```
Page 1
1
2
    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3
    WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
    No. 1:10-cv-00569-RJA
4
5
    PAUL D. CEGLIA,
6
                      Plaintiff,
7
                  vs.
8
    MARK ELLIOT ZUCKERBERG,
9
    Individually, and
    FACEBOOK, INC.,
10
                     Defendants.
11
12
13
14
                           July 11, 2012
15
                           10:03 a.m.
16
17
               Videotaped deposition of LARRY F.
18
         STEWART, held at the offices of Gibson,
19
        Dunn & Crutcher LLP, 200 Park Avenue,
20
        New York, New York, pursuant to notice,
21
        before Cary N. Bigelow, Court Reporter,
22
         a Notary Public of the State of New York.
23
24
25
```

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We are now on the record. Please note that the microphones are sensitive and they pick up whispering and private conversations.

Please turn off all cell phones or place them away from the mics as they can interfere with the deposition audio.

Recording will continue until all parties agree to go off the record.

My name is Daniel McClutchy representing Veritext New York. The date today is July 11, 2012, and the time is approximately 10:03 a.m. This deposition is being held at the office of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher located at 200 Park Avenue in New York, New York.

The caption of this case is Paul Ceglia versus Mark Elliot Zuckerberg and Facebook Inc. This case is filed in the U.S. District Court, Western District of New York, case number 1:10-cv-00569-RJA. The name of the witness is Larry Stewart.

At this time the attorneys present will identify themselves and the parties they

Public, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY

24

	Page 5
1	L. Stewart
2	MR. SNYDER:
3	Q. Good morning, Mr. Stewart.
4	A. Good morning.
5	Q. You just swore to tell the truth;
6	correct?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And you understand that knowingly
9	making a false statement that's material to the
10	proceedings under oath is a crime?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And I want to ask you whether you
13	consider yourself bound, sir, by the American
14	Academy of Forensic Science Code of Ethics and
15	Conduct.
16	A. They have a code of ethics and I'm a
17	member, so yes, I'm bound by that.
18	Q. So the opinion you give in this case
19	MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
20	Q. Are you aware that section 2 of article
21	2 of the code subjects members like you to
22	various penalties, including expulsion, in the
23	event that you provide an expert opinion that
24	falls below the standards set forth by the

academy?

	4		
	ı		
•			

L. Stewart

- A. I assume it does say that, I hope it does say that.
- Q. Are you aware that the code of ethics states that no member, such as you, shall materially misrepresent data or scientific principles in reaching a conclusion?
- A. Well, as I mentioned, I don't have the code in front of me, but I assume it says something like that.
- Q. Now, before we get to your opinion, sir, I just want to ask you whether you understand that it's the defendant's position in this case that Mark Zuckerberg never signed the so-called Work For Hire document on which the plaintiff is basing his claim in this lawsuit.
- A. It's not my understanding of what Mr. Zuckerberg has said, no. I don't know what he said.

Are you aware of that?

Q. It's your sworn testimony here today, sir, that as you sit here today you have no idea what Mr. Zuckerberg said with regard to whether he did or did not sign the Work For Hire document?

	Page 8
1	L. Stewart
2	the name, yes.
3	Q. Do you think I just asked you whether
4	you conducted a Google search concerning
5	Facebook?
6	A. Concerning this case, and that's one of
7	the defendants.
8	Q. So you have, prior to today, conducted
9	a Google search about this case?
10	A. Not specifically about this case. I
11	have done Google searches where defendant's name
12	was in the search, I'm sure.
13	Q. Are you aware that the defendants'
14	position in this case that the Work For Hire
15	contract attached to the complaint is a fraud, a
16	fake, a forgery, not authentic?
17	A. I assume that's your position, yes, I'm
18	aware of that.
19	Q. You just used two different verbs,
20	assume and aware; is that correct?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Are you aware that those two words mean
23	very different things?
24	A. They can.

Do you know, sir, as you sit here

Q.

	Page 9
1	L. Stewart
2	today, that our position is that this contract is
3	a fraud or are you assuming it?
4	MR. BOLAND: Objection.
5	You are changing the question,
6	Mr. Snyder.
7	Are you asking your position or the
8	defendants by themselves?
9	A. It's a common-sense answer. We
10	wouldn't be having a case if you didn't have a
11	different opinion than us.
12	Q. As you sit here today, sir, do you have
13	actual knowledge that the defendants have taken
14	the position that the Work For Hire contract is a
15	fake?
16	A. Actual knowledge?
17	Q. Yes.
18	A. I haven't talked to Facebook or
19	Zuckerberg. I have seen the original documents
20	filed in this case and from that I can say that
21	your position is different than ours, that you
22	feel the document's fraudulent.
23	Q. What documents have you read that
24	indicate defendants' position that the Work For

Hire document is fraudulent?

•	1	
	ı	
	_	

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

- A. I don't know what the name of the document is. The original filing in the case where there was a -- the Court case initiated based on two different beliefs, one side felt the document was real, one side felt that it was fake.
 - Q. Have you read on the Internet statements that I have made, sir, to the effect that this case is a fraud and that Mr. Ceglia is perpetuating a criminal fraud on the court?
 - A. I read, I believe, an Associated Press article where you said that.
 - Q. And so do I understand that it's defendants' position that Paul Ceglia is committing a crime in connection with the prosecution of this lawsuit?
 - A. I believe that article said that as well, yes.
 - Q. And do you understand, sir, that the defendants have moved to dismiss this lawsuit on the basis that the case is predicated on a fraudulent document?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. And do you understand that Mr. Ceglia

1	ı	
_	L	

L. Stewart

- has submitted your report, sir, among others, in response to our allegation that he is committing a criminal fraud on defendants and the Court?
- A. Well, that's an interesting way to put it, but yes, he submitted my report to the Court.
- Q. Do you understand, sir, that it's the defendants' position that you, sir, have submitted a report which you signed that is being used in furtherance of a crime?
- A. I have no way of answering that. My report has nothing to do with a crime.
- Q. You would agree, sir, that if in fact the Work For Hire contract is fraudulent -- assume that as a hypothetical -- and that Mr. Ceglia under this hypothetical submitted your report to further that fraud, that your report would, under that hypothetical, serve to further Mr. Ceglia's fraud?
- A. I'm not going to assume something I don't believe.
- Q. Now, you are not a computer forensic expert, are you, sir?
- A. I have supervised computer experts, I have some knowledge in the area, but I don't

1	L. Stewart
2	consider myself one.
3	Q. So the answer is you are not a computer
4	forensic expert; correct?
5	A. I can only answer it the way I have. I
6	have quite a bit of knowledge of the subject, I
7	have supervised the area in my laboratory and I
8	have technically and administratively reviewed
9	reports in the area.
10	Q. Have you ever been certified by any
11	society anywhere in the world as a computer
12	forensic expert?
13	A. No. That's why I don't consider myself
14	an expert in the field, although I have
15	supervised it.
16	Q. So let me ask the question again one
17	more time.
18	Am I correct, sir, that you are not a
19	computer forensic expert?
20	A. It depends on what you want to refer to
21	as a computer expert.
22	Do I meet the Frye Rule standard?
23	Probably.
24	Do I consider myself an expert?
25	No.

I'm going to leave a blank in the

Q.

1	L. Stewart
2	transcript and ask, sir, that you tell the Court
3	in that blank which judge and which court in
4	which year, including the caption of the case,
5	certified you as a computer forensics expert.
6	TO BE FURNISHED:
7	
8	A. It will remain blank.
9	As I put in my declaration, there were
10	a number of cases in the early years we did not
11	track and so I'm going based on recollection, so
12	there's no way I can give you that information
13	other rather than my testimony.
14	Q. We have to take your word for it,
15	right, sir?
16	A. It's up to you.
17	Q. And you've been deposed before many
18	times, have you not?
19	A. Yes, I have.
20	Q. Are you aware of the Western District
21	of New York's rules concerning your testimony
22	today?
23	A. I'm aware of the federal rules, I

You are not aware of any specific rules

assume that encompasses the western district.

Q.

24

	Page 16
1	L. Stewart
2	prepare your report, Milberg Weiss, the Milberg
3	firm?
4	No longer Weiss, they took his name off
5	the firm.
6	A. No, they were not.
7	Q. Did you talk to Paul Ceglia before your
8	testimony today?
9	A. One time.
10	Q. When was that?
11	A. A few months ago.
12	Q. What did he say and what did you say,
13	as best that you can recall?

- Α. I asked him about the storage conditions of the Facebook contract and he said, he gave me verbally what the storage conditions were and --
 - What did he say, sir? Q.
- Α. He told me that it was stored in a home that was a part-year used home up in New York and that the home was not heated, it didn't have -it didn't even have a heating system, from what I understand, and he had to winterize the house whenever he left it.
 - Have you told us everything you can Q.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

creating a Web page that showed that office as

Washington, D.C. and he experimented with

We have a shared office space in

your two names?

Α.

22

23

24

1	-
2	•

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

being a shared space, but it has never gone anywhere.

- Q. You hold yourself out to the public as having a business together, do you not?
 - A. No.

Again, I believe there's a Web page out there that says that, but that's not the truth.

- Q. There's a Web page that says Blanco & Stewart with an ampersand between your names, forensic document examiners; correct?
- A. Right, it's advertising the Washington, D.C. space.
- Q. It's your testimony that although you hold yourself out to the public as being Blanco & Stewart forensic document examiners, in fact you are not in business together?
- A. No, it's not my testimony, it's not what I said.

I said that there's a Web page that we experimented with and we set up, but we have never gotten any business that way, we do not conduct business together. The only thing we're doing is sharing expenses of the office space in D.C.

that he did physical examinations only, I recall

	rage 20
1	L. Stewart
2	him telling me that he suggested chemical
3	analysis.
4	Q. Did you take notes of that call?
5	A. No.
6	Q. Did you record the call?
7	A. No.
8	Q. Anything else you can recall about the
9	phone call?
10	A. No.
11	Q. Did Dr. Aginsky tell you that images
12	were taken of the so-called Work For Hire
13	contract in or around January of 2011?
14	A. He didn't tell me that, but I believe I
15	had received that from Mr. Argentieri.
16	Q. Did you ask Mr. Aginsky how they
17	appeared, the Work For Hire document, when he
18	examined it?
19	A. No. The call I had to him was before
20	I'd even examined the document. At that point I
21	high-resolution scanned images that he had taken,
22	so I knew how the document looked.
23	Q. How about Mr. Osborn, did you ever

speak to him?

No.

Α.

24

1		
4	-	

8

9

L. Stewart

- Q. Do you know whether Mr. Osborn or

 Dr. Aginsky are still experts for the plaintiff

 in this case?
- 5 A. No. You'd have to ask Mr. Boland or 6 Mr. Argentieri.
 - Q. Did you review your report before your testimony today?
 - A. Of course.
- 10 Q. When did you last read it?
- A. I read sections of it about five minutes before I came in.
- Q. And did you notice any errors in the report?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. Before you sign and submit a report, do
 you read it carefully to make sure that it is
 accurate and correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And if you see any errors do you correct them?
- 22 A. Of course.
- Q. Do you consider yourself a careful writer when you are writing your reports?
- 25 A. Yes.

1	L. Stewart
2	Q. Did you write this report yourself, sir?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Every word?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Every punctuation mark?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Is it your sworn testimony that
9	Mr. Boland didn't edit it in any respect?
10	A. I had him read it before I issued it,
11	but he did not edit it.
12	Q. Is it your sworn testimony that
13	Mr. Boland did not change any words in the report
14	between the time you gave him a draft and it was
15	submitted to the Court?
16	A. Right. Mr. Boland did not change any
17	of my words.
18	Q. So the report that you submitted to
19	Mr. Boland for his review is the exact same as
20	the report that was submitted to the Court?
21	A. No, I doubt that. It had many
22	iterations that I made up to the point that I
23	submitted it, there were a number of additions
24	that I made. I made editorial changes to it

And did Mr. Boland make any suggestions

Q.

1	L. Stewart
2	to you in terms of how to change the report?
3	A. I think I recall him making some
4	general observations about placement of
5	information, but nothing material.
6	Q. When you say nothing material, what do
7	you mean by that?
8	A. Nothing that would have changed any
9	observation or conclusion, anything that was
10	meaningful in the report.
11	Q. But you did proofread your report
12	before you submitted it?
13	A. Yes, I proofread it.
14	Q. Let me show you a copy of your report
15	which we will mark as Stewart 1.
16	We are going to go sequentially, so
17	this will be Exhibit 13.
18	(Defendants' Exhibit 13, declaration of
19	Larry Stewart in support of plaintiff's
20	forthcoming response to defendants' motion
21	to dismiss for fraud, marked for
22	identification, as of this date.)
23	Q. This is your report; right, sir?
24	A. It looks like it.
25	Q. Let me direct your attention to page 12.

Let me hand you the Work For Hire

Q.

1	L. Stewart
2	document, which we will mark as Exhibit 14.
3	(Defendants' Exhibit 14, photocopy of
4	Work For Hire contract, marked for
5	identification, as of this date.)
6	MR. BOLAND: Just to be clear, it is a
7	copy of the Work For Hire document.
8	Q. That was produced to defendants as
9	scans taken by Valery Aginsky during the
10	expedited discovery phase.
11	Have you seen this scan before?
12	A. I can't attest it's the one from Valery
13	Aginsky. I've seen the document before.
14	Q. Did you ever review Dr. Aginsky's scans?
15	A. Yes. I told you that I received them
16	early on from Argentieri.
17	Q. Let me present you with what I will
18	tell you is a scan of the Work For Hire document
19	created by Dr. Aginsky in January 2011. I would
20	like to direct your attention to the handwritten
21	interlineation on page 1 of that document.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Can you read the handwritten
24	interlineation in the bold ink handwriting?

It's running together, but it appears

Α.

1		
_	•	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- to read providing Web design or designer or designing -- I can't tell -- is finished by May 24, 2003, and then it's got two sets of initials.
- Q. So let's go back to your report,

 Defendants' Exhibit 13, where you purport to

 quote the Work For Hire document.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. You quote it incorrectly, do you not?
- 10 A. I don't know. It's what --
 - Q. You just read the verb "finished" and your report reads "funded"; correct?
 - A. If I look at it, it could be funded.
 - Q. Sir, you just read the document, did you not?
 - A. I did, and I can read it either way, I can see it reads funded or finished, and just like I said, designer looks like design, designing, designer, I read it as best that I could and I --
 - Q. What word did you tell the Court you saw when you read that document just now in your testimony, sir?
 - A. I quoted that it appears to read design. Just now I read it as design, it looks

1	L. Stewart	
2	like it has an E at the end, maybe something	
3	else, I don't know.	
4	Q. What word did you use just in your	
5	testimony right now, sir, that followed the word	
6	"is" and preceded the word "by"?	
7	A. I'm using multiple words.	
8	Q. What word did you use when you read it	
9	for the first time for the Court in this	
10	deposition, sir?	
11	A. I don't know.	
12	Why don't you tell me what I said	
13	because	
14	Q. Sir, it is not my	
15	MR. BOLAND: Objection. You don't need	
16	to raise your voice.	
17	MR. SNYDER: Excuse me, my voice is not	
18	being raised.	
19	MR. BOLAND: It is being raised.	
20	MR. SNYDER: No, sir, it is not.	
21	Q. Sir, I ask the questions, you answer	
22	them.	
23	Do you understand that?	
24	Do you understand that?	
25	A. Yes, I understand.	

1		
7	_	

L. Stewart

2

Q. Okay.

3 4 So don't ask me another question,

5

6

7

R

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

19

20

18

21

22

23 24

25

please, okay, because I will not answer them.

So what word did you use in your testimony, sir, when I asked you to read this handwritten interlineation?

- I don't know. Α.
- 0. Well, let's go back and we'll ask the court reporter to remind you.

Is it your sworn testimony, sir, sitting here today right now, that you do not recall what word you used when you read the handwritten interlineation?

What I recall is reading it and then Α. saying that the words are jumbled, that I can't make them out and read to you what it appears to read under magnification, I did that before for my report and I quoted what it appears to read there.

My sworn testimony today is that it appears to read what I've got in my report because that's what I read when I had it under magnification.

Sir, about three to five minutes ago 0.

1	L. Stewart
2	when I asked you to read this handwritten
3	interlineation, did you tell the Court that the
4	word you read was finished or funded? Which word
5	did you use? Do you recall?
6	A. No, I don't. It could have been either
7	one and I could read both of them right now in
8	the word.
9	Q. So your sworn testimony right now for
10	this court is that you cannot recall in this
11	deposition several minutes ago when you read this
12	handwritten interlineation whether you read the
13	word "finished" or "funded"?
14	Is that your sworn testimony right now,
15	sir, that you cannot recall which word you used
16	when you read it out loud into the record?
17	Do you understand my question, sir?
18	A. I understand your question.
19	Q. Let me withdraw the question and break
20	it down.
21	Do you recall, sir, me handing you this
22	document at the deposition?
23	A. Yes, I do.

attention to the handwriting on the document?

Do you recall me directing your

Q.

24

	Page 30
1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes, I do.
3	Q. Do you recall me asking you to read the
4	handwriting out loud?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Do you recall reading it out loud?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Do you recall, in reading it out loud,
9	that you read and read out loud each word that
10	you saw including indicating for the Court that
11	you saw two sets of initials?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Do you recall whether you read out loud
14	the word "finished" or "funded" when you read the
15	handwritten interlineation?
16	A. I believe when I first talked about it
17	I said finished.
18	Q. And what word do you use in your
19	report, sir?
20	A. Funded.
21	Q. Thank you.
22	A. And as I mentioned
23	Q. There is no question pending right now.
24	MR. BOLAND: Objection. He is

continuing to answer the question.

MR. BOLAND: Objection. He is

	4		
	ı		
•			

L. Stewart

A. I'd like to finish my answer.

•

As I mentioned in my testimony, I could read it either way. I did my report based on a microscopic examination and I gave my best read of what it read.

- Q. When I asked you a few minutes ago whether you remembered whether you used the word "funded" or "finished" and you said you can't recall -- do you remember saying that to me?
 - A. Something like that, yes.
- Q. Were you lying when you said you couldn't recall it or were you telling the truth?
- A. I was telling the truth and you were taking my words out of sequence and so I was trying to answer your question.
- Q. Can you tell the Court how you were telling the truth when you said first that you couldn't recall whether you used the word "finished" or "funded" and then several minutes later recalled that you used the word "finished" when you read the words out loud?
- A. What I was trying to describe to you and you kept breaking apart was that when I read it initially I told you the words were together,

4		
	L	
	_	

L. Stewart

I told you what it appears to read, and then I told you later on in the laboratory I examined it under a microscope and I quoted what it appeared to read there and so we got two different reads based on what I am using my eyes, which are requiring glasses right now, or my microscope in the office.

Q. Let's turn your attention back to your report and direct your attention to the paragraph after paragraph Q2, the paragraph that begins "Additional items."

Do you see that on page 12?

- A. Yes.
- Q. There you write that one of the other items you reviewed is a two-page nonoriginal StreetFax document presented by plaintiff as the smoking gun.

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Is it your professional expert opinion that the StreetFax document is a smoking gun?
- A. No. It was presented to me by plaintiff's attorneys as being referred to as the smoking gun document.

1		
7	_	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. And do you have an understanding as to why it's being referred to as a smoking gun document?
 - A. I was told that your side indicated that that was the end of the case because it was a smoking gun and that's why I referred to it as that.
 - Q. Right.
 - But do you have an understanding as to why it is a smoking gun that ends the case?
 - A. I would say I have an understanding of what your report indicated, yes.
 - Q. And what is that understanding?
 - A. I believe it revolved around the two pages having different margins, different fonts, different appearances.
 - Q. Do you also understand that the StreetFax contract in fact has different language on the first page than appears on the so-called Work For Hire document?
 - A. Of course it would, yes.
 - Q. Do you understand the StreetFax contract makes no reference to Facebook?
 - A. That's right, it's two different

1	L. Stewart
2	documents.
3	Q. Do you understand that Mr. Ceglia has
4	said under oath in this case in sworn documents
5	that he signed only one contract with
6	Mr. Zuckerberg?
7	A. No, I don't know that.
8	Q. You write that the StreetFax contract
9	document was presented by plaintiff as the
10	smoking gun.
11	What do you mean by presented by
12	plaintiff?
13	A. I received it from our attorneys and it
14	was provided to me as the smoking gun document.
15	Q. Okay.
16	Let's go to paragraph 325 and 326 of
17	your report, which is page 65.
18	Do you see that?
19	A. Yes, sir.
20	Q. You indicate that Mr. LaPorte testified
21	against you in a federal trial and that trial was
22	the 2004 Martha Stewart-Peter Bacanovic trial in
23	the Southern District of New York.
24	Do you see that?

Α.

25

No, he did not testify against me in

1	L. Stewart
2	that trial. He testified against me in a perjury
3	trial that was brought against me subsequent to
4	that case.
5	Q. You are aware that Mr. LaPorte did not
6	testify in United States versus Martha Stewart?
7	A. Right. That's not what it says there.
8	Q. You didn't intend to create the
9	impression that he testified in the Martha
10	Stewart case; right?
11	A. No. He was not involved in the Martha
12	Stewart case.
13	Q. Sir, throughout your report, for
14	example, in paragraphs 218 and 226, 249, you
15	offer a series of rhetorical questions; am I
16	correct?
17	A. 218 is a question, 224 is a question
18	I'm sorry, 226 is a question.
19	Q. And you are aware that they are I
20	don't need to go through them all.
21	You are aware you asked a series of
22	rhetorical questions throughout your report;
2 3	correct?

Did you write those questions?

I am sure that I did, yes.

Α.

Q.

24

	
1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And is that what you've done in
4	previous reports rather than rendering a
5	declarative opinion, just posing a rhetorical
6	question? Have you ever done that before in a
7	report?
8	A. I don't recall if I have ever had
9	questions in a report before.
10	Q. You don't answer those questions, do
11	you?
12	A. Yes, I do.
13	Q. Can you direct me to any other forensic
14	laboratory report submitted to a court of law in
15	which you have included rhetorical questions?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Can you point me to any report submitted
18	by any expert to any court at any time that posed
19	rhetorical questions?
20	A. I have to answer that in two parts.
21	First I say no. Secondly, this isn't rhetorical
22	in that I answer the question. I'm simply posing

Why do you chose in this report for the

Q.

23

24

25

first time in your career to ask questions of

a question and then answering it.

	Page 37
1	L. Stewart
2	this sort?
3	A. Probably because it's such a long
4	report and I'm trying to make it readable and so
5	I'm posing an issue and then answering it and
6	then going on to the next one.
7	Q. In paragraph 406 you state, sir, that
8	research discloses no reported decision that an
9	opinion concerning the age of ballpoint ink
10	writing on paper dot, dot, dot satisfies
11	Daubert's scientific reliability standards.
12	Do you see that?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And in paragraph 407 you actually cite
15	cases; is that correct?
16	A. That's correct.
17	Q. You are not a lawyer, are you, sir?
18	A. No, sir.
19	Q. You have never had any formal legal
20	training at an accredited law school?
21	A. I've taken law classes from a law
22	school, but I have not had any I'm not a
23	lawyer.

Do you conduct legal research?

Q.

Α.

No.

24

Because those are cases that have been

Α.

from Ohio in your report?

24

	rage 39
1	L. Stewart
2	involved in previous cases where this issue has
3	come up and those were the citations used there.
4	Q. And do you usually include the results
5	of your purported legal research in a forensic
6	laboratory report of your findings?
7	A. If the purpose of my declaration is to
8	answer questions brought on by opposing experts,
9	yes.
10	Q. In the next paragraph, 408, you quote a
11	legal standard, the Daubert standard; is that
12	right?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And in the succeeding paragraphs you
15	proceed to assess the ability of PE testing to
16	satisfy Daubert; is that right?
17	A. I guess you could say it that way.
18	Q. You've never been certified by any
19	court as a legal expert, have you?
20	A. No.
21	Q. You are not qualified to issue expert
22	legal opinions, are you, sir?
23	A. No.

cited legal standards and conducted legal

Is it your testimony that you have

Q.

24

2	analysis	i
1		

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- analysis in prior forensic laboratory reports that you've submitted to courts?
 - A. That wasn't my testimony.
- Q. Have you ever done that before this
 6 case?
 - A. In a report, no; in a declaration, I believe so.
 - Q. I'm going to leave a line in the transcript for you to indicate which case, which court you submitted a declaration that contains supposed legal analysis.
 - A. I need to correct you there. I did not say I did legal analysis. I'm referring to quoting the case files that were brought into other courts based on consideration for this 2 PE test.
 - Q. How many reports have you issued during the course of your career as an expert?
 - A. Thousands.
 - Q. Is this the first time out of those thousands that you've ever conducted legal analysis such as is presented in paragraphs 410 to 440?
- MR. BOLAND: Objection. The witness

1	L. Stewart
2	has said twice now he is not doing legal
3	analysis, you keep inserting it in the
4	question, that's improper.
5	MR. SNYDER: That's a speaking
6	objection, which is improper
7	MR. BOLAND: I am
8	MR. SNYDER: Excuse me, I am in the
9	middle of speaking, so please don't
10	interrupt me.
11	Under the rules of this court you're
12	not permitted to coach the witness, which is
13	what you just did.
1 4	MR. BOLAND: No, I did not.
15	MR. SNYDER: Excuse me, I'm not done.
16	When I'm done, you can speak.
17	MR. BOLAND: You were done with that
18	sentence. I didn't coach him.
19	MR. SNYDER: Mr. Boland, if you
20	interrupt me again I will get Judge Foschio
21	on the phone, I will read him the transcript
22	and I will ask him to admonish you.
23	Would you like to do that?
2 4	MR. BOLAND: Sir, you are asking him
25	leading questions you are not permitted to

	rage 42
1	L. Stewart
2	do that.
3	MR. SNYDER: Sir, I am permitted under
4	the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to
5	conduct this deposition as I see fit
6	pursuant to those rules and pursuant to the
7	local rules.
8	You are permitted only to object as to
9	form, as to privilege, and you are not
10	permitted to coach the witness by
11	suggesting
12	MR. BOLAND: And I objected as to form,
13	precisely what you just said, so you can
14	continue when you want.
15	MR. SNYDER: If you can confine your
16	objection to form, there will be no problem.
17	If you continue to coach the witness we will
18	get the Court on the phone, we will read the
19	questions, we will read your improper
20	coaching to the Court and we will let the
21	Court decide how he wants to deal with the
22	situation.
23	MR. BOLAND: There's no coaching, you
24	are falsely stating what happened.

The record speaks for

MR. SNYDER:

	rage 15
1	L. Stewart
2	itself.
3	MR. BOLAND: Indeed it does.
4	MR. SNYDER: Please refrain from
5	speaking objections. This witness is very
6	experienced in testimony and does not need
7	your help.
8	BY MR. SNYDER:
9	Q. Sir, during the course of your career
10	and the thousands of reports or more than the
11	thousands of reports that you have submitted have
12	you ever cited Daubert and then purported to
13	assess whether a certain forensic test satisfies
14	Daubert?
15	A. And as I mentioned before, my
16	recollection is I have done that in declarations
17	but not in a simplified laboratory report.
18	Q. So I'm going to leave a blank right
19	there in the transcript for you to indicate which
20	court, which case involved a declaration
21	submitted by you that cited Daubert and then
22	purported to assess whether a certain forensic
23	test satisfies Daubert.

1	L. Stewart
2	TO BE FURNISHED:
3	
4	Q. You don't want to change I am going
5	to give you an opportunity now, sir, to reflect
6	on that testimony and is that
7	A. No change
8	Q. Is that still your testimony?
9	A. No change is necessary, that's my
10	recollection.
11	Q. Your report contains 470 paragraphs; is
12	that correct?
13	A. I don't think the numbers pertain to
14	paragraphs. I think they were in some cases
15	there were multiple paragraphs under one, but it
16	is 470 numbered sections.
17	Q. Am I correct, sir, that the findings in
18	your November 2011 declaration and your June 2012
19	report are very similar?
20	A. I don't know how to answer that. The
21	June report is much more involved, it goes
22	through many of the questions that were left
23	unanswered in the earlier declaration.
24	Q. Can you tell the Court what additional

findings you made between your November 2011

	1490 10
1	L. Stewart
2	declaration and your June 2012 submissions?
3	A. We'll have to go through the entire
4	report, we can start doing that. The additional
5	findings in a nutshell are the responses based on
6	the 500 or so pages of expert reports from your
7	side.
8	Q. Can you tell the Court with specificity
9	what additional findings you made in the report
10	that were not contained in your declaration?
11	A. We can start doing that, yes.
12	Q. Let me withdraw the question and ask
13	I can save some time.
14	You do in your report, but not in your
15	declaration, talk about Walter Rantanen's
16	findings; correct?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Those are not your findings, those are
19	findings that he made on which you rely; correct?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. When you reviewed the expert report of
22	Mr. LaPorte am I correct that you did not, after
23	reviewing his report, test the toner again?
24	A. That's correct, I did not test it

again.

1	
_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

- Q. And you didn't test any of the ink again, did you not, to see if you could differentiate any of the inks?
- A. I can't say, again, because I never tested the ink chemically.
 - Q. And you didn't test the opacity of the paper, correct, after reviewing Mr. LaPorte's report?
- 10 A. No, I did not.
- Q. You didn't observe it under short-,
 mid- or long-wave ultraviolet; correct?
- A. I don't have the documents, I can't do that again.
 - Q. Well, you said you don't have the documents, but you understand that your client Mr. Ceglia and/or his counsel had the documents; correct?
- A. Right. I did not request to see them again.
- Q. You could have requested to see them again, could you have not?
- A. I chose not to.
- Q. And you also chose not to look at the ink, after Mr. LaPorte submitted his findings,

	Page 47
1	L. Stewart
2	with a stereo microscope; correct?
3	A. I did not look at the ink with a stereo
4	microscope after Mr. LaPorte issued his findings,
5	correct.
6	Q. And when you reviewed the expert report
7	of Mr. Lesnevich you did not go back and review
8	the interlineation again on the original document;
9	correct?
10	A. No, I believe that's incorrect. I
11	reviewed the scanned images based on Lesnevich
12	and Romano and then that led to what's in my
13	report.
14	Q. You didn't perform any overlays with
15	the interlineations from different scans to test
16	his conclusions, did you?
17	A. The only overlays are based on
18	indentations. If that's what you are referring
19	to, I did not do that again, no.
20	Q. And after reviewing Mr. Lesnevich's
21	report, you also didn't view the line quality of
22	the interlineation under a stereo microscope;
23	correct?
24	A. No, that's incorrect.

Again, I looked at the scanned images

	luge 10
1	L. Stewart
2	that were taken from those under after
3	Mr. Lesnevich's report.
4	Q. Under a stereo microscope?
5	A. No. Again, you would have to have the
6	original document for that.
7	Q. And Mr. Argentieri has access to that
8	in the safe-deposit box, correct?
9	A. Correct, but I did not need that at
10	that point, so I did review it or ask to see it
11	again.
12	Q. And you didn't go back to the document
13	to test any of Mr. Tytell's conclusions either,
14	did you?
15	A. I went back to scanned images. I did
16	not need to go back to the document.
17	Q. Or Dr. Lyter's, you didn't go back to
18	the document to test his findings either, did
19	you, after reviewing his report?
20	A. No. It would have been a waste of
21	time, there was no reason for me to go back to
22	the document.

before you signed and submitted it to the Court?

Did Mr. Blanco review your report

Q.

23

24

1	
_	

8

9

L. Stewart

- Q. You say he did a peer review of your report; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. That's the phrase you used, peer review; correct?
- 7 A. Correct.
 - Q. And when did he conduct this so-called peer review?
- 10 A. I believe it was around the last week
 11 before I submitted it.
- 12 Q. Did he suggest any changes?
- A. My recollection is he suggested placement changes but nothing material.
- 15 Q. Nothing substantive?
- 16 A. No.
- Q. Before I get back to the so-called peer review I just want to ask you a couple of questions.
- When were you first contacted to be involved in this case for Mr. Ceglia?
- A. I have submitted it to you, but I
 believe the first e-mail from Mr. Argentieri was
 in June of 2011.
 - Q. When were you retained?

	Tage 50
1	L. Stewart
2	A. It would have been at that time.
3	Q. It's your testimony you were retained
4	in June 2011?
5	A. I don't have the first e-mail in my
6	report here. I have submitted it to you. That
7	would be my first connection with Mr. Argentieri.
8	In that e-mail he indicates that I'm
9	being retained, if my recollection is correct.
10	Q. Do you have a written retainer
11	agreement with Mr. Argentieri or his client?
12	A. No, I do not.
13	Q. Who was contacted first, you or
14	Mr. Blanco, do you know?
15	A. I was.
16	Q. And then did you recommend Mr. Blanco
17	for the case?
18	A. Yes, I did.
19	Q. Are there areas in which you aren't
20	specialized in which Mr. Blanco does not and vice
21	versa?
22	A. That's a tough question to answer. We
23	both have different areas that we are probably

better in than the other and I suggested him as a

person that could assist in this case.

24

1		
L	_	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- Q. For what purpose did you recommend him specifically?
 - A. The handwriting and also the staple issue I thought he would be good at.
 - Q. And how much -- what are the financial terms of your retention with the plaintiff?
 - A. Hourly rate, I believe it's \$350 an hour for casework and \$450 an hour for depositions, trial.
 - Q. Is there a contingency fee component to your retention?
 - A. No.
- Q. Have you received any payment for your services?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Who's written the checks to you?
- A. Mr. Argentieri has written some and some came from Mr. Dumain's office.
- Q. Did Mr. Ceglia write any of the checks directly to you?
- 22 A. No.
- Q. And have you rendered invoices?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. And who do you send the invoices to?

1		
L	_	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- 2 Α. 3 4
 - In the beginning they went to Mr. Argentieri, later on they went to Mr. Lake, then they went to Mr. Dumain and now they go to Mr. Boland.
 - And is there any bonus or incentive 0. compensation involved in your retention?
 - Α. No.

There's a penalty clause if it's not paid within 30 days.

- And in your report you talk about being 0. engaged to oversee the forensic examinations on the part of plaintiff's experts; is that correct?
 - Α. Correct.
- 15 Did you oversee Dr. Aginsky's Q. 16 examinations?
 - Α. After the fact, yes.
 - After what fact? 0.
 - He was brought into the investigation Α. earlier on, so I was -- I looked at his report or looked at his, I don't remember if it was a report or e-mails that he sent, something that had his findings on it, so I did review that early on.
 - Did Mr. Argentieri ever tell you that 0.

1	
2	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- he contacted Mr. LaPorte to work for the plaintiff at any time?
 - A. No, he did not.
- Q. Were you aware before -- are you aware that Mr. LaPorte was contacted by the plaintiff's lawyers to work for the plaintiff?
 - A. No, I'm not.
- Q. Are you aware when Dr. Aginsky and Mr. Osborn stopped being part of plaintiffs' team?
 - A. I am not aware that they have stopped.
- Q. When was the last time you spoke with them?
 - A. As I believe I testified earlier, I talked to Mr. Aginsky very early on, it would have been approximately June of 2011, and I don't believe I've talked to him since then.
 - Q. Why not?
- A. Because there was no need for me to talk to him about this case since then.
 - Q. Is it your sworn testimony that no one has said anything to you one way or the other about whether those two individuals remain plaintiff's experts on this date one way or

	Page 55
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. Did he take samples of attorney?
3	A. I don't recall.
4	Q. Are you aware of whether he ran any
5	tests on these samples?
6	A. Yes, he did tests on the samples.
7	Q. Did he test the paper?
8	A. I don't know.
9	Q. Did he test the toner?
10	A. I don't know.
11	Q. Did he test the ink?
12	A. I believe so.
13	Q. What kind of test did he subject the
14	ink to?
15	A. I don't know all of the tests that he
16	conducted. I know he tried to identify the ink.
17	Q. Do you know what his results of his
18	examination were?
19	A. It would be best to come from him, but
20	I believe that his results from our phone calls
21	were that it was deteriorated to the point that
22	he could not identify it.

written report to that effect?

