2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EXAMINATION BEFORE TRIAL of the Defendant, KATHLEEN M. RICE, individually and in her official capacity as District Attorney of the County of Nassau, by a witness, PETER MANCUSO, taken by the Plaintiff, held at the offices of Diamond Reporting, 114 Old Country Road, Suite 344, Mineola, New York 11501, before Phyllis Goldberg, a Notary Public of the State of New York.
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EXAMINATION BY
MR. MALONEY: record. questions. birth? witness, having been first duly sworn by a Notary Public of the State of New York, was examined and testified as follows:
Q. Please state your name for the
A. Peter Mancuso.
Q. Where do you reside?
A. My office address is: 272 Old Country Road, Mineola , New York 11501.
Q. Good morning, Mr. Mancuso. I'm Jim Maloney, the Plaintiff in this case. I'm going to be asking you a series of

First of all, can you tell me the year of your birth and place of your
A. New York City in 1954.
Q. What is the extent of your education completely?
A. Law school.
Q. Where did you go to law school?
A. Cornell.
Q. What year did you graduate?
A. 1978 .
Q. What Bar admissions did you seek upon graduation? MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection. You may answer.
A. New York State, Eastern

District of New York, Southern District of New York, Second Circuit Court of Appeals of the Supreme Court of the United States.
Q. Actually, I asked upon graduation, and obviously, some of those were a little later.
A. Immediately upon graduation, New York State.
Q. And you continually maintain your admission in New York State since then?
A. Yes.
Q. What year were you admitted?
A. 1979 .
Q. Before you went to Cornell, what was your undergraduate education?

## MANCUSO

A. I had received a Bachelor of Science and Economics at MIT.
Q. What year was that?
A. 1975 .
Q. What was your first employment after law school?
A. Nassau County District Attorney's office.
Q. And your initial job title?
A. Assistant District Attorney. That is not true. District Attorney law assistant. It was prior to my admission to the Bar.
Q. And upon admission you became an ADA?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that would have been 1979 that you became an ADA; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the first promotion or change of job title that you received within that office?
A. I became a Deputy Bureau Chief in the 1983, 1984 time frame.

5 1984?
office.
solo?
okay.
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Q. Of any particular bureau?
A. Commercial frauds.
Q. I'm sorry, you said 1983 to
A. Somewhere in the 1983, 1984 time frame. I'm not sure.
Q. After that, what was the next professional job or title change?
A. I left the District Attorney's
Q. Where did you go?
A. I went into private practice.
Q. What year was that?
A. 1986 .
Q. What was the firm or was it
A. It was a solo practice.
Q. What type of law did you
practice?
A. General.
Q. Litigation?
A. Including litigation.
Q. Litigation and transactional,
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Where was your office?
A. In Mineola, at that point?
Q. And then it moved?
A. To Garden City.
Q. I'm assuming at some point you stopped a private practice and went into another area of employment; what was that year?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
You can answer.
A. 1993, I was employed as general counsel to a gasoline distributor.
Q. What gasoline distributor?
A. Tartan Oil. T-A-R-T-A-N.
Q. Where is Tartan Oil's office?
A. It was located in Melville. I don't know if it still exists.
Q. How long did you remain general counsel at Tartan?
A. Approximately, a year.
Q. What was the reason for you leaving?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. The position was terminated by

2 the employer.

Attorney's office.
A. Yes. you came back? than you left?
A. Yes. change? changes.
A. Yes.
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Q. And what was your next
employment after that?
A. Nassau County District
Q. So that would have been 1994 ?
Q. What was your job title when
A. Assistant District Attorney.
Q. So you came back in lower down

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
You can answer.
Q. After you returned to the District Attorney's office in 1994, what was your first promotion or other job title
A. There had been no job title
Q. When you first returned, were you assigned to any particular bureau?

## MANCUSO

Q. What bureau was that?
A. Special investigations.
Q. What was the scope of special
investigations work?
A. Investigation and prosecution of matters involving public officials, public employees.
Q. Would that be a bureau, a unit?
A. That was a bureau.
Q. Are you still in the Special

## Investigations Bureau?

A. Special Investigations Bureau was renamed the Public Corruption Bureau.
Q. And that's your current position?
A. That's correct.
Q. When was it renamed?
A. 2006, I believe.
Q. Would you consider yourself familiar with the policies and procedures of the D.A.'s office as relate to work within the Public Corruption Bureau?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you had any additional
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education while an assistant District Attorney either before or after you left?
A. I have continuing legal education on a regular basis.
Q. Other than the continuing general legal education that's to maintain your Bar membership, have you had any special programs within or as adjunct to your position in the District Attorney's office?
A. Yes.
Q. What were they?
A. I wouldn't be able to list them all.
Q. Quite a number of them?
A. There have been several over the years, yes, successfully.

MR. MALONEY: Mark this as
Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, please.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned
letter dated 3/17/09 was marked as
Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
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Q. Mr. Mancuso, I'd like you to take a look at the document that's been marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 and tell me if you've ever seen that document before?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And you wrote that document; did you not?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. I'd like to draw your attention to the date March 17th. Any particular reason you chose that date?
A. No.
Q. Do you know that that date represents a certain type of holiday?
A. I'm aware it's St. Patrick's Day.
Q. No reason for choosing St. Patrick's Day. MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. No.
Q. Did you send any other letters out on March 17th?
A. I don't recall.
Q. To expedite this, I'm going to

## MANCUSO

ask you in general terms, unless there's an objection, how it is that you came to write this letter; what transpired that led you to write this letter?
A. I was directed to conduct an investigation to determine whether I should make a recommendation to my superiors that Karen Hudson be prosecuted in connection with allegations that you made in a letter that was sent to the District Attorney in August of 2008, and I conducted that investigation. I made my recommendation that she not be prosecuted. My superiors approved that recommendation, closed the investigation, and I sent you this letter reflecting that.
Q. Okay, thanks.

You mentioned your superiors. To whom do you report and who are the superiors to whom you're referring? MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection to form.

> You can answer.
A. Are you asking me to whom I
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report now or if $I$ reported in that time frame?
Q. Good question, exactly. Then, not now.
A. In that time frame I reported to Meg Reis, who was the Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations, and that's R-E-I-S, and to Marshall Traeger, M-A-R-S-H-A-L-L, Traeger, who became the bureau chief following Meg Reis' service as the acting bureau chief. They both, during parts of that period of time, served as my superior. And was there another part to the question?
Q. Yes. It was really to whom you report overall.

Meg Reis you mention in two roles, as Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations and as acting bureau chief.

During what time frame did she assume both those roles at the same time?
A. I believe that -- well, when

2 did she assume it? I can't tell you
3 exactly. I would approximate that it was
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 sometime in the latter part of 2007, but I really can't tell you exactly.Q. So she was Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations prior to that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in addition to that, she became acting bureau chief for a period of time?
A. Yes.
Q. And then was replaced as acting bureau chief by Marshall Traeger?
A. Yes.
Q. When did that transaction take place?
A. That happened in the October 2008 time frame.
Q. Did Meg Reis leave the District Attorney's office at that time?
A. No.
Q. What was her position after that?

## MANCUSO

A. She continued in the position of Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations.
Q. And the bureau chief title was for which bureau?
A. Public Corruption.
Q. So would it be fair to say that you report both to the Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations and the bureau chief or acting bureau chief at any given time?
A. At any given time I report to the bureau chief. The bureau chief reports to the Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations. There may be matters in which the Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations has had some involvement and there may be some reporting function there, but that is on a case-by-case basis.
Q. So in the hierarchy, if I may use that term, the Executive Assistant District Attorney For Investigations is above the bureau chief for the Public

2 Corruption Bureau?
A. Yes. bureau chief? of this year.
A. Yes. Traeger? District Attorney?
A. No.
A. No.
Q. Who is now the bureau chief for the Public Corruption Bureau?
A. Stephen, with a P-H, and Antignani is A-N-T-I-G-N-A-N-I.
Q. When did Mr. Antignani become
A. In the time frame of February
Q. Did he replace Mr. Traeger?
Q. Do you happen to know if

Mr. Traeger is related to the late Judge
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Did you, at anytime between 2007 and 2009, report directly to the
Q. Do you, at the present time, report directly to the District Attorney?
Q. Going back to your original

## MANCUSO

 testimony, you were directed to investigate this matter, that would have been Meg Reis who gave that you direction?A. Yes.
Q. If you know, was that in her capacity as Executive Assistant District Attorney that she gave that you direction or as acting bureau chief?
A. I can't distinguish between the two roles.
Q. Did you review any documents before coming in today that are not privileged, any documents at all?
A. Yes.
Q. What documents did you review?
A. I reviewed certain records from this case that were provided to me and I reviewed certain correspondence with regard to this case and correspondence that you provided to the District Attorney's office, and I reviewed the Court cases that were referred to in Karen Hudson's Appellate Brief that were relevant to the review I was asked to conduct.

## MANCUSO

Q. Of the documents reviewed for today, were all of those documents documents you had seen back in the time frame in which you were reviewing my Complaint?
A. Yes, with the exception of any appellate decisions with regard to the underlying cases referred to Karen Hudson that were not in exist at that time she prepared the Appellate Brief. That had not been reached yet at the time she prepared the Appellate Brief.
Q. You mean the case in which the brief was submitted?
A. No, I'm referring to the case that Karen referred to in her Appellate Brief.
Q. Right, you had not reviewed those before?
A. I reviewed the case that Karen referred to in her Appellate Brief, but I had not reviewed the appeals and other cases that were generated following the existence of her Appellate Brief until I

## MANCUSO

prepared for this deposition today and discovered that they existed in doing so.
Q. In other words, you followed the research trail in the cases in her brief?
A. Right.

MR. MALONEY: I guess we can mark that brief as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned Appellate Brief was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
A. I should also add that I
reviewed the section of the Social Services Law that you cited in your letter to the District Attorney's office.
Q. Mr. Mancuso, I'd like you to take a few moments to look over at what's just been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, it's a multi-page document, and tell me if you can identify that document.
A. This is the Appellate Brief

2 that was prepared by Karen Hudson in
3 October of 2007. It's dated October 24, 42007 .

5 Q. And this is the brief you were

MANCUSO just referring to when I discussed
A. Yes.
Q. When was the first time that you saw that brief?
A. In the middle of August 2008.
Q. How were you given a copy of that brief?
A. It was provided to me by the Appeals Bureau of my office.
Q. Who specifically provided ?
A. Tammy Smiley, S-M-I-L-E-Y.
Q. Did you request a copy of it?
A. Yes. I requested copies of it and any other documents that might be relevant to the investigation that $I$ was asked to conduct.
Q. You made those requests of the Appeals Bureau of your office?
A. Tammy Smiley, yes.

