this?
        MR. BOVE: Objection.
        THE COURT: Sustained.
    Q. A few moments ago we saw a text in which you and Dylan
Howard were discussing the fact that you perceived Mr. Trump as
being frugal?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Do you remember giving that answer?
    A. Yes.
    Q. What about Mr. Trump's frugality is relevant to this
exchange that you were having with Mr. Dylan Howard?
    A. It was my understanding that Mr. Trump was the
beneficiary of this contract and that in the overwhelming
majority of cases the beneficiary of the contract is the one who
funds it.
                    MR. BOVE: Objection.
                    Move to strike the last part.
                    THE COURT: Sustained.
                    The answer is stricken.
    Q. So what did you an attribute the lack of funding of the
deal at this point?
```

    A. Frugality.
    

|  | Page 1791 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | People's 176 in evidence. |
| 2 | Did these texts -- actually, can we get the few texts |
| 3 | that happened right before it as well, please. |
| 4 | So at the top of the page, second down, we see the line |
| 5 | you have already told us, "Because Trump is tight;" is that |
| 6 | right, from Dylan? |
| 7 | A. Talking with Dylan, yes. |
| 8 | Q. You said, "Yep;" is that right? |
| 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | Q. What does Dylan say? |
| 11 | A. "I reckon that Trump impersonator I hired has more |
| 12 | cash." |
| 13 | Q. What did you interpret that to mean? |
| 14 | A. Yeah. |
| 15 | Q. What did you interpret that to mean? |
| 16 | A. That Trump wasn't as wealthy as he stated. |
| 17 | Q. And what is -- what is the relevance of that |
| 18 | observation? |
| 19 | A. I think that was a followup to Dylan's text where he |
| 20 | says, "Trump is tight." |
| 21 | Q. So, moving on, do you see a few lines down. |
| 22 | MR. STEINGLASS: I am going to ask you, please, to |
| 23 | blow up lines 513 to 519. |
| 24 | (Displayed.) |
| 25 | Q. And what do we see here? What date is this? Who is |


| 1 talking? Page 1792 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 2 | A. | I can't read the exhibit. |
| 3 | Q. | We will blow it back up for you in a second. |
| 4 | A. | From the top? |
| 5 | Q. | Yes. |
| 6 | A. | This is October 25, 2016, from Dylan Howard: "Going to |
| 7 | see Peck | r in 15. Will ask for an update. Any word?" |
| 8 | Q. | And did you respond to that? |
| 9 | A. | "Yes." |
| 10 | Q. | And what did you say? |
| 11 | A. | "I'm awaiting a call any second." |
| 12 | Q. | Who were you awaiting a call from, if you remember? |
| 13 | A. | I don't remember. |
| 14 | Q. | What did you understand Dylan Howard to mean when he |
| 15 | said, "Goi | ing to see Pecker in 15, will ask for an update?" |
| 16 | A. | I think Dylan or AMI was attempting to resurrect the |
| 17 | Stormy Da | niels deal. |
| 18 | Q. | Okay. |
| 19 |  | How did Dylan Howard respond? |
| 20 | A. | The third text down? |
| 21 | Q. | Yes. |
| 22 | A. | "Okay." |
| 23 | Q. | Did he send another text? |
| 24 | A. | Yes. |
| 25 | Q. | And what is the next text? |



MR. BOVE: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: Sustained.
The objection is sustained.
Q. So going back to People's 176A, after that last text, does Dylan Howard send another text?
A. Yes.
Q. What is that text?
A. "Push for the cash. D.P. and I told him he has to pay the \$150."
Q. What did you understand that to mean?
A. That in the context of what is on the screen there was an attempt to resurrect this deal that had once fallen apart.

That AMI had divested itself from the deal, but they were encouraging Cohen to deal directly with me, and that $I$ should try to get as much as I could, up to $\$ 150,000$.
Q. And who did you understand "D.P." to be a reference to?
A. David Pecker.
Q. So when you say "resurrect the deal," the deal between whom?
A. Well, the Stormy Daniels deal, but the party on the other side of the deal from Stormy had changed. It changed from AMI to Cohen or his corporate entity.