And do you know why he did not issue a

Q.

23

24

1	
_	

L. Stewart

2

3

- Q. But your task was overseeing the plaintiff's examinations; correct?
- 4
- A. That's correct.

5

Q. But you're not aware of what tests he conducted or not; right?

7

A. As I mentioned, he conducted the tests on the ink to see if he could identify it.

9

8

Q. But you weren't sure what other tests he conducted?

11

12

10

A. If I can answer that, I will explain why.

13

14

15

16

17

When you conduct an ink analysis where you are trying to do an identification, many times you have to do exams on the paper as well, so when you ask the question did he examine the paper, I can't answer that other than to assume that he did when he did the identification of the ink.

18 19

20

21

Q. As the person tasked with overseeing the plaintiff's examinations didn't you coordinate which tests he would be running and which he wouldn't?

23

24

22

A. Yes. I asked him to identify the ink.

25

Q. And did you get the samples he took

1	L. Stewart
2	and exhibits and reviewed them before it was
3	submitted?
4	A. That's correct.
5	Q. So if Mr. Boland represented that
6	neither he nor Mr. Blanco had sent Mr. Blanco's
7	declaration and exhibits to anyone, to any
8	person, that wouldn't be true; correct?
9	A. Well, I don't know what you mean by
10	sent. I reviewed it electronically, I did not
11	review a hard copy.
12	Q. Who sent it to you electronically?
13	A. Mr. Blanco.
14	Q. And that was before he submitted it to
15	the Court; correct?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. Did you provide Mr. Blanco with
18	comments or feedback?
19	A. Yes, I did.
20	Q. How did you provide that?
21	A. By telephone.

- Q. Now, am I correct that your specialty is in the chemistry aspects of document examination?
- 25 A. That's one of my specialities, yes.

23

1		
4	-	

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Do you consider Mr. Blanco to have expertise in that specific discipline gained through his training and experience?
 - A. Chemical analysis of documents, no.
 - Q. His specialty is in handwriting and handwriting identification; correct?
 - A. Among others.
 - Q. Do you consider yourself to have expertise in that specific discipline, that is handwriting and handwriting identification gained through documented training and experience?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. With whom did you do your two-year apprenticeship in handwriting as required specifically for that discipline?
 - A. There was never a two-year training in handwriting, there was a two-year training in document examination, and it included all aspects, that was done between 1982 and 1984 for me.
 - Q. When was the last time you were certified as an expert in handwriting analysis?
 - A. I have never been certified as an expert in solely handwriting analysis. I have been certified as an expert in examination of

1	L. Stewart
2	questioned documents by the Secret Service and I
3	have been proficiency tested in handwriting
4	analysis by outside proficiency groups as
5	recently as last October.
6	Q. So no court has ever admitted you as an
7	expert to provide handwriting identification
8	analysis; correct?
9	A. No, that's not true.
10	Q. What court has done that?
11	A. A few courts have done that. I don't
12	have that information in front of me.
13	Q. For actual handwriting identification
14	analysis?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. I'll leave a blank in the transcript
17	for you to provide that information.
18	TO BE FURNISHED:
19	
20	MR. SNYDER: Let's take a five-minute
21	break. I think we have been going, and the
22	tape is about an hour and 10 minutes or so.
23	Let's just take a five-minute bathroom
24	break.
25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the

1	L. Stewart
2	record. The time is 11:01. This ends tape
3	number 1.
4	(Recess taken.)
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
6	record. The time is 11:25. This is tape
7	number 2.
8	MR. SNYDER: I'm going to mark as
9	Exhibit 15 a printout that we just made off
10	of the Internet during the break.
11	(Defendants' Exhibit 15, two-page
12	printout from Internet of blancostewart.com
13	Web site, marked for identification, as of
14	this date.)
15	BY MR. SNYDER:
16	Q. Do you see that?
17	A. Yes, I do.
18	Q. What is this?
19	A. This is what you were referring to
20	before, it's a test that Blanco and I did to make
21	a Web page and advertise our new D.C. office.
22	Q. Are you aware that this remains visible
23	and searchable on the Internet today?
24	A. I'm sure it does. Everything stays on
25	the Web.

4		
	L	
	_	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Well, are you aware that this is an active Web site, www.blancostewart.com?
 - A. I am not aware that it's active. I haven't paid to keep it up, so I don't know what the status is of it.
 - Q. And can you read what is written under the word "Home"?
 - A. "Blanco and Stewart have joined forces to provide even more comprehensive forensic document examination services."
 - Q. Is that a true statement?
 - A. We joined an office together in D.C., yes.
 - Q. Is this a true statement?
 - A. It's a true statement that we joined together, we got an office together. We have never shared resources, we have never shared a case as far as financially and we are not on each other's payroll.
 - Q. Is there anything inaccurate about this statement that is present on the Web site blancostewart.com?
 - A. You are showing me one page.

 As far as that one sentence goes, no,

1	L. Stewart
2	that was accurate at the time.
3	I would personally take the Web page
4	down if I knew that I could do that.
5	Q. Have you personally taken any steps to
6	learn if you could take the page down?
7	A. I don't know if it is still up.
8	Q. I am representing to you that we just
9	printed this out at 11:15 a.m.
10	A. And as you asked me before to believe
11	in me, I guess I will believe in you.
12	You know, whether it's on the Web or
13	not is different than whether it's accurate or
14	not.
15	Q. I'm not going to ask you to believe me.
16	Can you please look at the date stamp
17	on the bottom of this page?
18	A. I see the date stamp. As you are aware
19	from computer forensics, date stamps mean
20	nothing, but
21	Q. Date stamps mean nothing?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Is it your testimony that this date
24	stamp here means nothing?

My testimony is that date stamps on

Α.

1	L. Stewart
2	computers can be manipulated.
3	Q. Do you have any basis to believe that
4	the date stamp on this document was manipulated
5	this morning?
6	A. No. You asked me to believe you, so
7	I'm believing you.
8	Q. I'm not asking you to believe me.
9	Look at this document, and what does
10	the document say?
11	A. It has typed at the bottom
12	http://www.blancostewart.com, and it has the date
13	7/11/2012 11:15:03 a.m.
14	Q. And what steps, if any, have you taken,
15	sir, to remove the Blanco & Stewart Web site from
16	the Internet?
17	A. I haven't taken any to remove it and I
18	haven't taken any to initiate it. It's not my
19	Web page.
20	Q. You are Mr. Stewart, are you not?
21	A. Yes, it is, and as I mentioned before,
22	Mr. Blanco and I created an initial Web page to
23	advertise our D.C. office and that's what this

was for. I have not paid for it, I don't know

what the status is of it and I have not gotten

24

L. Stewart
any business from this advertisement.
Q. Am I correct, sir, that you have not
taken any specialized courses in your area of
expertise for 12 years?
A. No.
Q. Let me show you what we'll mark as
Exhibit 16.
Before I mark it, you submitted a copy
of your resume or CV to us, did you not?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that was complete and accurate?
A. At the time it was.
(Defendants' Exhibit 16, curriculum
vitae of Larry F. Stewart, marked for
identification, as of this date.)
Q. Here you go, 16.
Do you recognize this to be your CV?
A. It appears to be, yes.
Q. And do you see where you list
specialized courses?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see that you don't have any
listed since 2000?

That's right, I do not have them listed

Α.

	rage 00
1	L. Stewart
2	on this document since 2000.
3	Q. So can you tell the Court why you
4	omitted any courses that you've taken in the past
5	12 years?
6	A. This document would be voluminous if I
7	had everything listed.
8	I have included in there all of the
9	course work that was pertinent to me getting
10	certified and getting my expertise. Since then
11	I've done continuing education, I've done a
12	number of things that are not listed on there.
13	Q. What was your security clearance with
14	the United States Secret Service?
15	A. It was it varied through the years,
16	it was a few steps above top secret.
17	Q. And you retired in 2005; is that
18	correct?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And that was after your 2004 perjury
21	trial; correct?
22	A. 2005 is after 2004, correct.
23	Q. Do you think that I asked you whether

I believe so, because the two were two

24

25

2005 was after 2004?

1	L. Stewart
2	separate events, but yes.
3	MR. SNYDER: Can you please read back
4	the last question.
5	Q. Because that wasn't my question. I
6	want to make sure you answer my question.
7	(Record read.)
8	Q. You answered 2005 is after 2004.
9	A. Correct, it is.
10	Q. You retired from the Secret Service
11	after you were indicted and tried for perjury;
12	correct?
13	A. And found not guilty, yes.
14	Q. You were acquitted; correct?
15	A. I was found not guilty and that's also
16	called acquittal.
17	Q. You left the Secret Service because you
18	had a mutual a disagreement with the Secret
19	Service about the way they handled the Martha
20	Stewart matter; is that correct?
21	A. That's largely it, yes.
22	Q. And you also were accused of sexual
23	harassment of a Secret Service employee; correct?
24	A. By the same person that shown to have

lied in the Martha Stewart case, yes, and that

1	L. Stewart
2	accusation was shown to be a lie and she was
3	actually reprimanded for that.
4	Q. And you were accused to have kissed
5	her; correct?
6	A. Right, which was all retracted and she
7	was reprimanded.
8	Q. She was shown to have lied.
9	Did the jury in the trial against you
10	make a finding that she lied?
11	A. No. I am basing it on the evidence
12	that was presented at the trial.
13	Q. So your opinion is she was shown to
14	have lied?
15	A. I know she was shown to have lied
16	because I was there when she was retracted and I
17	was there when she was reprimanded and I was
18	part of her year-long reprimand.
19	Q. And did you lose your security
20	clearance before you retired, sir?
21	A. Of course, that has to be removed when
22	you are retired.
23	Q. Before you retired I didn't ask your
24	retirement did you lose your security

clearance?

1		
L	_	

L. Stewart

2

3

- It would have happened at the same Α. No. date that I retired.
- 4
- Q. Are you sure?
- 5
- Α. Yes.

security clearance?

Q.

6

7

8

9

- Are you aware that a federal employee 0. security clearance is immediately removed if that employee is arrested for a federal crime related to his or her employment?
- 10
- Α. No, I'm not aware of that.
- 11
- 0. Is it your sworn testimony that after 12 you were arrested on the criminal complaint filed
- 13
- by David Essex and Steve Pekin and signed by
- 14
- David Kelly that you continued to enjoy a

maintained until I retired in June of 2005.

- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- charges; correct? Α. I never went back into the office after the accusation.

review any reports during the pendency of those

I don't know that I enjoyed it.

And you didn't conduct any casework or

my understanding that the security clearance was

Now let's talk a moment about your Q. publications and presentations.

	Page 70
1	L. Stewart
2	Let's talk about the prestigious
3	journals and organizations where you published or
4	presented prior to 2004.
5	For instance, you had presented
6	articles a couple of times at the American
7	Academy of Forensic Science meetings; correct?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And you presented to another esteemed
10	professional organization, the Mid-Atlantic
11	Association of Forensic Scientists; correct?
12	A. Yes, I have.
13	Q. You haven't presented to the American
14	Academy of Forensic Sciences since 1996; correct?
15	A. That appears to be correct, yes.
16	Q. And you haven't presented to the
17	Mid-Atlantic Association of Forensic Scientists
18	since 1991, 21 years ago; correct?
19	A. No. I believe there was one in 1993,
20	according to this.
21	Q. Okay.
22	Since 1993, 19 years ago; correct?
23	A. I believe that was the last time, yes.

American Society of Questioned Document Examiners;

And you previously presented to the

Q.

24

1	
2	

- of Forensic Sciences ethics committee in 2008 found clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Blanco submitted an erroneous and misleading report and violated the code of ethics by knowingly misrepresenting data?
- A. I'm aware that they brought that forward and it was vacated.
- Q. Are you aware that after the ethics committee made this finding it recommended to the board of directors that he be expelled from the academy?
- A. I'm aware of that and then it was vacated.
- Q. Are you aware that in September of 2008 the board of directors unanimously accepted the recommendation of the ethics committee and expelled your office mate Mr. Blanco?
- A. He's not my office mate and I'm aware that they made that accusation, they came to that decision, he was not present, and it's been vacated since then.
- Q. Are you aware that Mr. Blanco appealed his expulsion to the entire membership?
 - A. I believe that he did, yes.

4		
_	-	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And are you aware that his expulsion was not reversed by the entire membership when that was brought to it?
 - A. Until such point as it was vacated.
 - Q. Did you attend the meeting in Denver, Colorado in February of 2009 when Mr. Blanco's expulsion was taken up by the academy at its annual business meeting?
 - A. No, I did not.
 - Q. Did you vote one way or another?
- 12 A. No, I did not.
 - Q. And the membership didn't overrule his expulsion; correct?
 - A. Until he was vacated.
 - I don't understand your question. It was vacated.
 - Q. Do you recall that Mr. Blanco sued the academy?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And do you recall that the settlement agreement that he signed provided that they would vacate the expulsion, but that he would resign and never apply for membership again?
 - A. I believe that was the terms, yes.

	4		
	ı		
•			

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And while the expulsion was vacated,
 are you aware that the ethics committee finding
 was not vacated?
 - A. No, I am not aware of that.
 - Q. Do you have any basis, sir, to render an opinion one way or another as to whether Mr. Blanco violated the academy's code of ethics by submitting an erroneous and misleading report to be used in the judicial process?
 - A. I am not involved in that matter, so I'm not in a position to discuss it.
 - Q. So you have no information one way or another as to whether he did or didn't submit an erroneous and misleading report?
 - A. Only the fact that they vacated it and that's enough for me.
 - Q. But you conducted no examination of the facts and circumstances to determine whether the ethics committee finding was accurate?
 - A. It would not have been proper for me to do that, no.
 - Q. Did you ever ask Mr. Blanco about it?
 - A. We've discussed it.
 - Q. And what did he say?

•	1	
	L	

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- A. That he was in the right and that he was happy that they vacated it.
 - Q. When deciding to recommend Mr. Blanco to the attorneys for Mr. Ceglia did you take into account that an organization that is highly reputable ethics committee found that Mr. Blanco knowingly misrepresented data?
 - A. And then reversed it.
- It was a wash to me, so, no, I did not take that into account.
 - Q. What is the American College of Forensic Examiners?
 - A. It's believed to be the largest forensic organization in the world right now, it has over 20,000 members.
 - Q. And you say in your achievement section of your resume that you are a certified forensic consultant; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you have to take an exam to be a member of that college?
- A. To be a member, no. To be certified, yes.
- Q. And are you aware, sir, of an

1	
Т	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

article -- I'm sure you've been shown this in prior depositions -- how a graduate student with no background in forensics became certified as a forensics consultant by just paying \$495 and registering online and taking 90 minutes of video instruction and answering a hundred multiple choice questions?

You know what I'm talking about; right?

- A. Yes. It comes up in every deposition that Mr. LaPorte's on the other side of and it follows with a document that was produced by the American college by their legal team answering that question. I brought it with me, if you'd like to see it.
 - I have the article.

You think Mr. LaPorte is responsible for the question I just asked you?

- A. It comes up every time he's on the other side, yes.
- Q. So this question is present, appears in prior deposition transcripts?
- A. Yes.
- Q. So anyone who had a deposition
 transcript for a prior case where Mr. LaPorte was

1	
_	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- 2 on the other side would see this question;
 3 correct?
 - A. That would be the hard way to do it.

 Since you've hired him, I assume you got it done
 the easy way.
 - Q. Do you have a personal animus towards
 Mr. LaPorte?
 - A. I don't really know him as a person, so I would say no.
 - Q. Is it your sworn testimony that you have no negative feelings toward Mr. LaPorte?
 - A. That's not my testimony. I do not -- I didn't say that.
 - Q. Well, what feelings do you have about Mr. LaPorte?
 - A. I meant personally.

As far as business related I believe that he has shown not to be trustworthy, he's shown that he changes his mind, he testifies one way and then a different way, depending upon which side of a case he's on, and I picture him as a person who just wants to win a case as opposed to do what's morally correct.

O. He's still a member of the United

1		
1		
	•	

L. Stewart

States Secret Service, is he not?

A. No, he's not, he doesn't work for the United States Secret Service anymore.

Q. United States Department of Justice?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware that a cat, feline animal, house cat became certified by this organization that you have said is the largest organization of forensic examiners in the world?

A. Yes. I'm aware early on in the organization that somebody misrepresented themselves, filled out a false application and applied for membership and that also's been addressed by the organization and it was in the early years, nothing like that's ever happened since then.

Q. You know that for a fact?

A. I actually queried them after the last time Mr. LaPorte brought this up and I received documents from their legal team that I told you I would give you if you wanted.

Q. Sir, you're certainly aware that the American Bar Association Journal among many others has criticized the ACFE as a certification

	Page 79
1	L. Stewart
2	mill? You know that; right?
3	A. I know they did that early on. In the
4	organization now, in the past number of years
5	that's not been the accusation.
6	Q. Are you aware that in April 2012
7	articles appeared criticizing this so-called
8	college of forensic examiners as a mill?
9	A. I am not aware of an article in 2012.
10	Q. So you are proud to be a member of this
11	organization?
12	A. I would say I'm proud to be a member of
13	an organization because I believe that the
14	organization is built on its people and if
15	they've got good people they become a good
16	organization.
17	I'm aware of other organizations that
18	haven't gotten that type of press that you are
19	referring to and they have very bad people
20	working under those organizations in some cases,

- And what's the academy? Q.
- Oh, my board of directors? Α. That was an organization that had the

so it's not the organization, it's the people

within them.

21

22

23

24

	
1	L. Stewart
2	idea of creating a school for private
3	investigators and it has, it's still in the
4	creation stage, it has never taken off.
5	Q. And just to be clear, you are not
6	intending to mislead anyone into thinking that
7	you are on the board of directors of the American
8	Academy of the Forensic Sciences?
9	A. No. If I was, I would say that there.
10	It says the academy.
11	Q. Right.
12	And have you ever been to the office or
13	physical headquarters of the academy?
14	A. Yes, I have.
15	Q. When was your last board meeting?
16	A. It's been a couple of years. They
17	pretty much are trying to regroup at this point,
18	they are almost broke.
19	Q. Who are the members of the board right
20	now?
21	A. Bill Copeland is the head of the board.
22	As far as active members, I don't know.
2 3	I know that they were in a situation where some

anymore, so I don't know who is active anymore.

people weren't going to be involved with it

24

•	1	
-	L	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. So the academy hasn't started any classes yet, to your knowledge?
 - A. I believe they had a few a few years back, but they haven't had any recently. They still are trying to create books and create the academy and sell the idea.
 - Q. I saw on the books portion of the academy's Web site that they include your books "Document Examination" and "Identity Theft" in their list of proprietary textbooks.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And are those the same books you list on your resume as published by A-Z Publishing?
 - A. Yes, they are.
 - Q. If I wanted to buy your books, could I buy them on amazon.com?
 - A. I don't know. I doubt it.
- Q. Would it surprise you to learn that they are not available on amazon.com?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Would it surprise you to learn that they can't be found and purchased by searching Google for the books?
 - A. It's my understanding they are

_	

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- available through the academy and I know that I have them available and I have sold them myself before, but I don't believe it's on any Web site like Google or -- it's not being advertised that way.
- Q. Are you aware the books are not in the Library of Congress?
 - A. Well, they have a number. They should be in the Library of Congress.
 - Q. Are you aware that A-Z Literary Book Publisher's registration is no longer active?
 - A. No, I am not aware of that.
 - Q. Would it surprise you to learn that we tried to contact A-Z Literary Book Publishing's principal and could not find a working phone number?
 - A. That would not surprise me. They published in 2009, this is 2012.
 - Q. Are you aware that the academy doesn't even have a link that allows you to purchase the books on their Web site?
 - A. No, I'm not aware of that.
- Q. So where can I get these books other than from you?

	rage 05
1	L. Stewart
2	A. It is my understanding the academy or
3	myself.
4	Q. How would I contact the academy if I
5	wanted to?
6	A. I assume you would go to their Web site
7	and contact Bill Copeland, I assume it is still
8	active.
9	Q. Are you aware would it surprise you
10	to learn that the academy's Web site lists a
11	number and if you call that number you get a cell
12	phone of a man who has nothing to do with the
13	academy?
14	A. Your question is would it surprise me?
15	Q. Yes.
16	A. I don't know if that's the case or not.
17	Q. Why do you think that would be the
18	case?
19	A. Maybe they've changed phone numbers. I
20	don't know.
21	Q. Is the academy a real business?
22	A. It was when I was there. I don't know

from the academy because apparently it's closed

So assuming you can't get the books

what the status is right now.

Q.

23

24

1	L. Stewart
2	for business, is it a fact that you can only get
3	the books from you?
4	A. No. I can give you Mr. Copeland's
5	phone number, if you'd like, and I'm not sure
6	that the academy is defunct; it's my understanding
7	it's still in business.
8	Q. Can you give us Mr. Copeland's phone
9	number, please.
10	A. Yes, I can provide it to you. If you
11	want to give me a blank, I can fill it in.
12	TO BE FURNISHED:
13	·
14	Q. Have you published a single scientific
15	article in a single academic journal since 2004?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Tell us what you've published, what
18	scientific article you have published in an
19	academic journal.
20	A. I don't know what you are referring to
21	as an academic journal.
22	I have published "Forensic Science -
23	Fake Fingerprints" in the Forensic Expert Witness
24	Association, I published that was in 2007.

I published "Leveling the Playing

1	L. Stewart
2	Field"
3	Q. Sir, my question was an academic
4	journal, not an online publication in an experts'
5	directory.
6	A. Academic journal is kind of an
7	oxymoron, I don't know what you mean by that.
8	Q. You don't know what I mean by academic
9	journal?
10	What would you regard as an academic
11	journal?
12	A. A peer-reviewed publication that has
13	our peers in it and all of these that I am
14	mentioning are those.
15	Q. Is it your testimony that the online
16	publication where you published "Forensic Science
17	- Fake Fingerprints" is a peer-reviewed academic
18	journal?
19	A. Yes, of course it is.
20	Q. All right.
21	Now let's go to the Martha Stewart case.
22	Did you get in any trouble at all for
23	your testimony in the Martha Stewart case?
24	A. That was asked in a previous LaPorte
25	trial.

	·
1	L. Stewart
2	It depends on what you refer to as
3	trouble. I was accused of something I did not
4	do, so if you call that trouble, then yes.
5	(Defendants' Exhibit 17, excerpt from
6	trial transcript in Vanderbilt Mortgage
7	case, marked for identification, as of this
8	date.)
9	Q. Let me hand you what we will mark as
10	Exhibit 17.
11	The first page of this has the trial
12	caption for the Vanderbilt Mortgage case; correct?
13	A. That's correct.
14	Q. And it has the date November 15, 2010;
15	correct?
16	A. That's correct.
17	Q. And that was the day you testified in
18	that case; correct?
19	A. I don't know, I'd have to refer to my
20	testimony list.
21	Q. So this is a copy of your trial
22	transcript, or it appears to be, does it not?
23	A. I assume my transcript is quite a bit

longer than that, but it's a few pages of it.

All right.

Q.

24

7		
_	-	

L. Stewart

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me direct your attention to page 291 and ask you to please read out loud the question at line 18 and your answer at line 20.

Α. "And isn't it true that your testimony in the Martha Stewart trial got you in trouble; correct?"

And my answer was "No, I would not say that."

- So were you telling the truth on line Q. 20 when you testified "No, I would not say that"?
- Of course I am, and it's what I just mentioned to you, it depends on what you call trouble.

I was accused of something I did not do and, again, this was another LaPorte trial and he brought this out and we talked about it and discussed it.

- And the fact is, after you testified Q. that you hadn't gotten into trouble in the Vanderbilt case, the United States district judge admonished you in open court, did she not?
- She made a statement in open court Α. which we then responded to and cleared everything up.

1		
7	_	

L. Stewart

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 18
- 19 20
- 21

- 23
- 24 25
- Q.
- And do you recall that you testified on
 - two different dates?

- In fact, you recanted your testimony Q. the next day claiming that you hadn't understood the question; isn't that right?
- I don't know exactly what I said. repeated what I just told you, which is I was accused of something and I was wrongly accused. I don't consider that getting in trouble, I consider that being accused of something and showing that it wasn't accurate.
- Now, in the Martha Stewart case you 0. were a witness for the Government; correct?
 - Α. Yes
- And that's when you were the lab 0. director at the Secret Service; correct?
 - Α. And chief forensic scientist, yes.
- And you testified for the Government Q. regarding some ink analysis relevant to the case; correct?
 - Α. Among other things, yes.
- And do you recall that the trial 0. occurred in approximately February 2004?
 - Α. Yes.

	rage 89
1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And you testified that you had
4	personally participated in the forensic document
5	examination of the worksheet listing Martha
6	Stewart's stock holdings on which Peter Bacanovic
7	made a notation; correct?
8	A. I don't know if I said Peter Bacanovic
9	made the notation; it was a document where he
10	purportedly made the notations, yes.
11	Q. And on rebuttal did defense counsel ask
12	you about your familiarity with a book proposal;
13	correct?
14	A. That's correct.
15	Q. And that book proposal was by
16	Mr. LaPorte and Anthony Cantu, Tony Cantu?
17	A. That's correct.
18	Q. And at the time of that question on
19	February 25th, 2004 you were aware of that book
20	<pre>proposal; correct?</pre>
21	A. No, and that's not what I answered.
22	That was one of the accusations that was shown to
23	be false in the case, that was something that

Mr. LaPorte accused me of and that's what started

part of the investigation.

24

1	
	_
	_

L. Stewart

And following the Martha Stewart trial

3

4

where you testified, as we discussed, you were charged criminally with false declarations before

Α.

Q.

6

5

- 7
- 8
- 9
- 11
- ___
- 12
- 13 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Q. We'll stipulate that you were found not guilty, that's a historic fact.

the Court otherwise known as perjury; correct?

And found not quilty, yes.

- Now, at the time the prosecutors -- the prosecutors met with you the day before they charged you, did they not?
 - A. No.
- Prosecutors were in a separate room with an unknown-to-me video link and heard me discussing matters with Secret Service investigators, that they'd never met with me that day, they had an unknown-to-me link into the room and then charged me after they heard what I said.
- Q. And is it your sworn testimony that at the time you were charged there was a threat of a wrongful prosecution suit from Martha Stewart and Peter Bacanovic?
 - A. For two billion dollars.
- Q. And it's your testimony that that wrongful prosecution suit threat existed at the

	Page 91
1	L. Stewart
2	time you were charged?
3	A. That's my understanding, yes.
4	Q. Can you point to a single piece of
5	evidence anywhere, sir, that at the time you were
6	charged there was a threat of a wrongful
7	prosecution suit from Martha Stewart and Peter
8	Bacanovic?
9	A. I don't know what you mean by evidence.
10	It's something that came out in my preparation
11	for my defense that my lawyers found out.
12	Q. Are you aware of a single news article
13	or other public disclosure of a threat of
14	wrongful prosecution from Martha Stewart or Peter
15	Bacanovic prior to the time you were charged?
16	A. My lawyers told me that there were, but
17	at the time I did not read them.
18	Q. In fact, it was five months after the
19	Martha Stewart trial that you were charged with
20	perjury; correct?
21	A. Just before they were sentenced, yes.
22	Q. That's what you say in your affidavit,
23	correct, that it was five months?
24	In fact it was only three months after

your testimony; correct?

1	L. Stewart
2	A. If you are saying that I testified in
3	February, I don't recall the exact date. It
4	would have been the beginning of February, if it
5	was February, and so it would have been three and
6	a half, almost four months.
7	MR. SNYDER: I just need to take a
8	two-minute break. You can stay here or you
9	can go out. I need to clarify something.
10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
11	record. The time is 12 o'clock.
12	(Recess taken.)
13	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
14	record. The time is 12:02.
15	BY MR. SNYDER:
16	Q. Sir, you were charged based on a
17	criminal complaint filed on May 21st, 2004;
18	correct?
19	A. I don't know the date; that sounds
20	approximately right.
21	Q. And are you aware that the Government
22	disclosed the criminal charges against you to the

Court in the Martha Stewart case on that same day?

No, I'm not aware of what day they did

that.

Α.

23

24

1		
4	•	

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. Are you aware of a letter that Karen

 Patton Seymour from the United States Attorney's

 office sent to Judge Chin disclosing the perjury

 charge? Have you ever seen that letter?
 - A. Yes, I have.
 - Q. And you are aware that in that letter the Government reveals that they became aware of the facts leading up to the criminal complaint a week prior, on May 14th, from Miss Fortunato?
 - A. I am not aware of those dates, no.
 - Q. Let me show you what we will mark as Defendants' Exhibit 18, which is the letter from the Government.

(Defendants' Exhibit 18, letter dated May 21, 2004 from U.S. Attorney David N. Kelly, marked for identification, as of this date.)

- Q. Does this refresh your recollection, sir, about the sequence of events, namely that the Government notified the Court on May 21st, the day you were charged, of the facts and circumstances leading up to your arrest?
- A. It doesn't refresh my recollection.

 It's a letter by one side of an upcoming matter

•	١		
-	_		

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

and so it shows their description of what they believed happened.

- Q. And the indictment that followed the complaint charged you with having lied about personally having conducted the ink testing and about being familiar with the book proposal; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Let's turn to your report, which is Exhibit 13 in this case, and let me direct your attention to paragraph 327.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. On page 65.

You have four paragraphs that you describe what you say happened leading up to your charges, paragraphs 327 to 330; correct?

- A. I count more than that, but we can talk about those four if you like.
 - Q. All right.

In these paragraphs that I have highlighted you start by informing the Court of the idea that there was a threat of a multibillion-dollar suit against the Government, correct, and you say nearly five months after

1		
L	L	

L. Stewart

Martha Stewart and Peter Bacanovic were found guilty; correct?

- A. That's right. The --
- Q. And the paragraphs that follow describe you being questioned about the issues underlying the charges and your being charged; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So the point of your reference to the wrongful prosecution suit threat was to imply to the Court that the threat somehow was the cause of your being questioned and ultimately charged; is that right?
- A. No. My point was to indicate everything I was aware of in case it was a contributing cause; I don't know if it was or not.
- Q. You would agree that if a threat of a multibillion-dollar suit against the Government didn't occur until after you were charged then such a threat could not be a contributing factor to your arrest?

You'd agree with that; correct?

A. No, because I'm not aware that that's what happened. It's my understanding that it was

1	L. Stewart
2	before that and it was prior to Martha Stewart
3	and Peter Bacanovic being sentenced, which
4	happened, I believe, right after this.
5	Q. When do you believe they were sentenced?
6	A. I don't know. It's on the Internet.
7	It's either late May or it's when they were
8	supposed to be sentenced.
9	Q. You mentioned five months in paragraph
10	327.
11	That's incorrect, is it not?
12	In fact, you were charged in May of
13	2004, only three months after your February 2004
14	testimony; correct?
15	A. As I've testified, I believe it was the
16	beginning of February for one and the end of May
17	for the other, so without checking the dates it's
18	probably more like four months.
19	Q. Well, it certainly wasn't five months;
20	correct?
21	A. Since my testimony, no, it was not five
22	months.
23	Q. Let's turn to what you say actually
24	happened.

You mentioned that there was this

1	
Т	

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

threat, then you say in paragraph 328 "I was questioned about my knowledge of the subject."

What subject?

- A. The prior paragraph where it talks about the suit and the Government -- against the Government for wrongful prosecution based in part on the notoriety of the accused.
 - Q. Who questioned you?
 - A. The Secret Service investigators.
 - Q. And when was that?
- A. That was the days leading up to the arrest.
- Q. So it's your sworn testimony that the days leading up to your arrest U.S. Secret Service agents questioned you about the multimillion-dollar suit threat?
- A. In part, yes. It was an inspection being done based on the accusations from Mr. LaPorte and Ms. Fortunato and they were questioning me about a number of things.
- Q. And your testimony here today is that those Secret Service agents actually questioned you about a multimillion-dollar threat of a suit?
 - A. No. You have to read what's in the

1		
1	•	

L. Stewart

paragraph there; they questioned me about my knowledge of that.

- Q. Knowledge of a threatened lawsuit?
- A. No. Knowledge of the subject. It's in 328, I was questioned about my knowledge of the subject.
- Q. You testified a few minutes ago, just within the past two minutes, that one of the things the Secret Service questioned you about was your knowledge of a threat of a lawsuit?
- A. That's right. Once I brought it up to them that I was aware of that, they questioned me about it, they actually brought up some things pertinent to that and then they discussed it with me and that is at the time when I believe the prosecutors were listening in, and part of my testimony at that time concerned firsthand information that I heard in the prosecutor's office from the chief prosecutor, and that was disclosed at that time, that's what I mean by knowledge of the subject.
- Q. When you say you provided firsthand information regarding a meeting in the prosecutor's office, what information did you

1	L. Stewart
2	have regarding a meeting in the prosecutor's
3	office?
4	THE WITNESS: Maybe you and I should
5	talk about this, Dean. I don't know what I
6	can talk about here.
7	MR. BOLAND: Can you just repeat the
8	question, Mr. Snyder, so I can determine if
9	there is an objection for privilege? I
10	don't know what he's talking about.
11	Q. In paragraph 328 you say "I was
12	questioned about my knowledge of the subject."
13	Who questioned you?
14	A. Secret Service investigators.
15	Q. And you said provided firsthand
16	information regarding a meeting in the
17	prosecutor's office during which the chief
18	prosecutor disclosed pertinent case background
19	information.
20	Who was the prosecutor you are
21	referring to?
22	A. It was the chief prosecutor in the
23	Martha Stewart trial, I don't remember her name.
24	Q. At this time I want to remind

Mr. Boland and the witness of Judge Foschio's

1		
1	•	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

L. Stewart

particular rules governing depositions in his court. Rule 1, if you need clarification, a definition or explanation of any words, questions or documents throughout this deposition you are to ask me as deposing counsel rather than your own counsel.

Do you understand that?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. You and the plaintiff's counsel may not engage in private conversation during the deposition or any breaks except to determine whether to assert a privilege.

Do you understand that?

- A. Yes.
 - Q. Thank you.

Now, who was the chief prosecutor in the Martha Stewart trial?

- A. I don't recall her name, it's in the Internet and it's in my documents back in the office.
 - Q. Was it Karen Patton Seymour?
- 23 A. That sounds right.
- Q. What firsthand information regarding a meeting in Ms. Seymour's office did you provide

	rage 101
1	L. Stewart
2	during the questioning that you refer to in
3	paragraph 328?
4	A. I don't know that I am allowed to
5	disclose that to you, that's why I was asking for
6	a break to discuss it.
7	Q. Was Ms. Patton Seymour your lawyer?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Did you sign a confidentiality
10	agreement in connection with that interview?
11	A. I don't believe so, no.
12	Q. And at the time you were being
13	questioned as a subject or target of a criminal
14	investigation; correct?
15	A. No. At the time of the meeting I was
16	preparing for the Martha Stewart trial.
17	Q. Certainly, fine, all right.
18	So can you please tell the Court what
19	pertinent case background information are you
20	referring to in paragraph 328?
21	A. I will try.
22	Leading up to the Martha Stewart trial
23	there were four or five independent meetings that
24	I attended for, in the preparation of the case

and trial preparation, those were -- began in, I

4		
- 1		
-		

L. Stewart

believe, late December 2003 and went right up to the trial date. In one of those meetings -- I believe it was the fourth one, if I'm not mistaken -- there were the chief prosecutor present, there were two attorneys from the office present, there was myself, another Secret Service representative and two FBI agents along -- and I believe I began by saying the chief prosecutor.

