2.4

## PROCEEDINGS

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Your Honor, this afternoon's matter, United States versus Kassim Tajideen. This is Criminal Record 17-46. Ask the parties to step forward and identify yourselves for the record, please.

MR. GILLICE: Good afternoon. Tom Gillice along with Jacqueline Barkett and Joseph Palazzo on behalf of the United States.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. PALAZZO: Good afternoon.

MR. JONES: Good afternoon, your Honor. Mat Jones on behalf of Kassim Tajideen, who is present, along with my colleagues, Ronald Meltzer and David Bowker.

THE COURT: In reference to this motion, is the essence of the motion a desire to have information related to the designation of your client as a terrorist?

MR. JONES: To some extent, your Honor, yes.

We're seeking information that is in OFAC's files that

touches on virtually every aspect of preparing his defense

to the charges that are in the indictment. We're not

seeking, asking the Court to remove Mr. Tajideen from the

SDGT list. We're not asking only for the information that

the government will be putting forward during its

case-in-chief. We're looking for the information under Rule

16 and Brady that is material to preparing Mr. Tajideen's

defense on the charges that are in the indictment.

THE COURT: But as I understand the government, and obviously I'll hear from the government, even though there may be allegations in the indictment they don't intend to necessarily introduce evidence regarding all of those allegations.

MR. JONES: Regardless of whether the government intends to introduce that evidence those issues are inextricably tied in to the charges that the government continues to press.

Count one of the indictment charges Mr. Tajideen with a conspiracy to defraud OFAC of its lawful government functions by making material misrepresentations over a seven-year period in which he was engaged with OFAC trying to convince it that he should not have been designated as a specially designated global terrorist because he had not and does not support Hezbollah. As overt acts in further of that conspiracy the government selects a few sentence fragments from that seven-year long history and says they were materially false. That includes in Paragraph 29, of the indictment in which the government alleges that Mr. Tajideen lied about reframing from financial dealings with entities and individuals associated with terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah.

THE COURT: So are you saying that other things

that he would have said to the agency over that period of time would tend to undermine the suggestion that what the government's relying upon are falsehoods?

2.4

MR. JONES: That's right. It is our understanding that Mr. Tajideen's engagement with OFAC, his level of opening up his personal and business affairs over that seven-year period was literally unprecedented and fundamentally inconsistent with the government's theory that Mr. Tajideen was conspiring to defraud OFAC. You know, he was hiring a big four firm to vet millions of his transactions, offering to have in-person meetings with U.S. government officials, to answer their questions. Giving up reams of confidential business information.

And OFAC's analysis of all those submissions, their awareness of them, their remarking on the extensive degree of his transparency. Their decision to say we don't need any more information because you have provided us so much detail. All of that information would help to develop the defense that Mr. Tajideen was not intending to defraud OFAC of its lawful government functions.

To us it seems self-evident that in a case where he is charged with conspiring to defraud OFAC of its government functions you need some documents to describe what the government's lawful functions were in this case.

What was OFAC up to? What was important to OFAC? What was

```
1
     OFAC doing? Rather than honing in on this self-selected
 2
     record that the government has prepared. Instead it's
     important to look at the full context of the back and forth
 3
     with OFAC in order to understand that context.
 5
               THE COURT: Let me hear from the government, and
 6
     I'll let you obviously respond.
 7
               MR. JONES: Sure.
 8
               THE COURT: I guess I -- because obviously what's
 9
     alleged in the indictment isn't necessarily what the
10
     government will have to introduce evidence on. Because I
11
     think the government has a right to omit evidence related to
12
     allegations in the indictment if it deems that appropriate.
13
     I don't think that's inappropriate for the government to do.
14
     But what do you intend to present in support of the
15
     defendant's alleged culpability?
16
               MR. GILLICE: So, your Honor, with regard to the
17
     OFAC piece in particular what we would anticipate calling
18
     would be a witness from OFAC just in general say what the
     agency is, that is it's an arm of the Department of the
19
20
     Treasury. What its general purpose as an agency is. And
21
     from there we would ask whether or not the defendant was
22
     designated, and would show --
23
               THE COURT: Designated as?
24
               MR. GILLICE: As a specially designated global
```

terrorist, as I believe the words that the Federal Register

25

2.4

notice uses. We would enter the Federal Register notice into evidence. Thereafter, we would ask the witness whether or not the witness had run checks to determine whether or not licenses were prepared or were issued for specific transactions or for specific companies. And that of course, would go to the specific transactions that are at issue with regard to the indictment, the ones that are charged and alleged further as overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy.

THE COURT: In reference to the designation itself while I understand that the designation is not an element of the offenses charged in this case, considering the nature of the designation and considering the nature of the charges that have been filed against the defendant, which are terrorist related charges, isn't there the potential that if you introduce evidence about the designation even though it's not an element, that the jury may nonetheless consider that designation in their assessment as to whether or not he's culpable of a terrorist related conduct?

MR. GILLICE: Your Honor, I think the Court could adequately address that through appropriate jury instructions and instruct the jury they should draw no reference to, whatever the wording is that we would all decide on I'm sure together, that would be put forth to the jury in this case.

THE COURT: And hopefully, you know, the jury does listen to instructions and follow those instructions, but there's no guarantee that's always going to be the case.

And if there is evidence, I'm not saying there is, that would negate the legitimacy of the designation then why shouldn't they be able to prove that?

For example, even though motive is not an element of any crime if the government introduces evidence of motive in support of its theory as to why the elements have been proven, it seems to me that if the government has information related to motive that the defense would be entitled to discovery regarding that evidence in order to negate or undermine, defend against the claim that there was a motive. And why isn't this analogous?

MR. GILLICE: In this case, your Honor, I would point the Court to some of the cases we cited in our brief. The one that seems most appropriate is actually the <u>Lewis</u> <u>versus U.S.</u> case. That's a case in which a person who had been previously convicted of a felony was attempting to basically, collaterally attack that felony for purposes of subsequent charge. And the Court said no, you can't attack that now. You can't attack that in this proceeding, and because you had an opportunity to attack it previously and you chose not to do so.

And indeed, not only did you choose not to do so,

but you chose to in essence pretend you didn't have that prior felony when determining what actions you took going forward.

To my mind the defendant was designated. I understand that he was trying to fight that designation that he was engaged with OFAC and trying to get himself delisted and it was not working out. Nonetheless, he was required to abide by that designation and not do business with U.S. companies and entities and he continued to do so. So really the underpinnings of that particular designation, the basis whether or not it was correct are not at issue in this trial.

What are at issue are whether or not the defendant basically was involved in these transactions, caused transactions in violation of OFAC's regulations. And you know, as part of our proof of that of course, we have to show that he was designated, and so that's why we are circumscribing our proof. We under the case law to be relatively clear on this point that we would not, we would not presume to come in and try to prove that the defendant was materially supporting Hezbollah in a case where he's not charged with materially supporting Hezbollah.

THE COURT: What about the position articulated by defense counsel that if you're just using certain statements that he made to the agency in support of your theory that he

```
provided false and fraudulent information to the agency,
 1
 2
     that if there's additional information he provided to the
 3
     agency that that information they say would tend to
     undermine the suggestion that the limited number of
 5
     statements that he made that you're going to seek to use
 6
     were false, that these other statements would put those
     statements in context, and therefore conceivably undermine
 7
 8
     the position that those statements are false?
 9
               MR. GILLICE: And so in essence we agreed with the
10
     defendant that they should have access to that information.
11
     What we disagree about is exactly what that information is.
12
     So what the government has done is we have gone to OFAC, and
13
     we have gotten from what we understand or are in the process
14
     of getting. What we understand from them to be and this is
15
     their words, "All unclassified non-privileged materials
16
     relating to the defendant's designation." And some other
17
     related to his delisting petition, and the designation of
     his brother's and several companies.
18
               And we have provided --
19
               THE COURT: You're not saying that his statements
20
21
     that he made to OFAC would be privileged, are you?
22
               MR. GILLICE: No, no not at all.
23
               THE COURT: As I understand that's one of the
24
    things that they're saying they want any statements he would
```

have made to OFAC that they say if they're able to introduce

25

```
or have access to that and able to introduce that that would
 1
 2
     undermine your position that the statements that you're
 3
     using were false.
               MR. GILLICE: And I agree that they should have
 5
     access to that information. And that was the next part of
 6
    my summation. We have also asked OFAC for all official
 7
     communications back and forth between OFAC and the
 8
     defendant, and not only these attorneys, but the attorneys
 9
     that preceded them in representing the defendant. And so in
10
     the end, your Honor, what is left that has not been turned
11
     over from OFAC is a small universe of documents which OFAC
12
     -- what they did give us was what they said were all
13
     unclassified and non-privileged documents.
14
               So we have turned over what we understand to be --
15
               THE COURT: As I understand I guess it's public
    knowledge that a classified filing has been made to you by
16
17
     the Court?
18
               MR. GILLICE: That's correct.
19
               THE COURT: That additional information you say
20
    has not been produced is that, that's the subject of that
     classified filing or not?
21
22
               MR. GILLICE: I have to be very careful in my
```

THE COURT: I understand, and I'm not obviously trying to have you reveal any classified information. But

23

2.4

25

answers.

are you saying that the information you provided to me in this classified filing is that information that has not been introduced to the defense?

MR. GILLICE: I cannot make representations about that in particular, your Honor. What I can say is that OFAC has told us in essence what I've already told the Court, that they provided --

THE COURT: So if I review that information that's not going to inform me as to whether this additional information that you've produced should be produced?

MR. GILLICE: Your Honor, if I were to answer that question I think it would, I think it would implicate classified, a classified information privilege. And so I request to either answer that in some ex parte classified forum or to not answer it.

THE COURT: I may have to have you do that. I haven't had since that information was just submitted, I haven't had a chance to review that classified information yet, which I will do before I make a definitive ruling on the motion that's currently before me which hopefully I will be able to do expeditiously, but I need to I think review that. And that may inform me as to whether I think this additional information that conceivably we're talking about needs to be revealed to me in another classified filing or some type of classified proceeding.

2.4

MR. GILLICE: Very well. Your Honor, one other thing I would just point out to the Court. Defense counsel in their motions and in their oral argument today talks about how they need OFAC's internal documents. This is the other part of things apart from any information that might be classified with regard to OFAC files on the defendant. Our OFAC only internal documents and their presumedly this would be emails amongst OFAC personnel. If there are any internal memorandum that you know things of that nature.