## MANCUSO

Q. What other documents did she provide in or about August of 2008 to that request?
A. I don't know if I can remember all of them, but as best as I can remember, I received this document. I received the Memorandum of Law in support -- well, excuse me, you made a motion to strike this document or to retract this document. I received a copy of a Memorandum of Law in support of that motion, a Memorandum of Law in opposition to that motion, a response from you, I believe, was another document I received.
Q. Actually, a reply?
A. I want to use the word response. I want to use the word response. I don't want to ask you questions, but I want to say there was a response from you to the Memorandum of Law that she provided in connection with your motion arising from the Appellate Brief.
Q. That's your recollection?
A. That's my best recollection,

2 yes.
Q. Fair enough.
A. What other documents?

Ultimately, I received a copy of your motion to strike based -- the 28-J letters from the following summer, 2008. And I may have received other documents, but those were the ones that come to mind now.
Q. Do you remember receiving a 28-J letter after September of 2008?
A. I received letters -- yes, I did. I received -- in addition to court documents, $I$ also received the letters addressed to, is it Judge Wolf, over the summer. There were two letters that I received from the summer of 2008. One was a letter from you with regard to 28-J; another was a letter from Karen Hudson in opposition to that, I received those. I received the letter that you sent to the District Attorney in August of 2008, I received a copy of it. And I received a copy of the letter that you sent to the District Attorney in September 2008, which,

## MANCUSO

I believe, is the letter you're referring to now.
Q. No, I was referring to another 28-J letter, meaning a letter to the Second Circuit, but since we're on that topic, you first received that letter to the District Attorney when? Because you said you had received these documents in September of 2008.
A. The letter that you generated in late September 2008 or early October 2008.

MR. MALONEY: Let's mark this
letter of September 29, 2008 as Plaintiff's Exhibit 3, please.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned letter dated 9/29/08 was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
Q. Mr. Mancuso, I've just asked the court reporter to mark this letter as Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.

Is that the letter to the

MANCUSO
District Attorney that you were just referring to?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would have first received that --
A. Late September or early October 2008.
Q. Also from Tammy Smiley?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you mentioned Tammy Smiley's title. She's in the Appeals Bureau?
A. Yes.
Q. What is her title?
A. At the time we are discussing, she was a deputy chief in the Appeals Bureau.
Q. And what is her title now?
A. She is the Chief of the Appeals Bureau.
Q. If you know, why was the Appeals Bureau getting this letter?
A. I don't know.

MS. BEN-SOREK: Referring to
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this letter, Plaintiff's Exhibit 3? MR. MALONEY: Yes.
Q. If you know, did the District Attorney, Kathleen Rice, ever receive the letter that is Plaintiff's Exhibit 3?
A. It is my understanding that she did not.
Q. And upon what information do you base that understanding?
A. I base that on a conversation that Tammy Smiley and I had.
Q. When did that conversation take place?
A. Last Friday.
Q. Can you tell me the sum and substance of that conversation, how that came up?
A. Tammy Smiley told me that she had a conversation with Cheryl Rice, who is the personal assistant to the District Attorney, and that Cheryl Rice had told her that that letter and the letter from August 2008, also addressed to the District Attorney, were not letters that she would

## MANCUSO

have shown to the District Attorney.
MR. MALONEY: Let's mark the August 2008 letter as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4, please.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned letter dated 8/4/08 was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
Q. Mr. Mancuso, I'd like you to take a look at the one-page document that's just been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 and tell me, is that the letter that you just referred to as the August 2008 letter that, according to Tammy Smiley, would not have been shown to the District Attorney? A. Yes.
Q. And who, again, I'm sorry, is the person who Tammy Smiley said told her that the D.A. wouldn't have gotten that?
A. Her name is Cheryl Rice.
Q. Any relation to the District

Attorney?
A. She is her sister-in-law.

MANCUSO
Q. And her personal assistant?
A. Yes.
Q. If you know, would a letter like this that's marked "confidential", and as it states in the first line, "Sent in an envelope marked personal and confidential", have been opened in the first instance by Cheryl Rice?
A. I don't know, other than what I already told you, passed along. I don't know.
Q. Let's go back to that conversation last Friday --

MR. MALONEY: What was the date
last Friday?
MS. BEN-SOREK: 24th.
Q. -- June 24th, you had this conversation with Tammy Smiley?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you related some of the details of that conversation. Who initiated the conversation?
A. Tammy Smiley.
Q. Do you know why she contacted

2 you?

MANCUSO
A. This was only one part of the conversation, this was not the sole part of the conversation, but it was mentioned during the course of the conversation. Q. To the extent that matters in that conversation were not privileged, can you tell me what else was talked about?
A. I don't think there was
anything else in that conversation that would be -- that $I$ can recall that wouldn't be subject to an interoffice communication privilege.
Q. So other items were discussed and all of those, to your belief and recollection now, would be privileged?
A. I'm trying to recall exactly what was discussed in that conversation --
Q. Sure. Take your time.
A. -- before I answer that question.

I don't really recall the other contents of the conversation, other than in the nature of logistics and going forward,
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are we going forward with the deposition, am I going to be substituted, so I don't -let me retract that.

I don't know that I can tell
you that there's any aspects of that conversation that's privileged. It was more in the nature of housekeeping, what's going to happen next, is there going to be a motion to compel, was he not going to be testifying. It was really along those lines. I can't recall anything that was privileged in that conversation.
Q. Let's go back to the part of the conversation in which Tammy Smiley related things that she had been told by Cheryl Rice.

One of the things that she related to you as having been told to her by Cheryl Rice is that these two letters, Plaintiff's Exhibits 3 and 4, had never been seen by the District Attorney; is that correct?
A. She said that they would not have been shown to the District Attorney.
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Q. Was that pursuant to official policy or procedure?
A. I don't know.
Q. Did she give any explanation of why they would not have been shown to the District Attorney?
A. No.
Q. I'd like you to take a look at Plaintiff's Exhibit 4, which is the letter dated August 4, 2008, and there is a word in bold stamped, typed up on the upper right, can you read that word into the record?
A. Confidential.
Q. And can you read the first line of the letter after the salutation?
A. "The enclosures are being sent in an envelope marked "personal and confidential" to insure that they receive your personal attention."
Q. Having read that, would it surprise you that the intended recipient never received the communication?
A. No.
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Q. Do you know for a fact that D.A. Rice never saw this letter?
A. Personally, I have no knowledge as to who received what. I do know that Tammy Smiley told me that in the ordinary course, she would never have been shown these kinds of materials, that she received a great deal of mail marked personal and confidential would not cause concern to her in and of itself. Those things were told to me by Tammy Smiley.
Q. Who makes the decision, if you know, as to what to show the D.A. and what to shield from the D.A.?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. I don't personally know.
Q. Do you know if there is an actual policy relating to that decision-making?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. So would it be fair to say it's an ad hoc policy?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. Not that I'm aware of. I have
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no knowledge whether there's a policy in that regard.
Q. Do you know who actually makes that decision regarding incoming mail that is addressed to the District Attorney personally?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know who would know?
A. I don't know who would know. It would be logical to ask that question of people who operate at the executive level at my office.
Q. I agree.

Do you think the District
Attorney would know?
A. Do I think the District

Attorney would know? I express no opinion as to what the District Attorney would know or not know or what her state of mind is.
Q. So anything else in that conversation last Friday, June 24th, that Tammy Smiley related to you as having been told to her by Cheryl Rice in connection with any documents in this case?
A. No.
Q. Did Tammy Smiley give you any instructions during that conversation? A. No.
Q. Has Tammy Smiley ever given you any instructions with regard to how to proceed in this investigation or this matter?
A. No.
Q. When did you first communicate with Tammy Smiley about the investigation of my Complaint, would that have been around the time you got those documents from her?
A. Mid August 2008.
Q. Let's go back to Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, and if you would please turn to Page 6.
(Whereupon, the witness
complies.)
Q. Can you identify any text on Page 6 that you believe now or would have believed back in August 2008 to be the subject of the Complaint I was making?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you read that text into the record?
A. "In addition, since Plaintiff's infant sons had been in the home at the time of the incident, Office of Child Family Services investigated, concluding that the incident "indicated" maltreatment of his sons, and Plaintiff was listed on the New York State Child Abuse and Maltreatment Register, citing Maloney versus the County of Nassau, 2007, US DIST Lexus 71162, Page *9."
Q. Thank you.

When did you first read that
passage?
A. In mid August 2008.
Q. When did you first receive this file as a matter to investigate?
A. Mid August 2008.
Q. Did you investigate in any way the alleged listing on the Child Protective Services Register?
A. Yes.
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Q. What did you find?
A. I concluded that the listing -that there was, in fact, a listing at that time, and I concluded that the -- that there had been no basis to make a recommendation of criminal prosecution of Karen Hudson in connection with the statement made in the Appellate Brief that I just read, and I made such a recommendation.
Q. Did you investigate whether or not the listing had at that time been adjudicated as founded or unfounded?
A. No.
Q. Did you investigate who made the original call to Child Protective Services?
A. No.
Q. How did you determine that there was in fact a listing at that time.
A. By reading the case that $I$ just cited.
Q. At the time, that was an unpublished opinion; correct?
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A. At the time that $I$ was assigned the case, $I$ had no problem locating it as a reported opinion.
Q. Let me ask you about that.

When you say reported opinion, do you mean on Lexus with an Lex number?
A. I believe it was a Westlaw number at the time I located it in August 2008.
Q. You prefer Westlaw than Lexus?
A. That's the system we have in our office.
Q. When it came up, if you remember, did it show an F. Supp citation?
A. At that time it was a Westlaw citation. When I went back preparing for this deposition, it is an F. Supp citation now.
Q. Right. Did you find that odd? MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. No.
Q. Did you notice the time interval when it went from Westlaw to F. Supp?

1
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A. No. I just know what it was then and what it is now.
Q. Did you happen to look at it in the actual reporter?
A. What do you mean?
Q. You know those books?
A. No.
Q. On what basis did you make the determination that this Complaint, and I'm going to call it a Complaint of Violation of Social Services Law and Penal Law, and I'll cite statutes later, at what point did you decide or make a determination that that was not founded?
A. I made that determination in September of 2008, and I made a recommendation in that time frame that Karen Hudson not be prosecuted in connection with that.
Q. To whom did you make that recommendation?
A. Meg Reis and to Marshall

Traeger ultimately.
Q. Did you make that
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recommendation before you received the letter that was marked in this deposition as Plaintiff's Exhibit 3?