During that meeting she received a phone call that she took out in the open in front of all of us, she seemed openly excited about the phone call. At the end of the call she looked at the group of us and she said, I'm so happy that we are taking this case involving Martha Stewart to trial, we need to send a message to the American people that this kind of thing would not be allowed.

So as far as that was pertinent to the question at hand in front of me as to whether or not there was some kind of a prosecution based on the notoriety of the people, I felt it was important for me to tell that to the investigators, and unbeknownst to me the prosecution team was listening in on the

	Page 103
1	L. Stewart
2	conversation.
3	Q. Sir, we established that you were
4	charged on May 1st, 2004; correct?
5	A. That's what you said, yes.
6	Q. And you had gone to the prosecutor's
7	office the day before that on May 20th; correct?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Secret Service offices the day before?
10	A. That's correct.
11	Q. And you were also interviewed the
12	previous day, on May 19th; correct?
13	A. I believe the previous two days.
14	Q. Right.
15	And during those days of interview in
16	fact you told the Secret Service that you did not
17	conduct any actual tests in connection with the
18	investigation of Peter Bacanovic and Martha
19	Stewart; isn't that correct?
20	A. That, that's not correct.
21	Q. And did you tell the agents that you
22	didn't get involved with the making of the TLC
23	plates?

Did you tell the investigators, the

No, that's not correct.

Α.

Q.

24

1
_

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

agents, that your only involvement was looking at the final test results?

- A. No. I believe you're breaking up the segments of what I discussed with them and you're misinterpreting it.
- Q. Did you tell the interviewing agents that you were not aware of the book proposal before it was shown to you on the witness stand during the trial?
- A. Correct. I was not aware of the book proposal, but that's not the question that was posed to me on the stand.
- Q. In paragraph 333 you claim in your report submitted in this case that it was made clear to the jury that I had, in fact, testified truthfully. I was completely exonerated at the trial and found not guilty.

Did I read that correctly?

- A. That sounds right.
- Q. And you were a law enforcement officer for over 26 years; is that correct?
- A. No. I was never a law enforcement officer.
- Q. You were an employee of the United

1	L. Stewart
2	States Government for over 26 years?
3	A. I was credited with 27 as commissioned.
4	Q. You had substantial exposure to the
5	legal system, correct, during that career?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And you are aware that a finding of not
8	guilty can mean that the Government has not
9	sustained its burden of proof on each element
10	beyond a reason doubt, aren't you?
11	A. I am aware of that and I am also aware
12	that I am not guilty in this matter, so whether
13	it's an acquittal or not guilty, I am not guilty.
14	Q. You are aware that a not guilty verdict
15	doesn't mean that the jury found that you
16	testified truthfully at the trial, are you not?
17	A. I did not testify at the trial, so
18	Q. I'm sorry, the Martha Stewart trial.
19	In other words, the jury finding of not
20	guilty isn't a finding that you testified
21	truthfully at the Martha Stewart trial; correct?
22	A. I believe it is.
23	Q. Are you aware that a perjury conviction
24	requires a finding of materiality, sir?

No, I'm not aware of that law.

A.

•	1	
_	L	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. Are you aware that a perjury conviction requires a finding that the testimony at issue was actually material to the proceedings?
 - A. I'm not aware of a law, I just know that I did not lie in that case.
 - Q. Moving to paragraph 334, you also asserted that based on the California case People versus Williams arrests which do not result in convictions are inadmissible either as proof of guilt or for impeachment.

Do you see that?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Did you research that law yourself?
- 15 A. No. That's come out in previous cases
 16 where Mr. LaPorte has brought this up.
- Q. Who told you about People versus
 Williams?
 - A. No one's told me about it, it's just been cited in previous cases.
 - Q. Where did you get that citation from to insert in your report?
 - A. From lawyers that have been involved in previous cases where Mr. LaPorte's been on the other side.

1		
J	_	

L. Stewart

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

- Q. Are you aware that the Williams case applies to those who have been criminally charged -- are you aware that this case has nothing to do with expert witnesses and whether they can or cannot be impeached?
 - A. I am not aware of the case.
- Q. Why do you put it in your report if you are not aware of it?
 - A. As assistance to the trier of fact.
- Q. But you have no idea what this case actually stands for, do you?
- A. I don't believe it's my job to know the law. I just put it in there because it's been cited before in matters that Mr. LaPorte has brought up concerning the same subject.
- Q. So you put a case citation in your report even though you have no idea what the case means; is that correct?
 - A. No, it's not correct.
- Q. Tell the Court what People versus
 Williams stands for, what legal proposition.
 - A. It's my understanding from lawyers in the case that it showed that you are not allowed to bring into court information concerning a

1		
4	-	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- matter that was -- that someone was found not guilty of.
 - Q. When you come to court as an expert witness your credibility is very much at issue, isn't it?
 - A. Always.
 - Q. So if you lied in a prior proceeding or lied here earlier today in the deposition, you'd agree that that would be relevant to a fact finder in assessing your credibility as an expert?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And it's certainly relevant for the Court's assessment of your credibility to know that you were charged of perjury and then acquitted; isn't it?
 - A. I don't know. To me, what's been presented to me in the past is that the law says it can't be brought up to the Court, but that's for you guys to decide.
 - Q. Mr. LaPorte's here in this conference room, is he not?
 - A. Yes, he is.
- Q. And you've accused him several times -I'm using your word -- of engineering perjury

1	L. Stewart
2	charges against you?
3	A. I never used the word "engineer."
4	Q. Or behind perjury charges in some way?
5	A. I don't know that I've accused him. I
6	have stated what I understand to be the fact.
7	Q. Do you believe that Mr. LaPorte was
8	behind the bringing of criminal charges against
9	you?
10	A. I was told that he was in part behind
11	it, yes.
12	Q. Who told you that?
13	A. Lawyers that were preparing for my case.
14	Q. And do you know what facts or evidence
15	they based that assertion on?
16	A. Grand jury testimony and individual
17	interviews.
18	Q. Are you aware that Mr. LaPorte never
19	met with prosecutors prior to your being charged?
20	A. I don't know who she met with prior to
21	me being charged.
22	Q. Can you tell the Court every factual
23	basis you have to accuse Mr. LaPorte of being
24	behind the criminal charges that the United

States Government brought against you?

4		
	L	
	_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A. Well, first, I did not say he was behind it, I said he was a contributor, and I was told that by lawyers that were preparing for the case.
 - Q. And did the lawyers tell you what facts or evidence, if any, they were basing that assertion on?
 - A. Grand jury testimony and interviews with the inspection team with people like Mr. LaPorte.
 - Q. Is there any other time other than the Martha Stewart case in which you have been accused of testifying falsely?
 - A. Yes. The case in Germany involving Ivan the Terrible, his real name was John Demjanjuk, D-e-m-j-a-n-j-u-k.
 - Q. Prosecutors in Munich opened an investigation into allegations of perjury against you; correct?
 - A. Yes, they did. The judge found it to be not credible and dismissed it.
- Q. When did that happen?
- A. When I testified in the case, it's in the list of testimony.

1		
L	_	

L. Stewart

- Q. And was there a written decision by the Court in --
 - A. Yes. I brought that if you'd like to see it.
 - Q. Your counsel can provide that to us later.
 - A. I've also brought that up every other time Mr. LaPorte has brought this up and offered it and it's never been accepted.
 - Q. And now am I correct, sir, that there are times when you have been excluded by courts and not permitted to testify as an expert?
 - A. That's brought up every time against Mr. LaPorte as well.
 - Q. I'm going to move to strike all of those gratuitous references. I understand you've got this animus here, but pretty much every time I ask you a question you mention Mr. LaPorte. I am not asking you about Mr. LaPorte.

We'll stipulate that you don't like him and that you think that all of my questions were supplied by him and whatever else concerning Mr. LaPorte you want to stipulate, us to stipulate to concerning your attitudes about him,

1		
1		
	•	

L. Stewart

but just I'd ask that you not answer all of my questions with references to Mr. LaPorte, it just delays things.

MR. BOLAND: Objection.

A. I'm just simply trying to explain it to the trier of fact as to what's going on here.

I would think, as a witness in these kind of cases, that things that have been done before would be part of a playbook and we could cut through a lot of this, but I will certainly discuss it all, and to correct one thing that you said, I do not have any animosity against Mr. LaPorte as far as an individual, I don't know him that well, I'm talking about him as a forensic scientist.

- Q. Let's talk about the Lake Forest case, okay, sir? You recall that? It was just two years ago; right?
 - A. I believe so.
- Q. In that case the Court found the method you used didn't meet the Frye standard; correct?
- A. That's after I testified in the case they decided that the method did not meet it.

25 Your question earlier was have I been

	Page 113
1	L. Stewart
2	excluded.
3	No. I testified in that case, they
4	decided that they did not want to use that aspect
5	of the testimony, they allowed the other aspects
6	of the testimony in.
7	Q. Didn't the Court say that your
8	testimony not only didn't meet the Frye standard,
9	but that it didn't meet any basic scientific
10	principles studied by the Court? Wasn't that the
11	Court's finding?
12	A. That's what they said about one aspect
13	of the analysis, yes.
14	Q. And as to that aspect of your analysis
15	the Court found that your testimony was to
16	inconclusive as to be useless; correct?
17	A. I imagine they did. They excluded that
18	part of the analysis.
19	Q. And that wasn't the only time that a
20	court excluded a part of your analysis, was it?
21	A. To my knowledge, it is.
22	Q. Let's talk about the case in British
23	Columbia, Ellson versus Ellson.
24	Do you remember that case?

Do you remember that case?

Α.

Yes.

1		
7	_	

L. Stewart

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You were retained by the defendants who alleged that numerous documents were forgeries; correct?
- A. I don't remember if I was retained by the defendants or who. I was retained by Mr. Ellson.
 - Q. And do you remember the Court rejecting your handwriting analysis that certain signatures were forgeries?
 - A. No, I don't recall that.
 - Q. Do you recall the Court noting that in some instances you made a finding of forgery with respect to signatures that the defendants themselves confirmed were their authentic signatures?
 - A. No, I'm not aware of that.
 - Q. Are you aware of any criticism -MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
 - Q. Are you aware of any findings of the court in the British Columbia case where your testimony was rejected?
 - A. No. I testified in the case and I'm not aware of the findings after the fact.
 - Q. You're not aware of them or you don't

	rage 115
1	L. Stewart
2	recall them?
3	A. I am not aware of them, I have never
4	been told what the findings were.
5	Q. Are you familiar with the protective
6	order in this case?
7	A. No.
8	Q. No one ever told you about it?
9	A. No.
10	Q. Do you know what a protective order is?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Do you know whether you have complied
13	with the protective order in this case with
14	respect to your role as an expert witness?
15	A. I've never signed a protective order,
16	but had I signed one I believe I have complied
17	with the protective order.
18	Q. Well, but not knowing its terms you
19	can't tell this court one way or another whether
20	you are in compliance with the protective order?
21	A. No. I was trying to elaborate and you
22	cut me off.
23	Understanding what a typical protective
24	order is and understanding what this case is

about, I have not disclosed information to anyone

1	L.	Stewart
---	----	---------

- outside of the lawyers in the case, so I believe I would have complied with a typical protective order, but I have not signed a protective order in this case.
- Q. Did Mr. Lake ask you to sign Exhibit A to the protective order in this case?
- 8 A. I don't believe so. I could be
 9 mistaken. I don't recall signing anything with
 10 Mr. Lake.
 - Q. Did anyone at the Milberg firm ask you to sign Exhibit A to the protective order?
- 13 A. No.

3

4

5

6

7

11

- Q. Did anyone at Mr. Argentieri's office, including Mr. Argentieri, ask you to sign Exhibit A to the protective order?
- 17 A. Not that I recall, no.
- 18 Q. Did Mr. Boland?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. Did Mr. Ceglia?
- 21 A. No.
- Q. Are you familiar with the July 1, 2011
 hard copy document inspection protocol in this
 case?
- A. I don't know if it was titled that, but

1	L. Stewart
2	I'm familiar with a document where it dictated
3	what we could do.
4	Q. And you are aware that that document
5	governed the forensic examination of the
6	so-called original Work For Hire document;
7	correct?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Did you play any role in drafting the
10	language for that order?
11	A. I don't recall.
12	MR. SNYDER: Let me mark as Exhibit 19
13	what in the case docket is document number
14	84, which is the hard copy document
15	inspection protocol.
16	(Defendants' Exhibit 19, hard copy
17	document inspection protocol, marked for
18	identification, as of this date.)
19	Q. I ask if this is the protocol we have
20	been discussing.
21	A. I believe that's the document I
22	referred to.
23	Q. When did you first see this document?
24	A. I assume sometime between July 1st,
25	2011 and July 15th. It was filed on July 1st and

	_
1	L. Stewart
2	the examination was on the 15th.
3	Q. And you were not present at the
4	inspection on July 13th, were you?
5	A. No, I was not.
6	Q. And you were not present on July 14th,
7	were you?
8	A. I'll have to refer to my dates, they've
9	been provided to you already, but I was present
10	in Buffalo for part of the examination time there
11	and then my examination occurred in Chicago
12	beginning on the 15th.
13	I'm sorry, not the 15th. I need to
14	refer to my notes.
15	Q. You were there on the 16th, just that's
16	when you were there.
17	So you are aware that examination
18	occurred on the 13th and 14th?
19	I'm sorry.
20	The examination occurred on July 14th
21	and 15th and you were not present for either of
22	those days; correct?
23	A. I would believe I was there at the last
24	day of examination in Buffalo.
25	Q. And did plaintiff's counsel ask you to

1	ı	
_	L	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

L. Stewart

be present at the inspection on July 14th or 15th?

- A. They asked me to coordinate someone being there and I coordinated with Mr. Blanco to be there in the beginning and me to be there at the end.
- Q. And why weren't you present at the beginning of this important examination if you are overseeing the experts?
- A. Because it would be redundant and a waste of money for us.
- Q. And is it your sworn testimony that you told the attorneys to have Mr. Blanco present on July 14th, the first day of the inspection?
- A. No. I asked him to be there for the first day of the inspection, but I understand there was a reason that he couldn't be there and so he wasn't able to get there until a little bit later on.
 - Q. What were you doing on July 14th, 2011?
 - A. I don't recall.
 - Q. Were you working on another case?
- A. Probably.
- Q. Do you know what case you were working on?

	y
1	L. Stewart
2	A. No.
3	Q. Do you have a calendar or any record
4	that would tell you what you were doing on July
5	14th that prevented you from being present at the
6	inspection?
7	A. I have to answer that in two ways.
8	Yes, I have a calendar that would say
9	what I was working on, I do maintain a large
10	number of cases, and secondly, I chose not to be
11	there at the beginning of the examination because
12	of redundancy and I chose to come towards the end
13	of the examination.
14	Q. So you knew the inspections would begin
15	on July 14th; correct?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And you knew that no expert from the
18	plaintiff's side would be present that day?
19	A. No. I was not aware Mr. Blanco could
20	not be there that day until later on.
21	Q. When did you learn that Mr. Blanco
22	wouldn't be able to be present on the first day?
23	A. I recall it being something like the

Did you make any effort to have any

24

25

Q.

day before, but I don't know.

	Page 121
1	L. Stewart
2	other expert attend?
3	A. No. If my if I was told that the
4	day before, it wouldn't have been possible
5	without a private jet to get here in time.
6	Q. Did you ask to delay it so that someone
7	from the plaintiff's expert team could be
8	present?
9	A. No. I thought it was fine for him to
10	be there. I knew it was being videotaped and I
11	thought it was fine for him to come in a little
12	bit late.
13	Q. Were you aware there would be two
14	experts inspecting the hard copy documents
15	produced by plaintiff on that first day?
16	A. Yes, I believe it was.
17	Q. And were you aware those experts were
18	Peter Tytell and Frank Romano?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And you were familiar with both
21	Mr. Tytell and Mr. Romano as experts prior to
22	July of 2011; correct?
23	A. I'm verv familiar with Mr. Tvtell.

You have respect for Mr. Tytell as an

Mr. Romano is not a forensic document expert.

Q.

24

	
1	L. Stewart
2	experienced expert, do you not?
3	A. I have a great deal of respect for
4	Mr. Tytell.
5	Q. And you were not familiar with
6	Professor Romano prior to July of 2011?
7	A. Oh, I am familiar with him. He was
8	part of Rochester Institute of Technology, he was
9	part of classes that I produced for the school
10	and he took over some of those classes after I
11	left, so I'm familiar with him, but he is not a
12	forensic documents expert.
13	Q. He is a highly regarded expert in his
14	field, though, is he not?
15	A. On printing methods, yes.
16	Q. Were you aware that on the second day
17	of inspection, July 15th, Gus Lesnevich would
18	conduct an examination of the questioned
19	documents; correct?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And Gus Lesnevich is widely regarded as
22	one of the leading handwriting experts in the

He is regarded as a forensic document expert.

I don't know what you mean by widely.

23

24

25

world; correct?

Α.

•	1			
•	•	۰		

L. Stewart

Q. Sir, you know, do you not, that Gus
Lesnevich is regarded widely in the expert
community as one of the top handwriting experts
around?

MR. BOLAND: Objection.

A. I will try to answer your question a different way.

I know of instances where he's regarded and I know of instances where he's not, and so when you say highly regarded, that is your adjective, not mine.

- Q. Are you aware that the United States
 Government over the past two decades has often
 retained Gus Lesnevich as their primary
 handwriting expert in their most important high
 profile cases? Are you aware of that, sir?
- A. As a private citizen I would be surprised, but no, I am not aware of that.
- Q. Are you aware that in important cases involving terrorism and potential attacks against the United States of America the Government hires Mr. Lesnevich as their handwriting expert?
- A. As a private citizen, I'd be very surprised, but no, I am not aware of that.

1		
L	L	

L. Stewart

- 2
- Q. Do you have respect for Mr. Lesnevich as a handwriting expert?

4

A. I don't know him, I only know of cases

5

he has been involved in and, as I said, there are some that he is respected on and some that I understand he's not.

7

8

9

Q. And which do you understand he's not respected on?

10

11

A. I don't have citations for you, I just know the field is a fairly small field and I know of things that have been said in the past.

12 13

Q. You are comfortable making that statement --

15

14

MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.

16

Ο.

that up?

disparaging statement about Mr. Lesnevich's

18

17

expertise without having a single fact to back

Are you comfortable making a

19

A. What I'm comfortable with is removing your adjective highly when you describe him as

him that well, I only know what I've heard.

2122

being respected. I don't know that, I don't know

23

24

Q. Tell the Court every fact or piece of

25

evidence that you have to support the notion that

1		
4	-	

- Mr. Lesnevich is not respected as one of the leading handwriting experts in the world.
- A. First, I never said he was not respected; secondly, I don't have facts, I only have what I have been told.
 - Q. Who told you?
- A. Over the years I've heard things at meetings, I've heard things from people that used to work with him in government agencies. I don't have names and instances with me. Again, I don't know the man.
- Q. So tell me who at any meeting ever said a negative word about Mr. Lesnevich.
- A. I can't give you names and meetings at this point. Even if you leave a blank, I don't know if I can give it to you.
- I was answering your question which is a broad question about whether he's highly respected. I answered it the best that I can. If you want specifics, I have to step back and say that I don't know the man.
- Q. Have you heard it being said about Mr. Lesnevich that he is one of the leading handwriting experts in the world?

1	L. Stewart
2	A. I've heard you say it.
3	Q. Have you heard anyone else say it?
4	A. No, I have not.
5	Q. Who would you regard, sir, as the
6	leading handwriting experts in the world?
7	Names, please.
8	A. It depends on if you are talking about
9	with the Government or in private practice.
10	Q. Let's start with private practice.
11	A. I respect Mr. Tytell as a handwriting
12	expert, I respect Mr. Blanco as a handwriting
13	expert, they are both in private practice.
14	Q. Do you respect Mr. Lesnevich as a
15	handwriting expert?
16	A. Again, I don't know him as a
17	handwriting expert.
18	Q. Others besides Mr. Tytell and
19	Mr. Blanco, two experts in this case?
20	A. That I respect in the private field,
21	not as much as those two, no.
22	Q. And in the Government, what handwriting
23	experts do you respect?
24	A. People that have let me break it

down to people that have retired from the

1	L. Stewart
2	Government first. Dave Crown, ex-CIA postal
3	service, and John Hargett, ex-Secret Service; Ed
4	Alford, ex-Secret Service, I respect all of those
5	guys.
6	As far as people that are currently
7	within the Federal Government, I believe Richard
8	Dusak is still with the Secret Service, I respect
9	him as a handwriting expert.
10	Q. Have any of the individuals you've
11	mentioned as worthy of your respect as
12	handwriting experts ever made a single
13	disparaging comment about Gus Lesnevich's skills
14	as an expert?
15	A. My recollection is yes, but I cannot
16	give you a specific statement, I can only tell
17	you that my recollection is that Mr. Hargett,
18	John Hargett did not have a great deal of respect
19	for Mr. Lesnevich.
20	Q. All right.
21	And what do you base that on?

- Q. When was the last time you discussed with Lesnevich with this individual?
 - A. This would have been many years back.

Conversations that he's had with me.

Α.

22

23

24

•	1		
-	L		

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. So if we called Mr. Hargett on the phone and speak with him, do you think he'll remember that conversation?
- A. I doubt he would bring it into a case like this and discuss it with you without being subpoenaed, but I don't know if he would remember it or not. You are asking me for my recollection, not his.
- Q. You are aware, are you not, that none of the plaintiff's experts were present for the hard copy inspection on July 14, 2011?
- A. I would have to check our notes, but I believe that Mr. Blanco showed up late in the day on the 14th.
 - Q. And what do you base that on?
- A. What I believe the notes were, but, again, I don't have that in front of me.
 - Q. What notes are you referring to?
- A. We would have to look at his report where it says when he first got there.
 - Q. Are you aware that on the third day of inspection Mr. LaPorte was scheduled to conduct an examination of the questioned documents?
 - A. A physical examination, not a chemical

1	L. Stewart
2	one, I believe that's correct.
3	Q. And you consider Mr. LaPorte to be a
4	respectable forensic scientist, do you not?
5	A. You've asked me not to disparage him.
6	Q. Well, I am asking you a simple question.
7	A. No, I don't believe he is a respectable
8	forensic scientist.
9	Q. Let me mark what we will say is
10	Defendants' 20.
11	And I did not ask you not to disparage
12	him, you are free to testify as you see fit. I
13	am not in charge of your testimony, I'm just
14	asking questions.
15	(Defendants' Exhibit 20, excerpt from
16	transcript of deposition of Larry Stewart
17	held on March 15, 2010, marked for
18	identification, as of this date.)
19	Q. This is a do you recall testifying
20	again in Florida in March of 2010?
21	A. Not really, but I recall the case.
22	Q. All right.
23	So let's you certainly testified as
24	an expert in the Lake Forest Master Community

case against Orlando Lake Forest Joint Venture;

	rage 130
1	L. Stewart
2	correct?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And this was just a little over two
5	years ago; correct?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. And let's direct your attention to page
8	67 of the transcript, and line 14 is a question
9	and then your answer under oath is at line 16.
10	Can you read the question and answer,
11	please.
12	A. Do you I'm sorry, it does not start
13	with the, that's me.
14	I states "Do you consider Mr. LaPorte
15	to be a respectable forensic scientist?."
16	My answer is "Yes, sir, I believe so."
17	That was then, this is now.
18	Q. Are you aware that on the fourth day of
19	inspection, July 19, 2011, Dr. Al Lyter would
20	examine the questioned documents?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And you have respect for Dr. Lyter as a
23	forensic examiner, do you not?
24	A. Yes, I greatly respect him.
25	Q. And you didn't observe any observations

	_
1	L. Stewart
2	until July 16th, correct, when you observed
3	Mr. LaPorte conduct his exam?
4	A. Again, I'd have to check the dates. I
5	was there for Mr. LaPorte and Mr. Lyter, I
6	believe, at the beginning and also in Chicago.
7	Q. You did not observe in person the
8	examination of Peter Tytell, did you?
9	A. No, I did not.
10	Q. And you did not observe Frank Romano's
11	or Mr. Lesnevich's examinations, did you?
12	A. No, I did not.
13	Q. You did not observe in person the
14	documents presented for inspection until July
15	16th, the day you were there; right?
16	A. If that's the first day I was there,
17	yes.
18	Q. And the first time you saw the Work For
19	Hire document, the original, was on July 16,
20	2011; correct?
21	A. That's what you're telling me without
22	me referring to my notes, I believe you.
23	Q. Now, did you speak with Mr. Blanco
24	after he viewed the Work For Hire document on the

afternoon of July 15th and before you attended

1		
1	•	

L. Stewart

the inspection on the morning of July 16th?

A. I don't remember.

MR. SNYDER: The tape is over, so we're going to need to take a break.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The time is 12:45. This ends tape 2.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record. This is still tape number 2.

MR. SNYDER: Off the record during the break I offered the witness and his lawyer the opportunity to have lunch whenever they wanted to at their pleasure and discretion.

Mr. Stewart off the record said that's fine as long as we're done at 5:30.

I just want to make clear that we have seven hours to complete this deposition, that is seven hours of testimony, and it's highly unlikely we will be done by 5:30. If we can be done, that would be wonderful, but this deposition is not ending at 5:30 if we have not completed what we need to complete and the seven hours hasn't elapsed, so I just want to make that clear. If anyone has

L. Stewart

2

a problem with that, they should speak up now.

24

25

I agree with you about the MR. BOLAND: seven-hour rule, Mr. Snyder. I would just note that we've had two breaks already this morning that your side indicated would be approximately five minutes and one went a half hour and one went 15 minutes, and myself and the witness, while you were out and one of your representatives, I don't know if it was a summer associate or individuals in the back was here, we sat here that entire time except for probably a three-minute break to the bathroom and we assumed it would be a five-minute bathroom break, so we were present and ready for this deposition to continue and the calculation of the seven hours I think in all fairness shouldn't count the decision of your side at your discretion to leave the room for longer than it takes to go 50 feet down the hall to the bathroom and spend a half hour or 40 minutes doing whatever you're doing and then expect that the deposition is essentially

4		
	ı	
_	-	

L. Stewart

suspended while my client and I sit here and
wait.

So I do respect everyone's need for bathroom breaks, et cetera, but the seven-hour calculation, in all fairness, should go relative to a few breaks here and there being taken out of that calculation, it should continue marching on unless my client I have excused ourselves for a half hour or 45 minutes or whatever for whatever purpose.

MR. SNYDER: We disagree. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: I would like to say that I don't have any problem continuing through lunch as well if it's a time problem for you. I have brought snacks and I'm fine to continue.

MR. BOLAND: And I'm prepared to continue as well.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record. The time is 12:48. This ends tape 2. (Recess taken.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record. The time is 12:58. This is tape

	,
1	L. Stewart
2	number 3.
3	MR. SNYDER: I will mark as Defendants'
4	21 a document entitled "STREET FAX."
5	(Defendants' Exhibit 21, two-page
6	document entitled "STREET FAX" dated April
7	28, 2003, marked for identification, as of
8	this date.)
9	BY MR. SNYDER:
10	Q. Are you familiar with this document?
11	A. Yes, I am.
12	Q. What is it?
13	A. A two-page contract bearing the title
14	"STREET FAX" bearing the date of April 28, 2003.
15	Q. And do you know where this document was
16	found?
17	A. No.
18	Q. Did you ever ask anyone about this
19	document?
20	A. Did I ask about it?
21	No.
22	Q. You are aware that this is the document
23	that defendants contend is the authentic contract
24	between Mr. Zuckerberg and Mr. Ceglia; correct?
25	A Ves

1		
1	•	

- Q. When did you first see this document?
 - A. I don't know if I first saw it in

 Buffalo or if I first saw it by way of a scanned

 image prior to that, but it was around that time.
 - Q. And when you saw the document what was your reaction?
 - A. It's a two-page document and it has the signatures for the same two individuals as the document that's in contention in this case.
 - Q. But did you have a particular reaction to the fact that page 1 of this contract makes no reference to Facebook and if authentic means that the contract attached to the complaint is a fake?
 - A. I have no reason to believe that and so no, I cannot say that.
 - Q. What inquiry, if any, did you make to determine whether this contract was authentic before agreeing to continue as an expert in this case?
 - A. I made no actions that way, that makes no sense. It's a document that's in contention in a case and it was submitted as an additional document to look at, but not -- but at the core of this case is a completely different document,

	
1	L. Stewart
2	so I would not have asked to see additional
3	documents relative to the Street Fax.
4	Q. If you concluded as a matter of
5	MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
6	Q. If you concluded that this Street Fax
7	contract was authentic, meaning the contract
8	signed by Mr. Zuckerberg and Mr. Ceglia in March
9	of 2004, would you continue to serve as an expert
10	in this case?
11	A. Well, first off, I did not conclude it
12	was
13	Q. Sir, I'm asking you if hypothetically
14	you were to conclude
15	MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
16	Q. If it was demonstrated to you that that
17	was authentic and you so concluded, would you
18	continue to represent Mr. Ceglia in this case?
19	A. Yes.
20	MR. BOLAND: Objection.
21	A. They are two separate documents, so,
22	yes. It makes no difference to me whether this
23	is an authentic document. It has no bearing on

the other document. The other document stands on

its own.

24

1	1	
4	L	

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Are you aware Mr. Ceglia has submitted
 a sworn statement to the Court that he signed
 only a single contract with Mr. Zuckerberg in
 2004?
 - A. No, I'm not aware of that.
 - Q. If you learned of that -- MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
 - Q. Assume Mr. Zuckerberg and Mr. Ceglia signed only one contract in 2004. Assume further that you concluded that the Street Fax document was authentic, would you still continue to serve as an expert in this case?
 - A. First off, I can't assume any of that.
 - Q. I'm asking you to assume as an expert.
 - A. I can't because I know that the handwriting analysis does not agree with your opinion.
 - Q. Which handwriting analysis on the Street Fax contract doesn't agree with my opinion?
 - A. I know the handwriting analysis on the document in contention in this case, the Facebook contract, Work For Hire contract, the handwriting on that has been identified to Ceglia and

1	
Τ	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

21

22

23

24

- Zuckerberg, so it makes no difference to me what you say about the Street Fax.
 - Q. Sir, do you know where this two-page scan of the Street Fax contract came from?
 - A. A scanner and a computer is all I know, I don't know where.
 - Q. Are you aware that it was attached to an e-mail sent on March 3rd, 2004 by Paul Ceglia to a lawyer named Jim Kole at the Sidley & Austin law firm?
 - MR. BOLAND: Objection.
- A. No, I'm not aware of that.
- Q. Did anyone ever tell you that?
- 15 A. Not that I recall.
 - Q. Did you read that in any of the defendants' papers?
- A. Not that I recall. Again, if I read
 anything about the Street Fax document I went
 past it.
 - Q. Are you aware that it is defendants' position that Paul Ceglia sent that version of the contract to a lawyer at Sidley & Austin in 2004?
- A. No, I'm not aware of that.

1		
L	_	
	_	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

Q. So when you were provided with the

Street Fax contract did you ask where it came

from?

I'm not asking you to look at your report.

MR. SNYDER: Let the record reflect the witness is paging through his report.

- A. I'm trying to answer you correctly.
- Q. I'm asking you based on your recollection, sir.
 - A. I don't recall where it came from.
 - Q. Do you recall asking any lawyer where it came from?
 - A. That's why I was trying to refer to the declaration because under my exhibit list it should show what history I know about the documents.
 - Q. Well, wouldn't it be important to know where that Street Fax contract came from in assessing its effect on the authenticity of the Work For Hire contract?
 - A. It's hard to answer your question.

If you're asking me to rely on one side
of a disputed document's recollection, no, I'm

1		
4	-	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

2 not going to rely on that.

If you're asking me to look at the document and analyze it forensically, then it makes no difference where it came from.

- Q. If you knew that the Street Fax contract had been sent by e-mail from Paul Ceglia to another individual back in 2004, would that affect your opinion regarding the authenticity of the Work For Hire contract?
 - A. No. I don't see why it would.
- Q. You are not offering any expert opinion on the authenticity of the Street Fax contract, are you?
 - A. No, I'm not.
- Q. And you're not offering any opinion on whether Mr. Ceglia had the Street Fax contract on his computer in 2004?
 - A. No, that's not my expertise.
- Q. And you're not offering any opinion as to who specifically sent an e-mail attaching the Street Fax contract in 2004; correct?
- A. No. I don't know the history of the document.
- Q. And you understand that Mr. Ceglia has

1		
L	_	
	_	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

submitted the Work For Hire contract as the
authentic contract between the parties; correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And you're not offering an opinion that the Work For Hire document is the authentic contract signed by the parties in 2004, are you?
- A. I think to be accurate we need to read exactly what my opinion is.
- Q. Am I correct that you are offering an opinion that there's no indication to suggest that the document is a fraud but not offering an opinion that it is the authentic contract actually signed by the parties in 2004?
 - A. That's a fair assessment, yes.
- Q. Are you aware that Mr. Ceglia quoted or referenced purported e-mails in an amended complaint he filed in this case supposedly corroborating the authenticity of the Work For Hire document?
 - A. No.
- Q. Are you aware that it's defendants' position that these purported e-mails quoted in the amended complaint are fabricated?
 - A. No.

1		
4	-	

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 25
- 23 24

- So to be clear, you are offering no Q. expert opinion as to whether or not e-mails quoted in the amended complaint are real or fake?
 - Α. That's correct.
- Are you aware of what spoliation means 0. in the context of a lawsuit?
- There's a forensic meaning and there's Α. a legal meaning. I do not know the legal meaning, I know the forensic meaning.
- In your quarter of a century or more of 0. employment by the United States Government are you familiar with the concept that consciousness of quilt can be established by an individual's destruction of evidence?
 - Α. No, I am not aware of that.
- Are you aware that in this case USB 0. devices containing relevant evidence were destroyed or otherwise disposed of by the plaintiff or others working in concert with him?
 - No, I'm not aware of that. Α.
- 0. If you learned, sir, that USB devices existed in Mr. Ceglia's possession and control during the course of this lawsuit that contained images of the so-called --

1	L. Stewart
2	MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
3	Q images of a contract between
4	Mr. Ceglia and Mr. Zuckerberg, but those USB
5	devices no longer exist and cannot be produced by
6	Mr. Ceglia, would that concern you?
7	A. Only if it's the Work For Hire document
8	and it's different than the document I already
9	had in front of me.
10	Q. Now, you understand that it's
11	defendants' position that when Mr. Argentieri
12	produced the Work For Hire document on the
13	morning of July 14, 2011, when none of
14	plaintiff's experts were present, the document
15	was already damaged?
16	You know that's our position; correct?
17	A. That's your position, yes.
18	Q. And that the ink was faded and the
19	paper was discolored?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Are you aware that Mr. Southwell was
22	present during that examination?
23	A. I believe I saw him on the videotape,
24	but I'm not positive.
25	Q. Are you aware that Ms. Aycock was

1		
_	•	

L. Stewart

2 present?