So your Honor, those pieces of information the government believes are not relevant to anything that needs to be proven in this trial or that needs to be defended against in this trial. The government has charged the defendant with conspiracy to do two things, actually three things. Count one is violate i.e., but and defraud the government, so that's a conspiracy to defraud basically OFAC.

The conspiracy does not require that OFAC buy in to the fraud. And in fact, I think that, I don't want to speak for OFAC, but one presumes that in the course of getting, putting forward information to try to get himself delisted that if they'd have bought the fraud he would have been delisted by now. No. What we're required to prove is the defendant conspired to defraud OFAC. An attempt is good enough. A conspiracy and agreement with someone else to put

forward false information is good enough.

What OFAC thinks about what he said to them makes no difference. If the defendant lied to OFAC about item A, and they believe it, does that matter? If they don't believe it, does that matter to his intent as to what's in his mind? The only thing that matters for the defendant's mind is what he hears or says with regard to OFAC. So his correspondence as the Court has already pointed out would be relevant. As defense counsel pointed out. What he says to OFAC that would certainly be relevant. They can try to show that you know they set a thousand things to OFAC. And only X number of them were not true.

They could try to say that OFAC in their correspondence to the defendant said A, B, and C, and that therefore affected his intent. And that would be a logical argument.

THE COURT: And you've agreed that if there is such information you will provide that?

MR. GILLICE: Yes, your Honor. As I said we have provided, I believe we provided already if we haven't we are in the process of doing it, all correspondence, official correspondence from OFAC, between OFAC and the defendant and his prior counsels as well.

But what, what does not go into the defendant's intent were his knowledge or anything else, stuff that he

2.4

doesn't know about. So if you know per one of their points in their pleadings you know he tells OFAC about a company that he owns and thereafter that company is never designated as an SDGT as a number of other companies actually were.

That fact that it was never designated by OFAC where he can use that fact. He can use that fact by saying you know OFAC never designated this company. But what he can't use is any internal discussions about whether or not it should have been designated because he doesn't know about those. Those don't go to what his intent might be, or what he understands the law to be. Or whatever else is internal to the defendant's thinking that the defendant's defense is trying to point to in order to make these documents relevant.

THE COURT: So in reference to the designation itself since you say it's not an element of the crimes he's charged with then why is it even relevant to introduce evidence of the designation?

MR. GILLICE: Well, your Honor, there's one slight correction I'd make. The designation, the fact of the designation is an element that the government has to prove, but it's the biases behind the designation. We are not going to come into court and say the defendant was designated because he was providing financial support to Hezbollah as the press release says and et cetera, et cetera

about Hezbollah and financial support.

2.2

What we're going to do is come into court as -what we plan to do is come into court and present the
testimony as I recited to you earlier. Very bare bones.
This is a designation. This is a, you know, there were no
licenses. And just a little bit about OFAC as an agency
because not everybody knows what OFAC is or does or what
have you.

THE COURT: Thank you. I may have further questions after I hear from defense counsel.

In reference to the designations how do you distinguish the case the government relies upon as to why you should not have a right to challenge the designation since it was decided in the context of a felon previously convicted of a crime that he in that case did not have a right to challenge the underlying felony conviction?

MR. JONES: Your Honor, <u>Lewis</u> was followed by before administrative determination can be used as a conclusive element in support of a criminal case there must be some meaningful review of that review of that determination by an independent judicial officer. That has not occurred here.

This is a strange situation in which Mr. Tajideen himself is the target of the sanctions that were allegedly violated in this case. He has not had a chance to have that

designation reviewed at all by a judicial officer because he was --

THE COURT: He could have, right?

2.4

MR. JONES: Well, he was in the notice midst of the back and forth with OFAC when the Justice Department came in and brought these charges against him. So he was, so he was unable to do so. So the government's position is we can conclusively establish these, this element of the offense. It doesn't matter if independent judicial review would find it unlawful, discriminatory, pulled out of thin air. We can conclusively establish this element of the offense through the designation. We think that's incorrect.

But your Honor does not have to decide that question in order to resolve this motion. Because those designation materials are tied in and meshed with so many of the other part of preparing this defense. It's a bit of a moving target here, but it is incorrect to say as the government just did that this case is all about transactions, and whether those transactions were violative of the law.

The first count of this indictment is a conspiracy to defraud OFAC of its lawful government functions over the course of the seven-year period with the sole point of the back and forth between OFAC and Mr. Tajideen was over, does he support Hezbollah? Should he be especially designated

```
global terrorist on this list? That was the entire point of
the proceeding in which this fraud allegedly occurred. So

it's impossible to pull, to pull these charges out from
their context.
```

THE COURT: Have they provided you discovery about what those legitimate government functions were?

MR. JONES: No. What we have is -- what the government has provided is what its described as non-privileged, unclassified documents. It says we're going to get those eventually. But what that means is that the vast majority of that is documents that Mr. Tajideen himself submitted to OFAC to try to get delisted. We have two memos, heavily redacted memos that say Mr. Tajideen should be on the list, redacted, redacted. He supports Hezbollah, he should be on the list. That's the sum and substance of it.

We don't have anything that shows us what was going on inside OFAC. What its lawful government functions were. And we think that is indeed relevant to

Mr. Tajideen's intent, for example, if Mr. Tajideen gets up at trial.

THE COURT: I would assume, I could be wrong. I am not familiar with the statute. I haven't had a chance to really look at it in great detail, but I would assume that what the lawful government functions are are set forth in

```
the statute that created the agency, right? Maybe I'm wrong
 1
 2
     in that regard, but I would assume if that's the predicate
 3
     for the charges that they'd have to present some evidence to
     show what those lawful government functions were, and that
 5
     he in some way circumvented or did something that was
 6
     contrary to those functions.
 7
               MR. JONES: In order to understand what
 8
    Mr. Tajideen was doing, the effect of what he saying, the
 9
     intent of what he was saying, you have to understand the
10
     context in which it was taking place. Our argument would be
11
     that this entire, that this entire episode was about proving
12
     that he was not Hezbollah.
13
               THE COURT: Have they told you what those
14
     functions were that they believed he violated?
15
               MR. JONES: They say very broadly, they say I
     think it's the enforcement of OFAC regulations.
16
17
               THE COURT: I mean with reference to discovery, I
     assume there is a request that's been made, what were those
18
     regulations that you say were violated. And obviously
19
     they'd have an obligation it seems to me to tell you what
20
21
     those regulations were.
22
               MR. JONES: We have not put the question in exact
23
    that way. In the indictment they describe the OFAC, lawful
```

functions of OFAC just to be enforcement of the OFAC

regulations, I believe.

2.4

25

```
1
               THE COURT: Let me just ask the government and
 2
     I'll let you respond, does the government intend to
 3
     introduce evidence of what those lawful functions that you
     say he violated?
 5
               MR. GILLICE: Well your Honor, in one sense, yes.
 6
     The defendant was required to get a license or to not cause
 7
     U.S. firms to not get a license prior to dealing with him.
 8
               THE COURT: Right.
 9
               MR. GILLICE: And so that is a lawful government
10
     function that was the defendant --
11
               THE COURT: I guess my question is do you intend
12
     to reveal to them upon request what those lawful government
13
     functions were that you say he in some way made false
14
     statements in reference to or defrauded?
15
               MR. GILLICE: Certainly. I believe we already
    have, but I'm certainly happy to have a further conversation
16
17
     with defense counsel if they are unclear. Yes, absolutely.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. With those
     representations I mean why would you be entitled to anything
19
    more than that information as to what those lawful functions
20
21
     were and why they believe that he violated those?
22
               MR. JONES: Because it goes to Mr. Tajideen's
23
     intent and what he understood this whole proceeding to be
2.4
     about, which is reflected in OFAC's filing. What was
25
     actually going on? For instance, the government says
```

that -- so its key theory in this case is that Mr. Tajideen set up and then used these U.S. entities with which he was not associated to secretly conduct business with the United States. The whole theory is that he was trying to hide his association with these entities.

There's one in the indictment that's prominently featured called ICTC. The record would show that

Mr. Tajideen disclosed his association with ICTC to OFAC back in 2012, that he gave status reports on ICTC to OCTF in '13, '15 and 2016. And documents that would show OFAC's awareness of that issue, their analysis of the issue, and the fact that OFAC chose not to designate ICTC. Not to put it on the list of companies that can't do business with the U.S. Those could help establish a powerful defense that one, those transactions with ICTC were not in themselves violative of the regulations. Or that a minimum that

Mr. Tajideen did not intend them to violate the regulations.

The government wants to suggest that the regulations here are very clear cut, easy to understand, but they are incredibly burdensome and difficult. And OFAC's documents that show how they apply to this specific situations of this case will be very important in determining whether or not Mr. Tajideen -- a conspiracy existed and whether or not there was any intent to violate the law.

2.4

THE COURT: It seems to me you know what the regulations are. And if you're saying they are complex and difficult to understand obviously you can present those to the jury. And if the jury accepted your proposition that they are complex and difficult to understand why wouldn't that be in and of itself sufficient to support the theory that you're advancing?

MR. JONES: It would be easy for Mr. Tajideen to get up on the stand and say I don't understand all this stuff. It's really complicated, but if there's a document from OFAC that says it's unclear whether ICTC is covered by —

THE COURT: That would be great. I mean sure, if there's something that exists now that they know that's a theory of your defense that these regulations are complex and difficult to understand, if internally they have some information that people in OFAC were saying that information was difficult to understand then it seems to me that would qualify as *Brady* and have an obligation to produce it.

MR. JONES: We agree, your Honor. The concern here is the government has said we're not going to look at anything that OFAC determines to be classified or privileged. We're not sure what -- these are unspecified privileges. We're not sure if they're qualified.