MS. BEN-SOREK: What was the question?
(Whereupon, the question was read back by the Court Reporter.)
A. Yes, I did, but after I
received that letter, I renewed the recommendation that I had made.
Q. When you received that letter, did you receive the enclosure that's referenced with it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you read that enclosure?
A. Yes.
Q. To your recollection, what was that enclosure?
A. I really can't give you the details of it without seeing it in front of me.
Q. Request granted.

MR. MALONEY: Mark it as
Plaintiff's Exhibit 5, please.
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(Whereupon, the aforementioned Decision After Hearing was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
Q. I'd like you to take a look at what's been marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 5.
(Whereupon, the witness
complies.)
Q. Have you had a chance to review it?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that appear to you to be the same as the enclosure that went with the letter that's marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 3?
A. Yes.
Q. Rather than have the court reporter read back the question, I'll ask you: Did you review this document before you renewed your recommendation?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there anything in this document that caused you to reconsider any
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aspect of your initial recommendation?
A. No.
Q. Now, this document indicates that the listing on the register was all along not supported by a fair preponderance of the evidence; is that a correct statement?
A. I don't see the phrase "all along" in it anywhere.
Q. Well, you're right.

But the listing occurred in or around 2000, and this fair hearing occurred in or around 2008, and the fair hearing decides, if I'm correct, that there was not a fair preponderance of evidence to have placed my name on that register; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So that would have been a lack of a fair preponderance of evidence at the beginning, not in 2008?
A. The issue was whether you were on the register at the time that Karen Hudson wrote the Appellate Brief, not
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whether you should have been in light of subject court decisions. Not whether along or never or words to that effect. It was never about whether you were or you weren't, and you were.
Q. Has the District Attorney's office, to your knowledge, ever prosecuted anyone else for disclosing in a court proceeding that an adverse party is listed on the register?
A. I'm not aware of any such prosecution.
Q. Have you ever heard of a prosecution of an individual named Tuifel. I don't know if I'm pronouncing it correctly. It's spelled T-U-I-F-E-L.
A. I'm familiar with the name.
Q. In the context of that sort of prosecution?
A. In the context of having heard the name mentioned in my bureau.
Q. You never managed that case?
A. No.
Q. Do you know who managed that
A. No.
Q. But it's managed in your
bureau?
A. I believe so, or was. I've heard the name.
Q. We'll get back to Tuifel. MR. MALONEY: Let's mark the

Notice of Entry and Demand For
Retraction of Appellate's Brief as Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, please.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned
Notice of Entry and Demand For
Retraction of Appellate's Brief was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
Q. Mr. Mancuso, please take a look at the three-page document that's just been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 and tell me if you've ever seen that document before?
A. Yes.
Q. If you would please turn to the second page and tell me what the date is on

2 that document?
A. Yes. he knows. the document. that, yes.
A. November 19, 2007.
Q. Is it correct that you first saw that document in August of 2008?
Q. Would it be fair to say that this document is the initial reporting of what I consider to be a criminal act?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection. If
A. Well, first of all, I can't really comment on what you consider, but while you're rephrasing that, let me read
Q. Is this a notice, a report and Complaint to the District Attorney of the commission of a Class A misdemeanor?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
You can answer.
A. It's a Notice of Entry which makes reference that it is intended to serve as a notice reporting Complaint of
Q. To the best of your knowledge,
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did anyone else act on that notice, report and Complaint before forwarding this document to you in August of 2008?
A. Not so far as I know.
Q. Does this name, Karen Hudson, as the alleged perpetrator of that misdemeanor?
A. Not that I see.
Q. It alleges one or more public
servants; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. It's actually two misdemeanors, and we'll actually go into it now.

One is Subdivision 12 of
Section 422 of the Social Services Law. Are you familiar with that statutory provision?
A. Yes.
Q. That defines certain activity as a Class A misdemeanor; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Without reviewing the statute, what activities are defined as a Class A misdemeanor?
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A. I believe it defines to willfully permitting or encouraging the release, something along those lines, of the information contained on the central register.
Q. I'm going to, unless there's an objection, without marking this as an exhibit, I have a copy of it with me in my case, it's identical, I believe, in the main part, in the Appellate part, but if you want to take a look at both --

MS. BEN-SOREK: I think what's germane is whether the pocket part was amended.

MR. MALONEY: Well, it's
actually 2009.
Q. But that would have been in effect -- the main part would have been what was in effect at the time of the review you undertook.
A. Is that a question?
Q. No. I'm merely stating that this is a 2009 pocket part. I don't believe the subdivision differs from the
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main part. You can review both, but I'd like you independently, based on what you have, to tell me if the section that you can read there is the section that was in effect at the time you were undertaking this review?
A. If that's the question, the answer is yes.
Q. Which part can we look at, one pocket part or two?
A. I'm referring to the section itself, 422 sub 12 of the Social Services Law.
Q. I mean in this volume that you have in front of you, you're talking about the section, you're reading from the pocket part or main part? I think they're identical. I haven't looked this morning.
A. Section 12 is identical in the pocket part to the main volume.
Q. And in that case, so that we can both look at the same thing, I'll take one and let you have the other. Now that you had a chance to
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see that statute in front of you, could you read into the record the verbiage of Section 422 Subdivision 12 of the Social Services Law?
A. It reads as follow: "Any person who willfully permits and any person who encourages any release of any data or information contained in the central register to persons or agencies not permitted by this title shall be guilty of a Class A misdemeanor."
Q. At the time you conducted this investigation beginning in August of 2008, did you believe this to be one of the two statutory provisions I was complaining under?
A. Yes, but I have to tell you, I really did not interpret the material I received as a Complaint with regard to the other statutory provision. I focused on this (indicating).
Q. So you didn't investigate my Complaint under Subdivision 1 of Section 195.00 of the Penal Code?

1

5 knowledge? that's correct. released. it's fair game?
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A. I did not.
Q. Okay, we'll get back to that. Actually, did anyone else, to your
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. So your determination then was made solely on interpretation of this provision, Subdivision 12 of Section 422, as by the facts that you understood them?
A. With regard to this issue, yes,
Q. Do you believe, as you sit here today, that the verbiage on Page 6 of the brief, Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, amounts to release of any data and information contained in the central register?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because it had already been
Q. Is there a provision in the statute that says that once it's released,
A. The statute doesn't speak to
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the situation either way.
Q. Where and when had that data been released?
A. It had been released in the course of action you brought entitled Maloney versus County of Nassau as cited in Karen Hudson's Appellate Brief. In fact, it was one of the causes of action you brought in connection with that action, in violation of your Constitutional Rights as placed on the central registry. It was public information.
Q. When you say it was public information, do you believe it would be public information simply because it was reported on Lexus and Westlaw, or would it have had to be reported in the Federal Reporter to become public information?
A. At the time that I conducted my review, it had been reported on Westlaw. I consider that to be public information.
Q. Did you find any cases that said that if data contained in the central register is released in some public venue,
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it may then be freely released by anybody with impunity as to the provisions of Section 422 Subdivision 12?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. But I didn't see any cases for or against that would support either proposition.
Q. Did you write any memo about the interpretation of the statute as to that aspect?
A. I did not write a memo specifically about the interpretation of the statute, no.
Q. Did you raise the question of that aspect of the interpretation of the statute to any of your superiors?
A. My recommendation was based on my interpretation of the public release aspect that we've been discussing.
Q. Was your recommendation in writing?
A. Yes.
Q.

Do you consider that writing to be privileged?
A. Yes.
Q. How many memoranda or other writings constituted that recommendation?
A. Three.
Q. Can you give me the dates of those memoranda?
A. I don't know them offhand.
Q. Can you give me the approximate dates?
A. The fall of 2008.
Q. All three?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's including the renewal of the recommendation after you received what are Plaintiff's Exhibits 3 and 5 ?
A. Yes, actually, the renewal may have been an additional email regarding the recommendation. That may not have been a separate recommendation in and of itself. It was not a separate recommendation. It was in the nature of an email, which I also consider to be privileged.
Q. Sure.
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Would it be fair to say that the sole basis that you believed that this was not a violation of Subdivision 12 of Section 422 was that the disclosure had already been made in that Eastern District opinion?
A.

No.
Q. What other basis that you
believed --
A. I also concluded that the conduct couldn't be considered willful. One of the two ways in which one can violate that section is by permitting the release and I concluded the conduct not willful.
Q. On what basis did you determine that it was not willful?
A. On the basis, first of all, of examining the statute to see if it spoke to the subject of what willful means in that context, I saw no reference to that. But on the basis of concluding that willful meant something beyond intentional conduct, it meant something in the nature of
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demonstratively bad faith, and that was not present here.
Q. So your interpretation of the statute is that an element of it is that the release of the data not only be intentional, but be made in bad faith?
A. That it be willful. That's what the statute says. It did not provide any further explanation of what willful meant. I was able to interpret that in the course of deciding whether to recommend that Karen Hudson be prosecuted.
Q. In the statute I'm talking about, willful is actually written as an adverb, willfully?
A. That's correct.
Q. What adverb does that adverb provide?
A. What verb? Permit.
Q. Is there another component to the conduct that's prohibited?
A. I can break down the elements for you, if you wish.
Q. Sure.
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A. In order to prove that a person violated Subdivision 12 of Section 422 of the Social Services Law, one would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to the satisfaction of -- unanimous satisfaction of six jurors that the person under the first part willfully, would be the first aspect, permitted would be the second aspect, release data and information, that it be in the central register, that it be the persons or agencies not permitted by the title.

In a second way of prosecuting, one would have to show those same things, except those that show beyond a reasonable doubt that a person willfully permitted, it would be necessary to show that the person encouraged release of data. All of those would be elements of the crime that would have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.
Q. Did you consider encourage as an alternative, is that a disjunctive; in other words, is the prosecution successful
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if it proves either that the person willfully permitted or that the person encouraged release of data?
A. I viewed it as disjunctive, yes.
Q. You told me so far that you believe that the permitting of the release of the data was not willful in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. On what basis did you make that determination?
A. Because in reading the Appellate Brief, I came to the conclusion that there was a reason pertaining to the litigation for which that information was included.
Q. In other words, to make a good ad hominem?
A. No.
Q. I knew you were going to say that.