- A. I believe I saw her as well.
- Q. And are you aware that the former
 United States Attorney for the Western District
 of New York was present on the 15th on the
 defense side?
- A. No, I don't -- I saw people there, but I didn't recognize them. I recognized these two because they were present in Chicago as well.
- Q. And you understand that it's defendants' position that this degradation or damage to the document was done sometime after its production to Mr. Ceglia's former expert Dr. Valery Aginsky on January 15, 2011?
 - A. I understand that's your position, yes.
- Q. And do you understand that a factual basis for this position is the scan of the Work For Hire document taken by Dr. Aginsky in January of 2011?
- A. I understand that his document was scanned on that date, yes.
- Q. And you understand that another factual basis for this position is Dr. Aginsky's statements in his June 2011 declaration

1		
1	•	

L. Stewart

describing the appearance of the ink on the handwritten interlineation as black ballpoint ink?

- A. He did describe it that way, yes.
- Q. And you cannot testify under oath here to this court today, sir, can you, that plaintiff presented his then expert Dr. Aginsky with the same paper document as he produced to defendants' experts in July of 2011, can you?
- A. You mean to the chain of custody, whether it's the exact same document, no, I cannot.
- Q. So it is possible, sir, that the plaintiff or his lawyers gave Dr. Aginsky one document and gave defendants' experts on July 14th a different document in July of 2011?
 - A. No, I do not believe so.
- Q. But you don't know what document was given to Dr. Aginsky because you weren't there?
- A. No. I'm basing that on the scanned image that he took and the alignment of the interlineation between that and the document we have today.
- Q. You understand that it's defendants' position that the testing performed by

1	
J	_

L. Stewart

defendants' experts did not cause any damage to the Work For Hire document?

- A. I understand that's your position, yes.
- Q. So just to be clear about what your actual opinions are on these issues and the factual basis of your opinions, I just want to ask you a couple of questions.

Is it your opinion that when the Work For Hire document was presented to defendants' experts on the morning of July 14th outside the presence of any of plaintiff's experts, it was undamaged other than the normal wear and tear associated with an eight-year-old document?

- A. I can't attest to that because I was not there. I can only go by the evidence that your side has produced which is the videotape and also the images taken by Mr. Tytell and the notes that were taken by the experts.
- Q. It is your opinion that the ink was black when it was presented to the defendants at 9:11 a.m. on July 14, 2011?
- A. That's not my opinion. The evidence speaks for itself.
 - Q. You have no idea, sir, what the color

	luge 110
1	L. Stewart
2	of the ink was on the original document at 9:11
3	a.m. on July 14th, do you, sir, because you
4	weren't there?
5	A. No. All I have are the notes from your
6	experts and the video and the images.
7	Q. The notes of our expert indicate that
8	the ink was faded the minute that Mr. Argentieri
9	took it out of his envelope; correct?
10	A. No. Mr. Tytell's notes don't indicate
11	that till later on.
12	Q. You have read Mr. Tytell's report,
13	though?
14	A. Right.
15	Q. And what is his position about the
16	color of the ink on the 14th?
17	A. I believe he said, and I am
18	characterizing because I don't have it in front
19	of me, that he immediately noticed. However,
20	that's different than his notes.
21	Q. You have no opinion that the ink was
22	MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
23	Q. So it's not your opinion that the ink
24	was

MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.

•	•	
-	_	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

Q. Am I correct that your report does not talk about the condition of the ink when it was presented to our experts at 9:11 a.m.?

- A. I believe there are components of my report that do address that, but, again, that's based on the notes, the videotape and the images taken by your experts.
- Q. Let's look at the videotape and tell us what on the videotape enables you to conclude that the ink on page 1 of the document presented for inspection was not faded and discolored.

So let me direct your attention to the --

- A. I don't know that I can do that component from the videotape.
 - Q. Let's look at the videotape.

MR. SNYDER: Let the record reflect that we are projecting on the screen from the video embedded in document 189 -- my team wants me to do this a little bit later, so let's hold the video.

Q. So is it your opinion that the ink coloration on the morning of July 14th, 2011 was the same as it did in Dr. Aginsky's scans taken

	rage 150
1	L. Stewart
2	in January of 2011?
3	A. No, that's not my opinion.
4	Q. Do you have any opinion about how the
5	ink differed between the time Mr. Aginsky
6	photographed the document and the time it was
7	taken out of the envelope at 9:11 a.m. by
8	Mr. Argentieri?
9	MR. SNYDER: Let the record reflect
10	that the witness is reviewing his report.
11	A. I believe, to answer your question,
12	there is nothing in my report that describes the
13	appearance of the ink when it was first viewed on
14	the videotape.
15	Q. So you have no expert opinion about
16	what the ink looked like on the Work For Hire
17	document when Mr. Argentieri removed if from an
18	envelope at 9:11 a.m. on July 14th; correct?
19	A. No. I only have the first scan that
20	was taken by your experts which was shortly after
21	that.
22	Q. So you keep on talking about
23	Dr. Tytell's Mr. Tytell's notes.

Tell us about those notes, sir.

Let me get to that portion of my

Α.

24

1		
4	-	

L. Stewart

2 document.

I misstated this a moment ago. I think, I believe I stated that Mr. Tytell indicated that he immediately saw discoloration, and based on my report here on paragraph 123 it shows Lesnevich stated he immediately saw the documents were discolored and he made high resolution scans. I then compared that against the scans that Mr. Tytell took and noted that there is a difference.

Q. Sir, you told this court repeatedly this afternoon that you based your opinion about the ink on three pieces of evidence: Mr. Tytell's notes, the video, and images that were taken at 9:11 a.m. So I'm asking you about the notes.

What notes did you base that opinion on?

- A. The only notes that I have been provided to date are those that were included in the reports or declarations that were issued by your experts back, I believe, in March.
- Q. Sir, can you -- do you recall

 Dr. Tytell saying that he immediately noticed that the ink was faded in his report?
 - A. No. My report indicated Mr. Lesnevich

1	L. Stewart
2	stated that
3	Q. Do you recall whether Mr. Tytell did as
4	well?
5	A. No. If we have his document I can read
6	it. I don't have it with me.
7	Q. Were you telling the truth when you
8	said that you reviewed Mr. Tytell's notes?
9	A. Yes. Everything that was included in
10	the reports by all the experts I reviewed.
11	Q. Were you telling the truth when you
12	told the Court that you reviewed Dr. Tytell's
13	notes? Not his report, his notes.
14	MR. BOLAND: Objection. There is no
15	reason to raise your voice, Mr. Snyder.
16	MR. SNYDER: I am not raising my voice.
17	I emphasize because I can't use a bold or
18	underscore the word "notes."
19	A. We may have a different definition.
20	I am referring to as notes everything
21	included in his report as attachments of things
22	that he did during his examination. I had that
23	for a number of the experts and I reviewed all of
2 /	that

MR. SNYDER: Can we please go back, Mr.

1	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

Court Reporter to -- I know your name -- to where he testified about handwritten notes of Mr. Tytell being different than the report, I need to go back to that question. (Record read.)

You testified, sir, that Mr. Tytell's Q. notes don't indicate that he noticed the faded ink until later on, that was your testimony here today.

Can you explain what you meant by that?

Α. Certainly. I thought I already had.

When I referred to my documents directly I corrected that and said that it appears that it was Mr. Lesnevich that I was referring to.

As far as Mr. Tytell's notes, I only have what was provided in the March declaration reports.

- You testified under oath here today 0. that you reviewed notes that Mr. Lesnevich took during the course of the examination?
- Α. I can tell you exactly what I reviewed. Referring to Mr. Tytell's document number 238, that document has included with it

1		
4	-	

L. Stewart

whatever you guys submitted through that document as exhibits and that included some of the documentation and scanned images, so I'm referring to all of that as his notes.

Q. Are you aware that Mr. Tytell's report submitted in this case states that it was immediately apparent that the ink was faded brown or light tan, almost transparent in some places?

Do you recall that?

- A. That's what his report states, yes.
- Q. And are you aware that Mr. Tytell's report states that immediately noticeable was the appearance of the writing ink on the document?
- A. That's what his report, it's contradicting the other expert in the case on your side.
 - Q. Which expert?
- A. I believe it's Lesnevich, I already referred to that in my report.
 - Q. Sir, you are aware that Tytell states that surprising to him was that the ink was light tan or faded brown, not at all the kind of appearance that I would expect for black ballpoint ink after eight years, and in total

	
1	L. Stewart
2	accord was Mr. Tytell who said immediately
3	apparent that the ink of all of the handwriting
4	material was a faded brown, almost transparent.
5	Are you aware of that, sir?
6	A. I'm not I'm assuming you are reading
7	it correctly, so yes, I am aware of that.
8	Q. And are you aware Mr. Lesnevich came to
9	a contrary conclusion in his report?
10	A. I already referred to that earlier
11	today; I'll find it again and refer to it again
12	if you give me a moment.
13	Q. Are you aware that Mr. Lesnevich was
14	not even present at the inspection on July 14th,
15	sir?
16	A. I'm still trying to answer your
17	previous question.
18	MR. SNYDER: Withdraw the last
19	question.
20	Q. You'd agree that if Mr. Lesnevich was
21	not there on the 14th he couldn't offer an
22	opinion what about he saw firsthand on the 14th
23	when the document was removed from the envelope;

That would make sense. That's why I'm

correct?

Α.

24

1	L. Stewart
2	trying to refer to my notes and my report so I
3	can give you the accurate information. You keep
4	stopping me.
5	Q. Why don't you tell the Court right now
6	which expert from the defense side contradicted
7	Tytell's and Romano's sworn statements that upon
8	visual inspection of the document at 9:11 a.m. on
9	the 14th they were surprised to see that the ink
10	was faded?
11	A. I will try to do that again. If I can
12	finish this time, then I'll give you the answer.
13	I'll correct things as we go by reading
14	this.
15	I was there in Buffalo July 16th
16	through the 19th.
17	I refer to the time in the video of one
18	minute and 14 seconds to one minute and 17
19	seconds.
20	Q. Sir, I'm asking you a simple question.
21	You said that one of our experts
22	contradicted our other experts about the color of
23	the ink when it was taken out of the envelope by
24	Mr. Argentieri at 9:11 a.m.

Which defense expert contradicted the

1
_

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

statements of Romano and Tytell that upon immediately inspecting the document visually at 9:11 a.m. they saw discolored, faded ink?

A. I'm trying to answer that for you, if I can continue.

MR. SNYDER: Let the record reflect that the witness has been reviewing his declaration for the past several minutes, the video will determine exactly how long.

- A. I have 388 pages, so it may take me a while.
- Q. Well, you made a very serious charge there, sir, and I'm asking you to tell the Court what you base that testimony on.
 - A. I'm trying to.

MR. BOLAND: And the record should reflect he is answering your question, attempting to answer your question, and it is taking this effort he is engaged in to do that.

- A. I begin discussing what we're talking about here on my paragraph number 119.
- Q. Sir, I'm asking you a very specific question.

	4		
	ı		
•			

L. Stewart

You testified here to the Court that Lesnevich and then later you said an expert contradicted Romano's and Tytell's observation that immediately noticeable at 9:11 a.m. on July 14th was the faded discolored appearance of the writing ink on the document.

I'm asking you now to tell the Court on what did you base that testimony.

- A. I'm trying to and you keep stopping me.

 I am back to 119 where it begins and that over
 the next few paragraphs, many paragraphs,
 discusses it.
- As I mentioned before -- well, I'm not going to be taken out of context again.

What I'd like to do is read that whole segment into the --

- Q. No, sir, I am not asking you to read your report into the record.
 - A. Then I can't answer your question.
- Q. Sir, you're going to answer my question, so here's the question:

You told this court that Mr. Lesnevich contradicted Tytell and Romano in their opinion that the ink was discolored and faded at 9:11

1	L.	Stewart

2 a.m. on the 14th.

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- What did you base that testimony about Mr. Lesnevich on?
- A. First, I didn't say any of that about 9:11 or any of that, those are all your words.

I'm trying to read to you all my findings concerning that which discusses exactly what I found and what I can talk about. I can't talk about anything else out of the scope of my report.

- Q. Tell the Court the name of the expert who contradicted our other experts, the name.
 - A. Okay. I will start reading --
- Q. No, sir, I am not asking you to read your report.

MR. BOLAND: Objection.

- Q. I'm asking you to give the name, first and last name of the expert who you said under oath in this deposition today contradicted other defense experts about the color of the ink.
 - A. Okay.

We will start with Lesnevich, who stated he immediately saw the documents were discolored at 9:00 a.m., not 9:11 on 7/15/11.

•	1		
	_	_	

L. Stewart

We are talking about the 14th, sir,

- 2
- Q. 3 July 14th, sir.
- 4
- I can only go by the images and the Α. material that was passed on by you to me.
- 6

7

- Sir, what day was the document first examined by Mr. Tytell and Mr. Romano?
- 8
- I believe it was on the 14th. Α.
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- 0. And are you aware that Mr. Lesnevich did not examine the document until the 15th and was not present physically in Buffalo, New York on the 14th?
- Α. That's correct, he first examined it on 7/15 at 9:00 a.m.
- So tell the Court which expert who Q. examined the document on July 14th contradicted defense experts about the color of the ink as you just testified?
- With your scope you can't do that. Α. The contradiction occurs on the 15th.
- Are you aware that Mr. Lesnevich states in his declaration submitted on November 28, 2011 in this case that when I was first presented with the document at approximately 9:00 a.m. on the 15th it was clear that the integrity of the

1		
_	-	

L. Stewart

document was already severely degraded, the paper had a discolored appearance and the writing pen ink was very faint?

- A. That's correct, and that's what I'm referring to when he says he immediately saw the documents were discolored.
- Q. The day after Tytell and Romano made the same observation.
- A. They didn't make that same observation the day before.
- Q. Sir, I will show you the reports of Mr. Tytell and Mr. Romano, if you like, and read for you where they make the exact same finding.

Do I need to do that to refresh your memory?

- A. I don't need the report, I've got their scanned images, and the scanned images are very telling.
- Q. So in fact, sir, none of the expert opinions offered by the defendants contradicted one another with respect to the color of the ink; correct?
- A. No, that's completely wrong. Their own images contradict each other.

1	L. Stewart
2	MR. SNYDER: The record will speak for
3	itself.
4	Q. Did you rely at all on Mr. Argentieri's
5	declaration with regard to any opinion you are
6	rendering about the color of the ink?
7	A. No. I'm not even aware that he did a
8	declaration.
9	Q. Did you read a declaration submitted by
10	the videographer present who took the images,
11	Mr. Gianatto (phonetic)?
12	A. Yes, I believe I did read that.
13	Q. And were you relying on Mr. Gianatto's
14	statements at all in forming your expert opinion?
15	A. No, not at all.
16	Q. So just for the record, what is your
17	opinion, if any, about the color of the ink at
18	9:11 a.m. on July 14th, 2011? Was it faded?
19	A. At 9:00 a.m
20	Q. 9:11 a.m. on July 14, 2011.
21	A. I'm not hard of hearing, I'm right here.
22	At 9:11, I don't know exactly what the
23	appearance was, I can only go by the video
24	scanned images that were submitted to me and the

date stamps that are on them.

ı	

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

L. Stewart

2	I know that if we looked at Mr.
3	Tytell's initial scan from July 14th it is white
4	and clear and if you look at the yellowing on
5	Mr. Lesnevich from the day next, the next day,
6	it's completely different.

Q. I'm talking about the ink handwritten interlineation on page 1 on July 14th, 9:11.

Was it faded when it was presented at 9:11 a.m., the ink?

- A. We can't tell that from the cropped image that you guys produced, we can only tell that the document itself was faded and changed.
- Q. The image in your report, though, that you present is cropped by you and you cropped out the handwritten portion; correct?
- A. This -- you're looking at what I've got in my report. I don't know if I have for that image what the entire scan was.
- Q. I'm going to show you a scan taken by Mr. Tytell and ask you to look at it, please.

We'll give you as the next exhibit, 22, which is Exhibit F to our motion and it's the report of Peter Tytell.

(Defendants' Exhibit 22, one-page

1		
_	L	

L. Stewart

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

document labeled "Exhibit F" with attached report by Peter V. Tytell dated March 25, 2012, marked for identification, as of this date.)

I will direct your attention to his 0. scan, which is Exhibit A to his report.

And you would agree, would you not, that the ink, the writing pen ink on this scan has an appearance that is faint or faded as opposed to a dark ballpoint pen; correct?

- Α. Yes, the entire document is miscolored.
- Q. Thank you.
- But to correct your incorrect Α. statement, you just mentioned this is document 330 and I'm referring to document 238-2, which is visibly white.

The one you're showing me is visibly orangeish-brown and I referred to the scanned image, the best TIFF image available, not a document that's been produced so many times on a photocopier, so I don't know what you want me to talk about with your document, I can only go on the best evidence which is my scan of 238-2.

Are you telling the Court under oath Q.

1	L. Stewart
2	today that Mr. Tytell has some scan that he took
3	at 9:11 a.m. that's different than the scan that
4	you are looking at as Exhibit A, sir?
5	A. Yes. This is an unmanipulated scan
6	directly from the image that was submitted to me,
7	document 238-2, which is completely white,
8	compared to the document you are showing me with
9	document 330.
10	Q. And what is the color of the ink on
11	238-2?
12	A. I don't know. I've got a cropped image
13	here.
14	Q. Who cropped that image?
15	A. I don't it could have been me, I
16	could have the full thing in the back here or it
17	could have been when it was submitted to me. I
18	will have to check. It is part of
19	Q. We are going to get 238-2 in a minute
20	and show it to you.
21	So since you can't see the handwritten
22	interlineation on the cropped image that you have
23	in your report you can't point to a single

document of an image taken at 9:11 on July 14th

that has ink that is not discolored, can you?

24

•	•	
-	_	

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- A. I can only assume that with this much difference between the white and the yellow document there's been some discoloration, but I cannot point to it, I can only go by your own images.
 - Q. Now, it's your opinion that the Work For Hire document's paper was white when it was presented to defendants' experts on the morning of July 14th; correct?
 - A. Not in my opinion. It's Mr. Tytell and what he submitted here. It's Tytell Exhibit B, document 238-2, it's white.
 - Q. Sir, are you aware that Dr. Tytell says something to the contrary in his report, namely that the document was not white, it was discolored?
 - A. That's part of the contradiction I'm talking about.
 - Q. So you are aware that Mr. Tytell in fact has asserted under oath that he observed that the document was light tan or faded brown?
 - A. Which corresponds with your document 330, but it does not correspond with the document 238-2.

1	L. Stewart
2	MR. SNYDER: We are going to take a
3	break and get that document.
4	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
5	record. The time is 1:43.
6	(Recess taken.)
7	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
8	record. The time is 1:53.
9	MR. SNYDER: I'm going to mark as
10	Defendants' 23 the declaration of Peter
11	Tytell dated November 28, 2011, document 238
12	on the docket.
13	
	(Defendants' Exhibit 23, declaration of
14	Peter Tytell dated November 28, 2011, marked
15	for identification, as of this date.)
16	BY MR. SNYDER:
17	Q. I'm going to hand that to you.
18	Let me direct your attention first to
19	paragraph 29 of Mr. Tytell's declaration.
20	Do you recall this illustration where
21	Mr. Tytell compares an image of the handwriting
22	on page 1 of the Work For Hire document taken
23	from the scanned image of page 1 from Dr. Aginsky
24	in January 2011 with a similar portion of the

scanned image at page 1 that he made at 9:18 a.m.

1	L. Stewart
2	on July 14, 2011?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And do you recall that the condition of
5	the handwriting appears markedly different in the
6	two scans?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. Now, you said that you have a cropped
9	image of 238-2 and that was a document you were
10	relying on in providing your expert testimony, so
11	I'm going to direct your attention now to 238-2.
12	If you go toward the back of Mr. Tytell's
13	declaration you'll see his scanned image of the
14	Work For Hire contract that he took immediately
15	after Mr. Argentieri removed the document from
16	the envelope in the Harris Beach offices on July
17	14th, 2011.
18	Do you see the condition of the
19	handwriting ink on page 1 of that scan?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. How would you describe it?
22	A. It appears faded and the document
23	appears brownish.
24	Q. You would agree that the appearance of
25	the ink at 0.10 a m on July 14 2011 is markedly

1	L. Stewart
2	dissimilar from the appearance of the ink that
3	Dr. Aginsky photographed earlier in the year?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And you are offering no expert
6	opinion
7	MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
8	Q. You are offering no expert opinion,
9	sir, are you, about what happened to this
10	document between 1/13/11 when Dr. Aginsky
11	photographed it and 9:11 a.m. when Mr. Argentieri
12	appeared at the offices of Harris Beach with the
13	document in a Redweld?
14	A. He says that's on the 14th.
15	No, I'm not reaching any conclusion
16	between Aginsky and the 14th.
17	Q. And did you ask Mr. Ceglia or
18	Mr. Argentieri what if anything they did to the
19	document between January 2011 and July 14, 2011
20	to cause the handwritten ink to become faded?
21	A. No, of course I didn't ask them that.
22	Based on the scanned images of your
23	experts, the fading occurred between the 14th and
24	the 15th

Sir, are you aware that the scan that

Q.

7		
_	-	

L. Stewart

you just identified as discolored, faded ink was taken by Mr. Tytell just six and a half minutes after -- or less, after Mr. Argentieri removed it and placed it on the table before any testing was done, any lights were used or anything was done to the document other than it being laid on a table by the lawyer?

A. I am not aware of when this image was taken, I am only aware of the meta tags that are on the images that were submitted and those meta tags indicate that the image produced by Tytell on the 14th was quite a bit whiter than this document that you produced on a 400-dot-per-inch copier.

I'm going on a mini megabyte image that is a TIFF image and I imagine my image is clearer than yours. There has been no change to the image and you can see in the report that it's white when Tytell did it and it's yellow when Lesnevich did it the day after.

- Q. I'm talking about the ink, sir.
- A. I'm talking about the document.
- Q. I'm talking about the ink, sir.
- A. You are showing me a brown document

1	L. Stewart
2	that doesn't match anything that I was provided.
3	Q. Sir, were you provided with Dr. Tytell's
4	scan?
5	A. Mr. Tytell's
6	Q. Were you provided with Dr. Tytell's
7	scan?
8	A. I don't know a Dr. Tytell, I know a
9	Mr. Tytell and
10	Q. Mr. Tytell's scan is before you in
11	238-2; correct?
12	A. No. What's before me is your printing
13	of a document. I was provided the actual
14	document that was filed with the Court and in
15	there are scanned images that I used.
16	Q. Sir, I just handed you the document
17	that was filed with the Court by Mr. Tytell.
18	A. No. You handed me a photocopied
19	version of the file.
20	Q. Mr. Tytell testified under oath, swore
21	under oath that this image was taken at 9:18 a.m.
22	on July 14th.
23	Do you have any reason to think that
24	Mr. Tytell is not telling the truth?

No, not at all.

Α.

L. Stewart

- Q. And do you see that the image that he took at 9:18 a.m. shows a discolored faded ink?
- A. It's discolored along with the entire document.
- Q. What is your opinion about what happened to the ink between the time that Mr. Argentieri took it out of the envelope and the time that Mr. Tytell photographed it minutes later to cause it to become faded?
- A. When Mr. Argentieri took it out of the envelope on the 14th the scanned images appear white, when he took it out on the 15th they appear yellow.
- Q. Point to a document in the record, sir, that shows the condition of the ink being bold minutes after Mr. Argentieri took it out of the envelope.
- A. Again, my images are of the entire document, not strictly the ink, so I don't have an image like that.
- Q. Show me an image in your report that shows the condition of the ink being bold on July 14th, 2011.
 - A. I think I just told you I have got a

1	١		
_	L		

L. Stewart

different segment of a document scanned in here.

- Q. You mean because you cropped the document in your report to eliminate the appearance of the ink; right, sir?
- A. Why would I do that? I've got the white versus yellow document right here, it doesn't matter if I include the ink or not, and I have the scanned images, it's just not in this report.
 - Q. Where is it, sir?
- A. In the images that I provided to you in discovery back in November.
- Q. Is it your testimony, sir, under oath here today before this court on the video camera that you saw a version of document 238-2 filed by Mr. Tytell which bears handwriting ink on page 1 in bold pen? Is that your sworn testimony here today?
- A. No, it's not. I have shown you that I don't have the image of the ink there, I only have the top of the document shown there.
- Q. Have you ever seen any version of Mr. Tytell's scan from July 14, 2011 that has bold handwriting ink on the first page?

	4		
	ı		
•			

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

L. Stewart

- I don't know. I've got those images Α. and you've got them as well, so I don't know.
- Isn't it a fact that every single scan Q. that Mr. Tytell has produced from the 14th is consistent with his visual finding that the ink on page 1 was noticeably faded and not bold as it was when Mr. Aginsky took the scan in January?
- Α. I don't know about that particular scope of your statement, I don't know about the ink part. I'm talking about the document itself being white or yellow.
- Q. You are talking about the color of the document, not the condition of the ink; correct?
 - Α. At this point, yes.
- Ο. So you are offering no opinion here today, sir, about the condition or color of the ink on page 1 as it appeared when Mr. Argentieri took it out of the envelope and put it on the table?
 - Α. No, I can't opine about that.
- Q. Now, as we've discussed, defendants' examination began on the morning of July 14, 2011; correct?
 - Correct. Α.

	rage 175
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. And you weren't there, but you've
3	reviewed the video of that day of examination;
4	correct?
5	A. Correct.
6	Q. So you are aware, then, that at 9:11
7	a.m. Paul Argentieri removed the Work For Hire
8	document and the specifications document from a
9	United States Postal Service envelope?
10	A. I don't know the exact time, but I'm
11	aware that he removed it.
12	Q. Are you aware that he then placed those
13	documents on the black conference room table?
14	A. It's kind of black.
15	Q. Did he place them face up or face down?
16	A. I believe he placed them face up.
17	Q. And how do you know that?
18	A. My recollection.
19	Q. Recollection of what?
20	A. The videotape.
21	Q. And you rely on the video for your
22	opinion about the appearance of the Work For Hire

document when it was first produced to the

defendants' experts; correct?

In part, yes.

Α.

23

24

1		
7	_	

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

L. Stewart

Q. As an expert, would you rely on the visual observations of Mr. Tytell as being valid, meaning Mr. Tytell, you know, said he immediately noticed that the paper was discolored and the ink was faded?

Do you think Mr. Tytell was telling the truth when he notes his immediate observations?

- A. I don't know. I mean, I assume Mr. Tytell is an honest person.
- Q. And you are relying on the video in your report; correct?
 - A. Video and scanned images, yes.
- Q. And prior to making your report you reviewed the video clip; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And let's look at the video clip in the brief. We will look at the one embedded in the plaintiff's motions for sanctions, which is document number 189.
- So am I correct, sir, that you are crediting -- you are disagreeing with
- 23 Mr. Tytell's visual inspection and conclusions -24 MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
- Q. You're disagreeing with Mr. Tytell's

	Page 1//
1	L. Stewart
2	opinion that the document was discolored, which
3	he bases on his visual inspection, based on your
4	review of the video; is that correct?
5	A. No, not at all.
6	Mr. Tytell's initial observations were,
7	I believe, that it was a tanned document or it
8	had some coloration to it. I don't know if that
9	is halfway between white and yellow, I don't know
10	where it occurred, all I know is that he made
11	that observation and that he scanned in the
12	document and now I am relying at that point on
13	the scanned image.
14	Q. He also concluded, which you are
15	opining on, that the ink was discolored; correct?
16	A. I don't know if he said discolored,
17	faded or what, I don't recall his exact words at
18	this time.
19	MR. SNYDER: Let's look at the video.
20	(The video file was played.)
21	Q. So Mr. Argentieri is opening the
22	envelope, is he not?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And he is removing what appear to be

two U.S. Postal Service envelopes that are in the

24

	rage 170	
1	L. Stewart	
2	larger envelope and he is opening one; correct?	
3	A. Correct.	
4	MR. BOLAND: Can you just reiterate	
5	what document this is coming from for the	
6	record?	
7	MR. SNYDER: I will in a moment.	
8	MR. BOLAND: Very well.	
9	Q. And now he's removing something from	
10	the envelope; correct?	
11	A. Not yet, but	
12	Q. He is about to, it is 9:11:40, okay?	
13	A. Yes.	
14	Q. And he's put two pages down.	
15	MR. SNYDER: Can you freeze it there,	
16	please.	
17	Q. Can you tell me, do you see the title	
18	"Work For Hire Contract" on either of those	
19	pieces of paper based on the video at 9:11:51?	
20	A. No.	
21	Q. Can you tell me which piece of paper i	s
22	page 1 and which is page 2?	
23	A. No.	
24	Q. Can you show me where the handwritten	

interlineations are on this video still?

1	
2	

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- A. Of course not, I can't tell you which one is page 1 or page 2.
- Q. Can you show me where the signature of Mark Zuckerberg and Paul Ceglia are in this?
 - A. Same answer as before.
- Q. You can't see any text on either of those pages based on the video, can you?
 - A. No.
 - Q. You can't see any ink, can you?
- A. No. I can see what appears to be little lines on it, but I can't tell what's ink and what's printed.
 - Q. And to the naked eye these could be blank documents as well as text-laden documents; correct?
 - A. No, I don't think so. I see little lines where printing appears to be.
 - Q. But you can't see any distinct features in these videos, whether it's signatures, handwriting or content of any kind; correct?

 MR. BOLAND: Objection.
 - A. From that stilled frame, no, I can't.
 - Q. And what's your factual basis for asserting that the document is face up?

•	1		
	ı		
•	-		

L. Stewart

- A. When you look at the video in its entirety I believe there's a segment where you can see that it's placed face up.
- Q. So you agree with me that on the video the pages of the documents are so washed out at the moment that they are produced and laid out on the table that you cannot see the printed text; correct?
- A. No. As I testified before, I can see subtle little lines there, I can't tell what's printing and what's handwriting, and so in that particular still image of the video I cannot make it out.
- Q. But it is this video that you're relying on as the factual basis for your opinion that Mr. Tytell's visual observation of the document was invalid and that your conclusion that the Work For Hire document was white when it was produced is valid; is that correct?
- A. No, I've never said that. I have no reason to dispute his initial observation that he was looking at a tanned document with discolored ink. He had no comparison at that point and he didn't know what it looked like before unless he

	Page 181
1	L. Stewart
2	had been shown scanned images, so I have no
3	reason to dispute that it was tanned at that
4	point.
5	Q. And you just said that Mr. Tytell
6	didn't know what it looked like before unless he
7	had been shown scanned images.
8	Was that your testimony?
9	A. Right. I think that's the first time
10	he saw the original document.
11	Q. But you know that he had high-quality
12	images taken by a very reputable forensic
13	examiner named Dr. Aginsky who provided us with
14	scans that showed the document not discolored and
15	the ink bold and dark; correct?
16	A. I don't know what Dr. Aginsky provided
17	Mr. Tytell.
18	Q. You know what Dr. Aginsky provided to
19	you; correct?
20	A. That's correct.
21	Q. And the document had a very distinctly
22	different appearance when he took a photograph of
23	it than when Mr. Tytell did on July 14th; correct?
24	A. That's correct, at that point it was
25	white with distinct ink.

1	L. Stewart
2	Q. Meaning in January?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And were you involved, sir, personally
5	in any way in putting together the video clip
6	that was uploaded onto YouTube that was a video
7	of the July 14th examination?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Are you aware that a YouTube clip was
10	uploaded onto YouTube?
11	MR. SNYDER: Withdrawn.
12	Q. Are you aware that a video clip of the
13	July 14th inspection was uploaded onto YouTube?
14	A. I'm aware there is a video clip online,
15	I'm not sure if it was YouTube or not.
16	Q. And you were not involved in its
17	creation or editing at all?
18	A. No.
19	MR. SNYDER: We are going let the court
20	reporter get some lunch and then we can
21	proceed whenever as we are all ready.
22	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
23	record. The time is 2:13. This ends tape
24	number 3.
25	(Lunch recess: 2:13 p.m.)

1	١		
_	L		

2

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

3

(Time noted: 2:51 p.m.)

4

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the

5

record. The time is 2:51. This is tape

6

number 4.

7

MR. SOUTHWELL: We are back on the

8

record in the afternoon for Mr. Stewart's

9

deposition. I just want to note the

10

appearance of Anna Chase, a summer associate

11

with our firm who is here.

12

MR. BOLAND: And for Mr. Southwell, I

13 14 just want to put on the record we are coming

15

with the agreement of both parties, for the

back from a break that was made, I think

16

benefit of the court reporter for

17

approximately 20 minutes and that the

18

videographer, the court reporter and the

19

witness and myself were back in this room at

2021

2:30 promptly prepared to continue with the deposition and it's now 2:52 and the defense

22

counsel is now back and ready to begin.

2 4

LARRY F. STEWART, resumed and

24

23

testified as follows:

25

EXAMINATION BY

	rage 104
1	L. Stewart
2	MR. SOUTHWELL:
3	Q. Mr. Stewart, did you have any
4	conversations with Mr. Boland over the lunch
5	break about the substance of this case or the
6	deposition?
7	A. Not about the case. I talked about his
8	shoes and I talked to him about some software
9	that he's using.
10	Q. Did you discuss the substance of
11	deposition with Mr. Boland?
12	A. Not at all.
13	Q. You testified earlier about a
14	conversation you had with Mr. Ceglia concerning
15	some facts which you then say that you asked him
16	to put a declaration in to that effect.
17	Do you recall those questions and
18	answers?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And are you aware that he filed a
21	declaration on approximately June 4th of 2012?
22	A. Yes, I am.
23	Q. Your conversation with him was shortly

It was it was quite a bit before that.

before that; is that right?

Α.

24

1	
2	Q. App
3	A. A f
4	Q. A i
5	declaration o
6	saying?
7	A. It
8	Q. So
9	frame?
10	A. I h
11	was around er
12	right after y
13	Q. So
14	experts filed
15	about how so
16	you had this
17	A. Il
18	them within t

- Q. Approximately when was that?
- A. A few months before.
- Q. A few months before he filed his declaration on June 4th; is that what you are saying?
 - A. I believe so, yes.
- Q. So April of 2012, roughly in that time frame?
- A. I believe, if I recall correctly, it was around end of March, beginning of April, right after your experts filed reports.
- Q. So if I told you that the defendants experts filed their reports on March 26, 2012, about how soon after that do you think it was you had this conversation with Mr. Ceglia?
- A. I believe we had a conference call with them within two weeks, within a week or two weeks of that time.
- Q. And it was on that conference call that you say Mr. Ceglia spoke for a couple of minutes and provided his story about where the purported Work For Hire document had been allegedly stored; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.

19

20

21

22

23

24

•	1	
	ı	
	_	

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

Q. You testified earlier that part of your role was to oversee the plaintiff's experts and that you did that with respect to Dr. Aginsky and you said that you reviewed his report and e-mails, I think is perhaps what you said.

What do you recall reviewing of

What do you recall reviewing of Mr. Aginsky's?

A. I don't recall any e-mails.

There was something that he produced, I believe, back in June of 2011 that was filed in the case and I recall reviewing that and I believe that described his physical examination of the document.

- Q. If I were to tell you there is declaration in the record filed on June 17, 2011 in relation to a motion for expedited discovery by the defendants, does that sound like the document that you were referring to that you reviewed?
- A. That sounds like the correct frame, time frame.
- Q. Was there anything else of Dr. Aginsky's that you reviewed in your role as overseeing the plaintiff's experts?