THE COURT: Maybe I'm wrong, but I thought that

```
1
     initially they said they weren't going to review the OFAC
 2
     information. They took a different position and said
 3
     ultimately they would review it. Am I wrong in that regard?
 4
               MR. GILLICE: No, your Honor, we have and we are
 5
     reviewing OFAC information, that's correct.
 6
               MR. JONES: Including all classified and allegedly
 7
    privileged documents?
 8
               MR. GILLICE: I can't speak to classified
 9
     documents.
10
               THE COURT: But I mean obviously if that
     classified information would include exculpatory information
11
12
     that he'd be entitled to then he'd have a right either to
13
     receive it. Or under IEEPA for the consequences of it not
14
     being produced because it is classified which is a
15
     government decision coming into play.
16
               MR. GILLICE: Your Honor, what I can say is that
17
     if any classified information is implied or intersects with
     this case the government will absolutely deal with it
18
     through the appropriate processes.
19
20
               THE COURT: And if there is inculpatory
21
     information contained within that, I assume although you may
     not reveal the nature of it, that you would let me and the
22
23
     defense know that there is such information. Obviously you
```

may have to reveal that to me in an ex parte proceeding, and

then I would have to make a determination as to whether it

2.4

25

2.4

is in fact producible. If it is in fact producible then under IEEPA, I'd have to make a determination if you decide not to produce it, which you have a right not to do, whether there's any consequences from that decision, which is what I had to do quite frequently in the Libby case. Obviously, that's an obligation I have under IEEPA.

MR. GILLICE: Your Honor, one thing that might help in this regard. The other part of the question that I have not answered is with regard to privileged information from OFAC. If defense counsel has any specific items such as that that they would ask us to look for we're happy to do so with regard to any sort of privileged information, and then deal with that appropriately as well.

THE COURT: Okay. With the concessions that the government has made about what it would do, I guess I'm amiss as to what else it is you're saying that they have an obligation to do and that you're entitled to. Because they seem to say they will review all of the OFAC information whether it be classified or unclassified. And if there is in fact <u>Brady</u> information that's relevant to this case that they'll produce that. And they've already said they are prepared to introduce any of the statements your client is supposed to have made to OFAC. Whether they're relying upon them are or not. Consistent with your position that those other statements might in fact undermine the suggestion that

the statements they're relying upon were in fact fraudulent or false.

MR. JONES: What I think -- your Honor, I heard with respect to classified information that they do intend to review all of the classified information to look for otherwise discoverable material and then deal with it through the IEEPA process. As part of that process we would simply ask that the Court to the greatest extent possible, make those ex parte filings available in some redacted form to preserve due process to the extent possible while protecting what IEEPA is intended to protect.

As you know under IEEPA you are allowed to but not required to entertain ex parte submissions from the government. And in this case we're particularly concerned about the government's representations about classified information not being subject to the regular adversarial process. Because the drips and drabs of information that we've gotten out of OFAC over the last seven years have proven to be oftentimes faulty, flawed, demonstratively false, mixing up company names, conflating Mr. Tajideen's basic factual errors.

And obviously your Honor is naturally not sufficiently with the facts to sufficiently interrogate the government's representations in those regard. So to the extent that the adversarial process can be preserved, we

would ask your Honor to ask the government to make redacted
filings available. At least on legal argumentation issues
if not the classified information that's involved.

2.4

THE COURT: As I understand IEEPA and as I said became extremely emerged in the IEEPA process in the Scooter Libby case, I think the government has an obligation to do what you're requesting that they do. Obviously they can if they are seeking to use that redaction as a basis for introducing that information in the redacted form. And then I have to make a determination as to whether that essentially gives you what the classified information what it entails.

But if they decide that the information is so highly classified that it would potentially cause harm to the national security or whatever you know national security, then obviously they it seems to me don't have to produce it in an adversarial manner. Maybe they produce it to me if they so chose. I assume they could conceivably decide not to introduce it and then maybe suffer the consequences.

At least in the Libby trial they did in that case submit to me things that they weren't prepared to give to the defense and were prepared to give to me in an ex parte manner. And then I had to assess whether the information was in fact pertinent to the defense. And if it was

2.4

pertinent whether a redaction of it that would preserve its classified nature but nonetheless provide to the defense what the defense wanted and had to make a determination as to whether that was essential or not essential but whether it was in fact sufficient to provide what the defense wanted by way of a defense. And if I decided that was not the case then I would have to conclude that information related to a certain part of the government's case that related to that information could not be introduced.

MR. JONES: Yes, your Honor. You're exactly right about the general process. I apologize for not being more clear. I was speaking about their filing itself under Section IV, which they are, they are permitted to ask you to take that argument ex parte. Under Section IV you are allowed to but not required to take that motion ex parte. And in many cases judges will order the government to redact the filing so that, for instance, it leaves the cases in the legal argumentation so that the adversarial process is preserved to some degree.

And so we would ask as IEEPA litigation goes on here that we be permitted to engage in that process to the extent possible.

THE COURT: What if the government took the position, I don't know if they would, but what if they took the position that even in a redacted form it would

potentially disclose information that could be harmful to

the government, and therefore, it's not prepared to produce

that redaction?

MR. JONES: That would be up to your Honor to decide under IEEPA how to proceed then.

THE COURT: Considering it seems they've made concessions that to address to a significant degree what you're saying that you're entitled to.

MR. JONES: I think the one remaining piece here which seems — I'm still, perhaps I'm just being not sharp here, but is the question of what's going to happen with the documents that OFAC is calling privileged. I think

Mr. Gillice said that he wants us to come back with more specific requests, but I think that's putting the cart before the horse. Those documents the government in our view has an obligation to review them for <code>Brady</code>, to review them for Rule 16 materials. And then, and then decide whether the privilege is such that it is strong enough that they wouldn't have to turn over that information probably by providing a privileged log.

And in particular here where we don't even know what the grounds for this privilege is; if it's attorney client. If it's some flavor of deliberative process privilege, something that's qualified or unqualified. The government should have to look at those documents first to

determine whether or not they are otherwise discoverable rather than saying we're not going to look at them because they are privileged unless you come back and tell us exactly where to go look for Rule 16 or *Brady* materials.

I thought they said that they would review both the unclassified and the classified information. And if upon that review there was information that was producible either under Rule 16 or under <u>Brady</u> that they would either produce it. Or if they felt it was not subject to production either because of its classified nature or because of a privilege, that I assume they are saying they would then let the Court know that they have made that decision. And I guess we'd have to then go from there assuming that they in fact make one of those determinations.

MR. JONES: If the government intends to review all the potentially privileged documents for Rule 16 or  $\underline{\textit{Brady}}$  materials then we have no concern about that process.

MR. GILLICE: Your Honor, we do. The reason that I asked for some pointers as it were is because just like in any arena if the defendant has a certain view of <u>Brady</u> that we're not aware of and we don't know that and we don't know to look for that.

THE COURT: I think that's fair. I don't think you have to speculate as to what conceivably might be their

defense because I think that's probably impossible. And I think to the extent that they have a theory, and obviously in the IEEPA context it may be unfortunate, but it's the reality based upon the statute and why the statute was adopted that under certain circumstances the defense is going to have to, which is normally not the case, reveal what their potential defense is in order to put the government on notice as to what they should be seeking to assess, and what conceivably their discovery obligation is as a result of that assessment.

So I mean that's the unfortunate maybe reality of a situation where you're talking about classified information that requires in certain circumstances that the defense have to play its hand in order for the government to know to what extent it has a discovery obligation.

what's been represented to me, obviously I'll review the issue of if it needs to be done I will conclude that the motion for discovery should be denied based upon the government's representation that it will in fact review both the classified and the unclassified information contained in the OFAC file. And if there is in fact Rule 16 discoverable information or <u>Brady</u> information that that information will be produced. Or if the government decides that it cannot be produced the government will so advise the Court and then

```
we'll have to proceed from there.
 1
 2
               Anything else? Thank you.
 3
               MR. GILLICE: Your Honor, just to --
               [Brief pause.]
 5
               THE COURT: My clerk says there's another issue
 6
     regarding the speedy trial?
 7
               MR. GILLICE: Yes, your Honor. I apologize. Your
 8
    Honor, as the Court knows the government has filed a motion
 9
     under IEEPA. We reasonably believe that that does toll the
10
     Speedy Trial Act until the Court acts on that motion as
     well. But I wanted to make sure that that was clear on the
11
12
     record in this case. In addition, we reasonably may have
13
     some plea negotiations, whether or not they are fruitful we
14
     don't know, and the government is currently as the Court
15
     knows finishing discovery in this case.
16
               THE COURT: Response.
17
               MR. JONES: We have no objection to tolling of the
     Speedy Trial Act pending the disposition of the IEEPA
18
19
     section of the motion.
20
               THE COURT: Very well. Based upon that concession
21
     the speedy trial clock will be tolled until that
22
     determination is made. Thank you.
23
               MR. GILLICE: Thank you.
2.4
               [Thereupon, the proceedings adjourned at 3:49
25
               p.m.]
```

CERTIFICATE I, Cathryn J. Jones, an Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court of the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that I reported, by machine shorthand, the proceedings had and testimony adduced in the above case. I further certify that the foregoing 31 pages constitute the official transcript of said proceedings as transcribed from my machine shorthand notes. In witness whereof, I have hereto subscribed my name, this the 29th day of August, 2017. /s/\_Cathryn J. Jones Cathryn J. Jones, RPR Official Court Reporter 