Why was it included in the
brief then?
A. I came to the conclusion that
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it was being offered as a factor to be considered by the Court in determining whether it was appropriate -- excuse me, to
be considered by the Court in determining whether the statute in question was constitutional as applied to you and your situation.
Q. Is that the constitutional statute determined as applied to the individual?
A. I believe, and I certainly haven't made myself familiar, and certainly to the extent that you are with the underlying litigation, but I believe your declaratory judgment sort to seek the constitution under faith. And I believe the position that was taken with the Appellate Brief was that the statute applied to you is not unconstitutional and that this was a factor to be considered that in the very incident for which your declaratory challenge had arisen, you had involved yourself in a police stand-off with two one-year old children inside your
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house resulting in your being placed on the central register for maltreatment of those children, and that there was a reason for her to include this in the Appellate Brief, and therefore, $I$ didn't see it as being willful in any way.
Q. As you say, it was in the Appellate Brief?
A. Yes.
Q. So the Appellate Court reviews the decision of the Court below?
A. Yes.
Q. Were these factors considered by the Court below?
A. Well, you litigated that in the context of the Appellate Brief, and the position taken by Karen Hudson was that the Court is always free to take consideration of other court proceedings, and this was specifically cited as being information by another court decision, but certainly, I wouldn't hold myself to have anymore knowledge other than that.
Q. Did those considerations enter
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into your mind when you made a determination whether to be prosecuted?
A. The consideration of whether she had behaved willfully did. Now, of course, in order for her to be prosecuted, she would have to both act willfully and permit, one or the other wouldn't do, and I concluded that it didn't constitute release for the reasons I've already said. But in addition, as you asked in another question, were there any other considerations, yes, I considered the issue of willfully.
Q. Did you ever become aware of who set the wheels in motion and made the complaint to Child Protective Services?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection to form.

You can answer.
A. I don't know.
Q. Are you aware that had the police believed any maltreatment occurred, they would have had an obligation to call under Social Services Law?
A. I have no knowledge.
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Q. Let's look at the encourages file.

When you first received this
file, August of 2008, you received with it not only the document that's Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, but also the document that's Plaintiff's Exhibit 4; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In both of those documents, I had requested retraction of that part of the brief that made that disclosure; is that correct?
A. Both of those documents being this document and what other document?
Q. We'll be specific for the record, Plaintiff's Exhibit 4, which you have in front of you, and Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, which is right here (indicating).

MS. BEN-SOREK: I object to the form. The witness can answer.
A. In the document marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, you requested retraction of the Appellate Brief. I don't
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believe you did so in the document marked
A. I don't know.
Q. Who would know?
A. I don't know.
Q. When we look at the statute, the word encourage, encourage the release of any data or information, or what did that mean?
A. I can't recall how I interpreted it at the time, but probably the way I interpret it now, which is encourage would be to take actions to cause others to do it because understand, once I concluded that the data had already been released, then the matter was resolved so far as my recommendation was concerned, but I continued to look at it from these other
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points of view to consider other aspects of it, but the one point resolved it from my point of view.
Q. To the extent that you can tell me that it's not privileged, were those aspects of those considerations reflected in your memoranda?
A. I can't go into the substance of the memoranda, so the answer to your question is that it's privileged.
Q. Yes.

Do you recall having done any case law research to address those several considerations?
A. I reviewed the cases that were associated with the section. I should say I reviewed the annotations that were associated with the section, the Westlaw annotations that were associated with the section, to see whether any of them appeared to be relevant and would be worth reading in their own right, and I did not see that anywhere.
Q. Overall, from the time you got
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this file in August of 2008 to the time you made your final recommendation or renewal of your recommendation by email perhaps and wrote me that letter on March 17, 2009, how many hours of work time would you say you spent on this matter?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. I couldn't answer that
question. We don't keep billable hours.
(Whereupon, a brief recess was
taken.)
MR. MALONEY: Read back the
last question and answer, please.
(Whereupon, the question and answer was read back by the Court Reporter.)
A. Before you ask your next question, $I$ 've also remembered that $I$ did request recently and received a copy of the responses, the admissions that you sought. What is the proper name of that document?
Q. Request for Admission?
A. Request for Admissions, so I have seen that too. That's recently. Not
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at the time. That's documents from this year.
Q. Did anyone else in your office work on this matter with you?
A. No, other than to the extent that Tammy Smiley, you know, provided me with information.
Q. Would it be fair to say that if anybody in your office had some ability to consider whether or not to withdraw that Appellate Brief, by which I mean Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 here, that it would have been Tammy Smiley as chief of the Appeals Bureau?
A. Can you say it again?

THE WITNESS: Or read it back,
please.
(Whereupon, the referred-to question was read back by the Reporter.)

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
You can answer.
A. I really don't know where the authority in my office would lie to make
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that decision, and I can't say to you that Tammy Smiley, because she's the chief of the Appeals Bureau, would have such authority. This is a matter in which the District Attorney's office, the District Attorney is being represented by the County attorney, and I don't know what the parameters of Tammy Smiley's authority are under those circumstances.
Q. If the District Attorney's office wanted to make a change in a brief that had been filed on its behalf, would it be able to?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
You can answer.
A. I don't know.
Q. Let's look now to the other
statute. You said you didn't give it much consideration, and I'm talking now about Subdivision 1 of Section 195.00 of the Penal Code, and I'm going to do the same as before, give you McKinney's with a couple of tabs on it and ask you to take a look at it.
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(Whereupon, the witness complies.)
Q. Have you looked at both the pocket part and the main?
A. I'm familiar with that section.
Q. The pocket part hasn't changed and you're familiar it, so I'm just going to read to save your voice a minute here. 195.00 is headed Official

Misconduct.
"A public servant is guilty of official misconduct when, with intent to obtain a benefit or deprive another person of a benefit:
"Subdivision 1, he commits an act relating to his office but constituting an unauthorized exercise of his official functions, knowing that such act is unauthorized."

Do I read that correctly, Mr. Mancuso?
A. Why don't I read it again since I wasn't listening to the begin.
"A public servant is guilty of
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official misconduct when, with intent to obtain a benefit or deprive another person of a benefit:
"He commits an act relating to his office but constituting an unauthorized exercise of his official functions, knowing that such act is unauthorized."
Q. Okay, you said that you are already familiar with this provision?
A. Yes.
Q. And you also said, I believe, that this was not really something that you considered in any detail when you were evaluating my Complaint?
A. No, the evaluation of your Complaint was based on the August 4, 2008 letter that's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4. It only makes reference to the Social Services Law. I did not, at that time, review your Complaint through this prism of the official misconduct section of the Penal Law.
Q. But when you received the letter of August 4, 2008, which is
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Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 here, you also received the document that is Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 here; is that correct?
A. I did not receive all these documents at the same time. I received all of them in the August 2008 time frame, but not simultaneously, and I received that August 4, 2008 letter prior to receiving the document that's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 6. I did not interpret the documents I received as, nor the instructions I was given, as calling upon me to conduct an investigation under the official misconduct section.
Q. When you received the document that's marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, did you or did you not notice that it cited the official misconduct section?
A. I read it. I'm sure I noticed it at the time, but I did not interpret that as something to be investigated.

MR. MALONEY: Mark this as
Plaintiff's Exhibit 7, please. It's a WebCrims printout, two pages.
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(Whereupon, the aforementioned two-page WebCrims printout was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
Q. Are you familiar with the WebCrims system?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recognize this as a printout from WebCrims?
A. Yes.
Q. The first page of this document lists two charges against a certain defendant. Were those two -- actually, it seems to list four, but among them are Social Services Law Section 422 Subdivision 12, and Penal Law Section 195.00 Subdivision 1; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is the defendant whose name I mentioned before, Glenn Tuifel, T-U-I-F-E-L, who is currently being prosecuted by the District Attorney's office.
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A. Is that a question?
Q. Would you agree with that based on this WebCrims printout?
A. I would agree that he's currently being prosecuted from reading the second page that lists the date involving motions of August 9, 2011.
Q. You mention that the name sounded familiar to you. Does it sound familiar to you in the context of this particular prosecution or type of prosecution?
A. It sounds familiar to me as someone who is being prosecuted by our office, but as to what he was being prosecuted for or what the substance is, I do not have knowledge.

MR. MALONEY: Mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 8, please. It's a New York Post article, three pages.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned three-page New York Post article was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 8 for identification as of this date by the
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Reporter.)
Q. I'd like you to take a few
minutes to take a look at the first page of the three-page document that's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 8.
(Whereupon, the witness
complies.)
A. I've read it.
Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to the nature of the prosecution against Mr. Tuifel?
A. Does it refresh my
recollection?
Q. Right, specifically refresh
your recollection.
A. No.
Q. Obviously, it informs you.
A. Yes.
Q. But if it doesn't refresh your recollection --
A. That's correct.
Q. You have no other knowledge of this prosecution?
A. Right.

5 handling it.
Q. And I think we already established it would be in your bureau; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And can we agree that this
individual is being prosecuted under both of the provisions, at least, that I mentioned, including --
A. It would appear that way from the exhibits that you handed me, yes.
Q. Do you belong to any professional associations?
A. Yes.
Q. Which ones?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
You can answer.
A. Nassau County Bar Association.
Q. How long have you been a member?
A. For 32 years.
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Q. Do you currently hold any office with the Nassau County Bar

Association?
MS. BEN-SOREK: Same objection.
A. Yes.
Q. What office?
A. First vice-president.
Q. How long have you held that
office?
A. For less than one month.
Q. Are you also a sustaining member of the Nassau County Bar Association?
A. Yes.
Q. What does that mean?
A. It means that I pay some additional amount of money to the Bar Association, which is available for the Bar Association's general administrative uses.
Q. How much?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. I think it's something like 250, something in the range of $\$ 250$ a year.
Q. Are you acquainted with other
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sustaining members?
A. Yes.

MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection to this entire line, so I don't keep repeating it.

THE WITNESS: Do I keep answering?

MS. BEN-SOREK: Unless it's privileged, and I'll tell you then.

MR. MALONEY: I mean, you know, this is Rule 26, likely to lead to discoverable information.

MS. BEN-SOREK: No, I think the standard is likely to be admissible information as initial evidence.

MR. MALONEY: Well, then let's go down that dead end.

Mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 9, please.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned Rule 11 was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 9 for identification as of this date by the Reporter.)
Q. Mr. Mancuso, I'd like to direct
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your attention to the lower left quadrant of that page, Plaintiff's Exhibit 9, which lists, I guess, the most recent roster of sustaining members. You're among them. And what I want to ask you about is only certain members of that list, and I'm going to ask you the same question as to each one, so I would like to phrase that question now.
A. Okay.
Q. The question is: Whether you've ever had any conversation with that individual about either this investigation that we've just been discussing or about me?
A. Or about you?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
Q. And I will represent to you that these are all individuals in which I have had some personal dealings in one fashion or another in relatively recent times.

MANCUSO objection to the form of the question.
Q. It's just a yes or no question as to only a few of these individuals, and I didn't mark it ahead of time, so bear with me.

Lower left of the two columns,
Judge Kase, K-A-S-E?
A. No.
Q. Judge Kluewer, K-L-U-E-W-E-R?
A. No.
Q. Retired Magistrate Judge

Michael L. Ernstein?
A. No.
Q. And Marion C. Rice?
A. No.
Q. Marion C. Rice is the current president; correct?
A. No, she's the current president elect.
Q. I'm sorry.

Are you aware that Marion Rice was a member of the College Counsel For the State University of New York Maritime
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College?
A. No.
Q. That's all $I$ have on that.

Are you related to a Joseph
Mancuso?
A. My grandfather was named

Giuseppe.
Q. How about a Joseph Mancuso who
lives or lived in Jersey City, New Jersey?
A. No.

I also have a cousin Joseph
Mancuso who lives in California.
Q. Did he ever live in Jersey

City?
MS. BEN-SOREK: Objection.
A. Not to my knowledge.

MR. MALONEY: I think I'm done.
Perhaps counsel has follow-up questions.
(Continued on next page to
include jurat.)
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MS. BEN-SOREK: I don't believe I do at this time.
(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the Examination of this Witness was concluded.)
PETER MANCUSO

11 this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 20 $\qquad$ .
1 MANCUSO
3
4 PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS:
5
6 EXHIBIT EXHIBIT
7 NUMBER DESCRIPTION
81 Letter dated 3/17/09 10
92 Appellate Brief
Letter dated 9/29/08 23
Letter dated 8/4/08 26
125 Decision After Hearing
Notice of Entry 42
Two-page WebCrims 68
article
Three-page New York Post69
Rule 1173

1

4 STATE OF NEW YORK
5 COUNTY OF KINGS

MANCUSO
C E R T I F I C A TE

SS.:

I, PHYLLIS GOLDBERG, a Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do hereby certify:

That the witness whose examination is hereinbefore set forth was duly sworn and that such examination is a true record of the testimony given by that witness.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or by marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 30th day of July 2011.

MANCUSO

| \$ |  | ability [1] - 63:10 | amounts [1] - 48:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$250 [1] - 72:24 | [2] - 73:12, 78:11 | 64:1 | 61:20 |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 7 2}[1]-3: 12 \\ & \mathbf{2 8 - J}[4]-22: 6,22: 11, \end{aligned}$ | Abuse [1] - 34:11 according [1] - 26:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { answer [16] - 4:8, 7:11, } \\ & \text { 8:15, 12:24, 28:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $1[5]-47: 24,64: 21$, <br> $65: 16,68: 19,78: 8$ <br> $10[1]-78: 8$ <br> $10: 00[1]-1: 11$ <br> $11[2]-73: 22,78: 17$ <br> $11050[1]-2: 6$ <br> $114[1]-1: 19$ <br> $11501[3]-1: 20,2: 9$, <br> $3: 13$ <br> $11: 30[1]-77: 4$ <br> $12[9]-44: 15,46: 13$, <br> $46: 20,47: 4,48: 9,50: 4$, <br> $52: 4,54: 3,68: 18$ <br> $17[1]-62: 5$ <br> 17 th $[2]-11: 11,11: 23$ <br> $19[2]-43: 3,78: 9$ <br> $195.00[4]-47: 25$, <br> $64: 21,65: 10,68: 18$ <br> $1954[1]-3: 21$ <br> $1975[1]-5: 5$ <br> $1978[1]-4: 4$ <br> $1979[2]-4: 23,5: 18$ <br> $1983[3]-5: 25,6: 4,6: 6$ <br> $1984[3]-5: 25,6: 5,6: 6$ <br> $1986[1]-6: 15$ <br> $1993[1]-7: 12$ <br> $1994[2]-8: 7,8: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:18, 23:5 } \\ & 29[2]-1: 10,23: 15 \end{aligned}$ | acquainted [1] - 72:25 <br> act $[7]-43: 9,44: 2$, | 43:20, 46:9, 58:19, <br> 59:22, 61:10, 62:9, |
|  | 3 | 66:8 | 64:16, 71:21 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3[4]-29:21, 51:16, } \\ & \text { 78:10, 78:25 } \\ & \text { 3/17/09[2]-10:22, } 78: 8 \\ & \text { 30th [1]-79:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { acting }[6]-13: 12, \\ & \text { 13:21, 14:11, 14:14, } \\ & \text { 15:11, 17:9 } \\ & \text { action }[4]-49: 6,49: 9, \\ & 49: 10,79: 17 \end{aligned}$ | answering [1] - 73:8 <br> Antignani [2]-16:7, 16:8 <br> anybody [2] - 50:2, 63:10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 32[1]-71: 25 \\ & 33_{[1]}-2: 5 \\ & 344[1]-1: 19 \\ & 38\left[{ }_{[1]}-78: 12\right. \end{aligned}$ | actions [1] - 60:20 <br> activities [1] - 44:24 <br> activity [1] - 44:20 <br> actual [2] - 31:19, 37:5 | anymore [1] - 57:23 <br> anytime [1] - 16:18 <br> anywhere [2] - 40:10, 61:24 |
|  | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ad}_{[2]}-31: 23,55: 19 \\ & \text { ADA }[2]-5: 16,5: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Appeals [9] - 4:11, } \\ \text { 20:15, 20:24, 24:12, } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 4 \text { [6]-29:21, 30:11, } \\ 66: 17,66: 25,67: 9,78: 11 \end{gathered}$ | add [1]-19:16 <br> addition [4]-14:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 17,24: 20,24: 23, \\ & 63: 15,64: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 42[1]-78: 13 \\ & 422[8]-44: 16,46: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 22:13, 34:5, 58:11 } \\ \text { additional }[3]-9: 25, \end{gathered}$ | appeals [1] - 18:23 appear [2] - 39:14, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 4,48: 9,50: 4,52: 5, \\ & 54: 3,68: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:19, } 72: 18 \\ & \text { address }[2]-3: 12, \\ & 61: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 71:14 } \\ & \text { appeared }[1]-61: 22 \end{aligned}$ Appellate [22] - 17:23, |
|  | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { addressed }[3]-22: 15 \text {, } \\ & \text { 25:24, } 32: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 11,18: 13,18: 17, \\ & 18: 22,18: 25,19: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{5}[2]-51: 17,78: 12 \\ & 551[1]-2: 5 \end{aligned}$ | adjudicated [1] - 35:14 <br> adjunct [1] - 10:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:25, 21:23, 35:9, } \\ & \text { 40:25, 45:11, 49:8, } \\ & 55: 14,56: 19,57: 5,57: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6 | 72:20 | 57:11, 57:17, 59:25, |
|  | $6[5]-33: 19,33: 23$,$48: 14,60: 5,78: 13$$68[1]-78: 14$$69[1]-78: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { admissible [1] - 73:15 } \\ & \text { admission }[3]-4: 19, \\ & \text { 5:13, 5:15 } \\ & \text { Admission }[1]-62: 23 \\ & \text { admissions [2] - 4:5, } \\ & \text { 62:21 } \end{aligned}$ | appellate [1] - 18:8 <br> Appellate's [2] - 42:11, |
|  |  |  | Appellate's [2] - 42:11, 42:15 applied [3] - 56:7, |
|  | 7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Admissions [1] - 62:24 } \\ & \text { admitted [1] - 4:22 } \\ & \text { ADS)(AKT [1] - 1:6 } \\ & \text { adverb [3] - 53:16, } \\ & \text { 53:18 } \end{aligned}$ | appropriate [1] - 56:4 <br> approved [1] - 12:15 <br> approximate [2] - 14:3, 51:9 <br> Approximately [1] - <br> 7:21 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7[1]-78: 14 \\ & 71162[1]-34: 14 \\ & 73_{[1]}-78: 17 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | 8 | adverse [1] - 41:10 <br> aforementioned [9] - | 7:21 <br> area [1]-7:8 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8_{[1]}-78: 16 \\ & 8 / 4 / 08_{[2]}-26: 7,78: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:21, 19:11, 23:17, } \\ & \text { 26:6, 39:2, 42:13, 68:2, } \end{aligned}$ | arisen [1]-56:23 <br> arising [1] - 21:22 <br> article [3]-69:21, |
|  | 9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:22, 73:21 } \\ & \text { agencies [2] - 47:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:23, } 78: 15 \\ & \text { asking }[2]-3: 16,12: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 9[3]-34: 14,69: 8,78: 17 \\ & 9 / 29 / 08[2]-23: 18, \\ & 78: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:5, 71:10 } \\ & \text { allegations }[1]-12: 10 \\ & \text { alleged }[2]-34: 23,44: 7 \\ & \text { alleges }[1]-44: 10 \\ & \text { alternative }[1]-54: 24 \\ & \text { amended }[1]-45: 15 \\ & \text { amount }[1]-72: 18 \end{aligned}$ | asking [2] - 3:16, 12:25 <br> aspect [6] - 40:2, 50:11 |
|  | A |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:7 } \\ & \text { assigned }[2]-8: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | ```A-N-T-I-G-N-A-N-I[1] 16:7 a.m [2] - 1:11, 77:4``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:2 } \\ & \text { Assistant }[11]-5: 11, \\ & \text { 8:11, 13:8, 13:20, 14:6, } \end{aligned}$ |