1			
	l		

A. I believe his images were provided as the first images that were available and I

L. Stewart

- 4 believe I got that from Mr. Argentieri.
- Q. Those were his images of January 2011;
 6 is that right?
- 7 A. I believe so.
 - Q. Now, you are not an expert in video or film; correct?
- 10 A. No, I'm not.
- 11 Q. You are not an expert in forensic video 12 analysis; correct?
- 13 A. No.

8

- 14 Q. You are not a videographer?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. Have you taken a course or seminar on forensic video analysis from any law enforcement association?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. Ever taken a course or seminar in
 forensic video analysis from the International
 Association for Identification?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. You don't have any specialized training regarding film or video; correct?

Do you know if he used any additional

Α.

Q.

lighting?

No.

23

24

1		
1	•	

- 2
- I believe he did not, but that's just Α. my recollection.
- 4

5

3

- Your recollection is that he used Ο. whatever the office background lighting was;
- 6

7

correct?

other?

or not.

- Α. That's correct.
- 8

9

- Are you aware of whether in Buffalo in Q. the conference room the shades were drawn or open?
- 10
- Α. No. I'd have to look at the videotape.
- 11
- 0. You don't remember one way or the
- 12
- Α. I don't recall, no.
- 13 14
- What about in the conference room in 0. the inspection that occurred in Chicago, do you
- 15 16
- remember whether there were shades there?
- 17
- I don't recall if they were left open Α.

Buffalo conference room the shades were closed

- 18
- 19 Q. If I were to tell you that in the
- 20
- 21 and the lighting was mostly artificial
- fluorescent lighting, would that refresh your 22
- 23

24

Α. No.

recollection?

- 25
- And although you are not an expert in Q.

1				L.	St
2	video	analvsis.	vou	are	а

video analysis, you are aware, are you not, that fluorescent lighting is different than natural light particularly when it relates to sort of the color temperatures and the appearance of things; is that fair to say?

ewart

- 7 MR. BOLAND: Objection.
- 8 A. Yes, they're different.
 - Q. Mr. Stewart, are you familiar with VSC?
- 10 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

9

- Q. What is a VSC?
- A. Video spectral comparator and it's an acronym that many companies manufacture but one in particular is famous for, a company named

 Foster + Freeman.
- Q. Do you know the difference between a VSC 4, a VSC 40, a VSC 400 and VSC 2000?
- 18 A. I know some of the differences. I
 19 don't have a spec sheet in front of me.
 - Q. Which kind do you personally own?
- 21 A. I own a VSC 2000 high-resolution HR.
- Q. Where do you keep that?
- A. In my office.
- Q. Where?
- 25 A. In San Luis Obispo.

1		
7	_	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. And when did you purchase that machine?
 - A. Sometime last year, I don't remember the exact date.
 - Q. Last year as in the last calendar year?
 - A. Yes. I believe it was in early, maybe sometime -- I don't even want to speculate, it was sometime prior to this case, so it would have been either early 2011 or late 2010.
 - Q. So prior to your involvement in the case or prior to the inspection in the case?
 - A. Prior to my involvement in the case.
 - Q. How frequently do you use that in the course of your work?
 - A. I use that weekly.
 - Q. Now, in paragraph 108 of your report you state that there was a, quote, "potential problem with the VSC unit on the first day of the examination," and that was -- the nature of the problem was unknown, right? You say that in your report in paragraph 108?
 - A. That's not exactly what I say, but it's discussing a potential problem there.
 - Q. And you didn't inquire into that potential problem; correct?

1	
_	

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. I don't know what you mean by inquire.
- 3 I wasn't allowed to talk to you guys.
- Q. Did you ask anybody?
- A. I pointed it out to the lawyers for Mr. Ceglia's side.
 - Q. When did you do that?
 - A. As soon as I noticed that there was a problem, that there --
 - Q. And when was that?
 - A. It would have been when we first received the information from the experts from the other side, which would have been, I believe, October 2011 is when we first got any of their declarations or any of their information.
 - Q. What information are you referring to that you first received?
 - MR. SOUTHWELL: Let me strike that.
 - Q. You are not referring to when you got the expert reports from the defendants' experts; right?
 - A. No. In the early information one of your experts referred to it as a different model than the other, so either they were mistaken or else there was a change in the machine.

	Page 193
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. I see.
3	And that's when you say that you
4	noticed this and pointed it out to the
5	plaintiff's lawyers?
6	A. Correct.
7	Q. And who did you tell that to?
8	A. At the time it would have been
9	Mr. Argentieri and I believe Mr. Lake.
10	Q. And in your expert report you also talk
11	about the possibility of paperweights being used
12	in a VSC machine during examination and that
13	those may have caused fluorescent tab marks;
14	right?
15	A. That's essentially what I said, yes.
16	Q. Did you see paperweights present at the
17	examination?
18	A. No. I was not allowed to go back there.
19	Q. My question is did you see them present
20	during the defense examination.
21	A. No, from my vantage point I couldn't
22	see them.
23	Q. When you say you weren't allowed to go
24	back there, was there a rope that cordoned you

off and you could only stay in one corner of the

	rage 194
1	L. Stewart
2	room?
3	A. I was given instruction in the
4	beginning that I was to stay back and was not
5	allowed to approach the document.
6	Q. You were not allowed to approach the
7	document?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. So is it your testimony you never once
10	approached the document during the course of
11	defendants' examinations?
12	A. That's correct, I did not approach the
13	document until I did my examination.
14	Q. I remind you you are under oath today.
15	You are sure, your testimony is that you never
16	approached the document in the course of the
17	defendants' examination?
18	A. I do not recall approaching the
19	document. I recall the opposite, being told that
20	I cannot approach the document, and the first
21	time that I visually inspected the document was
22	when it was in front of me in Chicago.
23	I do not recall except from at least a

few feet away inspecting the document prior to

that.

24

1		
4	•	

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. So you're referring to an examination or an inspection that you would be, in other words, sitting in front of the document. You acknowledge that you were a few feet away from the document earlier than when you started your examination; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, I was a few feet away from the document.
 - Q. Okay.

So you could observe the document from a few feet; correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And do you know the dimensions of the paperweights that sometimes come with VSC units?
- A. Not exactly. I recall them from the time that I've used a VSC 4 and I believe that I printed out a specification sheet from Foster + Freeman that indicated the size of them, but I don't have it in front of me.
- Q. If I were to tell you that the Foster + Freeman brochure specifies that there are paperweights that typically measure 25 millimeters by 150 millimeters, does that sound consistent with your recollection?

1		
7	-	

L. Stewart

A. That would be about an inch by four inches, I believe, and no, my recollection is they are smaller than that.

You may be referring to a weighted clip. I'm referring to clips that they had that were not weighted, they are probably not even called a clip, they're just essentially little small white-colored weights that would sit on the document.

- Q. And are you referring to something that would be an accessory from Foster + Freeman that goes with the VSC or something else?
- A. We had it with our VSC when I had a VSC 4 at my disposal. I assume it came from Foster + Freeman, but I don't have the order sheet, so I don't know, and I do recall going back to them as a result of this case and asking for a specification sheet where it was described on there. I just don't know the exact size.
- Q. And when you are referring to when we had a VSC 4, what are you referring to?
- A. Early on in my career that was one of the models that the Secret Service had access to.
 - Q. And did you ever use that VSC machine

1		
4	-	

L. Stewart

in the course of your work when you were with the Secret Service?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And you're referring to small white clips; is that how you referred to them?
- A. You could argue that they are clips.

 don't know if that's what they at Foster +

 Freeman refer to them as because they also, I

 believe, held or had a device that physically

 kind of put pressure down on the document, and

 that may be also called a clip.

This was, as I said, something like a whitish-colored rectangular-shape piece and there were two of them.

- Q. And to be clear, you have no evidence that there were in fact weights of any kind in the room during the defendants' examination of the document in this case; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, as you testified earlier, you are aware that it's the defendants' position that the Work For Hire document is a recent forgery created for the purposes of bringing this fraudulent lawsuit; correct?

	Page 198
1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And in his report Mr. LaPorte sets
4	forth the basis for his opinion that the document
5	was created recently; right?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. He sets forth the basis for his opinion
8	that the ink in the interlineation on page 1 was
9	less than two years old when he tested the ink in
10	August of 2011; correct?
11	A. Correct.
12	Q. And he sets forth his basis for the
13	strength of his opinion, which was highly
14	probable or virtually certain; correct?
15	A. Correct.
16	Q. In his report Mr. LaPorte states that
17	he conducted GCMS testing on the inks; right?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. And he states from this GCMS testing he
20	determined that, among other things, the ink on
21	page 1 of the Work For Hire document contained PE
22	or phenoxyethanol; right?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And he states that the ink on page 1

had an unusually high PE level for a document

1	
т	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

L. Stewart

- that's purported to be eight years old; right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And in his report Mr. LaPorte states that he determined that the ink on page 1 of the Work For Hire document contained a sufficiently high level of PE to conduct an ink-dating method which we refer to as PE testing; right?
 - A. Part of the ink on page 1, yes.
- Q. And in fact the amount that Mr. LaPorte found in his opinion was more than double the usual threshold amount for conducting PE testing; right?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Specifically, he said that the abundance value was over 20,000, which was more than double the usual threshold of 10,000 to conduct PE testing; right?
 - A. That's what he said, yes.
- Q. And in his report Mr. LaPorte states that in order to conduct PE testing he measures the percentage of PE lost when an ink sample is heated; right?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. Mr. LaPorte further provides an opinion

1	
т	

L. Stewart

that the loss of PE of 25 percent or more indicates that the ink is less than two years old; right?

- A. Correct.
- Q. In his report Mr. LaPorte further states that after conducting PE testing on the samples from the ink in the interlineation on page 1 of the Work For Hire document he determined there was an average loss of 64 percent of PE from that ink; right?
 - A. I believe that's what he said, yes.
- Q. Now, to be clear, you are not offering an expert opinion that GCMS testing itself is unreliable; correct?
 - A. Can you specify GCMS testing on what?
 - Q. Well, what is GCMS testing?
- A. It's gas chromatography mass spectrometry, the technique itself has been around for many, many years.

GC began in 1903 for the study of chlorophyl. MS is a way of looking at ions and detecting things, it's an add-on to a GC and has been around for a long time as well, but not nearly as long as GC.

4		
_	L	
_	_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

The technique as far as forensics goes is used in many different applications and is reliable. I'm questioning its use here in ink age analysis.

Q. And I understand that and we'll get to that.

I'm asking a more general question which is, on its own GCMS testing itself, you are not offering an opinion that it is unreliable; correct?

- A. Across the board, no.
- Q. And you also do not offer an opinion there's anything wrong with conducting GCMS testing on ink; correct?
- A. For research no problem, beyond that there may be a problem.
 - Q. Okay.

Well, you don't offer any opinion about any GCMS testing that you yourself conducted; right?

- A. I did not conduct GCMS tests in this case.
- Q. In fact you conducted no ink testing in this case; correct?

	4		
	ı		
•			

L. Stewart

- A. No. I did physical analysis on the ink and decided at that point to hold off doing any chemical analysis and I still have the ink samples today, I have not tested them.
- Q. And why did you hold off on doing the chemical analysis?
- A. Because once we -- once I determined that the ink was degraded, I agree at that point that you're very limited what you can do chemically to analyze that ink and held off at that point doing any additional tests so I would not lose the sample that I had.
- Q. Did you explain that in your report that you have those ink samples and you decided not to do any ink testing?
 - A. No.
- Q. Any particular reason why you didn't explain that in your report?
- A. I'm not asked questions in the report,
 I am only putting in the report what I found. If
 I didn't do a test I didn't find anything.
- Q. You explain in the report that you took ink samples from the document, do you not?
 - A. Yes, I do. I still have them.

	а		
•		-	

Q. Right.

So you don't explain to the court what you did with those ink samples, you just leave it as an open question?

A. I believe at the end of the report I indicated that I still had -- I would still continue working on the case. I mean, I may still examine the inks today, I don't know. At this point I haven't examined those inks because

I don't see a need for it at this point.

Q. But you don't explain that to the Court, in other words, you didn't explain that I took ink samples, I still have ink samples, I did not test them because of to my conclusion, you didn't explain that in your report; correct?

A. No. To me, that's not a place to put that.

Q. Now I want to get into your opinion about PE, but I want to just also to make clear what you are not offering an expert opinion on relating to the general subject, so you are not also offering any expert opinion specifically refuting the propriety of Mr. LaPorte's threshold of an abundance level of 10,000 in order to

	Luge 201
1	L. Stewart
2	conduct the PE test; is that right?
3	A. It depends. I have to explain that
4	answer.
5	Q. Let me ask you more specifically.
6	In your report you are not offering any
7	expert opinion specifically refuting the
8	propriety of Mr. LaPorte's threshold of an
9	abundance level of 10,000 in order to conduct the
10	PE testing; correct?
11	A. In the report, no.
12	Q. Now, you do not offer an expert opinion
13	in your report that there was no PE contained in
14	the ink on the Work For Hire document at all;
15	right?
L 6	A. No.
17	Q. Because you didn't test the PE in the
18	ink; right?
19	A. Right.
20	Q. And so therefore you are not offering
21	an expert opinion that the PE levels in the
22	interlineation on page 1 were not high; right?
23	A. That's correct.
24	O. And you do not offer an opinion in your

report specifically refuting the propriety of the

1		
_	-	

L. Stewart

- 25 percent threshold that Mr. LaPorte uses to make the age determination; right?
- A. It goes back to my earlier answer to you which is in the report I don't have that information, but you asked me if I refute that, so it's two different questions.
- Q. Well, you submitted an expert report to the Court.

You understand this is an important case to your client and to our clients; right?

- A. Of course.
- Q. And it was not important to include your expert opinions in the expert report?
- A. Of course it's -- but that wasn't an opinion and --
- Q. If you want the Court to consider your opinion, it should be in your report; would you agree with that?
- A. No. There's many times reports are concise and there may be days' worth of testimony concerning a report or surrounding a report, so in testimony in depositions and in trial much more comes out than is oftentimes found in a report.

about this case that you're holding back on us

that you are not putting in your report?

So what other opinions do you have

2

3

Q.

Α.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22

23

2425

You asked for something in addition to my report, you asked me for an explanation and when I tried to tell you the explanation you told me to stick strictly to the report.

I'm not holding back anything.

- Q. I'm not asking for an explanation, I'm asking for your opinion, I'm asking for whether you have a particular opinion or not, and the question is, in your report do you state -- you offer an opinion specifically refuting the propriety of the 25 percent threshold Mr. LaPorte uses for making the age determination?
- A. And again you asked in your report, so you blocked me from answering the question.

If you're asking me the question to refute it --

Q. Well, why don't you answer my question, which is, in the report do you offer any -- an opinion specifically refuting the propriety of 25 percent threshold that Mr. LaPorte uses to make the age determination, yes or no?

1	
Т	

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

L. Stewart

- A. And I've answered that, in the report I
 don't have anything concerning that question,
 it's a new question.
 - Q. Well, you do state an opinion regarding
 PE testing and you state it's not a reliable
 test; right?
 - A. Not categorically I don't state that.

 I'm talking about the methodology that Mr. LaPorte used.
 - Q. And in your report you address some factors that might affect the amount of PE found in an ink on a document; right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You mentioned storage or environmental conditions; correct?
- 17 A. Correct.
 - Q. You mentioned other sources of contaminations, which is skin cream or perfume; right?
- 21 A. Among others, yes.
- Q. And you mentioned that an improperly conducted experiment might have an effect; correct?
- 25 A. Correct.

1		
4	-	

2

Q. So storage conditions, contaminants, improperly conducted experiment.

4

3

Did I miss anything?

5

A. I believe that's what I included in the report.

7

9

10

Q. So there are no other factors mentioned in your report that might affect the amount of PE found in the ink other than those three things; correct?

11

A. Well, you didn't give an all-inclusive list. I listed insect repellent --

13

14

15

16

12

Q. I understand. Other types of contaminants. I understand you listed others and it was not an exhaustive list, contaminants generally; right?

17

A. That's correct.

18 19

20

21

Q. So contaminants generally, improperly conducted experiment, storage and environmental conditions, those are the only factors mentioned in your report that might affect the amount of PE found in the ink; right?

22

23

24

25

A. Well, the amount that's originally in the ink would affect it. At that section of the report that's what I'm talking about are those

1		L. Stewart
2	three thi	ngs, but if you're asking me what can
3	affect it	, each ink is an individual formulation
4	and the m	anufacturer may put PE in, it may not,
5	it may pu	t varying amounts in.
6	Q.	Can you explain what phenoxyethanol is?
7	A.	It's a chemical.
8		Can I explain what it is beyond that?
9	Q.	Yeah.
10	A.	It's used, as I mentioned in the
11	report, f	or a number of different things; beyond
12	that I ca	n't explain what it's for.
13	Q.	Is it a volatile component?
14	A.	Yes.
15	Q.	What is a volatile component?
16	A.	Something that would evaporate with
17	heat is t	ypically what we call volatile.
18	Q.	Why is it used in ink?
19	Α.	It's used in ink as a solvent and when

Q. What else is it used in?

ink is first made it's made as a liquid, it stays

liquid until it's applied to paper and then it

initially hardens to where you are not going to

be able to rub it off and then slowly hardens

beyond that.

20

21

22

23

24

	rage 210
1	L. Stewart
2	A. In the world?
3	Q. Yeah.
4	A. It's on my list there, everything that
5	I could research, it's insect repellent,
6	fragrances, hand lotion.
7	Q. And you said that because it's a
8	volatile component a known feature is that it
9	will evaporate with heat; right?
10	A. That's typically what I mean when I
11	talk about something being volatile, yes.
12	Q. Why is PE used in ink other than other
13	chemicals?
14	A. I don't know. I'm not an ink
15	manufacturer.
16	Q. You are providing this court with an
17	expert opinion about the ink.
18	A. Correct. I know that it's found in
19	some inks.
20	Q. You don't know why it's included in the
21	inks?
22	A. No. I am not a manufacturer.
23	Q. And you are aware that PE in ink
24	MR. SOUTHWELL: Strike that.

You are aware that a known feature of

Q.

1	L. Stewart
2	PE in ink is that it evaporates for roughly two
3	years and then the evaporation more or less
4	ceases; right?
5	A. No. There's differing opinions about
6	that. Some articles talk about it being one
7	year, others talk about it being a few months and
8	then some articles talk about it up to two years,
9	so it's a point of contention.
10	Q. Well, you are aware that a known
11	feature of PE
12	MR. SOUTHWELL: Strike that.
13	Q. You would agree that a known feature of
14	PE in ink is that it evaporates for some period
15	of time and then the evaporation more or less
16	ceases; right?
17	A. I would believe that that's the case,
18	yes.
19	Q. When ink containing PE is fresh or
20	newer it will have a relatively high level of PE;

It would have its highest level based

And you are aware that it is known to

right?

Α.

Q.

on that formulation.

21

22

23

24

	rage 212
1	L. Stewart
2	right?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And that over time it evaporates more
5	and more slowly; right?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. Until at some point it levels off;
8	right?
9	A. Levels off based on the capabilities of
10	the instrument doing the detection.
11	Q. Fine.
12	So the PE, it will not measurably
13	evaporate much more at that point; is that fair
14	to say?
15	A. That's fair.
16	Q. And so ink that is not fresh or new
17	would have less PE, but it still would have a
18	certain level; right?
19	A. If it had any at all in it. Some inks
20	don't have it.
21	Q. Fair enough.
22	If it had any at all, it would have its
23	highest levels when it was freshest on the paper
24	and at some point it would have less and remain

at that lower level; right?

	rage 215
1	L. Stewart
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. Now let's discuss the factors you had
4	identified potentially affecting PE levels
5	putting aside how much was in the ink to start
6	with, all right?
7	It is your opinion storage conditions
8	are a critical factor in fading techniques;
9	right?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Your opinion relating to the effects of
12	storage conditions is contained in paragraphs 228
13	to 230, somewhere in that area of your report;
14	right?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And that's your report, Defendants'
17	Exhibit 13; correct?
18	A. I don't know that my report was entered
19	as a defendants' exhibit, I'm not sure.
20	Q. It was, it's Defendants' Exhibit 13 at

- Now, is it your position that it is important to know the storage conditions of a document; right?
- 25 A. It's important if you were going to

the outset of this deposition.

21

22

23

1		
L	_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

reach a conclusion about the age of the document.

- Q. And that's because its possible storage conditions could have affected the aging rate of the ink; right?
 - A. That's a known fact, yes.
- Q. Let's go to paragraph 235 of your report, Defendants' Exhibit 13.

Your opinion that specifically relates to PE and storage conditions is set forth there, correct, and it specifically reads "Without a full understanding of the storage conditions of the Facebook contract as well as a determination as to the cause of his purported unusually high levels of PE in the damaged document, there can be no weight given to his finding"; right?

- A. That's part of my finding. It continues there two paragraphs down where I talk about there's no published standard for using the LaPorte method.
- Q. I'm specifically referring to the storage conditions aspect of your opinion.
 - A. You're correct.
- Q. Right?

So you do not state an opinion that the

1		
_	•	

L. Stewart

storage conditions of the Work For Hire document

actually had an effect on the levels of PE in the

ink on the first page; right?

- A. No. It could have had an effect.
- Q. It could have, but you are not opining that it actually did have; correct?
- A. There's no way of knowing, so, no, I am not opining to that.
- Q. What are the factual bases for your opinion that storage conditions could have affected the PE levels?
- A. General understanding of chemistry where if something is volatile, if it's heated it's going to evaporate, if it's kept cold it's going to evaporate slower, knowledge of that actually being the case because of experiments and research that I've conducted and published, knowledge that other peers in the field have published where they all warn against making ink age analysis determinations without full knowledge of the storage conditions and appreciation of what they could have done as far as affecting the aging of the document.
 - Q. And I understand that those are your

•	١		
-	_		

L. Stewart

bases for your opinion that the storage conditions could have affected the aging rate, in other words, you are speculating about what could have affected the aging rate in the document here; right?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And what I'm asking, I guess, to be more specific, is what are your factual bases that the storage conditions of the actual document here could have caused the high levels of PE in ink on the first page?
- A. Simply the information that Ceglia has brought forward as far as his declaration.
- Q. That's the only piece of information you have on which to support your speculation that this could have happened; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And that was the, I think you said, roughly two-minute conversation you had with him followed by the declaration that he put in; correct?
- A. Followed by review of the weather conditions in that area over a period of time, I looked at that to decide whether or not

	Page 217
1	L. Stewart
2	Mr. Ceglia's response was accurate and I used
3	that as well.
4	Q. So two pieces of information, what Paul
5	Ceglia told you and the weather reports; right?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. And what Paul Ceglia told you is then
8	memorialized in the declaration that he filed;
9	right?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. You are not relying on anything other
12	than what he told you in that declaration; right?
13	A. That's correct.
14	Q. As you testified, if environmental
15	conditions are hot, for example, you would expect
16	to see evaporation of PE accelerate.
17	Fair enough?
18	A. We need to define hot, but basically,
19	yes.
20	Q. So you would not expect to see high
21	levels of PE in ink on a document that was stored
22	in summerlike conditions in the northeast United
23	States in a nonclimate-controlled room; right?
24	A We would have to address humidity in

the Northeast as a possible contributor that can

1		
_	•	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

affect how quickly something volatilizes or evaporates.

Using your scenario in Palm Springs, I would expect that it would evaporate quicker.

- Q. And what role would humidity have?
- A. It has a role that's been addressed by peers in the field and previous research. It's actual effect is unclear still and needs to be researched further, but it has shown to have an effect.
- Q. And as you state in your report, cold conditions could slow down the aging process; right?
 - A. It could.
- Q. So it might take longer than usual for PE to evaporate from ink if they are stored in what would be considered cold conditions?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So, as an example, if a document was stored in a meat refrigerator that was on and cold you might expect the PE to evaporate in the ink more slowly; right?
- A. I would expect that, yes.
- Q. How long would it be slower?

	rage 219
1	L. Stewart
2	MR. SOUTHWELL: Sorry. Let me strike
3	that.
4	Q. If something was kept in cold
5	conditions and it would cause the PE in the ink
6	to evaporate more slowly, how long how much
7	longer would it slow the evaporation?
8	A. There's no way of answering that
9	without doing experiments on the specific formula
10	of ink, and that has not been done. Not only was
11	the ink not identified here, we don't know what
12	was in it originally and there's not been any
13	research done on the potential effect of cold on
14	this ink.
15	Q. Now, you mentioned humidity and that
16	the results or the effects of that on evaporation
17	of PE are unknown.
18	What about the effects of humidity on
19	documents?
20	It's generally known that humidity and
21	moisture might cause mold in documents; right?
22	A. It could.
23	Q. You testified that you learned of what

document in roughly April of this year, that was

Mr. Ceglia has claimed was how he stored the

24

	rage 220
1	L. Stewart
2	roughly nine, 10 months after you actually
3	examined the documents in question; correct?
4	A. After I first examined them, yes.
5	Q. So prior to that you did not have any
6	information about how the Work For Hire document
7	was stored; correct?
8	A. No. I believe I was told by lawyers
9	that it was stored in a New York, northerly New
10	York home, but I don't have specifics.
11	Q. Did you ask those lawyers for more
12	specifics about the environmental conditions or
13	storage conditions?
14	A. At that point, no. We did not have an
15	ink age analysis report to look at.
16	Q. You mentioned you are relying on Paul
17	Ceglia's statements to you in his submission of a
18	declaration sworn under oath and I guess you are
19	referring also to weather reports as another
20	fact.
21	How do you know that Mr. Ceglia's
22	telling you the truth about this?
23	A. I don't, that's why I referred to the

And what kind of backup does the

weather reports as a backup.

Q.

24

	rage 221
1	L. Stewart
2	weather report show? It shows that it's cold in
3	Buffalo?
4	A. Exactly.
5	Q. And you need a weather report to tell
6	you that?
7	A. I thought you guys might as a document
8	to support my
9	Q. And how does that tell you that Paul
10	Ceglia's telling the truth?
11	A. It doesn't.
12	Q. So you don't have anything to tell you,
13	to support Paul Ceglia's testimony other than
14	what he's told you; right?
15	A. And the weather report.
16	Q. You just said the weather report
17	doesn't give you independent corroboration of
18	what he's telling you, it just simply says that
19	it's cold in Buffalo in winter, that's hardly
20	corroboration of his story.
21	His story is about how he stored the
22	document; right?
23	How does a weather report provide any
24	support for how he stored the document to give

you any confidence that he's telling the truth?

4		
J	L	

L. Stewart

2 A. I'll tell you why.

He told me where and how he stored the document. I then compared that against the independent weather report and realized that his recollection of the temperatures in the area were spot on and so I did use that as a way of looking at what he said and seeing if I agreed with it or not.

- Q. So he told you the average temperatures each year in the months that he was not living in Buffalo and that was corroborated by the weather reports because they were spot on?
 - A. No, he --
 - Q. What do you mean by spot on?

 MR. BOLAND: Objection.

Let him answer the question, Alex.

- A. He mentioned the number of months per year that he lived in the facility, he mentioned that the facility was not heated and the city and location of the facility, that I then corroborated with the weather report and then later on I received his declaration that elaborated even more on it.
 - Q. And does the weather report corroborate

1	1	
_	Ь	

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

the fact that he claims to have kept the document in a hope chest?

- A. No.
- Q. The only thing the weather report corroborates is that it's cold in Buffalo in the winter; right?
- A. It had the winter weather as well as the summer and the spring and the fall weather, so the entire time it was stored there we had the weather reports.
 - Q. Okay.

Does the weather report provide any corroboration for his claim he kept the document in a hope chest?

- A. No. I already told you that.
- Q. Does the weather report provide any corroboration that he kept the document in a hope chest in a room that was not insulated?
 - A. No.
- Q. Does the weather report provide any corroboration to the fact that he asserts that he kept the document in a house that does not have central heating?
- A. No. I assume that's easy to check

1	L. Stewart
2	into, but I don't have
3	Q. Did you check into it?
4	A. No. I assume that would be something
5	that the lawyers would do. I don't have that.
6	Q. You're representing him as his expert;
7	right? You could have asked him that?
8	MR. BOLAND: Objection.
9	A. Not as a plumber-heater expert. I'm
10	presenting the forensic findings to you.
11	Q. You just testified that the storage and
12	environmental conditions are a critical factor in
13	providing an opinion, this is critical piece of
14	information about that and you didn't ask him.
15	A. For independent verification that his
16	house was heated?
17	Q. To corroborate that he's telling the
18	truth.
19	A. No, I did not ask him for that.
20	Q. Have you personally seen the room in
21	which he says the Work For Hire document was
22	stored?
23	A. No, I have not.
24	Q. Do you know whether there's carpet in
25	the room?

	Page 226
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. And Mr. Ceglia in his declaration said
3	that the Work For Hire document was stored with a
4	series of other documents dating from the same
5	time.
6	Have you examined those documents?
7	A. No, I have not.
8	Q. Did you ask for them?
9	A. No.
10	Q. Didn't you think that would be
11	important to examine in rendering an opinion for
12	the Court?
13	A. No. It's different documents and, if
14	anything, they contaminated this document, they
15	are not going to add to the result here.
16	The ink on this document is
17	contaminated to the point it can't be tested.
18	Q. And that could have been caused by
19	other documents in this hope chest; is that what
20	you're saying?
21	A. No.
22	There could be a transference from
23	documents, there could be all kind of effect from

I don't know. All I know is that it

other documents.

24

	raye 227
1	L. Stewart
2	makes the document completely unreliable, as far
3	as ink age analysis goes.
4	Q. Do you have any basis, any factual
5	basis to support your speculation that there
6	could have been ink transference? Is that in
7	your report?
8	A. No, it's not in my report, that's not
9	something I
10	Q. Do you have any factual basis to assert
11	that?
12	A. Yes. Firsthand knowledge. If a
13	document is moistened, and you mentioned humidity
14	as a factor here, if it's moistened and you've
15	got a water-based ink, of course you could get
16	transfer.
17	Q. So what firsthand knowledge do you have
18	of the Work For Hire document being stored in a
19	hope chest with other documents?
20	A. I don't of that. My firsthand
21	knowledge is experimentation with inks and papers
22	and seeing that there can be a transfer.
2 3	O So you have no firsthand knowledge

about transference with respect to the document

in this case, the purported Work For Hire

24

1	L. Stewart
2	document; correct?
3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. You are just speculating about this;
5	right?
6	A. No. I'm answering your question.
7	You brought up humidity, you brought up
8	what I know and what I don't know, and so my
9	response to you is based on my own research and
10	that's as far as it goes. I don't know about
11	this case.
12	Q. I understand.
13	You've got research that says that
14	there can be transference in general. What I'm
15	asking is, you have no specific factual
16	information that there was transference of any
17	ink here, that's simply speculation; right?
18	A. I'm not speculating that there was
19	transfer, I'm saying I don't know one way or
20	another.
21	Q. Right.
22	Meaning that you have no opinion that
23	there was; right?
24	A. Correct.

Now, as you said, the weather report

Q.

1	
_	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

2 establishes that, well, there's winter, spring,
3 summer and fall in Buffalo; is that fair to say?

- A. It did establish that, yes.
- Q. Okay.

And you understand from, I would say, common sense understanding of what weather is like in the Northeast and I guess supposedly the weather reports that it's warmer and milder in the spring, even warmer in the summer and then colder in the winter; right?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And in Wellsville, New York, where we are talking about, it gets quite cold in the winter, right, freezing temperatures; correct?
 - A. That's my recollection, yes.
- Q. But it's not Antarctica, right, the temperature is not constantly freezing; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And in fact in the summer it can get hot, you can have highs in the upper seventies or eighties, even sometimes the nineties; right?
 - A. I believe so.
 - Q. So you would acknowledge that Mr.

1	
Т	

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Ceglia's house was not constantly in subzero temperatures; right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. It was subject to all the seasons of the year; right?
- 7 A. That's correct.
 - Q. So every year since 2003, since the Work For Hire document was supposedly signed in April of 2003, it was supposedly subjected to the summers of 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and part of 2010; right?
 - A. As well as the winters, yes.
 - Q. So roughly seven summers, seven winters; yes?
 - A. Again, I don't know if the document was stored there its entire life, but it's been -- it would have been seven years wherever it was stored.
 - Q. So you would acknowledge that in this area of the country where the document was stored you have substantial periods of time over those seven years where it's hot, which might accelerate the aging of ink, and where it's cold which might decelerate the aging of ink; right?

•	1		
•	4	_	

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- A. I would not refer to 70- to 80-degree temperatures as being hot as accelerating the ink, that would be pretty much normal temperatures that we would consider when we do research. Anything above that would be hot.
 - Q. So if there's normal temperatures you are testifying it would not accelerate, it would just have the normal evaporation?
 - A. Right. The age research that's been done on ink typically assumes normal aging as far as temperature and humidity.
 - Q. Now, as you said before, your factual basis with respect to what Mr. Ceglia told you about how the document was stored and the weather report is your support for providing this possibility that storage conditions could have had some affect; right?
 - A. No. Storage conditions having an affect on the aging of a document has been widely reported by peers in the field for decades.
 - Q. I understand that. Listen to my question, if you would.

My question is about the Work For Hire document here and what you are testifying to and

	1490 232
1	L. Stewart
2	what your report says is that based on
3	Mr. Ceglia's say-so and the weather reports there
4	is a possibility that those storage conditions
5	could have had some effect on this document;
6	right?
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. Now, you're familiar with a forensic
9	document expert named Albert S. Osborn; right?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And indeed, in your report, Defendants'
12	Exhibit 13, paragraph 32, you cite to a book by
13	Albert Osborn; right?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And Mr. Osborn is described by some as
16	the grandfather of forensic document examination;
17	right?
18	A. Yes, I've heard that.
19	Q. He is one of the esteemed practitioners
20	that document examiners study in the course of
21	their training; right?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And he wrote a number of leading books

Α.

in the field; right?

Yes.

24

	Page 233
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. What are their titles?
3	A. You're holding "Questioned Documents."
4	I don't know all of the titles.
5	Q. You cite "The Problem of Proof" in your
6	report, right, that's another one?
7	A. Okay.
8	I've got hundreds of books in my
9	collection, I believe those two are two of his.
10	Q. And those documents, "Questioned
11	Documents" by Albert S. Osborn and "The Problem
12	of Proof," those are reliable authorities;
13	correct?
14	A. I would consider then that, yes.
15	Q. You have read those books; yes?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Are all of those books in your library?
18	You said you've got hundreds of books.
19	Are those included in your library?
20	A. The two that I referred to are, yes.
21	Q. And the two being "Questioned
22	Documents" and "The Problem of Proof"; right?
23	A. I don't believe I refer to "The Problem

I think you do at -- no, I guess you

of Proof," do I?

Q.