Coop 1:17 or 00046 DD	accepted [1] 22/4  acces9(3)ment 37/1 Filled 08/30/1	are [43]
Case 1:17 cr 00046 RB MR. GILLICE: [26] 3/5 6/15 6/23 7/19		arena 49 29 20 1 40
8/14 10/8 10/21 11/3 11/17 11/21 12/3	Act [2] 31/10 31/18	argument [4] 13/3 14/16 19/10 27/14
12/10 12/25 14/18 15/18 20/4 20/8	actions [1] 9/2	argumentation [2] 26/2 27/18
	acts [3] 4/17 7/8 31/10	arm [1] 6/19
20/14 23/3 23/7 23/15 24/6 29/18 31/2	actually [4] 8/17 13/14 15/4 20/25	articulated [1] 9/23
31/6 31/22	addition [1] 31/12	as [54]
MR. JONES: [21] 3/10 3/16 4/6 5/3		
6/6 16/16 17/3 18/6 19/6 19/14 19/21	additional [4] 10/2 11/19 12/9 12/23	ask [10] 3/4 6/21 7/2 20/1 24/11 25/8
20/21 22/7 22/19 23/5 25/2 27/9 28/3	address [2] 7/21 28/7	26/1 26/1 27/13 27/20
28/8 29/15 31/16	adduced [1] 32/5	asked [2] 11/6 29/20
MR. PALAZZO: [1] 3/9	adequately [1] 7/21	asking [2] 3/21 3/22
	adjourned [1] 31/24	aspect [1] 3/19
THE COURT: [43]	administrative [1] 16/18	assess [2] 26/24 30/9
THE DEPUTY CLERK: [1] 3/1	adopted [1] 30/5	assessment [2] 7/18 30/10
•	advancing [1] 22/7	associated [2] 4/23 21/3
	adversarial [4] 25/16 25/25 26/17	association [2] 21/5 21/8
<b>'13 [1]</b> 21/10		
<b>'15 [1]</b> 21/10	27/18	assume [7] 18/22 18/24 19/2 19/18
	advise [1] 30/25	23/21 26/18 29/12
	affairs [1] 5/6	assuming [1] 29/14
.x [1] 1/6	affected [1] 14/15	attack [4] 8/20 8/21 8/22 8/23
L-1	after [1] 16/10	attempt [1] 13/24
/	afternoon [4] 3/6 3/9 3/10 3/11	attempting [1] 8/19
/e [1] 32/13	afternoon's [1] 3/2	attorney [2] 1/15 28/22
/ <b>s [1]</b> 32/13	against [4] 7/14 8/13 13/13 17/6	ATTORNEY'S [1] 1/13
1	agency [8] 5/1 6/19 6/20 9/25 10/1	
	, • ,	attorneys [2] 11/8 11/8
<b>1400 [1]</b> 1/16	10/3 16/6 19/1	August [2] 1/5 32/11
<b>16 [6]</b> 3/25 28/17 29/4 29/9 29/17	agree [2] 11/4 22/20	AUSA [2] 1/12 1/12
30/22	agreed [2] 10/9 14/17	available [2] 25/9 26/2
<b>17-46 [2]</b> 1/4 3/4	agreement [1] 13/25	Avenue [3] 1/16 1/20 2/2
<b>1875</b> [1] 1/20	aided [1] 2/7	aware [1] 29/22
	air [1] 17/11	awareness [2] 5/15 21/11
2	all [16] 4/5 5/14 5/18 7/23 10/15 10/22	
	11/6 11/12 14/21 17/1 17/18 22/9 23/6	В
20001 [1] 2/3		
20006 [1] 1/21	24/18 25/5 29/17	back [7] 6/3 11/7 17/5 17/24 21/9
<b>2012 [1]</b> 21/9	allegations [3] 4/4 4/6 6/12	28/13 29/3
<b>2016 [1]</b> 21/10	alleged [3] 6/9 6/15 7/8	bare [1] 16/4
<b>2017 [2]</b> 1/5 32/11	allegedly [3] 16/24 18/2 23/6	Barkett [2] 1/12 3/7
<b>20530 [2]</b> 1/14 1/17	alleges [1] 4/21	based [4] 30/4 30/16 30/19 31/20
<b>28</b> [1] 1/5	allowed [2] 25/12 27/15	basic [1] 25/21
<b>29</b> [1] 4/20	along [2] 3/6 3/12	basically [3] 8/20 9/14 13/16
	already [5] 12/6 14/8 14/20 20/15	basis [2] 9/10 26/8
<b>29th [1]</b> 32/11		
3	24/21	be [55]
	also [1] 11/6	became [1] 26/5
<b>31</b> [1] 32/7	although [1] 23/21	because [19] 4/16 5/17 6/8 6/10 8/23
<b>333</b> [1] 2/2	always [1] 8/3	15/9 15/24 16/7 17/1 17/14 20/22
<b>3:04 [1]</b> 1/6	am [2] 18/23 23/3	23/14 24/17 25/17 29/2 29/11 29/11
<b>3:49 [1]</b> 31/24	AMÉRICA [1] 1/3	29/20 30/1
	amiss [1] 24/16	been [12] 4/15 7/14 8/9 8/19 11/10
4	amongst [1] 13/8	11/16 11/20 12/2 13/23 15/9 19/18
<b>46 [2]</b> 1/4 3/4	analogous [1] 8/14	30/17
		before [5] 1/9 12/19 12/20 16/18 28/19
5	analysis [2] 5/14 21/11	
	another [2] 12/24 31/5	behalf [2] 3/7 3/12
<b>555 [1]</b> 1/14	answer [4] 5/12 12/11 12/14 12/15	behind [1] 15/22
6	answered [1] 24/9	being [4] 23/14 25/16 27/11 28/10
	answers [1] 11/23	believe [8] 6/25 14/4 14/5 14/20 19/25
<b>6521 [1]</b> 2/2	anticipate [1] 6/17	20/15 20/21 31/9
	any [14] 5/17 8/8 10/24 11/25 13/5	believed [1] 19/14
A	13/8 15/8 21/24 23/17 24/4 24/10	believes [1] 13/11
abide [1] 9/8	24/12 24/22 29/21	between [3] 11/7 14/22 17/24
able [4] 8/6 10/25 11/1 12/21		
about [26] 4/22 7/16 9/23 10/11 12/4	anything [6] 13/11 14/25 18/17 20/19	biases [1] 15/22
12/23 13/4 14/2 14/3 15/1 15/2 15/8	22/22 31/2	big [1] 5/10
	apart [1] 13/5	bit [2] 16/6 17/16
15/9 16/1 16/6 17/18 18/5 19/11 20/24	apologize [2] 27/11 31/7	bones [1] 16/4
24/15 25/15 25/15 27/11 27/12 29/18	APPEARANCES [1] 1/11	both [2] 29/6 30/20
30/12	apply [1] 21/21	bought [1] 13/22
above [1] 32/6	appropriate [4] 6/12 7/21 8/17 23/19	Bowker [2] 1/19 3/13
absolutely [2] 20/17 23/18	appropriately [1] 24/13	Brady [9] 3/25 22/19 24/20 28/16 29/4
	appropriately [1] 24/10	Diddy [0] 0/20 22/10 24/20 20/10 29/4

	T	T
B 0000 1:17 or 00046 DD	communications [1] 11/7	ln e
Case 1:17 cr 00046 RB Brady [4] 29/9 29/18 29/21 30/23	Von Pan⊌nent/36/9 Filed 188430/1	D.C [2] 1/5 2/3
Brady [4] 29/9 29/18 29/21 30/23	rcompanies [5] 19/9 9/9 10/48 19/400/1	h c'raig <sub>1/5</sub> 2/3
Diddy [4] 20/0 20/10 20/21 00/20	21/13	D. 0 [2] 1/0 2/0
brief [2] 8/16 31/4		David [2] 1/19 3/13
broadly [1] 19/15	company [4] 15/2 15/3 15/7 25/20	day [1] 32/11
	complex [3] 22/2 22/5 22/15	
brother's [1] 10/18	complicated [1] 22/10	DC [3] 1/14 1/17 1/21
<b>brought [1]</b> 17/6		deal [3] 23/18 24/13 25/6
	computer [1] 2/7	
burdensome [1] 21/20	computer-aided [1] 2/7	dealing [1] 20/7
<b>business [5]</b> 5/6 5/13 9/8 21/3 21/13		dealings [1] 4/22
	conceivably [5] 10/7 12/23 26/18	
<b>buy [1]</b> 13/18	29/25 30/9	decide [7] 7/24 17/13 24/2 26/13
		26/19 28/5 28/17
C	concern [2] 22/20 29/18	
	concerned [1] 25/14	decided [2] 16/14 27/6
called [1] 21/7		decides [1] 30/24
calling [2] 6/17 28/12	concession [1] 31/20	decision [4] 5/16 23/15 24/4 29/13
	concessions [2] 24/14 28/7	
came [1] 17/6		deems [1] 6/12
can [11] 12/5 14/10 15/6 15/6 16/18	conclude [2] 27/7 30/18	defend [1] 8/13
	<b>conclusive [1]</b> 16/19	
17/8 17/11 22/3 23/16 25/25 26/7		defendant [20] 1/6 1/18 6/21 7/14 9/4
can't [5] 8/21 8/22 15/8 21/13 23/8	conclusively [2] 17/8 17/11	9/13 9/20 10/10 11/8 11/9 13/6 13/14
	conduct [2] 7/19 21/3	
cannot [2] 12/4 30/24		13/24 14/3 14/14 14/22 15/23 20/6
careful [1] 11/22	confidential [1] 5/13	20/10 29/21
	conflating [1] 25/20	
cart [1] 28/14		defendant's [6] 6/15 10/16 14/6 14/24
case [30] 3/24 5/21 5/24 7/12 7/25 8/3	consequences [3] 23/13 24/4 26/20	15/12 15/12
	consider [1] 7/17	
8/15 8/18 8/18 9/18 9/21 16/12 16/15	considering [3] 7/12 7/13 28/6	defended [1] 13/12
16/19 16/25 17/18 21/1 21/22 23/18		defense [26] 3/19 4/1 5/19 8/11 9/24
24/5 24/20 25/14 26/6 26/21 27/6 27/8	Consistent [1] 24/24	
	conspiracy [9] 4/12 4/18 7/9 13/14	12/3 13/2 14/9 15/12 16/10 17/16
30/6 31/12 31/15 32/6		20/17 21/14 22/15 23/23 24/10 26/23
case-in-chief [1] 3/24	13/16 13/18 13/25 17/21 21/23	26/25 27/2 27/3 27/5 27/6 30/1 30/5
	conspired [1] 13/24	
cases [3] 8/16 27/16 27/17		30/7 30/14
Cathryn [4] 2/1 32/2 32/13 32/14	conspiring [2] 5/9 5/22	definitive [1] 12/19
	constitute [1] 32/8	
cause [2] 20/6 26/14		defraud [8] 4/12 5/9 5/19 5/22 13/15
caused [1] 9/14	Constitution [1] 2/2	13/16 13/24 17/22
	contained [2] 23/21 30/21	
certain [5] 9/24 27/8 29/21 30/5 30/13		defrauded [1] 20/14
certainly [3] 14/10 20/15 20/16	context [7] 6/3 6/4 10/7 16/14 18/4	degree [3] 5/16 27/19 28/7
	19/10 30/3	
CERTIFICATE [1] 32/1		deliberative [1] 28/23
certify [2] 32/4 32/7	continued [1] 9/9	delisted [4] 9/6 13/22 13/23 18/12
cetera [2] 15/25 15/25	continues [1] 4/10	
	contrary [1] 19/6	delisting [1] 10/17
challenge [2] 16/13 16/16		demonstratively [1] 25/19
chance [3] 12/18 16/25 18/23	conversation [1] 20/16	denied [1] 30/19
	convicted [2] 8/19 16/15	
charge [1] 8/21		<b>DEPARTMENT [3]</b> 1/16 6/19 17/5
<b>charged [6]</b> 5/22 7/7 7/12 9/22 13/13	conviction [1] 16/16	describe [2] 5/23 19/23
15/17	convince [1] 4/15	
	correct [3] 9/11 11/18 23/5	described [1] 18/8
charges [9] 3/20 4/1 4/9 4/11 7/13		designate [1] 21/12
7/15 17/6 18/3 19/3	correction [1] 15/20	designated [13] 4/15 4/16 6/22 6/23
	correspondence [4] 14/8 14/14 14/21	
checks [1] 7/3		6/24 9/4 9/17 15/3 15/5 15/7 15/9
chief [1] 3/24	14/22	15/24 17/25
	could [8] 7/20 14/13 17/3 18/22 21/14	1
choose [1] 8/25	26/18 27/9 28/1	designation [22] 3/16 7/10 7/11 7/13
chose [4] 8/24 9/1 21/12 26/18		7/16 7/18 8/5 9/5 9/8 9/10 10/16 10/17
	counsel [6] 9/24 13/2 14/9 16/10	
circumscribing [1] 9/18	20/17 24/10	15/15 15/18 15/20 15/21 15/22 16/5
circumstances [3] 30/5 30/13 30/16		16/13 17/1 17/12 17/15
circumvented [1] 19/5	counsels [1] 14/23	
	count [3] 4/11 13/15 17/21	designations [1] 16/11
cited [1] 8/16		desire [1] 3/15
claim [1] 8/13	course [4] 7/5 9/16 13/20 17/23	detail [2] 5/18 18/24
	court [24] 1/1 2/1 2/1 2/2 3/21 7/20	
classified [29] 11/16 11/21 11/25 12/2	8/16 8/21 11/17 12/6 13/2 14/8 15/23	determination [7] 16/18 16/21 23/25
12/13 12/13 12/14 12/18 12/24 12/25		24/2 26/10 27/3 31/22
13/6 22/22 23/6 23/8 23/11 23/14	16/2 16/3 25/8 29/12 30/25 31/8 31/10	
	31/14 32/2 32/3 32/14	determinations [1] 29/15
23/17 24/19 25/4 25/5 25/15 26/3		determine [2] 7/3 29/1
26/11 26/14 27/2 29/7 29/11 30/12	covered [1] 22/11	determines [1] 22/22
	CR [1] 1/4	
30/21		determining [2] 9/2 21/23
clear [4] 9/19 21/19 27/12 31/11	created [1] 19/1	develop [1] 5/18
<del>-</del>	crime [2] 8/8 16/15	
clerk [1] 31/5	crimes [1] 15/16	did [7] 8/25 11/12 16/15 17/18 19/5
client [3] 3/16 24/22 28/23		21/17 26/21
clock [1] 31/21	criminal [2] 3/4 16/19	
	culpability [1] 6/15	didn't [2] 9/1 29/5
collaterally [1] 8/20		difference [1] 14/3
colleagues [1] 3/13	culpable [1] 7/19	different [1] 23/2
	currently [2] 12/20 31/14	
COLUMBIA [2] 1/2 32/4	cut [1] 21/19	difficult [5] 21/20 22/3 22/5 22/16
come [6] 9/20 15/23 16/2 16/3 28/13	Cut[i] 21/10	22/18
29/3		1
		disagree [1] 10/11
coming [1] 23/15		disclose [1] 28/1
1	i	i