| $\mathbf{B}$ <br> Bachelor $[1]-5: 2$ <br> $\operatorname{Bar}_{[8]}-4: 5,5: 14,10: 8$, <br> $71: 22,72: 3,72: 13$, <br> $72: 18,72: 19$ <br> base $[2]-25: 10,25: 11$ <br> based $[5]-22: 6,46: 3$, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { children }[2]-56: 25, \\ & 57: 4 \\ & \text { choosing }[1]-11: 18 \\ & \text { chose }[1]-11: 12 \\ & \text { Circuit }[3]-4: 11,23: 6, \\ & 60: 9 \\ & \text { circumstances }[1]- \\ & 64: 10 \\ & \text { citation }[3]-36: 15, \\ & 36: 17,36: 18 \\ & \text { cite }[1]-37: 13 \\ & \text { cited }[5]-19: 18,35: 23, \\ & 49: 7,57: 21,67: 18 \\ & \text { citing }[1]-34: 12 \\ & \text { City }[4]-3: 21,7: 5, \\ & 76: 10,76: 15 \\ & \text { Class }[4]-43: 18,44: 21, \\ & 44: 24,47: 12 \\ & \text { closed }[1]-12: 15 \\ & \text { Code }[2]-47: 25,64: 22 \\ & \text { College }[2]-75: 24,76: 2 \\ & \text { columns }[1]-75: 8 \\ & \text { coming }[1]-17: 13 \\ & \text { comment }[1]-43: 13 \\ & \text { Commercial }[1]-6: 3 \\ & \text { commission }[1]-43: 18 \\ & \text { commits }[2]-65: 16, \\ & 66: 5 \\ & \text { communicate }[1]- \\ & 33: 11 \\ & \text { communication }[2]- \\ & 28: 13,30: 24 \\ & \text { compel }[1]-29: 10 \\ & \text { complaining }[1]-47: 16 \\ & \text { complaint }[1]-58: 16 \\ & \text { Complaint }[13]-18: 6, \\ & 33: 13,33: 25,37: 10, \\ & 37: 11,43: 17,43: 23, \\ & 44: 3,47: 20,47: 24, \\ & 66: 15,66: 17,66: 21 \\ & \text { completely }[1]-3: 23 \\ & \text { complies }[4]-33: 21, \\ & 39: 10,65: 3,70: 8 \\ & \text { component }[1]-53: 21 \\ & \text { concern }[1]-31: 10 \\ & \text { concerned }[1]-60: 24 \\ & \text { concluded }[7]-35: 3, \\ & 35: 5,52: 11,52: 15,58: 9, \\ & 60: 22,77: 6 \\ & \text { concluding }[2]-34: 8, \\ & 52: 23 \\ & \text { conclusion }[2]-55: 14, \\ & 55: 25 \\ & \text { conduct }[8]-12: 6, \\ & 17: 25,20: 22,52: 12, \\ & 52: 15,52: 24,53: 22, \\ & 67: 14 \\ & \text { conducted }[3]-12: 12, \\ & 47: 13,49: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```confidential [4]-27:5, 27:7, 30:20, 31:10 Confidential [1] - 30:15 connection [6] - 12:9, 21:22, 32:24, 35:8, 37:20, 49:10 consider [10] - 9:20, 43:9, 43:13, 49:22, 50:24, 51:24, 54:23, 60:7, 61:2, 63:11 consideration [3] - 57:19, 58:4, 64:20 considerations [4] - 57:25, 58:12, 61:7, 61:15 considered [7] - 52:12, 56:3, 56:5, 56:21, 57:14, 58:13, 66:14 constitute [1] - 58:9 constituted [1] - 51:4 constituting [2] - 65:17, 66:6 constitution [1] - 56:17 Constitutional [1] - 49:11 constitutional [2] - 56:7, 56:9 contacted [1] - 27:25 contained [4] - 45:5, 47:9, 48:17, 49:24 contents[1]-28:24 context [5] - 41:19, 41:21, 52:22, 57:17, 69:11 continually [1] - 4:18 continued [2] - 15:2, 60:25 Continued [1] - 76:21 continuing [2] - 10:4, 10:6 conversation [21]- 25:11, 25:13, 25:17, 25:20, 27:14, 27:19, 27:22, 27:23, 28:4, 28:5, 28:6, 28:8, 28:11, 28:19, 28:24, 29:7, 29:13, 29:15, 32:22, 33:4, 74:13 copies [1] - 20:19 copy [8] - 20:12, 20:18, 21:11, 22:5, 22:23, 22:24, 45:9, 62:20 Cornell [2]-4:2, 4:24 correctly [2] - 41:17, 65:21 correspondence [2] - 17:19, 17:20 Corruption [5] - 9:14, 9:23, 15:7, 16:2, 16:5 Counsel [1] - 75:24 counsel [3] - 7:13, 7:20,``` | 76:19 <br> Country [2] - 1:19, 3:13 <br> COUNTY [3] - 2:8, 79:5 <br> County [10]-1:8, 1:16, <br> 5:8, 8:5, 34:13, 49:7, <br> 64:7, 71:22, 72:3, 72:13 <br> couple [1] - 64:23 <br> course [5] - 28:6, 31:7, <br> 49:6, 53:12, 58:6 <br> court [7]-22:13, 23:23, <br> 39:19, 41:3, 41:9, 57:20, <br> 57:22 <br> Court [11] - 4:11, 4:12, <br> 17:22, 38:8, 56:3, 56:5, <br> 57:11, 57:12, 57:15, <br> 57:19, 62:16 <br> COURT [1] - 1:2 <br> cousin [1] - 76:12 <br> crime [1] - 54:20 <br> criminal [2]-35:7, 43:9 <br> current [3]-9:15, <br> 75:18, 75:20 <br> currently [3] - 68:23, <br> 69:6, 72:2 <br> CV-03-0786 [1] - 1:5 | ```decisions [2]-18:8, 41:3 declaratory [2] - 56:16, 56:23 defendant [2]-68:15, 68:21 DEFENDANT [1] - 1:9 Defendant [2]-1:14, 2:8 defined [1] - 44:24 defines [2] - 44:20, 45:2 Demand [2] - 42:10, 42:14 demonstratively [1] - 53:2 deposition [4]-19:2, 29:2, 36:18, \(38: 3\) deprive [2] - 65:14, 66:3 deputy [1]-24:17 Deputy [1]-5:24 DESCRIPTION \([1]\) - 78:7 detail [1] - 66:14 details [2]-27:22, 38:21 determination [6] - 37:10, 37:14, 37:16, 48:7, 55:12, 58:3 determine [3] - 12:7, 35:20, 52:17 determined [1] - 56:10 determining \({ }_{[2]}-56: 3\), 56:5 Diamond [1] - 1:18 Did he [2] - 16:12, 76:14 did it \([1]-36: 15\) did she [3]-13:23, 21:2, 30:5 did you [35] - 3:25, 4:3, 4:5, 6:12, 6:19, 7:19, 11:8, 11:22, 16:18, 17:12, 17:16, 20:18, 34:22, 35:12, 35:16, 36:20, 36:23, 37:4, 37:9, 37:13, 37:21, 37:25, 38:13, 38:16, 39:21, 47:15, 49:23, 50:9, 50:15, 52:17, 54:23, 55:11, 58:14, 67:17, 67:18 differs [1] - 45:25 direct [1] - 73:25 directed \({ }_{[2]}-12: 6,17: 2\) direction [2]-17:4, 17:8 disclosing [1] - 41:9 disclosure [2] - 52:5, 59:12 discoverable [1] - 73:13``` | ```discovered [1] - 19:3 discussed [3] - 20:6, 28:15, 28:19 discussing [3] - 24:16, 50:20, 74:15 disjunctive [2] - 54:24, 55:5 DIST [1] - 34:13 distinguish [1] - 17:10 distributor [2] - 7:13, 7:14 DISTRICT [2] - 1:2, 1:2 District [53]-1:7, 1:15, 4:10, 5:8, 5:11, 5:12, 6:10, 8:5, 8:11, 8:18, 10:2, 10:10, 12:11, 13:8, 13:20, 14:7, 14:21, 15:3, 15:10, 15:15, 15:18, 15:24, 16:20, 16:23, 17:7, 17:21, 19:19, 22:22, 22:25, 23:7, 24:2, 25:4, 25:21, 25:24, 26:2, 26:17, 26:23, 29:22, 29:25, 30:7, 32:6, 32:15, 32:17, 32:19, 41:7, 43:17, 52:6, 60:7, 64:6, 64:11, 68:24 do you [23]-3:11, 11:14, 12:20, 16:14, 16:22, 22:10, 25:9, 27:25, 31:2, 31:18, 32:4, 32:9, 32:15, 36:7, 37:6, 41:25, 48:13, 49:15, 50:24, 61:13, 68:10, 71:16, 72:2 Document [1] - 60:5 document [32] - 11:3, 11:5, 11:7, 19:23, 19:24, 21:7, 21:10, 21:14, 26:12, 39:21, 39:25, 40:4, 42:20, 42:22, 43:2, 43:5, 43:8, 43:15, 44:4, 59:6, 59:7, 59:15, 59:23, 60:2, 62:22, 67:3, 67:10, 67:16, 68:13, 70:5 documents [20]-17:12, 17:14, 17:16, 18:2, 18:3, 18:4, 20:7, 20:20, 21:2, 22:4, 22:8, 22:14, 23:9, 32:25, 33:14, 59:10, 59:14, 63:2, 67:6, 67:12 Does it [2]-69:10, 70:13 Does that \([4]-39: 14\), 53:18, 70:10, 72:16 Does this [1] - 44:6 doesn't [2] - 48:25, 70:20 doubt [3] - 54:5, 54:17, 54:22``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