24

1	L. Stewart
2	may not.
3	And which edition of "Questioned
4	Documents" do you have in your library?
5	A. The 1910 edition.
6	Q. Do you have the second edition from
7	1929?
8	A. I believe I do, yes.
9	Q. Okay.
10	You don't cite "The Problem With
11	Proof," but you're familiar with the book; right?
12	A. Yes. I believe that was one of his
13	books, yes.
14	Q. You testified a moment ago that you
15	read it?
16	A. Yes. I just don't recall the exact
17	title, but I think that's one.
18	MR. SOUTHWELL: If I could have this
19	marked as our next exhibit, please,
20	Defendants' Exhibit 24.
21	(Defendants' Exhibit 24, excerpts from
22	Albert S. Osborn's book "The Problem of
23	Proof," marked for identification, as of
24	this date.)
25	O. I'm showing you now Defendants' Exhibit

1	L. Stewart
2	24, which are some excerpts from Albert S.
3	Osborn's 1922 book "The Problem of Proof."
4	Look at that, please.
5	A. Thank you.
6	Q. I'm going to direct your attention to
7	page 32.
8	A. I believe you said 1924. It says 1922
9	on the front page.
10	Q. Thank you. Yes, that's right.
11	A. 32, did you say?
12	Q. Yes.
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. And there Mr. Osborn is talking about
15	questioned document stories and studies of
16	inherent improbability and provides an example
17	relating to foundling wills.
18	Have you heard of the term, these types
19	of documents, foundling wills?
20	A. I am trying to find that in the
21	document.
22	I believe he is referring to wills that
23	come in after the fact, after the death.
24	Q. Are you familiar with the concept of

foundling wills?

ı		
1	_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- A. I recall reading about it in very early books, but I'm not familiar with the concept, no, other than his explanation of what he means by it.
- 0. Let's look here in the middle paragraph on page 32, starting with the second sentence, Osborn defines foundling wills as a particular type of questioned document and he says, quote, "One class of stories of this kind are those relating to foundling wills which make a tardy appearance and in effect, at least, are left on the doorstep of the administrator or an executor of an estate. When these peculiar papers, many of which are spurious, are brought into court they must, of course, be accounted for in some way. The stories designed to explain the long delay, the unusual appearance and the startling contents of these documents furnish most interesting studies."

Is that what this says here?

- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And then it goes on: "When analyzed, these stories often are inherently improbable. This improbability is accentuated when they are compared with the stories relating to similar

1		
7	_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

L. Stewart

papers in other cases. One of the common similarities in the alleged life histories of these misplaced documents is the utter indifference with which a very valuable paper was handled and kept by those in whose hands it was left and in whose interest it was drawn. apparently was tossed about from pillar to post with the utmost unconcern. It was thrown into some old box or basket or shoved into some old book or almanac or handed over to a witness who is almost a stranger and then entirely forgotten. After the death of the testator, and sometimes long after, it all at once turns up 'accidentally and providentially.' The accounts of the hiding places of some of these forgotten wills develop some occasional and striking originality, but in numerous ways the stories are strangely alike."

19

Do you see that?

20

A. Yes.

21

22

23

Q. Now, seeing this description, doesn't the Work For Hire document and the circumstances of its supposed discovery sound an awful lot like a foundling will?

2425

A. Not to me. I don't know the

1		
_	-	

L. Stewart

- circumstances of the discovery completely. I know that it is at issue between two sides who both have a different opinion about its origin.
- Q. Wouldn't you agree that it has startling contents, a two-page contract purporting to entitle someone to half of a multibillion-dollar company, isn't that startling contents to you?
 - A. It is.
- Q. And wouldn't you agree that it has made a tardy appearance, appearing seven years after which it was purportedly signed?
- A. That's the document that we're seeing,
 I believe, is seven years afterwards. I don't
 know that there's any earlier e-mails or things
 that discuss the document and its provenance.
 - Q. Are you aware of any?
- A. No, but I'm not aware that there aren't any.
- Q. And that tardy appearance must, of course, be counted in some way, as Osborn says, and the way that it was accounted here was that it was thrown into some old box or basket like a hope chest.

٠	ı		
	ı		

L. Stewart

Doesn't that sound like what the situation we have for the Work For Hire document?

A. No. That's what sounds like one side of a party is saying that has then become an issue that forensic scientists have to look at and address and that's what's happening.

Q. And that's precisely what Osborn says, that these stories often alone are sufficient to arouse a strong suspicion that the document is not genuine and it requires examination and analysis; right?

A. Of course. You always get a one-sided view from one party in a case, you don't trust that.

Q. And Osborn's conclusion as to these types of stories is that they alone are sufficient to arouse a strong suspicion that the document is not genuine; right?

Would you agree with Osborn's conclusion about these foundling will stories?

A. I've never examined any of his wills from 1922 that led to him writing this book. I have examined numerous wills in recent years and oftentimes they're false.

	١		
	ı		
-			

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

2 Q. And would you agree with the assertion, 3 which is what Osborn also concludes, that when you're presented with a document that is 4 5 questioned and it comes with a story of tardy appearance and startling contents, that that 6 7 would arouse a strong suspicion that the document's not genuine, that it would require 8 9 additional testing; would you agree with that?

- A. I would say that any document like that that becomes an issue of a court case requires independent forensic testing and that you shouldn't trust what either side tells you as being accurate.
- Q. And you want to seek out solid facts that would address what could be a suspicion the document's not genuine based on the story about how it was discovered; is that fair to say?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Yes?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And here you relied, in addition to your examination, which, of course, doesn't go to the question of the storage of the document, you relied on Mr. Ceglia's statement and declaration

1	١		
_	L		

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

L. Stewart

regarding the storage of the document; right?

A. Well, my examination does go towards the storage of the document and that I reported that your expert who's opining about the age of the document did not consider that in his opinion, so I do refer to that.

As far as Mr. Ceglia making a comment about its storage conditions, we got the weather report and the rest I assume is records that we could obtain regarding whether heaters were put in his house, whether he paid services to have the house prepared for winter. I'm sure there's ways of checking to see if his story is accurate; but that is not part of what I've done.

- Q. And you've provided no evidence of that; right?
 - A. I've provided just his --
 - Q. His statements, yes, and --
 - A. And the weather --
- Q. -- and the weather report that -
 MR. BOLAND: Objection.
 - A. -- and then my reliance on other research and research I've done to show that it is an important factor.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

Q. Right.

And as you've just agreed, the weather report provides no corroboration as to actually how the document was stored in a hope chest in an uninsulated room; correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. So you weren't suspicious or skeptical of Mr. Ceglia's story, you're perfectly comfortable relying on that?
- A. I am suspicious about what both sides are saying.
- Q. You also testified about your assertion that other experts in this case did not rely on information about the storage conditions.

What is your factual basis for asserting that the defendants' experts did not rely on the available information from plaintiff about the storage conditions?

- A. Factually I have Mr. LaPorte's own research that he's published where he talks about the importance of relying on that --
- Q. You are not listening to my question.

 Can you answer my question rather than the question you want to answer?

4		
_	-	

L. Stewart

2

MR. BOLAND: Objection.

4

5

3

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

- My question is, what factual basis do 0. you have to assert that the defendants' expert did not rely on information about the storage of this particular document, the Work For Hire document?
 - Α. And I'm trying to answer that for you.
 - Ο. Okay.
 - So try answering that question, please.
 - Α. Okay.
- If Mr. LaPorte published reality, which is that the storage conditions do affect the aging of the document, then he did not follow that in this case because he would not have tested the document.
 - Q. That does not answer my question.
- My question is, you have asserted that there is no -- that defendants' experts have not -- have ignored the evidence of the storage conditions of this particular document. I'm not talking about published reports, I'm talking about this particular document.
- What is your factual basis for that assertion?

L. Stewart

- A. It's an assumption and it's assumption
 based on had he followed his own research, he
 would never have done the test.
 - Q. So you have no factual basis, you are simple making an assumption and speculating; correct?
 - A. I'm assuming it based on his original research being accurate; if that's accurate then there should not have been a test here.
 - Q. So you have no factual basis, you are assuming it; correct?
 - A. I'm assuming it, correct.
 - Q. Now let's talk about the other factor you note as potentially having an affect on PE levels, the contamination; right?

So in paragraph 223 you state that

LaPorte indicates the amounts of PE he found in

the Facebook contract was in abundance and more

than double the usual threshold for conducting PE

testing. This clearly shows that surprisingly

high levels of PE most probably came from some

other contamination source or else from an

improperly conducted experiment or conclusion

reached by LaPorte.

	rage 245
1	L. Stewart
2	Did I read that correctly?
3	A. That's what it said.
4	Q. And we'll talk about the suggestion of
5	improperly conducted experiment in a moment, but
6	it's your position that a high level of PE in the
7	ink in the Work For Hire document most probably
8	came from some other contamination source; right?
9	A. No. It's my finding that it should
10	have been considered.
11	Q. Could I direct your attention to
12	paragraph 223 of your report, the second
13	sentence, which reads "This clearly shows that
14	the surprisingly high levels of PE most probably
15	came from some other contamination source or else
16	were from an improperly conducted experiment or
17	conclusion reached by LaPorte."
18	Do you see that?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. Do you want to change the answer you
21	just testified to?
22	A. No. You're not reading the five
23	paragraphs before that that all pertain to the

same thing. I am leading up to an opinion based

on numerous things and you're breaking it apart

24

1	L. Stewart
2	in individual components.
3	Q. So you're saying that the high levels
4	of PE came from a cumulative effect of a variety
5	of things? Is that what you're saying?
6	A. No, that's not what I just said.
7	You can go back to early on in that
8	section and you can see a number of different
9	factors that I'm pointing out that may effect the
10	level of PE. It's not something new I'm coming
11	up with, it's something that's been reported
12	widely in the research.
13	Q. Let's look then at your sentence in
14	paragraph 223.
15	Can you read the second sentence in
16	paragraph 223?
17	A. "This clearly shows that the
18	surprisingly high levels of PE most probably came
19	from some other contamination source or else from
20	an improperly conducted experiment or a
21	conclusion reached by LaPorte."
22	That's three separate components that
23	refer to the 10, 12 paragraphs before.
24	O. And you mention in 221 the idea that

there could be various contaminants and you list

1	L. Stewart
2	sunscreens skin creams, sunscreens, fragrances
3	and cosmetics as well as insect repellents; right?
4	A. That's correct.
5	Q. Those are other contaminants that you
6	assert have PE as a component; right?
7	A. Not I.
8	Those are assertions by Mr. LaPorte and
9	then other cited sources that I have.
10	Q. Okay. But I'm talking about your
11	report.
12	This is not an assertion of your report
13	where you say it is known to be widely used in
14	skin creams, you're referring to you are
15	disclaiming that this is your opinion that you're
16	providing in 221?
17	A. No. That was researched and reported
18	by LaPorte earlier on, so I trust that that's
19	true.
20	Q. Okay.
21	But this is your opinion, I'm talking
22	about your report.
23	So you're saying you don't adopt that,
24	you are just saying that's LaPorte?

No, I'm not saying that at all.

Α.

	rage 248
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. I am asking if this is your opinion.
3	Is this not your opinion?
4	221, paragraph 221, look at that,
5	please.
6	A. Okay.
7	Are you ready?
8	Q. Go ahead.
9	A. I am trying to say that if you read
10	that it says that it is found, it is known to be
11	widely used in all of those different things. I
12	believe four of those came from Mr. LaPorte's
13	research and the fifth one came from a chemistry
14	guidebook called "The Merck Index."
15	Q. Are you providing this opinion to the
16	Court?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And how would those products have made
19	their way onto the document such as the Work For
20	Hire document such that they might have this
21	possible effect that you comment upon?
22	A. A number of people did not use gloves
23	when they examined the document in Buffalo, if

of a lotion on their hands it could affect it; if

they went to the restroom and they put some kind

24

-		
_	-	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

2 the document was stored in a facility that was 3 sprayed for bugs it could affect it.

I don't know. I'm putting it out there because I'm putting out possibilities that should have been considered and they weren't.

Q. And you say a number of people handled the document without gloves.

Who?

- A. I don't know. We'd have to review the entire tape. I don't want to point fingers without reviewing it, but I do recall that there people that did not have gloves on when they touched the document.
 - Q. How many people?
 - A. I don't have a number.
- Q. But you are just speculating that a number of people did?
- A. I'm trying to answer your question. We can stop and review the tape, if you like.
- Q. You are prepared to testify here and tell the Court many people, but you don't actually know because you haven't reviewed the tape recently and you don't have that number at the ready; is that right?

•	•	
-	_	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

L. Stewart

- A. My recollection is that there were a number of people who touched it without gloves on.
 - Q. And if they touched the edges of the document would that have --

MR. SOUTHWELL: Well, strike that.

- Q. How would touching a document using -let's use an example -- an arm that had sunscreen
 on it, how would that put the contaminant onto
 the document? Would it have to be a palm or a
 forearm, something like that?
- A. I don't know that it would. It would have to be researched.

If we know that PE is in that material and somebody had it on their hands and they touched the document without gloves, then there's certainly the possibility of transfer.

To get it on the ink there would have to be a specific touch to the area that had the ink on it or it would have to be rubbed over to that area by someone else at a later time.

- Q. And just to be clear, you are speculating that these might be options that should be considered; right?
 - A. Correct.

4		
ı	L	
	_	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. You didn't find any of these items,
 these contaminants on the Work For Hire document;
 correct?
 - A. No. We don't know if there's any contaminants on the document.
 - Q. Well, did you look?
 - A. I wouldn't know what to look for. I don't have chemical compositions of these materials. The mere presence of PE could have come from a number of sources.
 - Q. Did you conduct any test to determine whether there were contaminants on the page?
 - A. No. It would be a permanent position for the rest of my life to try to figure that out.
 - Q. But the answer is you did not conduct any tests to determine whether there were any contaminants on the page; correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Did you see anyone buy lotion or sunscreen on their hands and then handle the document?
 - A. No. I saw people leave the room for restroom breaks and I don't know what they did.

	3
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. Did you see anyone spray insect
3	repellent on the document?
4	A. No. That referral was maybe under the
5	control of the Ceglias when it was in the hope
6	chest.
7	Q. He might have sprayed insect repellent
8	on it?
9	A. He might have. I don't know.
10	Q. Do you know who did test the document
11	for contaminants?
12	A. I don't know if anyone tested it.
13	Q. Mr. LaPorte tested the document for
14	contaminants.
15	Did you know that?
16	A. I would love to have the chance to
17	depose him on that.
18	Q. Oh, okay.
19	You want to depose Mr. LaPorte now?
20	MR. BOLAND: Objection.
21	A. No. I assume when his chance for
22	deposition comes I will be, as he is here with
23	you, I'll be providing questions and I'd love
24	that opportunity.

Do you want to ask the questions in the

Q.

L. Stewart
deposition?
MR. BOLAND: Objection.
A. That would not be my role. I would
just, as your experts are doing, provide
information to the lawyers.
Q. You're sure you wouldn't like to ask
the questions?
MR. BOLAND: Objection.
A. I think I answered that.
Q. Okay.
So you're not aware that it's
Mr. LaPorte's standard protocol to run paper
blanks prior to GCMS testing and PE testing?
A. Of course that's his protocol, but that
would not test for contamination of the area of
the ink.
Q. Did you know that he ran paper blanks
and found no phenoxyethanol in the paper blanks?
A. A paper blank that had no ink on it
having no phenoxyethanol means nothing to me.
Q. It means nothing to you?
A. Right, because it's not the what he
tested to get phenoxyethanol was ink plus paper.

Q.

I see.

1		
7	_	

L. Stewart

So there had to be a tiny dab of sunscreen on exactly that little piece of ink and that could have possibly caused the contamination; is that it?

A. I don't know the amount. I'm just saying the literature says it is something that should be considered and there's a number of things that could have caused contamination, I just put it in the report.

Q. So it's possible that somebody could have had sunscreen on their arm and they could have brushed against the paper and that would have contaminated only the ink and not the paper; is that right? Is that what you're saying?

A. You are talking about a microscopic plug of paper sample taken from the paper versus the entirety of an 8-1/2-by-11 sheet, so simply testing a paper blank in relation to this does not mean the document was not contaminated.

Q. You testified that you have provided expert analysis in, I think you said, thousands of cases; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And are those all cases involving ink?

	Page 255
1	L. Stewart
2	A. No.
3	Q. Quite a few of them involved ink;
4	correct?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And have you ever offered an opinion
7	about ink and about your findings with respect to
8	ink on questioned documents in those reports?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And in those occasions when you did
11	provide an opinion about ink, did you rule out
12	all possible explanations for the findings that
13	you had?
14	A. I never testified to GC mass spec, that
15	is a completely different avenue for doing ink
16	analysis than from what I have used in actual
17	casework.
18	Q. So you've never testified, you have
19	never put in an expert report related to GCMS
20	testing and the results therefrom?
21	A. I have with GC, not GCMS, and based on
22	the research that's been conducted and reported I
23	would not do that, I would not allow it to be

And how would you propose to rule out

24

25

done in casework.

Q.

•	1	
-	L	

L. Stewart

every theoretical possibility for chemical results? Would one have to interview every single person who touched a document?

- A. Thus the problem with the technique.
- Q. So you're saying it's worth absolutely no weight because you cannot rule out every possible way that you might have certain chemical findings? Is that what you're saying?
- A. I don't know if it is feasible in the future that that could be done. Today it has not been done.
- Q. There is absolutely no way because you cannot rule out every possible alternative explanation; right?
- A. To the Federal Government and to my opinion, correct, the federal government is not using the approach and neither am I.
- Q. So it's your opinion that you should not use such an approach because you cannot rule out all possible alternative explanations; right?
- A. Of course, especially if you are going to issue a finding that something's fraudulent.
- Q. Now, you said that you don't do any analysis using a GCMS machine; right?

1		L. Stewart
2	A.	No.
3	Q.	Let me restate that.
4		You have not issued findings in reports
5	using GCM	S testing; right?
6	A .	On ink, correct. I have on other
7	materials	•
8	Q.	Do you own a GCMS machine?
9	Α.	No, I do not.
10	Q.	Do you know how to use one?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	When was the last time you used one?
13	Α.	The last time in casework was back at
14	the Burea	of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
15	between '	79 and '82.
16	Q.	Was that the last time you used a GCMS
17	machine f	or casework?
18	Α.	With MS, correct, I believe that's the
19	last time	•
20	Q.	Was that for ink analysis?
21	Α.	No. It was for explosives.
22	Q.	When was the last time you issued an
23	expert re	port based on results of your own work
24	on a GCMS	machine?

It would have been during that time

Α.

1	L. Stewart
2	period.
3	Q. And that was before you were with the
4	Secret Service?
5	A. That's correct.
6	Q. Have you ever testified about a GCMS
7	result when you personally conducted the testing?
8	A. I don't recall if any of those old
9	cases ever went to trial, I'm not sure.
10	Q. And you were with the Bureau of
11	Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms up until 1982; is
12	that right?
13	A. July of 1982, yes.
14	Q. Okay.
15	So that was back before 1982 that you
16	had done the GCMS testing; correct?
17	A. Correct.
18	Q. And not since then; right?
19	A. No, I have not done that particular
20	approach since then.
21	MR. SOUTHWELL: Why don't we take a
22	quick break here.
23	MR. BOLAND: Before you do that, just a
24	note that it's approximately 4:10 p.m. and
25	so we started at 10 o'clock this morning. I

1	L. Stewart
2	think we'd all agree, we took one break for
3	20 minutes, so at 5:20 will be seven hours,
4	just letting you know.
5	MR. SOUTHWELL: We dispute that that is
6	the correct count of the amount of time.
7	MR. BOLAND: Well, I got it from the
8	videographer, so he is the guy calculating
9	the time.
10	MS. AYCOCK: We have seven hours of
11	deposition.
12	MR. BOLAND: We were back here after
13	the 20-minute break, the court reporter, the
14	witness, myself, the videographer.
15	MR. SOUTHWELL: I've heard you, I've
16	heard you. We have a different
17	MR. BOLAND: You are on your time.
18	MR. SOUTHWELL: We have a different
19	perspective on how much time it is, I think
20	it's the correct perspective based on the
21	case law, so if you want to go to the Court
22	on it, I'm more than happy to do that.
23	I have a case in the other room that
24	makes it quite clear that it is deposition

time, so you can make all the records you

	rage 200
1	L. Stewart
2	want to make about this and if you want to
3	go see the judge, let's go do it, but we're
4	going to finish our deposition and we're
5	going to take our seven hours, if we need
6	it; I'm not sure we do.
7	MR. BOLAND: I'm just letting you know
8	5:30 is seven hours, anything after that is
9	a bonus, that's all I wanted to put on the
10	record.
11	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
12	record. The time is 4:10. End of tape 4.
13	(Recess taken.)
14	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
15	record. The time is 4:25. This is tape
16	number 5.
17	BY MR. SOUTHWELL:
18	Q. Now, Mr. Stewart, in your report at
19	page 74 you describe what you believe Gerry
20	LaPorte did as the LaPorte method of PE testing;
21	correct?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And your description is based on his
24	report and your experience with Mr. LaPorte;

right?

	Page 261
1	L. Stewart
2	A. In part.
3	Q. Well, you weren't present when he ran
4	his testing, were you?
5	A. Well, when he ran his GCMS testing, no.
6	Q. Right.
7	You were not present when he ran any of
8	his chemical analysis; correct?
9	A. That's correct.
10	Q. Can you explain how the procedure used
11	by the Canada Border Services Agency and the
12	procedure used by Mr. LaPorte differs?
13	A. I can, if I refer to documents I have
14	back in my office. I do not have those documents
15	here.
16	Q. What documents are those?
17	A. Published research by the Canadians
18	versus published research by Mr. LaPorte and then
19	the notes of his examination in this case.
20	Q. Your report is offered, it's fair to
21	say, as a rebuttal to Mr. LaPorte's report; right?
22	A. No. It was my own independent analysis
23	plus a rebuttal.

own independent analysis, but in part you were

Well, right, there may have been your

Q.

24

1	L. Stewart
2	offering a counter opinion or a rebuttal to what
3	Mr. LaPorte's report said; yes?
4	A. That's what it ended up being. It
5	equally possibly could have been that I agreed
6	with Mr. LaPorte, I just didn't in this case.
7	Q. Well, that it seems you two have a
8	long history, so that seems unlikely, wouldn't
9	you say?
10	A. Just in the past couple of years since
11	he's been in private practice, yes.
12	Q. I see.
13	And you knew you were supposed to be
14	deposed here for a month or so; right?
15	A. Correct.
16	Q. And you knew one of the big issues that
17	certainly is in your report is your critique of
18	the LaPorte method; right?
19	A. That's correct.
20	Q. And you are aware, are you not, that
21	the Canada Border Services Agency uses a
22	procedure that is quite similar to that used by
23	Mr. LaPorte; right?
24	A. Oh, it's similar. It's not the same,

though.

4		
L	_	
	_	

L. Stewart

2

I understand. Q.

3

4

My question was, you are aware that they use a procedure that is quite similar to

5

that used by Mr. LaPorte; correct?

6

I would say similar, not quite similar, Α. but yes.

7

8

0. Okay.

9

10

11

But you are not prepared to testify about that because you don't have those documents and you don't have that information in your head;

12

is that right?

13 14

Α. I did not receive a subpoena duces tecum and I brought everything I thought I would be talking about, which are all of my

16

15

declarations and depositions and then the

17

additional documents you guys requested. I did not go beyond that, no.

18 19

But you critique Mr. LaPorte's use of Q. his method for ink dating; right?

20 21

Α. His method in this case for ink dating,

But you are aware that there are a

22

yes.

0.

23 24

number of agencies, including the Canada Border

25

Services Agency, that uses a procedure which you

	Page 264
1	L. Stewart
2	said is similar to the method he used for ink
3	dating; correct?
4	A. Yes. None of them use his procedure.
5	Q. You just testified they use a procedure
6	that is similar to his; yes?
7	A. Similar, yes.
8	Q. Now, can you describe step by step what
9	you call the LaPorte method?
10	A. Well, it's changed over the years. I
11	can go through what he originally reported in his
12	research that he published and we can look at
13	what he published in this case as far as his
14	technique.
15	Q. Why don't we talk about this case; okay?
16	A. Well, that doesn't answer your
17	question, then.
18	Q. Well, my question is describe step by
19	step what you describe as the LaPorte method that
20	was used in this case, that's my question.
21	A. Okay.
22	I can only partially answer that
23	because you did not give full disclosure of his
24	method. All I have is the printout from his

machine, I can only gain certain knowledge from

1	L. Stewart
2	that.
3	Q. Okay. Go ahead and describe it.
4	A. Would you hand me his declaration?
5	Q. You don't have a copy there?
6	A. No. I was not asked to bring that.
7	Q. Okay.
8	Let me ask we are going to hand that
9	to you in a moment do you know how many ink
10	samples Mr. LaPorte uses for each extraction
11	vial?
12	A. It's changed between his point of doing
13	his research and what he's reported he's done in
14	casework, so I don't know, it changes each time I
15	talk to him about it.
16	I do have three pages from his report
17	here that I did bring.
18	Q. Okay.
19	What pages is that?
20	A. I have 15, 16 of 26 and then his, one
21	of his exhibits which is the printout from the
22	machine.
23	Q. And page 15 and 16 is the section that
24	is titled "Ink Dating Analysis of the Writing

Inks on the Work For Hire Document"; is that

1	L. Stewart
2	right?
3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. So that is what I was going to hand to
5	you, it sounds like you have that in front of
6	you.
7	So you testified a moment ago that his
8	method changes each time you talk to him.
9	How often do you talk to him about his
10	method? What are you referring to?
11	A. Only in court cases, and I say talk
12	meaning in depositions and trials.
13	Q. When you're talking to him in those
L 4	depositions and trials?
15	A. No. I don't talk to him directly. I
16	am talking about reading his transcripts and
17	listening to him testify.
18	Q. Okay.
19	So let's focus on the ink-dating
20	analysis in this case outlined on pages 15 and 16.
21	Now, this is a discussion of ink-dating
22	analysis using a PE method that you are referring
23	to as the LaPorte method.
24	Have you had other cases involving PE
25	ink-dating testing with Mr LaPorte?

	Page 267
1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes, I have.
3	Q. What case was that?
4	A. There was one in Boston that we were
5	both involved in a year and a half, two years
6	ago.
7	Q. What was the name of that case?
8	A. I don't recall.
9	Q. Any others?
10	A. I may recall it if I think a moment.
11	It had to do with a union dispute for an
12	election, but I don't recall the case name at
13	this point.
14	Q. Okay.
15	So in this case how many ink samples
16	did he use for his extraction vial?
17	A. I don't see that he says.
18	Q. And it's your understanding that some
19	samples are unheated and others are heated under
20	the LaPorte method; right?
21	A. That's what he's testified to in the
22	past.
23	Q. Let's talk about the unheated examples
24	first.

What is your understanding of what

1	
Т	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

L. Stewart

- Mr. LaPorte does in order to prepare ink samples for the GCMS?
 - A. Well, he's very cryptic here. He says he ran the test twice, that doesn't tell if he ran it on two different samples or if he ran the same vial twice or what twice means, so that I can't define for you.
 - Q. My question is, what do you understand he does in order to prepare the ink samples for the GCMS?
 - A. He says absolutely nothing about preparing them here.
 - Q. Do you know what kind of vial he uses to extract the ink?
 - A. No, that's not been disclosed.
- Q. Do you know what kind of solvent he uses?
- A. I know what he has said in the past he uses, but in this case he has not disclosed it.
 - Q. Do you know how much solvent he uses?
- 22 A. No, he does not indicate that.
- Q. You are familiar with the fact that
- 24 Dr. Aginsky also has an ink-dating method
- 25 involving phenoxyethanol; correct?

1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Can you describe what his method is?
4	A. It's listed pretty accurately in one of
5	his publications, but I don't have that with me.
6	Q. How does Dr. Aginsky's method differ
7	from Mr. LaPorte's method?
8	A. Again, it's difficult to say what
9	Mr. LaPorte's method is, it wasn't disclosed in
10	this case. I have disclosure in other cases from
11	him where he's testified and I have his own
12	published research and it's changed between
13	those, so
14	Q. And I understand that you keep
15	repeating that it's changed and it's difficult to
16	understand because it's not disclosed, but you
17	are providing an expert report that criticizes
18	that method, correct, Mr. LaPorte's method?
19	A. Yes, I criticize his method in this
20	case.
21	Q. Okay.
22	But I'm trying to focus in on what
23	exactly you are criticizing.
24	What is it that you think is incorrect
25	or wrong about his method? Can you be specific,

1	L. Stewart
2	please?
3	A. Yes. The published research and the
4	method today indicates that a number of factors
5	have not been properly researched in order to use
6	it in casework.
7	Q. Okay.
8	Let me pause there. I want to make
9	sure I understand exactly what you're saying.
10	The published research and the method
11	today indicates that a number of factors.
12	What can you be specific? What is
13	it that you're saying?
14	A. Certainly.
15	There are a number of articles, the
16	most recent one was published in 2010 concerning
17	the age method using PE for ink age determination.
18	Those methods outline specific methodology that
19	is not the same as the methodology that
20	Mr. LaPorte has testified that he uses and what
21	he put in his research that he uses.
22	Q. Right.
23	And so what specifically is your
24	criticism with respect to that article and the
25	LaPorte method?

	Page 2/1
1	L. Stewart
2	A. There's numbers. That article talks
3	about
4	Q. Please point them out.
5	A. That article talks about the inherent
6	dangers are not knowing the effect of paper and
7	age considerations, it talks about
8	contaminations, it also talks about doing
9	studies, blind studies and research studies to
10	determine whether or not the test even works.
11	Those haven't been conducted yet and the studies
12	that have been conducted show that it's riddled
13	with fault, it's very easy to make mistakes, the
14	most recent being one that's
15	Q. Let me pause you because you are
16	throwing a whole lot of stuff in there and I want
17	you to be specific.
18	What is the 2010 article that you are
19	referring to?
20	A. It is by Mr if I can pronounce it
21	correctly it's referred to in my report, if
22	you just give me a moment.
23	MR. SOUTHWELL: The record should

reflect the witness is leafing through his

declaration.

24

•	1		
-	۰	-	

L. Stewart

_	
2	A. There's a couple. The one that just
3	came out in 2010, I'm still looking for that
4	citation, but the same author Weyermann, that's
5	W-e-y-e-r-m-a-n-n, et al., published an earlier
6	article that outlined a lot of the concerns in
7	2007, those same concerns were reiterated in his
8	2010 publication and nowhere in that publication
9	does he even reference Mr. LaPorte's method, he
10	simply talks about other methodology using PE.
11	Q. And what exactly is the criticism of
12	the PE methodology in the Weyermann article?

A. It's very simple. If you develop a new test, a new technique, you must do studies to show that that particular technique works before you put it into a forensic scheme. You certainly would not use it until you understand all the parameters of it, and when you start changing things like columns, ramps, temperatures, amount that you use, that you extract from, solvents, when you start changing things like that, you change a lot and every bit of that needs to be re-examined before put into casework; that's why the Department of Justice, who he currently works for, the Department of Secret Service, none of

1	L. Stewart
2	those agencies use the approach. You're only
3	going to find it used in some European
4	laboratories and the Canadians that you mentioned
5	and Mr. LaPorte and Mr. Aginsky.
6	Q. I see.
7	Mr. Aginsky's is one of plaintiff's
8	forensic document examiners; correct?
9	A. I don't know if he still is, but he was.
10	Q. Okay.
11	You testified earlier that he was, so I
12	guess I was just going based on what you said.
13	A. I testified that you would have to ask
14	the lawyers. I'm not sure if he is still
15	involved in the case.
16	Q. Okay.
17	I think you testified that you believed
18	he was, but that's fine.
19	And so the Canadians and the Europeans,
20	they apparently don't know what they're doing; is
21	that your opinion?
22	A. No. They know exactly what they're
23	doing. They're actually doing studies on their
24	approach and they're showing many limitations

even within their own approach to the point that

1
т

L. Stewart

2 they

they're saying in a lot of cases they would not use it in casework.

4

Q. And where exactly are they saying in a lot of cases they would not use it in casework?

6

5

I need you to be very specific, Mr.

Stewart, because what you are doing is you are

7 8

throwing out these very broad generalizations,

9

studies show it's riddled with fault, and you're

10

not being specific, so I don't know how the Court

11

can evaluate your opinion unless you are specific

12

about what you are saying.

13

You can't just paint with a broad brush

14 15 without being very specific, so I'm asking you, please, to be specific, and not just throw out

16

statements like they said, you know, studies say

17

it's riddled with fault.

18 19 Can we agree that you can try to do that, please?

20

A. I am trying to. I will tell you my

21

22

reports that I've issued and exhibits, I was not

I have 370-something pages of

23

given prior knowledge of what to bring to this

24

other than assumption, that we were going to talk

25

about that, and now you're asking me other

limitation.

1		
1	•	

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

questions, so I can either take time to go through my report and my documents and show you those articles there and direct your attention to it, but I believe if you read my report and you see where I cited those articles you'll see exactly what I'm talking about. I'm trying now to go back to those articles and show them to you again.

Q. I'm trying to ask questions about your report because frankly I found it very nonspecific about what the actual criticisms were other than your claim that the PE tests had not been validated, so let me ask a specific question about that.

You criticize the validity of LaPorte's method; right?

Can you explain what part of the PE testing that LaPorte conducted you believe has not been validated?

- A. None of it has.
- Q. None of it has?
- A. It's not used by the Federal Government.
- Q. So none of the LaPorte method has been validated; is that what you're saying?

4	
_	•

L. Stewart

- A. That's correct. There's no standard --
 - O. How has it not been validated?
 - A. -- there is no federal agency using the approach, it's not been validated.
 - Q. I'm not asking about what agencies are using it or what agencies are not. Please listen to the question.

My question is what part of the tests, the methods you believe have not been validated, and you said all of it; right?

- A. That's correct. That's no --
- Q. The next question is, how is the testing method validated? What's required?

 MR. BOLAND: Objection.
- A. Well, first you have to have a method that you stick with instead of changing it every couple weeks. Once you come up with a method that you think works, you have to publish that with sufficient information that people can do peer-reviewed studies.

That's never happened with his technique. The only time he came close to that was in his article, I believe, in 2004, where he outlines his approach, but he's deviated from

_	

L. Stewart

that approach many times since then, as recently as a couple of months ago in a case that he was deposed and he deviated from it.

- Q. And your testimony is that he deviates from it every two weeks? That's what you just testified; yes?
 - A. No. I didn't say he.

You asked specifically how do you go through and validate a study or validate an approach. I'm telling you if you make changes to that approach that means you start all over again. If you have a consistent approach that you feel is valid, you then put that out to your peers and have it reviewed, you have studies done to show does it work, can it be reproduced in multiple laboratories using that same technique and that has not occurred here, so that, based on my time as a laboratory director for a leading law enforcement agency, that's why it's not used.

O. I see.

And when I asked you how is the testing method validated and you answered you have to stick with a method instead of changing it every couple weeks --

	Page 278
1	L. Stewart
2	A. Right.
3	Q you're saying that Mr. LaPorte
4	changes it every couple weeks?
5	A. No. I did not put his name in there.
6	I said that if you change a
7	Q. We're talking about Mr. LaPorte's
8	method.
9	A. Okay.
10	And you asked me a specific question,
11	how do you validate an approach. You can't
12	change that approach. You have to sit there and
13	come up with a technique you think works. You
14	then have to put that out there to your peers and
15	you have to show the entire recipe of how it's
16	done and then you have to allow people to see
17	does it works or not work; that hasn't occurred
18	here.
19	Q. You're saying a part of the LaPorte
20	method uses GCMS; right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Are you saying that GCMS is not a valid
23	instrument for testing chemicals?
24	A No. I am not saying that

That has not been validated?

Q.

-1	
_	

L. Stewart

- A. No. It has nothing to do with the machine.
 - Q. Because you just mentioned a few minutes ago that all of Mr. LaPorte's method has not been validated and that, you just testified, is part of Mr. LaPorte's report and in fact it has been validated, so I guess I'm not really clear what exactly is your testimony.

Are you saying that all of it has not been validated or are you saying that parts of it have not been validated?