et [2] 15/25 15/25 fragments [1] 4/19 D Case 1:17 cr 00046 RB Ween per 4/15/23 13/23 15/16/24/29/30/1 17raud age 13/5/91/34/20 18/2 28/21 fraudulent [2] 10/1 25/1 discoverable [3] 25/6 29/1 30/22 eventually [1] 18/10 frequently [1] 24/5 discovery [7] 8/12 18/5 19/17 30/9 fruitful [1] 31/13 every [1] 3/19 30/15 30/19 31/15 **everybody** [1] 16/7 full [1] 6/3 discriminatory [1] 17/10 evidence [12] 4/5 4/8 6/10 6/11 7/2 function [1] 20/10 discussions [1] 15/8 7/16 8/4 8/8 8/12 15/18 19/3 20/3 functions [15] 4/13 5/20 5/23 5/24 disposition [1] 31/18 evident [1] 5/21 17/22 18/6 18/18 18/25 19/4 19/6 distinguish [1] 16/12 ex [7] 12/14 23/24 25/9 25/13 26/23 19/14 19/24 20/3 20/13 20/20 **DISTRICT [6]** 1/1 1/2 1/10 2/2 32/3 27/14 27/15 fundamentally [1] 5/8 further [5] 4/17 7/8 16/9 20/16 32/7 ex parte [1] 26/23 do [26] 6/13 6/14 8/24 8/25 9/8 9/9 exact [1] 19/22 furtherance [1] 7/8 12/16 12/19 12/21 13/14 16/2 16/3 exactly [3] 10/11 27/10 29/3 16/11 17/7 20/11 21/13 24/3 24/5 G example [2] 8/7 18/20 24/11 24/15 24/17 25/4 26/6 26/7 gave [1] 21/9 exculpatory [1] 23/11 29/19 32/4 general [3] 6/18 6/20 27/11 existed [1] 21/24 Docket [1] 1/4 exists [1] 22/14 get [7] 9/6 13/21 18/10 18/12 20/6 document [1] 22/10 20/7 22/9 expeditiously [1] 12/21 documents [16] 5/23 11/11 11/13 13/4 gets [1] 18/20 **extensive** [1] 5/15 13/7 15/13 18/9 18/11 21/10 21/21 getting [2] 10/14 13/21 extent [7] 3/17 25/8 25/10 25/25 27/22 23/7 23/9 28/12 28/15 28/25 29/17 Gillice [3] 1/12 3/6 28/13 30/2 30/15 does [11] 4/17 8/1 13/18 14/4 14/5 give [3] 11/12 26/22 26/23 **extremely [1]** 26/5 14/24 16/7 17/13 17/24 20/2 31/9 gives [1] 26/11 doesn't [3] 15/1 15/9 17/9 Giving [1] 5/12 doing [3] 6/1 14/21 19/8 fact [16] 13/19 15/5 15/6 15/6 15/20 global [3] 4/16 6/24 18/1 don't [15] 4/4 5/16 6/13 13/19 14/4 **go [5]** 7/6 14/24 15/10 29/4 29/14 21/12 24/1 24/1 24/20 24/25 25/1 15/10 18/17 22/9 26/16 27/24 28/21 26/25 27/5 29/14 30/20 30/22 goes [2] 20/22 27/20 29/22 29/22 29/24 31/14 going [14] 8/3 9/2 10/5 12/9 15/23 facts [1] 25/23 done [2] 10/12 30/18 16/2 18/9 18/18 20/25 22/21 23/1 factual [1] 25/21 drabs [1] 25/17 fair [1] 29/24 28/11 29/2 30/6 draw [1] 7/22 false [9] 4/20 10/1 10/6 10/8 11/3 14/1 gone [1] 10/12 drips [1] 25/17 20/13 25/2 25/20 good [6] 3/6 3/9 3/10 3/11 13/24 14/1 due [1] 25/10 falsehoods [1] 5/3 gotten [2] 10/13 25/18 during [1] 3/23 government [57] familiar [1] 18/23 faulty [1] 25/19 government's [8] 5/3 5/8 5/24 17/7 25/15 25/24 27/8 30/20 featured [1] 21/7 earlier [1] 16/4 Federal [2] 6/25 7/1 great [2] 18/24 22/13 easy [2] 21/19 22/8 felon [1] 16/14 greatest [1] 25/8 effect [1] 19/8 felony [4] 8/19 8/20 9/2 16/16 grounds [1] 28/22 either [5] 12/14 23/12 29/8 29/9 29/10 felt [1] 29/10 guarantee [1] 8/3 element [8] 7/11 7/17 8/7 15/16 15/21 few [1] 4/18 guess [5] 6/8 11/15 20/11 24/15 29/13 16/19 17/8 17/11 fight [1] 9/5 **elements** [1] 8/9 file [1] 30/22 else [5] 13/25 14/25 15/11 24/16 31/2 had [12] 4/16 7/3 8/18 8/23 12/17 filed [2] 7/14 31/8 emails [1] 13/8 12/18 16/25 18/23 24/5 26/24 27/3 files [2] 3/18 13/6 emerged [1] 26/5 32/5 filing [7] 11/16 11/21 12/2 12/24 20/24 **end [1]** 11/10 **HALE [1]** 1/20 27/12 27/17 enforcement [2] 19/16 19/24 filings [2] 25/9 26/2 hand [1] 30/14 engage [1] 27/21 financial [3] 4/22 15/24 16/1 happen [1] 28/11 engaged [2] 4/14 9/6 happy [2] 20/16 24/11 **find [1]** 17/10 engagement [1] 5/5 harm [1] 26/14 finishing [1] 31/15 enough [3] 13/25 14/1 28/18 harmful [1] 28/1 firm [1] 5/10 entails [1] 26/12 firms [1] 20/7 has [23] 6/2 6/11 8/10 10/12 11/10 enter [1] 7/1 11/16 11/20 12/2 12/6 13/13 14/8 first [2] 17/21 28/25 entertain [1] 25/13 15/21 16/21 16/25 18/8 22/21 24/10 flavor [1] 28/23 entire [3] 18/1 19/11 19/11 24/15 26/6 28/16 29/21 30/15 31/8 flawed [1] 25/19 entities [4] 4/23 9/9 21/2 21/5 have [74] follow [1] 8/2 entitled [5] 8/12 20/19 23/12 24/17 haven't [4] 12/17 12/18 14/20 18/23 followed [1] 16/17 28/8 foregoing [1] 32/7 he [54] **episode [1]** 19/11 he'd [2] 23/12 23/12 form [3] 25/9 26/9 27/25 errors [1] 25/21 he's [3] 7/19 9/21 15/16 forth [6] 6/3 7/24 11/7 17/5 17/24 **especially [1]** 17/25 hear [3] 4/3 6/5 16/10 18/25 **Esquire [3]** 1/18 1/19 1/19 heard [1] 25/3 forum [1] 12/15 essence [4] 3/15 9/1 10/9 12/6 **HEARING [1]** 1/8 forward [5] 3/4 3/23 9/3 13/21 14/1 essential [2] 27/4 27/4 **four [1]** 5/10 hears [1] 14/7 **essentially [1]** 26/11 heavily [1] 18/13 Fourth [1] 1/14 establish [3] 17/8 17/11 21/14