| ```73:11, 73:17, 76:18, 78:25 Maloney [3] - 3:15, 34:12, 49:7 maltreatment [3] - 34:9, 57:3, 58:22 Maltreatment [1] - 34:12 managed [3] - 41:23, 41:25, 42:4 MANCUSO [2]-1:17, 77:8 Mancuso [12] - 3:10, 3:14, 11:2, 19:20, 23:22, 26:11, 42:19, 65:22, 73:25, 76:6, 76:9, 76:13 March [3]-11:11, 11:23, 62:5 Marion [3] - 75:16, 75:18, 75:23 Maritime [1] - 75:25 mark [6] - 19:9, 23:14, 23:23, 26:3, 42:9, 75:6 Mark [5] - 10:19, 38:24, 67:23, 69:19, 73:19 marked [26] - 10:22, 11:4, 19:12, 19:22, 23:18, 26:7, 26:13, 27:5, 27:7, 30:19, 31:9, 38:3, 39:3, 39:8, 39:16, 42:16, 42:21, 59:23, 60:2, 66:18, 67:10, 67:17, 68:3, 69:24, 70:5, 73:22 marking [1] - 45:8 marriage \({ }_{[1]}\) - 79:17 Marshall [3] - 13:10, 14:15, 37:23 MARSHALL [1] - 13:10 material [1] - 47:19 materials [1] - 31:8 matter [8]-17:3, 33:9, 34:20, 60:23, 62:7, 63:5, 64:5, 79:19 matters [3] - 9:7, 15:17, 28:7 McKinney's [1] - 64:23 mean [8]-18:14, 36:7, 37:6, 46:15, 60:16, 63:12, 72:16, 73:11 meaning [1] - 23:5 means [2]-52:21, 72:17 meant [3] - 52:24, 52:25, 53:11 Meg [6] - 13:7, 13:11, 13:19, 14:21, 17:3, 37:23 Melville [1] - 7:17 member [3]-71:24, 72:13, 75:24``` |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { offered }[1]-56: 2 \\ & \text { offhand }[1]-51: 8 \\ & \text { OFFICE }[1]-2: 8 \\ & \text { Office }[1]-34: 7 \\ & \text { office }[32]-3: 12,5: 9, \\ & 5: 23,6: 11,7: 2,7: 16,8: 6, \\ & 8: 18,9: 22,10: 11,14: 22, \\ & \text { 17:21, 19:19, 20:15, } \\ & \text { 20:24, 32:13, 36:13, } \\ & \text { 41:8, } 60: 7,63: 4,63: 10, \\ & 63: 25,64: 6,64: 12, \\ & 65: 17,66: 6,68: 25, \\ & 69: 16,71: 3,72: 3,72: 7, \\ & 72: 10 \\ & \text { offices }[1]-1: 18 \\ & \text { Official }[1]-65: 10 \\ & \text { official }[10]-1: 7,1: 15, \\ & 30: 2,65: 13,65: 18,66: 2, \\ & 66: 7,66: 22,67: 15,67: 19 \\ & \text { officials }[1]-9: 7 \\ & \text { Oil }[1]-7: 15 \\ & \text { Oil's }[1]-7: 16 \\ & \text { Okay }[6]-12: 18,48: 3, \\ & 60: 4,66: 9,74: 11,74: 19 \\ & \text { okay }[1]-6: 25 \\ & \text { old }[1]-56: 25 \\ & \text { Old }[2]-1: 19,3: 12 \\ & \text { one-page }[1]-26: 12 \\ & \text { one-year }[1]-56: 25 \\ & \text { ones }[2]-22: 9,71: 19 \\ & \text { opened }[1]-27: 8 \\ & \text { operate }[1]-32: 12 \\ & \text { opinion }[5]-32: 18, \\ & 35: 25,36: 4,36: 6,52: 7 \\ & \text { opposition }[2]-21: 13, \\ & 22: 20 \\ & \text { order }[2]-54: 2,58: 6 \\ & \text { ordinary }[1]-31: 6 \\ & \text { original }[2]-16: 25, \\ & 35: 17 \\ & \text { outcome }[1]-79: 18 \\ & \text { Overall }[1]-61: 25 \\ & \text { overall }[1]-13: 18 \\ & \hline \quad \text { P } \\ & \hline \text { P.O }[1]-2: 5 \\ & \text { Page }[4]-33: 19,33: 23, \\ & 34: 14,48: 14 \\ & \text { page }[14]-19: 23,26: 12, \\ & 42: 20,42: 25,68: 3, \\ & 68: 13,69: 7,69: 23,70: 4, \\ & 70: 5,74: 3,76: 21,78: 14, \\ & 78: 16 \\ & \text { PAGE }[2]-78: 6,78: 24 \\ & \text { pages }[2]-67: 25,69: 21 \\ & \text { parameters }[1]-64: 9 \\ & \text { part }[20]-13: 15,14: 4, \\ & 28: 3,28: 4,29: 14,45: 11, \\ & 45: 14,45: 19,45: 24, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 46:2, 46:10, 46:11, | 48:15, 51:16, 59:6, 59:8, | 71:17 | Read [1] - 62:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46:18, 46:21, 54:8, | 59:17, 59:18, 59:24 | [ [1] - 10: | read [20]-30:13, 30:16, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 59:11, 65:5, 65:7 } \\ \text { parties [1] - 79:16 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:3, 63:13, 66:18, 67:2, } \\ & \text { 67:3, 67:11, 67:17, } \end{aligned}$ | prohibited [1] - 53:22 <br> promotion [2] - 5:21, | $30: 22,34: 3,34: 16,$ |
| parts [1] - 13:13 | 67:24, 68:4, 69:20 | 8:1 | 20, 43:14, 46:5, 47:3, |
| ty [1] - 41:10 | 69:24, 70:6, 73:19 | pronouncing [1] - 41:16 | 62:16, 63:17, 63:20, |
| ssage [1] - 34:17 | 73:22, 74:3 | 2:2 | 5:9, 65:21, 65:23, |
| passed [1]-27:11 | ase [1]-3: | osition [1] - 50:8 | 67:20, 70:9 |
| Patrick's [2] - 11:16, | please [13]-10:20 | ecuted [12]-12:9 | reading [5] - 35:22, |
| ```11:19 pay [1] - 72:17 Penal [5] - 37:12, 47:25,``` | 23:16, 26:5, 33:18 | 12:14, 37:19, 41:8 | 46:17, 55:13, 61:23, 69:6 |
|  | 38:25, 42:12, 42:19 | 53:13, 58:3, 58:6, 68:24, | reads [1] - 47:6 |
|  | 42:24, 62:14, 63:18 | $69: 6,69: 15,69: 17,71: 11$ | reason [5] - 7:22, 11:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:22, } 66: 23,68: 18 \\ & \text { people }[1]-32: 12 \\ & \text { period }[2]-13: 13,14: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 67:24, 69:20, 73:20 pocket [7] - 45:14, | prosecuting [1] - 54:14 <br> prosecution [10] - 9:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:18, 55:15, 57:4 } \\ & \text { reasonable }[3]-54: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 45:24, 46:11, 46:17, | $35: 7,41: 13,41: 15,$ | 54:16, 54:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Permit }[1]-53: 20 \\ & \text { permit }[1]-58: 8 \\ & \text { permits }[1]-47: 7 \\ & \text { permitted }[5]-47: 11 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:21, } 65: 5,65: 7 \\ & \text { point }[5]-7: 3,7: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 41:20, 54:25, 69:12, 69:13, 70:12, 70:24 | reasons [1] - 58:10 <br> recall [7]-11:24, 28:12, |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 37: 13,61: 3,61: 4 \\ \text { points }[1]-61: 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Protective [3] - 34:23, } \\ & 35: 17,58: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 18,28: 23,29: 12, \\ & 60: 17,61: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 54:9, 54:12, 54:17, 55:3 permitting $[3]-45: 3$, | police [2] - 56:24, 58:22 <br> policies [1] - 9:21 | prove [2] - 54:2, 54:5 <br> proven [1]-54:21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { receive }[5]-25: 5, \\ 30: 20,34: 19,38: 13,67: 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| $52: 14,55: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { policy [4] - 30:3, 31:19 } \\ & 31: 23,32: 2 \end{aligned}$ | proves [1]-55:2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { received }[36]-5: 2,5: 22, \\ 21: 7,21: 11,21: 15,22: 5, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { perpetrator }[1]-44: 7 \\ & \text { person }[11]-26: 20, \end{aligned}$ | Port [1] - 2:6 <br> position [7]-7:25, 9:16, | 53:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 8,22: 12,22: 13, \\ & 22: 14,22: 17,22: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:7, 54:2, 54:7, 54:17, <br> 54:18, 55:2, 55:3, 65:14, | $10: 10,14: 24,15: 2$ | $17$ | $22: 21,22: 23,23: 7,23: 9$ |
| 66:3 personal [7] - 25:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:18, 57:18 } \\ & \text { Post }[3]-69: 21,69: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:21, } 63: 7 \\ & \text { provision [5] - 44:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 6,30: 24,31: 5,31: 8, \\ & 38: 2,38: 10,38: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:2, 27:7, 30:19, 30:21, } \\ & 31: 9,74: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:16 } \\ & \text { practice }[4]-6: 13,6: 18 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $47: 21,48: 9,48: 22,66: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 20,51: 16,59: 4,59: 5, \\ & 62: 20,66: 24,67: 3,67: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| Personally ${ }_{[1]}-31: 4$ <br> personally [2] - 31:17, <br> 32:7 | 6:20, 7:7 <br> prefer [1] - 36:11 <br> prepared [4] - 18:11 | 50:3, 71:12 <br> PUBLIC [1] - 77:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:8, } 67: 12,67: 16 \\ & \text { receiving }[2]-22: 10, \\ & 67: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| persons [2]-47:10, | 18:12, 19:2, $20: 2$ | 44:10, 49:13, 49:14 | recent [2] - 74:4, 74:23 |
| 54:12 | preparing [1] - 36:17 <br> preponderance [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 16,49: 19,49: 22 \\ & 49: 25,50: 19,65: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recently [2]-62:20, } \\ & 62: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PETER [2] - 1:17, 77:8 } \\ & \text { Peter [1] - 3:10 } \end{aligned}$ | 40:6, 40:16, 40:21 | 65:25 | recess [1] - 62:11 |