Please be specific.

- A. I believe his technique for using a microscope has been validated, I believe his technique for using ultraviolet light and infrared light to do chemical analysis has been validated, his method for identifying ink has been validated, those are all things that are discussed in standards.
- Q. And what are the parts that you are saying specifically that have not been validated as part of the LaPorte method?
- A. Using a GC mass spec to look for 2-phenoxyethanol using his specific methodology

1	١		
_	L		

L. Stewart

2 has never been validated.

- Q. And what is his specific methodology that you are saying has not been validated to look for 2-phenoxyethanol?
- A. I can only go by what he put into this report, which is very cryptic, or what he's testified to as recently as a month or two ago. If you would like me to bring that out, we can talk about that.
- Q. As you sit here today, you can't say what it is that you think has not been validated in his approach?
- A. I can say that his methodology that he testified to recently is not the same as the methodology that's discussed by the most recent articles on the subject and none of them refer to the LaPorte method.
- Q. And what specifically about the methodology are you referring to?
- A. Again, I have to pull it out to look at it to show you that.
- Q. So you don't know, you can't testify to that as you sit here today?
 - A. Off the top of my head, no; it's a very

1	L. Stewart
2	difficult technique.
3	Q. Do you understand the difference
4	between a static and dynamic approach to dating
5	inks?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And a static approach relies on
8	characteristics of the document that will not
9	change and allow for dating; right?
10	A. Say that again?
11	Q. A static approach relies on
12	characteristics of the document that will not
13	change and that allows for dating; right?
14	So I will give you an example.
15	You identify the components of a
16	formulation of ink in a static approach; right?
17	A. Right, but that doesn't date the ink.
18	Q. I understand.
19	But it could date the ink if perhaps
20	there is ink that has a known introduction date
21	or a marker inserted by the manufacturer; correct?
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. And that would be a static approach;
24	right?
25	A. Yes.

1	
Т	

L. Stewart

- 2
- Q. And a dynamic approach relies on how a document changes over time; right?
- 4

3

- A. Yes.
- 5
- Q. In a dynamic approach one measures physical or chemical properties that change over time; right?
- 8

7

- A. Correct.
- 9
- Q. Contrary to the static approach and the dynamic approach, one does not necessarily use a library of standards; right?
- 11

12

10

- A. I disagree with that.
- 13

14

- Q. Well, it's not necessary to identify a particular formulation of ink in a dynamic
- 15
- approach; right?
- 16
- A. I disagree with that.
- 17
- Q. Let's -- are you familiar with Exhibit 20 of your report?
- 19

18

- A. Yes, sir.
- 20

21

- Q. This is an article by Valery Aginsky in the Journal of Chromatography?
- 22
- A. Yes, sir.
- 23

24

Q. And you cite this article in your

report and you've attached it as Exhibit 20;

- 25

right?

1	L. Stewart
2	A. Correct.
3	Q. And you've read it?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. This is a reliable authority; correct?
6	A. Yes. It's dated, but it's reliable at
7	the time.
8	Q. And on the first page of the article
9	the article states that discrimination between
10	fresh, age less than several months, and old
11	ballpoint ink entries and it does not need dated
12	reference entries written with ink having the
13	same formula as that of the questioned ink.
14	Did I read that correctly?
15	A. You are cutting off the sentence.
16	He's talking about a specific procedure
17	that he's outlining in this research and he says
18	the procedure allows discrimination between fresh
19	and then forward, so
20	Q. And what he says is you do not need a
21	dated reference entry?
22	A. That's what he's saying, yes.
23	Q. Right.
24	And so this is a reliable authority

that you cite that establishes that one does not

1	
_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

need to identify the ink formula in a dynamic approach?

- A. No. I cited it, I cite certain aspects of it, I don't necessarily agree with everything in it. That's one thing I don't agree with. I think it is very important to identify the ink composition before you do any of the dynamic approaches.
- Q. Do you have any articles that agree with your position that you need to identify the ink before using a dynamic approach to ink dating?
- A. It's articles that I publish, but if you want people publishing them, I believe there have been, but I'd have to go and check that, I don't know.
- Q. You can't point to any that say that other than the ones that you've written; right?
- A. As we sit here right now, no, I cannot point to them.
 - Q. And the PE test is a dynamic approach; right?
- A. Given the scope of your question, it is a portion of a dynamic approach.

1		
L	_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

- Q. And your report cites to the article by Gerry LaPorte on the identification of 2-phenoxyethanol in ballpoint inks, and it goes on, but an example of that is Exhibit 10 to your report, right, you cite to that article?
 - A. Yes, I cite that article.
 - Q. You attach it as Exhibit 10; right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- Q. You also attach part of it as Exhibit

 11 of your report; right?
- 12 A. Yes, that's part of Exhibit 11.
 - Q. And you also attach part of it as Exhibit 23 to your report; yes?
- 15 A. Yes.
 - Q. Can I ask why it is you are citing and including this article and portions thereof in three different exhibits to your report?
 - A. Because I thought it was easier for the Court because I would it references in one exhibit as opposed to making the Court go back to two or three different exhibits.
 - Q. It wasn't meant to bulk up your report?
- A. I was trying to make my report smaller, actually.

	rage 286
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. You've read this article; yes?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And the article discusses a dynamic
5	approach to ink dating; right?
6	A. If you want to direct me to where it
7	talks about dynamic, that it would make it
8	quicker, otherwise I can read it.
9	Q. Well, it talks about the fact of doing
10	ink dating based on how a document changes over
11	time, which, as you agreed earlier, is a dynamic
12	approach; yes?
13	A. Yes. I just don't know if he he
14	does refer to it as a dynamic approach on page 2,
15	the first line.
16	Q. And this article talks about using GCMS
17	to detect PE in ink samples; correct?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. And the method described in the article
20	is extremely similar to the method that LaPorte
21	used here with the Work For Hire contract; right?
22	A. I have no way of knowing, it's not been
23	discovered or disclosed.

paragraph 358 of your report. There you quote

Now let's turn to page -- I am sorry,

Q.

24

	rage 207
1	L. Stewart
2	from an article by Berger-Karin which you have
3	attached as Exhibit 25 of your report; right?
4	A. I believe you said 358, it's 357, but
5	yes.
6	Q. All right.
7	So the cite you have here is 357,
8	actually, and I take it back, this is commentary
9	on the Berger-Karin article, but it is actually
10	<pre>by Weyermann; correct?</pre>
11	A. That is correct.
12	Q. Earlier you referred to Weyermann as a
13	male.
14	Was that accurate?
15	A. I don't know. I've only spoken with
16	the person via e-mail. I think I've only seen
17	their first name as an initial, so I'm not sure
18	if it is male or female.
19	Q. You can see down at the bottom of this
20	article which you have and you cite in your
21	report that her name is Celine.
22	Do you see that?
23	A. I have seen males named Celine as well.
24	T don't know

Now, you refer to this article in 357

Q.

1	L. Stewart
2	and in 358 you purport to quote from it; correct?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And paragraph 358 of your report, you
5	start "They concluded," and the they here refers
6	back to the article by Weyermann; correct?
7	A. There's two different referrals there.
8	357 begins with in 2009 there is a notation there
9	about one of their findings, and then that is
10	referred back to a 2008 publication.
11	Q. Okay.
12	Well, you have a quote here.
13	Where is this quote from?
14	A. I don't know. Let me look for it.
15	Q. Well, maybe I can make it a little
16	easier.
17	Let's look at the last line of this
18	Exhibit 25, which is to the right-hand side of
19	the first page.
20	Do you see that there is a quote or
21	there is a section there in italics and that is
22	in fact what you are purporting to quote from in
23	paragraph 358 of your report?
24	A. Yes.

And do you see that in paragraph 358 of

Q.

	Tuge 203
1	L. Stewart
2	your report you purport to quote from this
3	article by saying, quote, "Forensic scientists
4	should not attempt to examine actual criminal or
5	civil cases until they (the methods to include
6	unvalidated PE method, e.g., reports) have been
7	tested"?
8	A. That's correct.
9	Q. Do you see that?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And so do you see in 358 of your
12	paragraph you are representing to the Court that
13	this author has made this statement in the
14	article and in fact is criticizing specifically
15	Mr. LaPorte; right? That's in 358 of your
16	report?
17	A. If that's the inference, I'm sorry for
18	that. There should have probably been a quote at
19	the end of "they" and at the beginning of "have."
20	The part in the parentheses is my
21	continuation of the thought of what I was
22	discussing before and after that.
23	Q. Right.

So paragraph 358 of your report is

inaccurate; correct?

24

1	
Т	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

- A. Grammatically, maybe, not in content.
 - Q. Well, if you are purporting to quote from an article and you have inserted words that are your own that are not in the article, you will agree with me that they are not in the article; right?

The words "the methods to include unvalidated PE methods, e.g. LaPorte's, those are not in the article Exhibit 25; correct?

- A. No. Those are my words there that probably should have been taken out of the quotation.
 - Q. Right.

You have inserted those into a quotation purporting to be from an article by Weyermann; right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And that is inaccurate, correct, because that's not in fact in the article?
- A. The part in parentheses is not in the article, those are my words.
 - Q. So paragraph 358 is inaccurate; correct?
- A. No, I think it's very accurate. It's not accurate as far as what he said. It's --

4		
	L	
	_	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. It's accurate, huh? It's accurate --
 - A. Yes, it's accurate.
 - Q. -- because it is a quote from a book where you insert -- a quote from an article where you insert your own words into the quote and you are telling the Court that that's accurate?
 - A. No. Grammatically this should be been structured differently, so grammatically it's inaccurate. The content is accurate as far as what they said and what I'm saying in my report.
 - Q. Grammatically it's inaccurate?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. So if I were to quote from your report and put my own words into the middle of it, that would only be grammatically incorrect?
 - A. I would have to see --
 - Q. If I were to tell the judge Mr. Stewart testified at his deposition that the Work For Hire document is a fraud, if I told the judge that, but I had inserted the part "was a fraud" that would simply be grammatically incorrect? Wouldn't that be actually incorrect?
 - A. In that case it would be actually incorrect. That's not what's happening here.

	•
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. It's not what's happening here?
3	Look at 358. They conclude it by
4	emphasizing that quote and then you purport to
5	have a quote from the article.
6	You are telling us this is not a
7	representation to the Court that this is a quote
8	from an article?
9	A. It is a quote from an article minus the
10	part that I've got in parentheses and that was
11	done incorrectly. I should have done that a
12	different way.
13	Q. So the quote is inaccurate, correct?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Okay.
16	It's very hard for you to admit that
17	you're wrong; is that right?
18	MR. BOLAND: Objection.
19	A. I do not agree that that's a wrong
20	statement.
21	Q. It's not a wrong statement to quote
22	erroneously from an article, to represent to the
23	Court that they are criticizing the LaPorte

method when in fact that's not what they are

doing?

24

	4		
	ı		
•			

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

L. Stewart

- A. That part is wrong and it's the
 grammatical part that I should have done
 differently. The content of the paragraph I do
 not believe is wrong, I believe it's accurate.
 - Q. You believe it's accurate that
 Weyermann in their article published in the
 Journal of Forensic Science has said that the
 methods in the specified LaPorte's method, you
 think that's accurate, huh?
 - A. What I believe is accurate is that forensic scientists should not attempt to examine actual criminal or civil cases until they have been tested and that is the method that includes LaPorte's unvalidated PE test, I think that that is a very accurate statement.
 - Q. But paragraph 358 purports to be a quote to the Court, you are representing that this is what someone else has said; right?
 - A. And I apologize for that, I did that incorrectly there.
 - Q. Okay.
- So that is an inaccurate quote; right?
- A. Yes, it's an inaccurate quote.
 - Q. Now, in your report you also stated

1	
Т	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

that you prohibited Mr. LaPorte from using his methods for ink dating in casework while you supervised him at the Secret Service; right?

- A. Our policies prohibited it and I was in charge of the policy, so yes.
- Q. You actually say at paragraph 210, quote, "I prohibited him," close quote.

Am I being accurate in how I quoted your report?

- A. And as I just explained to you, I did prohibit him by being in charge of the system and it was our policy.
 - Q. How did you prohibit him?
- A. We had a policy that any untested and unreliable forensic tests could not be used in actual casework until it was reviewed by our peers and authorized by the laboratory director and that was me.
- Q. And did the policy specifically prohibit him from using this test, i.e., the PE test in casework?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Specifically it referred to the PE test and it prohibited him from doing that?

1	
Т	

L. Stewart

- 2
- 3
- 5
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13 14
- 15 16
- 17
- 18
- 19

- 2122
- 23
- 24
- 25

- A. We referred to any test that was outside of our scope, so that would be one of them.
- Q. Let's read paragraph 210 together, okay?
- "These are the core of the reasons I prohibited him from using this test in casework when I supervised him at the U.S. Secret Service."
 - Did I read that accurately?
 - A. Yes, that's accurate.
- Q. How did you prohibit him from using this test? What does this test refer to? This test refers to his ink-dating method that you're referring to in this section of your report; right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So how specifically, please be specific, did you prohibit him from using this test, his ink-dating method in casework?
- A. Well, that was included in a recent filing to the Court, it had the actual scope of what was allowed at the Secret Service under my direction, it showed that any technique that was

1		
_	-	

L. Stewart

not within that scope was not allowed until it was peer reviewed and it was accepted for use in tests -- in casework by me. I included that in a recent filing to the Court.

- Q. And what specifically is that that you are referring to?
- A. That is the standard operating procedures for the Secret Service questioned document branch.
- Q. Does that refer to the ink-dating method with specificity?
- A. It refers to any ink-dating method outside of the scope and this was one of those, so, yes, it refers to all ink-dating methods that aren't within the scope.
- Q. Listen very carefully to my question and please be specific in your answer.

Is it a policy that specifically prohibits Mr. LaPorte or anyone else from using the ink-dating method that you referred to as the LaPorte method, yes or no?

- A. Yes.
- Q. It specifically says you are prohibited from using the LaPorte ink-dating method?

_	
7	
_	

L. Stewart

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25

- It specifically says any method and Α. that is a method, so I can't --
- I understand what you are saying, Q. but -- okav.
- I can't anticipate what methods may be thought up in the future by examiners to be used on casework, I can only go by what's in the scope and then they have to be peer reviewed.
- You're saying that there was a policy Q. that any method that hadn't been tested and peer reviewed could not be worked in casework, that's what you're pointing to; correct?
 - Α. Yes, any new method.
 - Q. Any new method.
 - So you're not saying -- well, let me
 - Who wrote that policy?
- Α. It was written under my predecessor Chief John Hargett at my direction prior to our first ASCLD accreditation, so that would have put it back, I'm guessing, somewhere around 2003 or so.
- And the policy prohibits use of any new Q. untested method in casework; correct?

back up.

1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And you are testifying that that means
4	that it prohibits the LaPorte ink-dating method
5	because that falls within the scope; right?
6	That's your specific statement; correct?
7	A. Yes, it prohibited using that in
8	casework.
9	Q. And that's the policy that you provided
L O	to the Court in this case; right?
L1	A. Yes.
L 2	Q. That is not a policy that prohibits
13	anyone from specifically using the ink-dating
14	method that is discussed in your report; correct?
15	A. You've got to rephrase that one.
L 6	Q. Which part of it don't you understand?
L 7	A. I don't understand any of it.
L 8	Q. Okay.
19	Your statement here on 210 is I
20	prohibited him from using this test in casework.
21	My question is, how did you prohibit
22	him from using this test, and I guess what I'm
23	hearing you say is there was a general policy
24	that said any untested methods are not to be

used.

٠	1	
_	L	

L. Stewart

That's what you are referring to when you say I prohibited him from using this test; is that right?

A. No. There was not a general policy, there was a standard operating procedure and that standard operating procedure dictated what could and could not be used in casework.

This fell -- his technique falls outside that, it fell outside that while I was there and it was never allowed to be used, so in fact I prohibited him from using it.

Q. And you are saying the standard operating procedure -- you would concede, would you not, that the standard operating procedure does not name this ink-dating test with specificity; yes?

A. No. It does it in a more universal approach and says any, any technique outside of this.

Q. And so you still believe I prohibited him from using this test is an accurate statement to the Court?

A. Yes, it is, yeah, very accurate.

Q. All right.

1	
_	

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

Now, in the course of your work in the

Secret Service you signed off on certain reports

that Mr. LaPorte submitted while he was there;

right?

- A. I wasn't his immediate supervisor, I don't know if I signed off any of his reports, I'm not sure.
 - Q. You don't know if you did?
- A. It would have been unusual for me to sign his reports, so I don't know if I did or not.
- Q. I'm not asking you whether you signed his reports specifically, I'm asking whether you signed off on his reports, in other words, you were the supervisor of the lab at the time.
 - A. I have to explain that.

There's an administrative and a technical review that's done on all employees who issue reports; it's possible that I conducted either of those in a case involving him, but it would not have been normal in that I wasn't his first-line supervisor.

Q. Isn't it a fact that among those reports that you signed off on were reports where Mr. LaPorte used PE testing as an ink-dating

1		
_	•	

L. Stewart

method; correct?

- A. No. As I just testified, I don't recall ever signing off on any of his reports. If I did, it would be unusual and the only time I ever recall him using the technique under my direction was an after-the-fact situation, in other words, we had already reached a conclusion in a case, we had already reached an opinion and we were looking to see if the technique reached the same opinion or not; that's different than putting it into a report and putting it out there in a case.
- Q. I understand the difference you are drawing, then.

But you did a technical review of his analysis in at least two cases where he did PE testing for ink dating; right?

- A. I don't know that, I don't know.
- Q. You don't know that you did a technical review of two cases where you approved of his use of ink dating?
- A. I did not approve his use of ink dating in any case to be issued in a report. There were instances, as I mentioned, in research where he

1	
Т	

L. Stewart

used it after the fact; that's different than what you are describing, though, with me approving it in a report or in a case. I did not.

- Q. There were instances, then, when it was used, you're distinguishing from when it was used in a report, and there were at least two instances where it was used and you approved it; correct?
- A. No. Those are your numbers and I'm telling you I don't recall that. It would be highly unusual and if it was, the only recollection I have is allowing him to do it in cases as an after, an after-test when we did not need it and utilize it in reaching the report.
 - O. I see.

Let me ask you some questions about the examination you did in this case.

What were you tasked with in terms of forensic examination of the document?

- A. Separate from overseeing the forensics?
- Q. Did you have any specific tasks that you were given with respect to forensic examination of the document?

-1	
_	

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- A. I wasn't given tasks. I was -- since I
 was directed to put together a forensic team and
 an analysis scheme, I directed people within that
 group as to what they would conduct and what I
 would conduct separately.
 - Q. And so you put together the forensic team, is that right, as you just said?
 - A. Midstream I did. I didn't put together the initial team, I put together the team that we have now.
 - Q. And who's included in that team?
 - A. Right now I know of Mr. Blanco, myself, Mr. Rantanen, and there's two computer folks that I do not have any involvement in, but I know that they are the team as well.
 - Q. How about Mr. Speckin? He's on the team. Did you put him on the team?
 - A. No. I don't recall if I originally suggested him or if he was already on the team.
 - Q. What's your opinion of Mr. Speckin?
 - A. He's a nice gentleman, he's had some controversy in his casework in the past.
 - Q. What's your opinion of his professional capabilities?

1		
L	_	

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- A. I have known him to be very capable,

 but I've also known instances where he has gone

 too far and I think that that may be where he has

 gotten into some situations in the past.
 - Q. Where he's been sloppy; is that right?
 - A. No. Kind of what I'm reporting in this case, using a technique that shouldn't have been used and gone too far with it.
 - Q. So you did not include Mr. Aginsky and Mr. Osborn as part of the team you selected.

Are you aware of why they did not issue a report in this case?

- A. No, I'm not.
- Q. Are you aware of why Mr. Speckin did not issue a report in this case?
 - A. No, I'm not.
- Q. What was your role for the forensic document examination as contrasted to Blanco or Speckin or the computer forensics experts?
- A. I directed Mr. Speckin to do the chemical analysis of the ink with potential follow-up of any age analysis if we went that route. I directed Mr. Blanco to do the handwriting analysis, the analysis of the staple,

	rage 505
1	L. Stewart
2	the general analysis of the document, the
3	indentations and the interlineation, I examined
4	the document in general, I looked to see if the
5	two pages were together, bound together, or if
6	they came from two different sources; I also
7	looked at the staple, I also looked at the
8	interlineations and then I addressed the ink
9	issues. I also did the toner analysis and
10	directed sending the paper out for testing.
11	Q. Right.
12	And Mr. Speckin, he has got a GCMS
13	machine; right?
14	A. Yes, he does.
15	Q. And he does PE ink-dating testing;
16	right?
17	A. He has in the past. That's not the
18	direction that I would have had him go in this
19	case if we had chosen to do ink-age determination.
20	Q. Did he do ink-age determination?
21	A. I don't know if he did in this case or
22	not.
23	Q. Did you ask him?
24	A. No, because his connection to me in

this case involving what he did and didn't do has

1	L. Stewart
2	been disconnected the past number of months, so I
3	don't have a current connection with him on this
4	case.
5	Q. What exactly do you mean by that, your
6	connection to him has been disconnected?
7	A. Once we decided that ink-age analysis
8	wasn't feasible, then it wasn't important for him
9	to issue any additional work in the case, so we
10	continued at that point with Mr. Blanco and
11	myself doing the lion's share of the forensic
12	work.
13	Q. You testified that we decided ink-age
14	analysis wasn't feasible.
15	Who's we?
16	A. Well, on our side I decided, on your
17	side Mr. Lyter decided.
18	Q. I'm asking who is we.
19	You said we decided that ink-age
20	analysis wasn't feasible.
21	Who is we?
22	A. It would have been myself when I was
23	Q. You decided that?
24	A. I shouldn't have included Lyter in

that, it should have been just me.

1	

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

2

Q. Okay.

And as you said before, I think,

Mr. Speckin apparently told you that it was -
well, let me ask you this: Did Mr. Speckin tell

you that he had come to any conclusions about ink

dating?

- A. He told me that he had come to conclusions about ink analysis and identification, and when he told me he could not identify the ink because of its deterioration that is, I believe, the end of the work that he did. You would have to ask the lawyers for further information; that's the last I know of.
- Q. So you didn't interact with him anymore after that?
- A. I have on other cases. I have not interacted with him about his findings in this case.
- Q. Is everything you did as part of your examination spelled out in your report?
 - A. I doubt it.
- Q. Are all the tests that you ran detailed in your report?
 - A. The tests that yielded a finding are

•	1	
_	L	
	_	

L. Stewart

2 detailed in the report, yes.

- 3
- So what other tests did you run that 0. didn't yield a finding?
- 5

4

Α. Let me think.

6 7

it matched up with the indentations. I did not

I examined the interlineation to see if

- 8
- include that in the report because it was
- 9
- something that Mr. Blanco had already addressed
- 10
- and so there was no point in me including that.
- 11
- Did you disagree with Mr. Blanco's 0.
- 12 results?
 - Α. No.

13

14 I did not include anything in my report

- 15
- to a great extent regarding the staples because
- 16
- Mr. Blanco addressed that, although I did agree
- 17
- with his results and likewise with the

You did thin-layer chromatography; yes?

- 18
- handwriting analysis, he addressed that and I
- 19
- agreed with his results, so it was not important
- 20
- to put in my --
- 21
- And what specific tests did you run?
- 22
- Yes. Α.
- 23 24
- You did not do gas chromatography or Q.
- 25
- mass spectrometry; correct?

	rage 303
1	L. Stewart
2	A. No, I did not.
3	Q. You did examination with a video
4	spectral comparator; yes?
5	A. On site Mr. Speckin and I did, yes.
6	Q. Who actually did the VSC examination?
7	A. We both did.
8	Q. Who operated the VSC machine?
9	A. Well, we were both there in front of
10	it. I don't recall who pushed the button.
11	Q. Did you do that at the same time?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Did you conduct microscopy?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. You also stated in your report you
16	conducted a physical analysis.
17	What did that include?
18	A. Visualizing the document, just looking
19	at it using various light sources, scanning in
20	the document, making notations about the
21	document.
22	Q. And you said also in paragraph 89 that
23	you conducted a chemical analysis of the toner,
24	and that was just a TLC analysis; correct?

It was largely a TLC analysis.

Α.

1		
4	-	

L. Stewart

- Q. When you say largely, what else was it?
 - A. Well, it starts with a microscopic examination of the document to determine if it is toner, then a determination is made as to whether or not it is single-color toner versus toner from a machine that uses multiple colors of toner, and then there's a physical removal of the toner and then comparison against a library of standards, and that's done using primarily thin layer chromatography.
 - Q. Let's talk about your opinion about the toner.

First of all, the defendants' experts made some comments about toner and printing, Mr. LaPorte in his report stated he was able to chemically differentiate the toners on each page of the Work For Hire document using TLC analysis; right?

- A. I believe that's what he said, yes.
- Q. And he provides a detailed description of how he differentiated the toners, noting the two differences that he says demonstrate the toners have different ingredients; right?
 - A. You're reading it. He said something

1	L.	Stewart

2 like that.

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Specifically on page 12 of his report
 he says the two toners dissolve differently in
 the same solvent and the two toners streak
 differently on the developed TLC plate and
 diffuse differently from the point of origin;
 right?
 - A. I believe he said something like that.
 - Q. And Professor Romano in his report stated that two different laser printers were used to print page 1 and page 2 of the Work For Hire document; right?
 - A. Yes, that's what he says.
- Q. And he states the basis for his conclusion; right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Now let's talk about your opinions about the toner and the printing.
 - First of all, you agree with the defendants' experts that the printing was black toner from a laser machine at 600 DPI; right?
 - A. It could have been a laser -- at the point of the initial examination it could have been a laser printer or it could have been a

	rage 312
1	L. Stewart
2	laser copier.
3	Q. Well, I just said a laser machine at
4	600 DPI.
5	You are not disputing that the printing
6	was black toner from a laser machine at 600 DPI?
7	A. I am not disputing that it was small
8	size toner, it would have been 600 DPI.
9	Q. But you do counter Mr. LaPorte's
10	conclusion that the toner on the two pages was
11	<pre>different; right?</pre>
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And it's your position that the toners
14	match; right?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And you state at paragraph 93 that this
17	is based on your, quote, "exhaustive physical and
18	<pre>chemical testing"; right?</pre>
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And you mentioned specifically TLC and
21	microscopy; right?
22	A. I believe so, yes.
23	Q. Was there anything else included in
24	your exhaustive testing?

Comparison against the library of

1	
2	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

standards and creation of the library, that type of thing.

Q. Okay.

And in your microscopy examination of the toner did you actually use a stereo microscope?

- A. On site, no, I did not.
- Q. What did you use on site?
- A. I used the VSC scanned image, I used my own eye and some microscopic devices that I took with me. I do not believe that I took a digital microscope -- I'm trying to think -- and so it would have been scanned images.
- Q. I'm talking about the actual document, the physical actual document. You used a hand-held microscope; right? That was your microscopy examination of the toner; yes?
- A. At that time and then that was furthered when I went back to my laboratory.
- Q. Well, you didn't have the original document back in the laboratory, did you?
- A. Didn't need it. I had the plugs that I took.
 - Q. And what were the -- you had -- you

	rage 514
1	L. Stewart
2	developed TLC plates of the toner; right?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And then you claim that you matched the
5	TLC results with the toner from your toner
6	library; is that right?
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. Can you name a study that validates the
9	use of TLC analysis on black toners to identify
10	the manufacturer of a printing device used to
11	produce a questioned document?
12	A. The standard operating procedures for
13	the Secret Service questioned document laboratory.
14	Q. Is that a peer-reviewed study?
15	A. Yes, internally peer reviewed.
16	Q. Any other study that has been published
17	externally that validates the use of a TLC
18	analysis on black toners to identify the
19	manufacturer of a printing device used to produce
20	a questioned document?
21	A. Yes, I believe there was one by Cantu
22	where he talks about the use of TLC to analyze
23	and identify toner

It's in one of my exhibits. I'll look

And which article is that?

Q.

Α.

24

	Page 315
1	L. Stewart
2	for it.
3	Q. Let me help you out.
4	You cite Exhibit 5 in your report, you
5	cite to an article by Dr. Cantu in support of
6	your toner identification; right?
7	A. Do you want to direct me to that,
8	please?
9	Q. Exhibit 5.
10	A. Exhibit 5, yes, I believe that's the
11	article.
12	Q. And the Secret Service study that you
13	are referring to, that's for color toner, not
14	black toner; right?
15	A. No. Well before Mr. LaPorte worked
16	there we developed a system for doing black-only
17	toner, we also had a system for doing
18	monochromatic or toners that were specific colors
19	and we developed a library of standards many
20	years back and we used that throughout the years,
21	so it was black-only, it was monochromatic and
22	later on it was three- and four-color systems.
23	It's gotten much easier with the new

technology, but in the old days we did it the

earlier method.

24

	4		
	ı		
•			

L. Stewart

Q. Now, the Cantu article that you're referring to here is talking about the type of toner, right, it discusses identifying characteristics and features of toner; correct?

Let me ask you more specifically.

The article talks about characteristics and features of toners, it does not mention identifying a printer, manufacturer or even a cartridge; is that right?

- A. It does not mention a cartridge, it talks about how some black toners contain extractible dyes and that those can be identified and characterized by TLC, separated and characterized, I'm sorry, by TLC.
- Q. And it recites that most of the chemical information in black toners is in the organic resins used; correct?
- A. I agree with that, yes. I didn't say it was easy. It's difficult.
- Q. And what tests did you conduct to determine the organic resins in the toners on pages 1 and 2 matched?
- A. Organic resins?

I did not do any tests on the organic

1	-
т.	П
	- 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

L. Stewart

resins, I did the tests on the extractible components.

- Q. So when you say the toners matched, what you actually mean is that they matched at the level of analysis of TLC; right?
- A. Right. I followed the protocol of the federal agency and I stopped at the point of a match.
- Q. But there are other tests that you did not perform; correct?
 - A. Of course.
- Q. And it's possible that these other tests could find differences in other components of the toner; right?
- A. Right. That's why I kept some sample behind. It may be we go to Hewlett-Packard directly and have them identify it.
- Q. And if there are differences in the organic resins or other components then the toners could be said to not match; right?
 - A. Not if it matches, but yes.
- Q. But if it doesn't match, then it wouldn't match?
- A. Of course.

1		
L	_	

L. Stewart

And you say the toner from this

document is consistent with toner from an HP

1100/3200 series machine; right?

Correct.

2

Q.

Α.

- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 1920
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 25 Q.

- Q. Consistent with does not exclude the possibility that it's also consistent with other printers; right?
- A. I found none, but there is the possibility of that, yes.
- Q. Well, consistent with doesn't strike me as a very strong conclusion.

Do you mean it to be a strong conclusion?

- A. No. We are directed by standards on what consistent with means and doesn't mean. I agree with you it's not a very strong conclusion because there is a possibility that there's some other printer out there we are not aware of.
 - Q. And how did you do your comparison?
- A. A number of years back I developed a library of standards for toners and printers and I had those filed in my collection along with the analysis results.
 - Q. Let me stop you there for one second.

1	L. Stewart
2	I'm going to get to the library.
3	What I'm asking you is how did you do
4	the comparison. We are going to get to the
5	library.
6	What was the comparison?
7	A. You run the questioned sample and you
8	compare it against the non sample.
9	Q. What specifically do you compare?
10	A. The separation on a thin-layer
11	chromatography plate along with any associated
12	fluorescence characteristics.
13	Q. Now let's look on paragraph 97 of your
14	report where you say that you compared it against
15	your library of standards.
16	Do you provide a chart or illustration
17	demonstrating this comparison?
18	A. I can in court. I don't have a chart
19	with me today.
20	Q. But your expert report did not include
21	a chart of this comparison; is that right?
22	A. No, it does not have a chart in my
23	report showing a layperson a thin-layer
24	chromatography separation, no, I did not do that.

You do actually cite something, though,

Q.

1	L. Stewart
2	at the end of 97, right, Exhibit 6; right?
3	A. I'm citing information from, I believe,
4	Hewlett-Packard there.
5	I'm sorry, that citation is the
6	section, I believe, of the Secret Service
7	operating procedures for the questioned documents
8	branch, if I am not mistaken.
9	Q. So that does not actually provide a
10	specific illustration of your comparison; right?
11	A. No, I did not I purposely did not
12	put an illustration of my comparison in there.
13	Q. Now, you didn't identify a specific
14	cartridge in your report; right?
15	A. No. That would not be possible.
16	Q. You identified two printer series;
17	right?
18	A. It's two series that use the same
19	cartridge or same toner.
20	Q. And what cartridge is that?
21	A. I believe it's a 92A.
22	Q. Now, you don't include in your report
23	the fact that a 92A cartridge used in those
24	printer series is still commercially available

today, do you?

1		

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- A. No, I do not include that.
 - Q. Are you aware of the fact that the 92A cartridge is still commercially available today?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. I could print a document today using that cartridge, couldn't I?
 - A. Yes, if you had one of those printers and you had that cartridge, you could.
 - Q. In fact, the 92A cartridge works in lots of different printers, not just those printer series; right?
 - A. I believe I listed all of them. I can find that if you direct me --
 - Q. You're not providing an opinion that the 92A cartridge works only in those two machines, are you?
 - A. No. I do not recall if my list had other machines, but I did not -- I can find that, as I said, if you would like to discuss it.
 - Q. So, but you agree with me that I could go today to the Staples down the street, assuming they have this, and get a 92A cartridge and then print a document with it; right?
 - A. You'd probably would have to do that

	
1	L. Stewart
2	online, but yes, you can do that.
3	Q. So today someone could purchase that
4	toner and use it to print a fraudulent document;
5	correct?
6	A. Yes. I believe I included the printout
7	from Amazon that lists it as being available
8	today.
9	Q. Now, you also counter Professor
10	Romano's conclusion the two pages were printed on
11	two different printers; right?
12	A. Yes and no. I countered his conclusion
13	based on his results he cannot say that.
14	Q. I see.
15	But as you said, I think, earlier, you
16	are not an expert in typeface, typography or
17	<pre>printing technology; right?</pre>
18	A. I disagree. I taught that at Rochester
19	Institute of Technology and I have been trained
20	in that by the Secret Service, so I disagree with
21	you.
22	Q. Have you ever been qualified by a court
23	as an expert in typeface, typography and printing
24	technology?

Quite often. The first time was in the

Α.

1	
1	

L. Stewart

Unibomber case when I worked on that, involved typeface and typography.

- Q. And what were you qualified as an expert in that case?
- A. I performed analysis in that case on an unexploded bomb, the label from an unexploded bomb, and I identified it to a make and model of the printer using the same technology I used in this case and then I also performed software analysis on the font to identify the font package that eventually was found in his shed when they arrested him.
 - Q. Did you testify in that case?
 - A. No. It never went to trial.
- Q. And you are not specifically refuting Professor Romano's conclusion, you're simply saying you need more information before you can assess his opinion; right?
- A. No, I didn't ask for more information.

 I said that he was unqualified to make an opinion on forgery because he's not a qualified forensic document examiner and based on his findings that the two pages are different and why he says they're different based on scaling and things

4		
L	_	
	_	

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

like that he can't draw that conclusion because there are software packages that were available back then in 2003 that would have done that, so I disagree with his opinion.

- Q. And what software packages are those?
- A. I had them in my office, a list of the dates on them. I believe that date --
 - Q. Did you spell them out in your report?
- A. No. I believe at that time Word

 Perfect offered it as well as some of the

 printers, I believe the Laserjet 3 may have

 offered it as well, which was a Hewlett-Packard.