H Case 1:17 cr 00046-RB instructions [3] 7/22 8/2 8/2 lg/ql (28/30/1 leaves [1] 27/17 help [3] 5/18 21/14 24/8 instructions [3] 7/22 8/2 8/2 8/2 lg/ql (28/30/1 leaves [1] 27/17 help [3] 5/18 21/14 24/8 legal [2] 26/2 27/18 here [8] 16/22 17/17 21/19 22/21 intended [1] 25/11 legitimacy [1] 8/5 27/21 28/9 28/11 28/21 **legitimate [1]** 18/6 intending [1] 5/19 hereby [1] 32/4 let [6] 6/5 6/6 20/1 20/2 23/22 29/12 intends [2] 4/8 29/16 hereto [1] 32/10 intent [8] 14/5 14/15 14/25 15/10 **level [1]** 5/5 Hezbollah [9] 4/17 4/24 9/21 9/22 18/20 19/9 20/23 21/24 **Lewis [2]** 8/17 16/17 15/25 16/1 17/25 18/15 19/12 Libby [3] 24/5 26/6 26/21 internal [5] 13/4 13/7 13/9 15/8 15/11 hide [1] 21/4 internally [1] 22/16 license [2] 20/6 20/7 highly [1] 26/14 interrogate [1] 25/23 licenses [2] 7/4 16/6 him [2] 17/6 20/7 **intersects** [1] 23/17 lied [2] 4/22 14/3 himself [4] 9/6 13/21 16/24 18/11 introduce [10] 4/5 4/8 6/10 7/16 10/25 like [1] 29/20 hiring [1] 5/10 11/1 15/17 20/3 24/22 26/19 **limited [1]** 10/4 his [17] 3/19 5/5 5/6 5/10 5/16 10/17 list [5] 3/22 18/1 18/14 18/15 21/13 introduced [2] 12/3 27/9 10/18 10/20 14/5 14/6 14/7 14/15 introduces [1] 8/8 listen [1] 8/2 14/23 14/25 15/10 21/4 21/8 **literally [1]** 5/7 introducing [1] 26/9 history [1] 4/19 involved [2] 9/14 26/3 **litigation [1]** 27/20 honing [1] 6/1 little [1] 16/6 is [92] **Honor [29]** 3/2 3/11 3/17 6/16 7/20 isn't [3] 6/9 7/15 8/14 log [1] 28/20 8/15 11/10 12/5 12/11 13/1 13/10 issue [7] 7/6 9/11 9/13 21/11 21/11 logical [1] 14/15 14/19 15/19 16/17 17/13 20/5 22/20 30/18 31/5 long [1] 4/19 23/4 23/16 24/7 25/3 25/22 26/1 27/10 issued [1] 7/4 look [9] 6/3 18/24 22/21 24/11 25/5 28/4 29/19 31/3 31/7 31/8 issues [2] 4/8 26/2 28/25 29/2 29/4 29/23 **HONORABLE** [1] 1/9 looking [1] 3/24 it [66] hopefully [2] 8/1 12/20 it's [15] 6/2 6/19 7/17 11/15 15/16 horse [1] 28/15 15/22 17/16 18/3 19/16 22/10 22/11 how [4] 13/4 16/11 21/21 28/5 28/2 28/22 28/23 30/3 machine [3] 2/7 32/4 32/9 made [12] 9/25 10/5 10/21 10/25 11/16 item [1] 14/3 19/18 20/13 24/15 24/23 28/6 29/13 items [1] 24/10 l'd [2] 15/20 24/2 31/22 its [13] 3/23 4/12 5/20 5/22 6/20 8/9 **I'II [4]** 4/3 6/6 20/2 30/17 majority [1] 18/11 17/22 18/8 18/18 21/1 27/1 29/11 I'm [9] 7/24 8/4 11/24 19/1 20/16 22/25 make [12] 12/4 12/19 15/13 15/20 30/14 24/15 28/10 28/10 itself [4] 7/10 15/16 22/6 27/12 23/25 24/2 25/9 26/1 26/10 27/3 29/14 I've [1] 12/6 IV [2] 27/13 27/14 31/11 i.e [1] 13/15 makes [1] 14/2 ICTC [6] 21/7 21/8 21/9 21/12 21/15 making [1] 4/13 22/11 manner [2] 26/17 26/24 Jacqueline [2] 1/12 3/7 **identify [1]** 3/5 Jones [6] 1/18 2/1 3/11 32/2 32/13 many [2] 17/15 27/16 IEEPA [13] 23/13 24/2 24/6 25/7 25/11 32/14 **Mat [1]** 3/11 25/12 26/4 26/5 27/20 28/5 30/3 31/9 Joseph [2] 1/15 3/7 material [3] 3/25 4/13 25/6 31/18 **JUDGE [2]** 1/9 1/10 materially [3] 4/20 9/21 9/22 implicate [1] 12/12 materials [5] 10/15 17/15 28/17 29/4 judges [1] 27/16 implied [1] 23/17 judicial [3] 16/21 17/1 17/9 29/18 important [3] 5/25 6/3 21/22 jury [7] 7/17 7/21 7/22 7/25 8/1 22/4 matter [4] 3/3 14/4 14/5 17/9 impossible [2] 18/3 30/1 22/4 **matters** [1] 14/6 in-person [1] 5/11 just [11] 6/18 9/24 12/17 13/2 16/6 **Matthew [1]** 1/18 inappropriate [1] 6/13 17/18 19/24 20/1 28/10 29/20 31/3 may [9] 4/4 7/17 12/16 12/22 16/9 include [1] 23/11 JUSTICE [2] 1/16 17/5 23/21 23/24 30/3 31/12 includes [1] 4/20 maybe [5] 19/1 22/25 26/17 26/19 **Including [1]** 23/6 Κ 30/11 inconsistent [1] 5/8 KASSIM [3] 1/5 3/3 3/12 me [18] 6/5 8/10 12/1 12/9 12/20 12/22 incorrect [2] 17/12 17/17 key [1] 21/1 12/24 19/20 20/1 22/1 22/18 23/22 incredibly [1] 21/20 know [23] 5/9 8/1 9/16 13/9 14/11 23/24 26/16 26/18 26/22 26/23 30/17 inculpatory [1] 23/20 15/1 15/1 15/2 15/7 15/9 16/5 22/1 mean [5] 19/17 20/19 22/13 23/10 indeed [2] 8/25 18/19 22/14 23/23 25/12 26/15 27/24 28/21 30/11 independent [2] 16/21 17/9 29/13 29/22 29/22 30/15 31/14 meaningful [1] 16/20 indictment [11] 3/20 4/1 4/4 4/11 4/21 knowledge [2] 11/16 14/25 means [1] 18/10 6/9 6/12 7/7 17/21 19/23 21/6 knows [3] 16/7 31/8 31/15 meetings [1] 5/11 individuals [1] 4/23 **Meltzer [2]** 1/19 3/13 inextricably [1] 4/9 memorandum [1] 13/9 inform [2] 12/9 12/22 last [1] 25/18 memos [2] 18/13 18/13 information [63] law [4] 9/18 15/11 17/20 21/25 meshed [1] 17/15 initially [1] 23/1 lawful [12] 4/12 5/20 5/24 17/22 18/18 midst [1] 17/4 inside [1] 18/18 18/25 19/4 19/23 20/3 20/9 20/12 might [5] 13/5 15/10 24/7 24/25 29/25 instance [2] 20/25 27/17 20/20 millions [1] 5/10 Instead [1] 6/2 least [2] 26/2 26/21 mind [3] 9/4 14/6 14/7 instruct [1] 7/22