|  | present [2]-16:22, 53:3 | Public [8]-1:21, 3:4, | recipient [1] - 30:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PH [1] - 16:6 } \\ & \text { phrase [2] - 40:9, } 74: 9 \\ & \text { PHYLLIS [2] - 79:8, } \end{aligned}$ | president [3] - 72:8, | 9:14, 9:23, 15:7, 15:25, | recognize [1] - 68:10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 19,75: 20 \\ & \text { printout }[4]-67: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $16: 5,79: 8$ <br> pursuant [1]-30:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recollection [8]-21:24, } \\ & 21: 25,28: 17,38: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 79:24 | 68:3, 68:11, 69:4 |  | 70:11, 70:14, 70:16, |
| Phyllis [1] - 1:20 <br> place [3]-3:19, 14:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { prior [3] - 5:13, 14:7 } \\ & 67: 9 \end{aligned}$ | Q | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 21 \\ & \text { recommend }[1]-53: \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6:2 | quadrant [1] - 74:2 | recommendation $[21$ |
| 25:14 <br> placed [3] - 40:17, | private [2] - 6:13, 7:7 | stion [24] - 13:4 | 12:8, 12:13, 12:15, 35:7, |
|  | privilege [1] - 28:14 | 6, 28:22, 32:11, | 35:11, 37:18, 37:22, |
| $49: 12,57: 2$ | privileged [10]-17:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 6,38: 7,39: 20,45: 22, \\ & 46: 8,50: 15,56: 6,58: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $38: 2,38: 11,39: 22,40: 2,$ 50:18, 50:21, 51:4, |
| PLAINTIFF [1] - 1:4 <br> Plaintiff [3]-1:18, 3:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:8, 28:17, 29:7, 29:13, } \\ & 50: 25,51: 24,61: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 61:11, 62:10, 62:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 18,50: 21,51: 4, \\ & 51: 15,51: 20,51: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| PLAINTIFF'S [1] - 78:4 | $61: 11,73: 10$ | 62:15, 62:19, 63:20, | $1: 22,60: 24,62: 3,62$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Plaintiff's [48]-10:20, } \\ \text { 10:23, 11:4, 19:9, 19:13, } \end{gathered}$ | Pr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:2, 74:8, 74:10, 74:12, } \\ & 75: 3,75: 4 \end{aligned}$ | reconsider [1] - 39:25 |
|  | blem [1] - 36:3 | questions [3]-3:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { record }[6]-3: 9,30: 14, \\ 34: 4,47: 3,59: 17,79: 13 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:22, 23:16, 23:19, } \\ & \text { 23:24, 25:2, 25:6, 26:4, } \end{aligned}$ | procedure [1] - 30:3 <br> procedures [1] - 9:21 |  | records [1] - 17:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 26: 8,26: 13,29: 21, \\ & 30: 10,33: 17,34: 5,38: 4, \end{aligned}$ | coed [1] - 33:8 <br> ceeding [1] - 41:10 | R | $\begin{gathered} \text { reference [3] } \\ 52: 22,66: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 38: 25,39: 4,39: 8,39: 16, \\ & 42: 12,42: 16,42: 21, \end{aligned}$ | proceedings [1] - 57:20 <br> professional [2]-6:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { raise }[1]-50: 15 \\ & \text { range }[1]-72: 24 \end{aligned}$ | ```referenced [1] - 38:14 referred [6] - 17:23, 18:9, 18:17, 18:22,``` |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { stand-off }[1]-56: 24 \\ & \text { standard }[1]-73: 15 \\ & \text { state }[2]-3: 8,32: 20 \\ & \text { State }[8]-1: 21,3: 4,4: 9, \\ & 4: 17,4: 19,34: 11,75: 25, \\ & 79: 9 \\ & \text { STATE }[1]-79: 4 \\ & \text { statement }[2]-35: 9, \\ & \text { 40:8 } \\ & \text { states }[1]-27: 6 \\ & \text { STATES }[1]-1: 2 \\ & \text { States }[1]-4: 12 \\ & \text { stating }[1]-45: 23 \\ & \text { statute }[16]-44: 23, \\ & 47: 2,48: 23,48: 25, \\ & 50: 10,50: 14,50: 17, \\ & 52: 20,53: 5,53: 9,53: 14, \\ & 56: 6,56: 10,56: 19, \\ & 60: 13,64: 19 \\ & \text { statutes }[1]-37: 13 \\ & \text { statutory }[3]-44: 17, \\ & 47: 16,47: 21 \\ & \text { Stephen }[1]-16: 6 \\ & \text { stopped }[1]-7: 7 \\ & \text { Street }[1]-2: 9 \\ & \text { strike }[2]-21: 9,22: 6 \\ & \text { sub }[1]-46: 13 \\ & \text { Subdivision }[11]- \\ & 44: 15,47: 4,47: 24,48: 9, \\ & 50: 4,52: 4,54: 3,64: 21, \\ & 65: 16,68: 17,68: 19 \\ & \text { subdivision }[1]-45: 25 \\ & \text { subject }[4]-28: 13, \\ & 33: 25,41: 3,52: 21 \\ & \text { submitted }[2]-18: 15, \\ & 60: 9 \\ & \text { Subscribed }[1]-77: 10 \\ & \text { substance }[3]-25: 17, \\ & 61: 9,69: 17 \\ & \text { substituted }[1]-29: 3 \\ & \text { successful }[1]-54: 25 \\ & \text { successfully } \\ & \text { Suite }[1]-1: 10: 18 \\ & \text { sum }[1]-25: 16 \\ & \text { summer }[3]-22: 7, \\ & \text { 22:16, } 22: 17 \\ & \text { superior }[1]-13: 14 \\ & \text { superiors }[5]-12: 8, \\ & 12: 14,12: 19,12: 21, \\ & 50: 17 \\ & \text { Supp }[3]-36: 15,36: 18, \\ & 36: 25 \\ & \text { support }[3]-21: 8, \\ & 21: 12,50: 7 \\ & \text { supported }[1]-40: 6 \\ & \text { Supreme }[1]-4: 12 \\ & \text { surprise }[1]-30: 23 \\ & \text { sustaining }[3]-72: 12, \\ & 73: 2,74: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\qquad$ <br> 79:12 <br> system [2] - 36:12, 68:8 <br> T <br> T-A-R-T-A-N [1] - 7:15 <br> T-U-I-F-E-L [1] - 41:17 <br> tabs [1]-64:24 <br> talked [1] - 28:9 <br> talking [3]-46:16, <br> 53:14, 64:20 <br> Tammy [21]-20:17, <br> 20:25, 24:9, 24:11, <br> 25:12, 25:19, 26:16, <br> 26:20, 27:19, 27:24, <br> 29:15, 31:6, 31:12, <br> 32:23, 33:3, 33:6, 33:12, <br> 63:7, 63:14, 64:3, 64:9 <br> Tartan [3] - 7:15, 7:16, 7:20 <br> term [1] - 15:23 <br> terminated [1]-7:25 <br> terms [1]-12:2 <br> testified [1] - 3:5 <br> testifying [1]-29:11 <br> testimony [2]-17:2, <br> 79:14 <br> text [2]-33:22, 34:3 <br> Thank [1] - $34: 15$ <br> thanks [1] - 12:18 <br> THE [3]-2:8, 63:17, <br> 73:7 <br> there's [4]-12:2, 29:6, 32:2, 45:7 <br> they're [1] - 46:18 <br> three [5]-42:20, 51:12, <br> 69:21, 69:23, 70:5 <br> Three [2]-51:5, 78:16 <br> Three-page [1] - 78:16 <br> three-page [3] - 42:20, <br> 69:23, 70:5 <br> TIME [1]-1:11 <br> times [1] - 74:24 <br> title [12]-5:10, 5:22, <br> 6:9, 8:9, 8:19, 8:21, 15:5, <br> 24:12, 24:15, 24:19, <br> 47:11, 54:13 <br> topic [1]-23:6 <br> Traeger [7]-13:10, <br> 14:15, 16:12, 16:15, <br> 16:16, $37: 24$ <br> trail [1]-19:5 <br> transaction [1] - 14:17 <br> transactional [1] - 6:24 <br> transpired [1] - 12:4 <br> TRIAL [1]-1:13 <br> true [2]-5:12, 79:13 <br> TUIFEL [1] - 68:23 <br> Tuifel $[4]$ - 41:15, 42:8, |  | was he $[1]-29: 10$ was it $[3]-6: 16,9: 18$, 55:23 was that $[8]-5: 4,6: 14$, 9:2, 17:6, $30: 2,52: 5$, $56: 19,57: 18$ was there $[2]-13: 15$, $39: 24$ Washington $[1]-2: 6$ ways $[1]-52: 13$ We'll $[2]-42: 8,59: 16$ we'll $[2]-44: 14,48: 3$ we're $[1]-23: 6$ we've $[2]-50: 20,74: 15$ WebCrims $[6]-67: 25$, $68: 3,68: 8,68: 11,69: 4$, $78: 14$ were you $[3]-4: 22$, 8:23, 20:12 weren't $[1]-41: 6$ West $[1]-2: 9$ Westlaw $[7]-36: 8$, $36: 11,36: 16,36: 24$, $49: 17,49: 21,61: 19$ what are $[1]-51: 16$ What did $[2]-35: 2$, $60: 15$ What is $[4]-3: 22$, $24: 15,24: 19,62: 22$ what was $[17]-4: 25$, $5: 6,5: 21,6: 8,6: 16,7: 8$, $7: 22,8: 3,8: 9,8: 18,9: 4$, $14: 24,27: 15,28: 19$, $38: 5,38: 18,45: 20$ What were $[1]-10: 13$ what's $[4]-19: 21,29: 8$, $39: 8,45: 13$ wheels $[1]-58: 15$ when did $[7]-13: 25$, $14: 17,16: 8,25: 13$, $33: 11,34: 16,34: 19$ when you $[10]-8: 9$, $8: 23,36: 6,38: 12,49: 14$, $58: 2,59: 4,66: 14,66: 24$, $67: 16$ Where is $[1]-7: 16$ Where was $[1]-7: 2$ whereof $[1]-79: 20$ Whereupon $[18]-$ $10: 21,19: 11,23: 17$, $26: 6,33: 20,38: 7,39: 2$, $39: 9,42: 13,62: 11$, $62: 15,63: 19,65: 2,68: 2$, $69: 22,70: 7,73: 21,77: 4$ who are $[1]-12: 20$ Who is $[4]-16: 4,25: 20$, $68: 23,69: 15$ who was $[1]-13: 7$ willful $[10]-52: 12$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

```
52:16, 52:18, 52:21,
52:23, 53:8, 53:10,
53:15, 55:9, 57:7
    willfully [9] - 45:3, 47:7,
53:16, 54:8, 54:17, 55:3,
58:5, 58:7, 58:13
    wish [1]-53:24
    withdraw [1]-63:11
    Witness [1] - 77:5
    witness [9]-1:17, 3:3,
33:20, 39:9, 59:22, 65:2,
70:7, 79:11, 79:14
    WITNESS[3] - 63:17,
73:7, 79:20
    Wolf [1] - 22:15
    word [5] - 21:17, 21:18,
30:11, 30:13, 60:14
    words [4]-19:4, 41:4,
54:25, 55:18
    work [4]-9:5, 9:22,
62:6, 63:5
    worth [1] - 61:22
    wouldn't [5] - 10:14,
26:21, 28:12, 57:23,58:8
    write [4]-12:3, 12:5,
50:9,50:12
    writing [2]-50:22,
50:24
    writings [1]-51:4
    written [1] - 53:15
    wrote [3] - 11:7, 40:25,
62:5
\
4:22, 5:4, 6:14, 7:9, 7:21,
16:11, 56:25, 63:3, 72:24
    years [2]-10:18, 71:25
    YORK [2] - 1:2, 79:4
    York [18]-1:20, 1:22,
2:6, 2:9, 3:4, 3:13, 3:21,
4:9, 4:10, 4:11, 4:17,
4:19, 34:11, 69:21,
69:23, 75:25, 78:16, 79:9
    you've [3] - 11:5, 42:22,
74:13
    yourself [2]-9:20,
56:24
```