Q. So when you said "resurrect the deal," are you speaking that you interpreted this as resurrecting AMI's deal with Stormy Daniels or resurrecting Michael Cohen and his entity's deal with


| 1 | were delays in funding, cancellations, disengaging from the 1796 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | client, reengaging with the client, Stormy and Gina. |
| 3 | Then Dylan sort of as a peacemaker, sort of brought me |
| 4 | back into the fold. He said he reached out to Pecker, and that |
| 5 | everything was teed up. |
| 6 | And then Dylan tells me: Push for the cash. And then |
| 7 | basically tells me to call Cohen. |
| 8 | Then when I call Cohen, he says: I'm not paying |
| 9 | anything, AMI is paying. |
| 10 | It was just one more snafu. |
| 11 | Q. How did you respond to Dylan Howard? |
| 12 | A. "I am sorry." |
| 13 | Q. You said you sent that text: "He says you're paying?" |
| 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | Q. Did you then send another text? |
| 16 | A. Yes. "Call whenever." |
| 17 | Q. Okay. I am now showing you People's 283 in evidence. |
| 18 | MR. STEINGLASS: Maybe load that top portion up. |
| 19 | (Displayed.) |
| 20 | Q. I am going to ask you, what is this document? |
| 21 | A. This is now the fourth or fifth time I sent my wiring |
| 22 | instructions to Michael Cohen. |
| 23 | Q. And in this email, to which domain, email address did |
| 24 | you use for Michael Cohen? |
| 25 | A. Gmail.com. |


|  | Page 1797 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. | And what was the subject line? |
| 2 | A. | "Wiring instructions." |
| 3 | Q. | And the date of this email? |
| 4 | A. | October 26, 2016. |
| 5 |  | This is now October 26, 2016. |
| 6 | Q. | Thank you. |
| 7 |  | What does the body of the email say? |
| 8 |  | There is no body of the email. |
| 9 |  | Is there an attachment? |
| 10 | A. | Yes. |
| 11 |  | What is the attachment? |
| 12 |  | My wiring instructions. |
| 13 |  | MR. STEINGLASS: Can we see Page 2 in this |
| 14 | ex | bit. |
| 15 |  | (Displayed.) |
| 16 |  | Is this, Page 2, is this the wiring instructions to |
| 17 | wire mo | y to your attorney/client trust account? |
| 18 |  | Yes. |
| 19 |  | What made you resend these instructions? |
| 20 | A. | Cohen's repeated assertion that he didn't have my |
| 21 | wiring | nstructions despite the fact they were repeatedly sent |
| 22 | to him | reviously. |
| 23 | Q. | I am now showing you People's 284 in evidence. Do you |
| 24 | recogni | this? |
| 25 | A. | Yes. |


|  | Page 1798 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. And what is this? |
| 2 | A. Michael Cohen had called me and said: Hey, everything |
| 3 | is A-okay. We got everything we need. You know we're sending |
| 4 | you the money. |
| 5 | So I told him that I didn't believe him, and he |
| 6 | forwarded this email to me. |
| 7 | Q. And where was the email from that he was forwarding to |
| 8 | you? |
| 9 | A. First Republic Bank. |
| 10 | Q. What was the subject line that he was forwarding to |
| 11 | you? |
| 12 | A. "First Republic Bank Transfer." |
| 13 | Q. From which email address did he send this to you? |
| 14 | A. TrumpOrg.com. |
| 15 | Q. Does it look like he also forwarded it to his own Gmail |
| 16 | account? |
| 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | Q. Now, does this -- can we look at the bottom. Does this |
| 19 | appear to be a forwarded email? |
| 20 | A. Yes. |
| 21 | Q. Who was the original email, from whom to whom? |
| 22 | A. This is from, it looks like Liz Rappaport, assistant to |
|  | Gary Farro -- to Michael Cohen. Michael Cohen. |
|  | Q. What is the date of that -- the date and time of that |
| 25 | email being sent from Ms. Ms. Rappaport to Mr. Cohen? |

A. I think this was 16 days after the original agreement was entered into: October 16, 2016.
Q. What does the body say?
A. "Good afternoon, Mr. Cohen. The funds have been deposited into your checking account. Entered in 1897. Best, Lizzie."
Q. What did you take it to mean that Michael Cohen forwarded you to this email?
A. It meant nothing to me.
Q. Why not?
A. Because he had my wiring instructions, all he needed to do was wire funds, but he didn't wire funds, he forwarded me an email saying that he had the money, not that he sent the money to me.
Q. How would you describe Michael Cohen -- withdrawn. During this time, were you also speaking with Michael Cohen on the phone?
A. Yes.
Q. How would you describe his demeanor during this time?
A. He was highly excitable. Sort of a pants on fire kind of guy. He had a lot of things going on. Frequently $I$ would be on the phone with him, he would take another call, he would be talking out of two ears. Sort of like that movie with the dogs and squirrels.

THE COURT: Mr. Steinglass, is this a good time to

|  | Page 1800 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | break? |
| 2 | MR. STEINGLASS: We can break here. |
| 3 | THE COURT: All right. |
| 4 | Jurors, we're going to stop at this time. We're |
| 5 | going to pick up on Thursday at $10 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. We're going to |
| 6 | start a half hour later than usual. |
| 7 | I remind you, please, not to talk either among |
| 8 | yourselves or with anyone else about anything related to |
| 9 | the case. |
| 10 | Keep an open mind. Do not form or express an |
| 11 | opinion about the defendant's guilt or innocence until all |
| 12 | the evidence is in and I have given you my final |
| 13 | instructions on the law and you have begun your |
| 14 | deliberations. |
| 15 | Do not request, accept, agree to accept or discuss |
| 16 | with any person the receipt or acceptance of any payment or |
| 17 | benefit in return for supplying any information concerning |
| 18 | the trial. |
| 19 | Report directly to me any attempt within your |
| 20 | knowledge involving an attempt by any person improperly to |
| 21 | influence you or any member of the jury. |
| 22 | Do not visit or view any of the locations |
| 23 | discussed in the testimony. |
| 24 | Do not use any program or electronic device to |
| 25 | search for and view the locations discussed in the |


|  | Page 1801 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | testimony. |
| 2 | Do not read, view or listen to any accounts or |
| 3 | discussions of the case, that includes the reading or the |
| 4 | listening to the reading of any transcripts of the trial or |
| 5 | the reading of posts on any court site. |
| 6 | Do not attempt to research any fact, issue or law |
| 7 | related to the case. |
| 8 | Do not communicate with anyone about the case by |
| 9 | any means, including by telephone, text message, email or |
| 10 | the internet. |
| 11 | And do not Google or otherwise search for |
| 12 | information about the case or the law which applies to the |
| 13 | case or the people involved in the case. |
| 14 | Have a good night. |
| 15 | I will see you Thursday. |
| 16 | (Jury leaving courtroom.) |
| 17 | THE COURT: Please be seated. |
| 18 | Mr. Davidson, you can step out. |
| 19 | (Witness leaving courtroom.) |
| 20 | *** |
| 21 | THE COURT: So I asked the jury to come back at |
| 22 | 10. We have our hearing at 9:30. Let's get started at |
| 23 | 9:30 sharp. I don't think we will need more than a half |
| 24 | hour. |
| 25 | Thank you. |