		1 - 101 - 0/10 - 0/10 - 10/0 - 15/10 - 17/10
M Case 1:17-cr-00046-RB	offering [1] 5/11 ២೯೯៥೬೭៤ព្រាម្នាថ្ងៃ 37 Filed 08/30/1	<b>point [6]</b>
	officer [2] 16/21 17/1	pointed [2] 14/8 14/9
misrepresentations [1] 4/13 mixing [1] 25/20	official [6] 2/1 11/6 14/21 32/2 32/8	pointers [1] 29/20
more [4] 5/17 20/20 27/11 28/13	32/14	points [1] 15/1
most [1] 8/17	officials [1] 5/12 oftentimes [1] 25/19	<b>position [8]</b> 9/23 10/8 11/2 17/7 23/2 24/24 27/24 27/25
motion [9] 3/14 3/15 12/20 17/14	Okay [2] 20/18 24/14	possible [3] 25/8 25/10 27/22
27/15 30/19 31/8 31/10 31/19	omit [1] 6/11	potential [2] 7/15 30/7
motions [2] 1/8 13/3 motive [4] 8/7 8/8 8/11 8/14	one [14] 4/11 8/17 10/23 13/1 13/15	potentially [3] 26/14 28/1 29/17
moving [1] 17/17	13/20 15/1 15/19 20/5 21/6 21/15 24/7	powerful [1] 21/14
Mr [16] 3/21 3/25 4/11 5/5 5/9 5/19	28/9 29/15 ones [1] 7/7	preceded [1] 11/9 predicate [1] 19/2
16/23 17/24 18/11 18/13 18/20 20/22	only [6] 3/22 8/25 11/8 13/7 14/6	prepared [6] 6/2 7/4 24/22 26/22
21/1 21/23 22/8 25/20 Mr. [6] 4/22 18/20 19/8 21/8 21/17	14/11	26/23 28/2
28/13	opening [1] 5/6	preparing [3] 3/19 3/25 17/16
Mr. Gillice [1] 28/13	opportunity [1] 8/23 oral [1] 13/3	<b>present [5]</b> 3/12 6/14 16/3 19/3 22/3 <b>preserve [2]</b> 25/10 27/1
Mr. Tajideen [4] 4/22 19/8 21/8 21/17	order [8] 6/4 8/12 15/13 17/14 19/7	preserved [2] 25/25 27/19
Mr. Tajideen's [1] 18/20 much [1] 5/18	27/16 30/7 30/14	press [2] 4/10 15/25
must [1] 16/19	organizations [1] 4/24	presume [1] 9/20
my [8] 3/12 9/4 11/6 11/22 20/11 31/5	other [9] 4/25 10/6 10/16 13/1 13/5	presumedly [1] 13/7
32/9 32/10	15/4 17/16 24/8 24/25 otherwise [2] 25/6 29/1	presumes [1] 13/20 pretend [1] 9/1
N	our [7] 5/4 8/16 9/16 9/18 13/7 19/10	previously [3] 8/19 8/23 16/14
N.W [1] 2/2	28/15	prior [3] 9/2 14/23 20/7
name [1] 32/11	out [7] 9/7 13/2 14/8 14/9 17/10 18/3 25/18	<b>privilege [5]</b> 12/13 28/18 28/22 28/24 29/11
names [1] 25/20	over [9] 4/13 5/1 5/6 11/11 11/14	privileged [12] 10/15 10/21 11/13 18/9
national [3] 1/13 26/15 26/15 naturally [1] 25/22	17/22 17/24 25/18 28/19	22/23 23/7 24/9 24/12 28/12 28/20
nature [6] 7/12 7/13 13/9 23/22 27/2	overt [2] 4/17 7/8	29/3 29/17
29/11	owns [1] 15/3	privileges [1] 22/24 probably [2] 28/19 30/1
necessarily [2] 4/5 6/9	P	proceed [2] 28/5 31/1
need [4] 5/17 5/23 12/21 13/4 needs [4] 12/24 13/11 13/12 30/18	<b>p.m [2]</b> 1/6 31/25	proceeding [5] 8/22 12/25 18/2 20/23
negate [2] 8/5 8/13	pages [1] 32/7 Palazzo [2] 1/15 3/7	23/24
negotiations [1] 31/13	Paragraph [1] 4/20	proceedings [4] 2/7 31/24 32/5 32/8 process [13] 10/13 14/21 25/7 25/7
never [3] 15/3 15/5 15/7	part [7] 9/16 11/5 13/5 17/16 24/8 25/7	
New [1] 1/16 next [1] 11/5	27/8	27/21 28/23 29/18
no [13] 1/4 7/22 8/3 8/21 10/22 10/22	parte [7] 12/14 23/24 25/9 25/13 26/23	
13/23 14/3 16/5 18/7 23/4 29/18 31/17	27/14 27/15 particular [4] 6/17 9/10 12/5 28/21	<b>produce [7]</b> 22/19 24/3 24/21 26/17 26/17 28/2 29/9
non [3] 10/15 11/13 18/9	particularly [1] 25/14	produced [7] 2/7 11/20 12/10 12/10
non-privileged [3] 10/15 11/13 18/9 nonetheless [3] 7/17 9/7 27/2	parties [1] 3/4	23/14 30/24 30/25
normally [1] 30/6	pause [1] 31/4	producible [3] 24/1 24/1 29/8
not [87]	pending [1] 31/18 Pennsylvania [1] 1/20	production [1] 29/10 prominently [1] 21/6
notes [1] 32/9	people [1] 22/17	proof [2] 9/16 9/18
notice [4] 7/1 7/1 17/4 30/8 now [3] 8/22 13/23 22/14	per [1] 15/1	proposition [1] 22/4
number [3] 10/4 14/12 15/4	perhaps [1] 28/10	protect [1] 25/11
NW [3] 1/14 1/16 1/20	period [4] 4/14 5/1 5/7 17/23 permitted [2] 27/13 27/21	protecting [1] 25/11
0	person [2] 5/11 8/18	<b>prove [4]</b> 8/6 9/20 13/23 15/21 <b>proven [3]</b> 8/10 13/12 25/19
objection [1] 31/17	personal [1] 5/6	provide [3] 14/18 27/2 27/5
obligation [8] 19/20 22/19 24/6 24/17	personnel [1] 13/8	provided [10] 5/17 10/1 10/2 10/19
26/6 28/16 30/9 30/15	pertinent [2] 26/25 27/1 petition [1] 10/17	12/1 12/7 14/20 14/20 18/5 18/8
obviously [14] 4/3 6/6 6/8 11/24 19/19	piece [2] 6/17 28/9	providing [2] 15/24 28/20 proving [1] 19/11
22/3 23/10 23/23 24/5 25/22 26/7 26/16 30/2 30/17	pieces [1] 13/10	<b>public [1]</b> 11/15
occurred [2] 16/22 18/2	place [1] 19/10	pull [2] 18/3 18/3
OCTF [1] 21/9	Plaintiff [1] 1/3 plan [1] 16/3	pulled [1] 17/10
OFAC [63]	play [2] 23/15 30/14	purpose [1] 6/20 purposes [1] 8/20
<b>OFAC's [7]</b> 3/18 5/14 9/15 13/4 20/24 21/10 21/20	plea [1] 31/13	put [6] 7/24 10/6 13/25 19/22 21/12
offense [2] 17/9 17/12	pleadings [1] 15/2	30/7
offenses [1] 7/12	please [1] 3/5	putting [3] 3/23 13/21 28/14

<u>Case 1:17 cr 00046 RB</u> Response [1] 31/16 wesult (Գրևթյալի 137) since [3] 12/17 15/16 16/14 Filed 08/30/13 itu Ring 12/38 0/24 90/12 reveal [5] 11/25 20/12 23/22 23/24 situations [1] 21/22 qualify [1] 22/19 30/6 slight [1] 15/19 question [6] 12/12 17/14 19/22 20/11 revealed [1] 12/24 small [1] 11/11 24/8 28/11 review [17] 12/8 12/18 12/21 16/20 so [37] questions [2] 5/12 16/10 16/20 17/9 23/1 23/3 24/18 25/5 28/16 **sole [1]** 17/23 quite [1] 24/5 28/16 29/6 29/8 29/16 30/17 30/20 some [16] 3/17 5/23 8/16 10/16 12/14 reviewed [1] 17/1 12/25 16/20 19/3 19/5 20/13 22/16 reviewing [1] 23/5 25/9 27/19 28/23 29/20 31/13 rather [2] 6/1 29/2 right [10] 5/4 6/11 16/13 16/16 17/3 someone [1] 13/25 reality [2] 30/4 30/11 19/1 20/8 23/12 24/3 27/10 something [3] 19/5 22/14 28/24 really [3] 9/9 18/24 22/10 Ronald [2] 1/19 3/13 sort [1] 24/12 reams [1] 5/13 Room [1] 2/2 speak [2] 13/20 23/8 reason [1] 29/19 **RPR [2]** 2/1 32/14 speaking [1] 27/12 reasonably [2] 31/9 31/12 Rule [6] 3/24 28/17 29/4 29/9 29/17 specially [2] 4/16 6/24 receive [1] 23/13 30/22 specific [6] 7/4 7/5 7/6 21/21 24/10 recited [1] 16/4 ruling [1] 12/19 28/14 record [5] 3/4 3/5 6/2 21/7 31/12 **run [1]** 7/3 speculate [1] 29/25 recorded [1] 2/7 **speedy [4]** 31/6 31/10 31/18 31/21 redact [1] 27/16 stand [1] 22/9 redacted [8] 18/13 18/14 18/14 18/14 said [14] 5/1 8/21 11/12 14/2 14/14 statements [12] 9/24 10/5 10/6 10/7 25/9 26/1 26/9 27/25 14/19 22/21 23/1 23/2 24/21 26/4 10/8 10/20 10/24 11/2 20/14 24/22 redaction [3] 26/8 27/1 28/3 28/13 29/6 32/8 24/25 25/1 reference [7] 3/14 7/10 7/23 15/15 sanctions [1] 16/24 **STATES [8]** 1/1 1/3 1/10 1/13 3/3 3/8 16/11 19/17 20/14 say [20] 5/16 6/18 10/3 10/25 11/19 21/4 32/3 reflected [1] 20/24 12/5 14/13 15/16 15/23 17/17 18/13 status [1] 21/9 reframing [1] 4/22 19/15 19/15 19/19 20/4 20/13 22/9 statute [4] 18/23 19/1 30/4 30/4 regard [10] 6/16 7/7 13/6 14/7 19/2 23/16 24/18 29/5 step [1] 3/4 23/3 24/8 24/9 24/12 25/24 saying [14] 4/25 8/4 10/20 10/24 12/1 still [1] 28/10 regarding [3] 4/5 8/12 31/6 15/6 19/8 19/9 22/2 22/17 24/16 28/8 strange [1] 16/23 Regardless [1] 4/7 29/2 29/12 Street [1] 1/14 **REGGIE** [1] 1/9 says [8] 4/19 14/7 14/9 15/25 18/9 strong [1] 28/18 **Register [2]** 6/25 7/1 20/25 22/11 31/5 stuff [2] 14/25 22/10 regular [1] 25/16 Scooter [1] 26/5 subject [3] 11/20 25/16 29/10 regulations [10] 9/15 19/16 19/19 **SDGT [2]** 3/22 15/4 **submissions [2]** 5/14 25/13 19/21 19/25 21/16 21/17 21/19 22/2 secretly [1] 21/3 submit [1] 26/22 22/15 section [4] 1/13 27/13 27/14 31/19 **submitted [2]** 12/17 18/12 related [8] 3/15 6/11 7/15 7/19 8/11 security [3] 1/13 26/15 26/16 subscribed [1] 32/10 10/17 27/7 27/8 seek [1] 10/5 subsequent [1] 8/21 relating [1] 10/16 seeking [4] 3/18 3/21 26/8 30/8 **substance** [1] 18/16 relatively [1] 9/19 such [5] 4/24 14/18 23/23 24/10 28/18 seem [1] 24/18 release [1] 15/25 seems [9] 5/21 8/10 8/17 19/20 22/1 suffer [1] 26/19 relevant [7] 13/11 14/9 14/10 15/14 22/18 26/16 28/6 28/10 sufficient [2] 22/6 27/5 15/17 18/19 24/20 **selected** [1] 6/1 sufficiently [2] 25/23 25/23 relies [1] 16/12 selects [1] 4/18 suggest [1] 21/18 relying [3] 5/3 24/23 25/1 self [2] 5/21 6/1 suggestion [3] 5/2 10/4 24/25 remaining [1] 28/9 self-evident [1] 5/21 **sum [1]** 18/15 **remarking [1]** 5/15 self-selected [1] 6/1 **summation** [1] 11/6 remove [1] 3/21 **SENIOR [1]** 1/9 support [9] 4/17 6/14 8/9 9/25 15/24 reported [1] 32/4 sense [1] 20/5 16/1 16/19 17/25 22/6 Reporter [4] 2/1 2/1 32/2 32/14 sentence [1] 4/18 supporting [2] 9/21 9/22 reports [1] 21/9 set [3] 14/11 18/25 21/2 supports [1] 18/14 representation [1] 30/20 seven [5] 4/14 4/19 5/7 17/23 25/18 supposed [1] 24/23 representations [4] 12/4 20/19 25/15 seven-year [4] 4/14 4/19 5/7 17/23 sure [6] 6/7 7/24 22/13 22/23 22/24 several [1] 10/18 31/11 represented [1] 30/17 **sharp [1]** 28/10 representing [1] 11/9 shorthand [3] 2/7 32/5 32/9 request [3] 12/14 19/18 20/12 should [13] 4/15 7/22 10/10 11/4 TAJIDEEN [19] 1/5 3/3 3/12 3/21 4/11 requesting [1] 26/7 12/10 15/9 16/13 17/25 18/13 18/15 4/22 5/9 5/19 16/23 17/24 18/11 18/13 requests [1] 28/14 28/25 30/8 30/19 18/20 19/8 21/1 21/8 21/17 21/23 22/8 require [1] 13/18 shouldn't [1] 8/6 **Taildeen's [5]** 3/25 5/5 18/20 20/22 required [5] 9/7 13/23 20/6 25/13 show [7] 6/22 9/17 14/10 19/4 21/7 25/20 21/10 21/21 take [2] 27/14 27/15 requires [1] 30/13

shows [1] 18/17

simply [1] 25/8

significant [1] 28/7

resolve [1] 17/14

respect [1] 25/4

respond [2] 6/6 20/2

taking [1] 19/10

talks [1] 13/3

talking [2] 12/23 30/12

| three [1] 13/14 | target [2] 16/24 17/17 | us [8] 5/17 5/21 11/12 12/6 18/17 | us [8] 5/17 5/21 11/12 12/6 18/17 | target [2] 16/24 17/17 tied [2] 4/9 17/15 use [5] 10/5 15/6 15/6 15/8 26/8 tell [2] 19/20 29/3 time [1] 5/2 used [2] 16/18 21/2 tells [1] 15/2 today [1] 13/3 uses [1] 7/1 tend [2] 5/2 10/3 using [2] 9/24 11/3 together [1] 7/24 terrorist [7] 3/16 4/16 4/23 6/25 7/15 told [3] 12/6 12/6 19/13 7/19 18/1 toll [1] 31/9 testimony [2] 16/4 32/5 vast [1] 18/11 tolled [1] 31/21 than [3] 6/1 20/20 29/2 tolling [1] 31/17 versus [2] 3/3 8/18 Thank [5] 16/9 20/18 31/2 31/22 31/23 very [7] 11/22 13/1 16/4 19/15 21/19 **Tom [1]** 3/6 that [287] 21/22 31/20 took [4] 9/2 23/2 27/23 27/24 that's [26] 5/4 6/13 8/3 8/18 9/17 vet [1] 5/10 touches [1] 3/19 10/23 11/18 11/20 12/8 12/20 13/16 view [2] 28/16 29/21 transactions [8] 5/11 7/5 7/6 9/14 17/12 18/15 19/2 19/18 21/6 22/14 violate [3] 13/15 21/17 21/24 9/15 17/19 17/19 21/15 23/5 24/6 24/20 26/3 28/14 28/24 violated [5] 16/25 19/14 19/19 20/4 transcribed [1] 32/9 29/24 30/1 30/11 transcript [3] 1/8 2/7 32/8 20/21 their [18] 5/12 5/15 5/15 5/16 7/18 transcription [1] 2/7 violation [1] 9/15 10/15 13/3 13/3 13/7 14/13 15/1 15/2 violative [2] 17/19 21/16 transparency [1] 5/16 18/4 21/11 27/12 29/25 30/7 30/9 virtually [1] 3/19 Treasury [1] 6/20 them [12] 5/15 10/14 11/9 14/2 14/12 trial [10] 1/15 9/12 13/12 13/13 18/21 20/12 21/17 24/24 28/16 28/17 29/2 W 26/21 31/6 31/10 31/18 31/21 29/5 **WALTON [1]** 1/9 true [1] 14/12 themselves [1] 21/15 want [2] 10/24 13/19 try [5] 9/20 13/21 14/10 14/13 18/12 then [21] 8/5 15/17 21/2 22/18 23/12 trying [6] 4/14 9/5 9/6 11/25 15/13 wanted [3] 27/3 27/5 31/11 23/25 24/1 24/13 25/6 26/9 26/16 wants [2] 21/18 28/13 21/4 26/19 26/24 27/7 28/5 28/17 28/17 was [59] turn [1] 28/19 29/12 29/14 29/18 30/25 turned [2] 11/10 11/14 Washington [5] 1/5 1/14 1/17 1/21 2/3 theory [8] 5/8 8/9 9/25 21/1 21/4 22/6 way [4] 19/5 19/23 20/13 27/6 two [2] 13/14 18/12 22/15 30/2 we [53] type [1] 12/25 there [19] 4/4 6/21 7/15 8/4 8/4 8/13 we'd [1] 29/13 13/8 14/17 16/5 16/19 19/18 21/24 we'll [1] 31/1 23/20 23/23 24/19 29/8 29/14 30/22 we're [15] 3/18 3/20 3/22 3/24 12/23 **U.S [8]** 1/16 2/2 5/11 8/18 9/8 20/7 31/1 13/23 16/2 18/9 22/21 22/23 22/24 21/2 21/14 there's [8] 8/3 10/2 15/19 21/6 22/10 24/11 25/14 29/2 29/22 ultimately [1] 23/3 22/14 24/4 31/5 unable [1] 17/7 we've [1] 25/18 thereafter [2] 7/2 15/3 unclassified [6] 10/15 11/13 18/9 well [8] 13/1 14/23 15/19 17/4 20/5 therefore [3] 10/7 14/15 28/2 24/19 29/7 30/21 24/13 31/11 31/20 Thereupon [1] 31/24 unclear [2] 20/17 22/11 were [28] 4/20 5/24 7/4 7/4 10/6 11/3 these [11] 9/14 10/6 11/8 15/13 17/6 11/12 12/11 14/12 14/25 15/4 16/5 under [14] 3/24 9/18 23/13 24/2 24/6 17/8 18/3 21/2 21/5 22/15 22/23 16/24 17/19 18/6 18/19 19/4 19/14 25/12 27/12 27/14 28/5 29/9 29/9 30/5 they [70] 19/18 19/19 19/21 20/13 20/21 21/15 30/16 31/9 they'd [3] 13/22 19/3 19/20 underlying [1] 16/16 22/17 25/1 26/23 29/20 they'll [1] 24/21 undermine [6] 5/2 8/13 10/4 10/7 11/2 weren't [2] 23/1 26/22 they're [5] 10/24 10/25 22/24 24/23 what [80] 24/25 what's [4] 6/8 14/5 28/11 30/17 underpinnings [1] 9/10 they've [2] 24/21 28/6 whatever [3] 7/23 15/11 26/15 understand [20] 4/2 6/4 7/11 9/5 **thin [1]** 17/10 when [2] 9/2 17/5 10/13 10/14 10/23 11/14 11/15 11/24 thing [3] 13/2 14/6 24/7 19/7 19/9 21/19 22/3 22/5 22/9 22/16 where [6] 5/21 9/21 15/6 28/21 29/4 things [8] 4/25 10/24 13/5 13/9 13/14 22/18 26/4 29/5 30/12 13/15 14/11 26/22 whereof [1] 32/10 understanding [1] 5/4 think [20] 6/11 6/13 7/20 12/12 12/12 whether [26] 4/7 6/21 7/2 7/3 7/18 understands [1] 15/11 12/21 12/22 13/19 17/12 18/19 19/16 9/11 9/13 12/9 12/22 15/8 17/19 21/23 understood [1] 20/23 25/3 26/6 28/9 28/12 28/14 29/24 21/24 22/11 23/25 24/3 24/19 24/23 unfortunate [2] 30/3 30/11 29/24 30/1 30/2 26/10 26/24 27/1 27/4 27/4 28/18 29/1 UNITED [8] 1/1 1/3 1/10 1/13 3/3 3/8 thinking [1] 15/12 31/13 21/3 32/3 thinks [1] 14/2 which [18] 4/14 4/21 7/14 8/18 11/11 universe [1] 11/11 this [48] 12/19 12/20 16/23 18/2 19/10 20/24 unlawful [1] 17/10 **Thomas [1]** 1/12 21/2 23/14 24/3 24/4 27/13 28/10 30/6 unless [1] 29/3 those [32] 4/5 4/8 5/14 8/2 10/6 10/8 while [2] 7/11 25/10 unprecedented [1] 5/7 13/10 15/10 15/10 17/14 17/19 18/6 who [2] 3/12 8/18 unqualified [1] 28/24 18/10 19/4 19/6 19/13 19/18 19/21 whole [2] 20/23 21/4 unspecified [1] 22/23 20/3 20/12 20/18 20/20 20/21 21/14 why [10] 8/5 8/9 8/14 9/17 15/17 16/12 until [2] 31/10 31/21 21/15 22/3 24/24 25/9 25/24 28/15 up [8] 5/6 5/12 5/25 18/20 21/2 22/9 20/19 20/21 22/5 30/4 28/25 29/15 will [15] 3/23 6/10 12/19 12/20 14/18 25/20 28/4 though [3] 4/3 7/16 8/7 21/22 23/18 24/18 27/16 30/16 30/18 upon [10] 5/3 16/12 20/12 24/23 25/1 thought [2] 22/25 29/6 30/20 30/23 30/25 31/21 29/7 30/4 30/16 30/19 31/20 thousand [1] 14/11

W Case 1:17 cr 00046 RBW WILMER [1] 1/20	Document 27	Filed 08/30/17	Page 40 of 40
WILMER [1] 1/20 within [1] 23/21	Pocument 37	1 1160 00/30/1/	1 aye 40 01 40
witness [4] 6/18 7/2 7/3 32/10 wording [1] 7/23			
words [2] 6/25 10/15			
working [1] 9/7 would [59]			
wouldn't [2] 22/5 28/19 wrong [4] 18/22 19/1 22/25 23/3			
Y			
year [4] 4/14 4/19 5/7 17/23 years [1] 25/18			
yes [6] 3/17 14/19 20/5 20/17 27/10 31/7			
yet [1] 12/19			
York [1] 1/16 you [66]			
you're [13] 9/24 10/5 10/20 11/2 22/2 22/7 24/16 24/17 26/7 27/10 28/8 28/8			
30/12 you've [2] 12/10 14/17			
your [36]			
yourselves [1] 3/5			