If I am not mistaken, at that time it was Word Perfect 3.1.

- Q. And you don't specify any of that in your report, though, do you?
- A. No, I was not asked that in the report. You are asking me that now.
- Q. You provide an opinion that attempts to refute Professor Romano because you say he's not qualified and you provide an alternative opinion; right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. But you didn't provide the basis for

	Page 325
1	L. Stewart
2	that opinion in your report?
3	A. Oh, I believe I did. I didn't include
4	every little reason. You're asking me for a
5	specific reason and about a specific subject and
6	I am trying to answer your question.
7	Q. But you agree with me that you didn't
8	include any detail on any software packages in
9	your report; right?
10	A. No, but I can. If this goes to trial,
11	I will certainly have it there.
12	Q. Good.
13	Now, Mr. LaPorte also concluded in his
14	report that the paper used for pages 1 and 2 of
15	the Work For Hire document is different; right?
16	A. Yes, he did.
17	Q. And he laid out the basis for that
18	conclusion; correct?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And the bases are that the paper on
21	page 2 is significantly more tensile than page 1,
22	right, that's one of them?
23	A. I don't have it in front of me. so I

Does that sound right?

don't know.

Q.

24

-		
_	-	

L. Stewart

- 2
 - That sounds correct. Α.
- 3 4
- And did he also provide a basis that 0. the difference in thickness between pages 1 and 2 is statistically significant; right?
- 6

7

5

- If he said statistically significant, he is mistaken, but I think he did address that as well.
- 8 9
- 0. We are going to get to statistics.
- 10
- He also said that the opacity was
- 11
- different between pages 1 and 2; yes?
- 12
- Α. I believe so.
- 13

14

- Q. And that the UV characteristics on page 1 and 2 are different when viewed with shortwave
- 15
- and medium wave light, he also said that; yes?
- 16
- Α. I don't recall him saying that, I'm not sure.

Do you recall that he also said the

Now, in terms of your report, you do

- 17
- 18 Q.

right?

0.

- 19 chemical tests using GCMS revealed the two pieces
- 20
- of paper have different chemical compositions;
- 21
- 22
- Α. No, I don't recall that either.
- 23
- not state an opinion that the pages of the Work
- 24 25
- For Hire document are of the same stiffness or

1	L. Stewart
2	tensility; correct?
3	A. No, I do not reach that opinion.
4	Q. You did not assess the stiffness of the
5	pages; right?
6	A. No, and there's a reason for that.
7	Q. Okay.
8	And you did not state an opinion
9	stating that the opacity of the Work For Hire
10	pages is the same; right?
11	A. The opacity of a damaged document, no,
12	I did not address that.
13	Q. You didn't assess the opacity of the
14	pages; right?
15	A. No. It would have been ridiculous to
16	do that.
17	Q. Okay.
18	And you did not state an opinion that
19	the pages appear the same when viewed with
20	shortwave or medium wave UV light; right?
21	A. Not since the documents were damaged,
22	no.
23	Q. Now, your overall conclusion regarding
24	the paper seems to be that defendants' experts

claim of different papers is wrong.

1	L. Stewart
2	Is that your conclusion?
3	A. Based on my work and that of
4	Mr. Rantanen, yes.
5	Q. And you don't clearly state that the
6	papers are definitively the same; right?
7	Are you concluding that they are the
8	same?
9	A. He did.
10	Q. What do you say?
11	A. I say we need to send it to an expert
12	like Mr. Rantanen and that's what I did.
13	Q. So you are relying on his opinion, you
14	are not providing a particular opinion about
15	that; is that right?
16	A. My opinion was based on the erroneous
17	measurements that were conducted on the damaged
18	document.
19	As far as a chemical analysis and a
20	fiber analysis, I sent that to one of the most
21	world-renowned experts that we have.
22	Q. And what is your opinion based on
23	Mr. Rantanen's testing results?
24	A. My opinion is not based on his test
2 5	results. His opinion if you want me to read it

-1	
_	

L. Stewart

to you, I can go to his report.

- Q. Well, what do you believe his opinion to be with respect to whether the pages are the same?
- A. I believe he decided that they were not only the same fiber composition, but they were consistent with coming from the same production run, which would be inconsistent with the defendants' theory that the documents were from many years apart.
- Q. And do you have a particular opinion as well or are you simply relying, as to that issue, you are simply relying on his opinion?
- A. No. My opinion is that you can't do a chemical or an accurate physical test on damaged documents and that you certainly can't measure them to a 10,000ths of an inch and then say that they are slightly different and that that imparts a difference, that was totally erroneous, and that is something that I do refer to.
- Q. Yes, I understand that, and we are going to get to that, but with respect to Rantanen's results you are relying -- the basis for your statements, your opinion about the

	rage 330
1	L. Stewart
2	papers being the same is Rantanen's results and
3	the statistics interpretation; yes?
4	A. No. I don't think I have an opinion in
5	there showing that I believe the papers are the
6	same.
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. I discussed problems with the
9	procedures that were used by your team and then I
10	included a reference in there that I quoted
11	Mr. Rantanen and what his results were.
12	Q. I see.
13	And you criticized Mr. LaPorte's use of
14	a handheld micrometer; right?
15	A. No. I criticized his finding.
16	Q. You are aware, are you not, that your
17	partner Mr. Blanco used a handheld micrometer to
18	take measurements of the document; right?
19	A. That's correct.
20	Q. And you challenged that the
21	measurements that Mr. LaPorte took actually
22	constitutes a statistically significant
23	difference; right?
24	A. I don't know if that's the words I

would use, but I would stand by that.

25

	Page 331
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. And what exactly is your statistics
3	background?
4	A. I have taken a number of courses in it
5	in college, I've
6	Q. What courses specifically?
7	A. Statistics 101, 201, et cetera.
8	Q. How many? You said a number.
9	A. I believe I took it for three years of
10	the four-year degree, my lower degree.
11	Since then I've used it from time to
12	time when I've been working on research that
13	needed to be published.
14	Q. And what is a standard deviation
15	measure?
16	A. Well, you take the mean, the average,
17	and then you can do standard deviation based on
18	different amounts of reliability, whether you
19	want it to be very reliable or not so reliable.
20	O. Can you explain the difference between

- between the standard deviation and the variance?
 - Not without referring to my books. Α.
- Turn your attention to paragraph 303 of Q. your report.

There you state, quote, "Furthermore,

21

22

23

24

•	1		
-	L		

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

for LaPorte to report a difference in the paper used to create pages by measuring the two pages as 0.0042 plus or minus 0.00005 inches" -- dot, dot, dot -- "is equally ludicrous since the two measurements can be equal based on his own report of variance."

- A. Yes.
- Q. Right.

And then you proceed to show this by adding 0.00005 to 0.0042 and subtracting that from 0.0043; right?

- A. Which makes them the same number.
- Q. Did you see the footnote in Mr. LaPorte's report on page 11, footnote 19?
 - A. Not that I recall.
- Q. Do you recall the footnote that says that he used students' T-tests to calculate the statistical significance of his results?
 - A. No. I don't dispute that he did that.
 - Q. Do you know what a T-test is?
- A. It's a reliability test you can do with statistics to see if it falls within a certain range that we talked about.
 - Q. Test whether the test statistic follows

1	L. Stewart
2	normal distribution if a null hypothesis is
3	supported?
4	A. It has to do with the bell-shaped curve
5	and whether it follows that, yes.
6	Q. Do you understand the difference
7	between a T-test confidence interval and a
8	Bayesian credible interval?
9	A. Not without going back to my books, I
10	don't.
11	Q. A T-test measures the probability that
12	a difference between the two independent data
13	points is not statistically significant; is that
14	right?
15	MR. BOLAND: Objection.
16	A. I would have to look at my books before
17	I would quote something like that. I don't know.
18	Q. Are you aware that a Bayesian statistic
19	determines the uncertainty distribution of a
20	parameter?
21	A. No. What I'm reporting here is simple
22	mathematics. His report doesn't make sense.
23	Q. Let's take a look at what you say.
24	Do you recognize that your
25	interpretation of Mr. LaPorte's opinion describes

1		

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- a Bayesian credible interval when in fact
 Mr. LaPorte provides a T-test confidence interval?
- A. No, I did not report any of that. I am simply using his numbers, his math, and the fact that he used a very easily changeable device where one thousandth of an inch means nothing.
- Q. Let's look at your analysis of the statistical measurements because you point to that as, you know, a claimed error.

What's the standard deviation found by Mr. LaPorte in the measurement in mean thickness on page 1?

- A. What are you referring to, what page?
- Q. Well, I'm referring to your report here on page 62, paragraphs 302 and 303.
 - A. All right.

Please repeat your question.

Q. Hold on one second.

I show you page 11 of Mr. LaPorte's report. If you look up at the top you see in the first paragraph it describes the measurements and that the average of the measurements is .0042 and the standard deviation is .00005.

Is that accurate as what he describes

1	L. Stewart
2	as the average measurement and the standard
3	deviation?
4	A. In one case. In the other
5	Q. It's .0043, that's the average, but the
6	standard deviation he finds in both is .00005;
7	right?
8	A. Which is 1/100th of a thousandth of an
9	inch, which is well beyond the capability he
10	quoted.
11	Q. You have to take the square of the
12	deviation to get the variance; right?
13	A. I don't know. I'd have to look at my
14	books.
15	Q. So you don't recall the a variance is
16	simply the square of the standard deviation?
17	MR. BOLAND: Objection.
18	A. No. I'm using simple mathematics here,
19	not statistics. I'm looking at his numbers and
20	saying they don't follow, his numbers don't
21	follow the capability of the equipment and his
22	numbers don't follow even amongst themselves.
23	Q. Right.
24	And you're reporting to you're

pointing to the number, you are saying that

٠	1	
_	L	

L. Stewart

- Mr. LaPorte's reported variance is .00005 when in fact that's what Mr. LaPorte reports is the standard deviation; correct?
- A. What I'm showing is that he is measuring the two pages as .0042 plus or minus .00005 inches and then the same with .0043 plus or minus.
 - Q. Right.
- And the plus or minus he reports is the standard deviation; right?
- A. That's what he's reporting as the standard deviation, which is inaccurate if you are using a machine that goes to ten thousandths, you can't use a hundred thousand.
- Q. And in 303 you use that number .00005 as the variance, but in point of fact the variance and standard deviation are two very different terms in statistics; right?
- A. I think you are using variance as a statistical term and I am using it as a simple term that he is showing that there is a variance between the figures. I'm not using it statistically.
 - Q. You're not using it statistically.

1	L. Stewart
2	You're criticizing his statistics, but you're
3	not using the term variance in a statistical way?
4	A. I don't criticize his statistics
5	anywhere. I'm simply saying that his numbers
6	don't work and they certainly can't be used with
7	a machine that only or an instrument that only
8	goes to ten thousandths of an inch.
9	MR. SOUTHWELL: Let's take a quick
10	break. We are almost done.
11	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record. The
12	time is 5:46. This ends tape number 5.
13	(Recess taken.)
14	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
15	record. The time is 5:56. This is tape 6.
16	BY MR. SOUTHWELL:
17	Q. Did you discuss the case or the
18	deposition over the break with Mr. Boland at all?
19	A. No.
20	Q. Now, in paragraph 305 of your report
21	A. I did talk to him about scheduling
22	problems, but I did not talk about the
23	deposition, as far as what we've been discussing.
24	Q. Okay.
25	At paragraph 305 of your report you

4		
_	L	
_	_	

L. Stewart

write that LaPorte, Lesnevich, Romano, and Tytell each concluded that page 1 of the two-page Facebook contract was substituted at a later date; is that right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And you have referred to this in your report as the, quote, page 1 substitution theory; right?
- A. I don't know if I refer to it that way, but that's fine, if you want to refer to it that way.
 - Q. Well, okay.

In paragraph 165 you describe it, you don't describe it quite like that, but that's essentially what you're referring to it as, and that theory that you are advancing suggests that a recently fabricated page 1 was substituted for the genuine page 1 created in 2003 and appended to the genuine page 2 created in 2003. That would be the general nature of that type of a theory; yes?

- A. Yes, that's defendants' theory.
- Q. Right.

Well, you're advancing that as

1	L. Stewart
2	<pre>defendants' theory; right?</pre>
3	Can you cite to me where defendants'
4	experts actually advance that theory?
5	A. If we can stop and look for it, it's in
6	each of their reports where they concluded that
7	page 1 was substituted at a later date.
8	Q. Really? In each of their reports they
9	concluded that page 1 was substituted at a later
10	date?
11	Okay. That's your opinion; yes?
12	A. I believe that's accurate, yes.
13	Q. Great. Okay. We can move on, then.
14	Now, you advance that Mr. Rantanen's
15	paper composition analysis shows why this
16	conclusion is wrong, and that's at paragraphs 305
17	to 308; right?
18	A. I'm saying that it's wrong why?
19	Q. Because Mr. Rantanen's composition
20	analysis demonstrates that the two pages in your
21	view are the same; yes?
22	A. That's not why I'm saying Mr. LaPorte's
23	math is wrong and his use of equipment is wrong;
2.4	it's two independent things

Q. I'm not asking you any questions about

1	L. Stewart
2	Mr. LaPorte's math or his equipment.
3	A. You pointed to that paragraph 303.
4	Q. Okay. I was referring to paragraph
5	305.
6	Maybe I misspoke. I am referring to
7	paragraph 305 where you are talking about the
8	paper composition analysis, and you state in your
9	report and this is actually paragraph 304
10	that that paper composition analysis shows
11	defendants are wrong; right?
12	A. No. My 304 is a title "Paper
13	Composition Analysis Shows Defendants Are Wrong."
14	There's no finding there, that's a title of a
15	section.
16	Q. Isn't that your opinion?
17	That's a title of a section of your
18	report.
19	That's not your opinion?
20	A. I'm trying to answer your question
21	based on what you called it. It is a title. I
22	then go from that and describe the reason behind
23	that observation.
24	Q. Did you write that title?

Α.

Yes.

1	L. Stewart
2	Q. So these are your words, "Paper
3	Composition Analysis Show Defendants Are Wrong"?
4	A. Yes. I stand by the words.
5	Q. Okay.
6	But it's not your opinion or it is your
7	opinion?
8	A. You could call it an opinion if you
9	want.
10	Q. I'm just asking what your expert
11	opinion is that you provided to the Court.
12	It certainly appears to say paper
13	composition analysis shows defendants are wrong.
14	A. Well, I wouldn't call that an expert
15	opinion, I would call that a statement and then
16	what follows are paragraphs defining the opinion.
17	Q. Okay.
18	Well, I think you just agreed with me
19	that it's opinion, but that's fine.
20	Now, Mr. Rantanen supposedly
21	contradicts defendants' expert's purported
22	conclusion
23	MR. SOUTHWELL: Strike that.
24	Q. The only relevance Mr. Rantanen's paper

composition analysis has is that it supposedly

1	ı		
_	L		

L. Stewart

contradicts defendants' expert's purported conclusion that page 1 was substituted at a later date; correct?

- A. No.
- Q. Its relevance is, in your view, that it establishes that the two pages were from the same mill and production run; right?
- A. That's one thing. It also establishes that they have consistent reactions for starch and pH. It also allowed us to figure out where an additional contamination on the document came from, which are black particles that are found on the front of the page.
- Q. Now, you didn't actually perform the testing there, that was Mr. Rantanen; right?
- A. I took the samples and he performed that test.
 - Q. And what specific samples did you take?
- A. I produced this to you. I sent him plugs that were taken from page 1 of the Work For Hire document out of my -- it was my vial number 7 and I sent him plugs from page 2 of the document, which was my vial number 9, I sent those to him on October 30, 2011.

_	

L. Stewart

- 3
- 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- Q. And how do you know that -- what are you referring to when you're giving this information?
- Α. The TLC worksheet -- not that, that's There's another one that an analysis worksheet. you have that has --
 - Q. Can you hold it up so we can see it?
- Α. That is the top of the page. You have to go down from that to get the rest.
- I sent photographs that were broken, so you probably have two or three to make up the document.
- This is the document, it's different than the document you've got right there.
 - Ο. Right. I understand.
- So these are the documents that we have that you provided us, it appears this is one page, it's just the top line of the TLC worksheet form that includes -- I suppose this is vial 1.
 - MR. SOUTHWELL: Why don't we mark this as the next exhibit, please.
 - (Defendants' Exhibit 25, one-page photograph of document, marked for identification, as of this date.)

1	
1	

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

Q. Showing you Defendants' Exhibit 25, that's, you're saying, one page of this, and you are saying that page continues.

Why is it you took photographs of these pages rather than simply making a Xerox copy?

- A. Trying to give you the best quality, I took high-res digital photographs as opposed to a 400-dot-per-inch photocopy.
 - Q. Okay.

I don't believe we have the rest of those pictures or the rest of that sheet, so we would ask that you provide that to us.

May I take a quick look at it?

- A. Certainly.
- Q. And that sheet explains what's in vials
 7 and 9 and where those come from; yes?
 - A. In part.
- Q. Does this explain where the plugs come from?
 - A. The -- no. The video shows where they came from and there's photocopies of the document before and after I took my plugs. There isn't anything that shows specifically where an individual plug came from, just them in toto.

	Page 345
1	L. Stewart
2	Q. How many paper blanks did you take?
3	A. For that particular document?
4	Q. How many paper blanks did you take of
5	the Work For Hire contract document?
6	A. Looks like 16 from page 1 and then 16
7	from page 2 and then an additional 20 from page 1
8	and an additional 20 from page 2.
9	Q. And what vials were those paper blanks
10	in?
11	A. That would be vial 1, vial 2, vial 7
12	and vial 9.
13	Q. Those were all paper blanks in those
14	vials?
15	A. They were paper-only samples.
16	Q. And of those samples you gave the
17	entirety of vials 7 and 9 to Mr. Rantanen?
18	A. I believe so.
19	Let me check.
20	Q. Sir, if you don't mind, if you'd leave
21	that out, I could just have a quick copy made of
22	that.
23	A. Okay. I just want to make sure I get

it back in the right place.

24

	Page 346
1	L. Stewart
2	A. That's all you've asked for.
3	Q. Well, is there anything else that you
4	haven't produced provided to us?
5	A. I provided that to you. You say you
6	didn't have it, but I did provide it to you.
7	Q. Okay.
8	Is there anything else that you have
9	that you haven't provided to us?
10	A. I provided you everything. I don't
11	know whether you have everything.
12	Q. And what did you do with the rest of
13	the paper blanks?
14	A. I have them.
15	Q. Did you do anything with them?
16	A. I used some for the toner analysis and
17	I have the rest in my laboratory.
18	Q. How did you use them for the toner
19	analysis?
20	A. As a paper blank to subtract any
21	influence from the paper from the results of the
22	toner.
23	Q. You ran those before you ran the TLC of

You run them at the same time.

the toner, the TLC analysis on the toner?

Α.

No.

24

•	1	
	ı	
	_	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

- Q. Now, you provide -- you completed a test services request form for Mr. Rantanen; right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And you asked him to determine consistency of composition with paper in vials 7 and 9; right?
 - A. If you want to show me the document, it would be quicker or -- so do you want me to read from that or do you want to read from it?
 - Q. Sure.

So the test requested reads determine consistency -- sorry, hold on -- determine consistency of composition with paper in vials 7 and 9 and also determine if paper composition is one that would be affected by exposure to intense ultraviolet light as one side of these paper samples are yellowed and we are trying to determine why.

Is that accurate as to what you asked Mr. Rantanen to do?

- A. Yes.
- Q. You didn't ask him to perform any other tests; correct?

•	1		
•	4	-	

L. Stewart

A. Later on I asked him to identify the black particles that he had observed.

Q. Okay.

And with respect to your second request you concluded in your report that the yellow discoloration damage evident in the Facebook contract is, in my opinion, the result of repeated exposure of the document to high intensity or UV light, and in response to that Mr. Rantanen made conclusions about the UV exposure concluding that the paper samples did not have any detectable mechanical high pulp fibers which would be affected by photo degradation from UV light; is that right?

A. No, not entirely.

 Q. Isn't that what he concluded?

A. No. I assume you'll find out when you depose him if it's not in his report, but it's -- he requested to be able to analyze the document in person, he said that there wasn't enough in the very small circles that he was provided by me to properly address what caused the UV fluorescence or UV change in the document on one side only, so he asked to be able to look at the

1	L. Stewart
2	document.
3	Q. I see.
4	So he could not conclude one way or the
5	other whether the paper samples were affected by
6	contact with UV light?
7	A. At this point, no, he could not
8	conclude it.
9	Q. Right.
10	And with respect to the first
11	request
12	MR. SOUTHWELL: Sorry. Strike that.
13	Q. Right.
14	So he determined that the fiber
15	contents of the two samples is consistent with
16	coming from the same mill and production run;
17	correct?
18	A. I believe that's what he
19	Q. And that does not mean the paper
20	samples actually came from the same paper mill
21	and production run; right?
22	A. No.
23	Q. It means only that he could not
24	differentiate the paper samples at the level of
25	analysis he performed; right?

1		
L	_	
	_	

L. Stewart

And based on that conclusion one

actually produced during the same production run;

- 2
- Α. That seems accurate, yes.

3

4 couldn't conclude that the paper samples were

0.

5

6 right?

- 7
- Based on a consistent -- the word Α. "consistent," no, you cannot conclude that.

9

8

Q. Right.

10

So it would be inappropriate to conclude that the paper samples were produced on

12

11

the same day; right?

13

14

15

16

Α. I don't want to put words into Mr. Rantanen's mouth, but based on my use of the word "consistent" you would not be able to say that they were done on the same day, no.

17

18

And assuming that -- well, a conclusion 0. that the paper came from the same mill and production run would be completely consistent

20

19

with Mr. Ceglia having created a fraudulent

21

contract and printed it on paper from the same

22

23

I assume so, yes. Α.

production run; correct?

24

25

And such a conclusion would be Q. consistent with Mr. Ceglia having created

1	L. Stewart
2	multiple versions of the fraudulent document and
3	printed them on paper from the same production
4	run; right?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And you noted also with respect to the
7	paper that it is bond type paper.
8	What do you mean by bond type paper?
9	A. As opposed to hundred percent wood
10	paper that would be found in poor quality Xerox
11	paper.
12	Q. I am handing you back your TLC
13	worksheet form which we have now made a copy of.
14	What are the characteristics of bond
15	paper?
16	A. Typically it would involve some type of
17	rag content, cotton fiber, linen, that type of
18	thing, to make it have a softer feel.
19	Q. You state in your report that you
20	observed the white fluorescing tab marks on the
21	front of pages 1 and 2 of the Work For Hire
22	document; right?
23	A. That's correct.
24	Q. Did you document those tab areas?

Α.

Yes, I did.

1	L. Stewart
2	Q. How?
3	A. In my notes that were taken at the desk
4	as I was doing the examination.
5	Q. Did you measure them?
6	A. Yes, I did.
7	Q. What were the measurements?
8	A. Reading from my notes it says there
9	were two slightly wider areas on both pages on
10	top edges about 1/2 inch in from left on page 1
11	and one inch from right on page 1.
12	They are and this is not in my
13	notes, but just my recollection, they are
14	amorphous in size so that you cannot do an
15	accurate measurement of exactly how big they
16	were.
17	Q. And what are you you're reading from
18	your notes in the case.
19	Can you just hold those up, please?
20	A. Yes. It was provided to you, it's got
21	Staples at the top from a Staples
22	Q. And how many pages?
23	A. Just one page.
24	Q. And how do you know it was provided to

us? Did you provide it to us?

1	L. Stewart
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. You did?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. How?
6	A. It's my recollection it was provided to
7	you back in November and it was provided to you
8	again on Mr. Southwell's request last week when
9	you got that file.
10	Q. And you provided it to us directly?
11	A. No. I don't deal with you directly. I
12	provided it to the lawyers on Mr. Ceglia's side
13	and they provided it to you.
14	Q. How do you know they provided it to us?
15	A. You are showing me some of them, so I
16	assume that they did.
17	Q. Do you want to look through here,
18	because those notes are not in here, those notes
19	were not provided to us.
20	A. If you want me to look through there, I
21	will.
22	Q. Can I make a copy of those notes?
23	Let's look at the TLC worksheet form
24	that you just provided to us today and which we

have made a copy of.

1	L. Stewart
2	MR. SOUTHWELL: Why don't we mark this
3	as Defendants' Exhibit 26, please.
4	(Defendants' Exhibit 26, one-page
5	document headed "TLC Worksheet Form," marked
6	for identification, as of this date.)
7	Q. That's the form you just gave to us,
8	right?
9	It notes Q1 and Q2.
10	What is Q1?
11	A. That was what I called the Work For
12	Hire document.
13	Q. Right.
14	And that's in your report, you call Q1
15	the Work For Hire document and you call Q2 the
16	specs document, the specifications document;
17	right?
18	A. I don't know. I have to look at my
19	notes back here. You just took my notes, so
20	Q. Well, why don't I refer you to your
21	report on page 12.
22	A. You are referring to a report that was
23	done afterwards. I need to look at the original
24	notes when I first made these notations and

that's what you just took.

٠	1	
_	L	

L. Stewart

2

3

4

Q. Okay. All right. We will come back to that, then.

5 6

7

8

Now, with respect to your opinions regarding the staple holes in the Work For Hire document, your expert opinion with respect to those staple holes is that the Facebook contract was only stapled one time; right?

9

A. That's Mr. Blanco's opinion and I agree with him.

11

10

Q. Well, in paragraph 181 -- would you refer to paragraph 181 of your report.

13

12

A. All right.

14

15

Q. There's no mention of Mr. Blanco's opinion there.

16

This is your opinion, is it not?

17

A. Right.

18

19

As I mentioned, I looked at the same evidence, I agree with that finding, and then he did additional work on it.

2021

Q. So your opinion here is that the Facebook contract was only stapled one time?

23

22

A. Yes.

2425

Q. And you state that the basis of your conclusion is a combination of examining the

	Luge 330
1	L. Stewart
2	resultant holes from the previously stapled
3	Facebook contract along with the detent markings
4	found on the back or reverse side of each page;
5	right?
6	A. Right.
7	Q. Now, you didn't examine the Work For
8	Hire document in its original state or the staple
9	holes with a microscope; correct?
10	A. I believe I had a handheld microscope
11	at the site. I don't recall.
12	Q. When you describe a handheld
13	microscope, are you referring to a magnifying
14	glass?
15	A. No. I believe I brought a digital
16	microscope.
17	Q. Is that the only microscope device that
18	you used in your examination of the original
19	document?
20	A. I don't recall. I also had a
21	handheld I also had I think I may have had
22	two handhelds.
23	I don't recall exactly what I used

Did you take any photographs of the

there, I would have to look at the videotape.

Q.

24

1	L. Stewart
2	staple holes?
3	A. I took scans on site, I did not take
4	any photographs.
5	Q. And you understand that someone who
6	is that it is possible to
7	MR. SOUTHWELL: Strike that.
8	Q. Let me actually hand you back your
9	notes here and if we could have this marked as
10	Defendants' Exhibit 27.
11	(Defendants' Exhibit 27, photocopy of
12	one page of handwritten notes by Mr.
13	Stewart, marked for identification, as of
14	this date.)
15	Q. Defendants' Exhibit 27 is the notes we
16	were just referring to?
17	A. Yes, sir.
18	Q. Yes?
19	So if you refer to that, can you
20	identify what Q1 and Q2 on Defendants' Exhibit 26
21	is?
22	A. I will try.
23	There I'm calling Q2 the six-page
24	document. I believe what is going on there, if
25	you look at the worksheet, you'll see that

1	
Т	

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

L. Stewart

- there's two pages listed for Q1, two pages listed for Q2, and I just doubled my sampling because at the time of the analysis we were asked -- we were allowed to do additional plugs and so I'm using the same name twice, it appears.
- 7 Q. Well, let's discuss this.
 - So Defendants' 27 are your notes from the date of the inspection July 25th, 2011; correct?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- Q. Those are your contemporaneous notes of what you did; yes?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- Q. And Q1 is the two-page document that we've been referring to as the Work For Hire document; yes?
 - A. The six-page document, yes.
 - Q. Q1 is the two-page document that we referred to as the Work For Hire document on your notes, Defendants' Exhibit 27?
 - A. I'm sorry. Yes, Q1 is the Work For Hire document.
- Q. Q2 is the six-page document titled
 "StreetFax Back-End" dot, dot, dot, that we

1		
4	-	

L. Stewart

- referred to as the specifications document; yes?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And if you look in your report at paragraph -- page 12, you refer to, again, Q1 is the Work For Hire contract, Q2 is the Street Fax back-end technical specification; yes?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, the TLC form that we were referring to as Defendants' Exhibit 26 is also a contemporaneously dated document from July 25, 2011, when you conducted this examination; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And there vials 1 through 6 reflect your document here, your log reflects that those samples were taken from Q1 and your log reflects that vials 7 through 10 were taken from Q2; correct?
- A. That's what that says, yes, and I'm trying to explain that to you. If you look at the videotape, you'll see where the analysis was taken from. I was given the authority to take additional plugs and I renamed it. I unfortunately used the same name there that I

1	
1	

L. Stewart

then used in the report, but you could see that those are both two-page documents and it's just reiteration of the same analysis.

- Q. So your testimony is that this inventory is inaccurate with respect to -- well, your inventory uses a different nomenclature than your contemporaneous notes of the same day, that's what you're testifying to?
- A. That's not my testimony. I would have made it clearer to you reading it now if I'd used an A or some other name that I didn't use in the report, so, again, I could have probably clarified it, but it's very clear from reading the worksheet that it's a two-page document in what I did there.
- Q. And so you are absolutely certain that vials 7 to 10 which are denominated Q2 are not actually the specs document?
- A. Right. You can see from the pieces of plugs that it's yellow on one side; the specs document was not.
- Q. And if we go back and check the videotape do you think that that's going to support your opinion?

4		
	L	
	_	

L. Stewart

- A. For that worksheet, yes.
 - Q. All right. We will do that.

Now, you understand that it's defendants' position that Paul Ceglia has proffered at least two physical documents as the Work For Hire documents over the course of the lawsuit.

Do you understand that?

- A. I assume so, yes.
- Q. When you testified a few moments ago that you were allowed to take additional plugs, what are you referring to?
- A. My recollection of the first time when we were allowed to take plugs, there was quite a bit of discussion about the number of plugs and where they could be taken from and at some point that was cleared up and so I took the maximum number I was allowed and I photographed the document before and after -- I'm sorry, photocopied the document before and after.
- Q. Do you recall that there was a protocol document that was handwritten and initialed by the parties that established exactly what plugs they were producing?

-1	
_	

L. Stewart

- A. I recall that name being used. I don't recall seeing the document, I was just told what I could do.
- Q. And you recall that in fact you were allowed to take only 20 plugs from the Work For Hire document?
- A. I don't recall the number, I would have to go back and look.
- Q. But your testimony here is that you were allowed to take additional plugs.

Are you sure that wasn't later when you had access, exclusive access to the documents that was not part of the authorized examination?

- A. No. My analysis as far as taking plugs was only done in Chicago.
- Q. So did you send plugs from the specifications document to Mr. Rantanen?
- A. No. I sent him only the document, the Work For Hire document.
- Q. Now, it's your position that the physical document that was used to create the copy that was attached to the complaint of the Work For Hire document is the same physical document as the one produced to experts in this

1	L. Stewart
2	case; right?
3	A. You are going to have to repeat that.
4	Q. Let's turn to page 58 of your report.
5	MR. BOLAND: Alex, it's 6:26 p.m., so
6	we have been here 8-1/2 hours now, which is
7	more than reasonable to get the seven hours
8	of deposition time. I have moved my flight
9	twice and there's a car going to be waiting
10	for me downstairs, so time's running out.
11	MR. SOUTHWELL: I understand your
12	position. We'll be done when we're done.
13	Q. Let's look at the images that you
14	labeled here on page 58. You've got Q1, Q2, Q3,
15	Q4 let's actually go back to page 56.
16	Do you see the images here on 56?
17	Did you create all of these images and
18	the words around the images?
19	A. I created that from images that were
20	submitted by your experts, yes.
21	Q. And the words around the images, those
22	are yours?
23	A. Yes.
2 4	Q. And do you understand that

Mr. Lesnevich states his opinion to the highest

1	L. Stewart
2	degree of certainty that the handwriting is
3	different between Q1 and Q2 and Q3 and Q4? Do
4	you understand that?
5	A. That the handwriting is different?
6	Q. Yeah.
7	A. He's saying that there are differences
8	between the two.
9	Q. Right.
10	And you are in agreement with Jim
11	Blanco's report in this case that in fact these
12	are all the same, the handwriting is the same on
13	Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4; right?
14	A. Okay.
15	There's only two questioned documents.
16	Are you referring to Lesnevich's image
17	where he's got Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4?
18	Q. I'm referring to page 58 of your report.
19	A. And the question there is do I believe
20	Mr. Lesnevich or Mr. Blanco?
21	Q. Well, let's look at page 58. You've
22	got above the line and you've got below the line,
23	you have got Q1 and Q2 at the top and Q3 and Q4
2.4	at the bettem

So is it your expert opinion that the

1	L. Stewart
2	handwriting represented here on your page 58 in
3	Q1 and Q2 matches the handwriting from Q3?
4	A. Using Lesnevich's images they do not
5	appear to match.
6	You're talking about a layperson or
7	after
8	Q. My question is, is it your expert
9	opinion that the handwriting represented in Q1
10	and Q2 matches the handwriting in Q3, that's the
11	question.
12	A. Yes, it's my opinion that they are all
13	from the same document.
14	Q. So it's your expert opinion that there
15	are no differences between the M's represented in
16	these groups of images?
17	A. No. There are many differences to a
18	layperson and that's why you have to look at it
19	forensically.
20	Q. I see.
21	So there's differences that a layperson
22	might comment upon, but in your expert opinion
23	there's no difference, they are the same?
2.4	A No I say that there are differences

but they are explained away if you know what

1	L. Stewart
2	you're talking about and you know what you're
3	looking at.
4	Q. I see.
5	And Mr. Lesnevich doesn't know what
6	he's talking about or what he's looking at; is
7	that your opinion?
8	A. I think Mr. Lesnevich made a mistake
9	here.
10	Q. I see.
11	Now, are there any other documents that
12	you have that you have not produced to us?
13	A. No. As I've mentioned before, I've
14	produced everything.
15	Q. And let's look at your TLC plates.
16	You ran the TLC plates on the toner?
17	A. Yes, sir.
18	MR. SOUTHWELL: Let me mark this as
19	Defendants' Exhibit 28.
20	(Defendants' Exhibit 28, one-page
21	photograph of TLC plate, marked for
22	identification, as of this date.)
23	Q. Take a look at Defendants' Exhibit 28.
24	Can you identify for us what those
25	lanes are?

	Page 367
1	L. Stewart
2	Do you have a document that identifies
3	what the lanes on this TLC plate Defendants'
4	Exhibit 28 is?
5	A. I'm looking.
6	Yes. It was provided to you, it has 10
7	lanes described on the left column.
8	Q. What are you referring to?
9	A. Another TLC worksheet that you were
10	provided in that package.
11	Q. Can you hold that up, please?
12	A. It says "Plate 1" in the upper left and
13	the upper right "Plugs taken from those removed
14	7/25."
15	Q. And how many sheets do you have here
16	that refer to the different plates?
17	You just have this one sheet that
18	refers to plate 1?
19	A. Yes, one plate and one sheet.
20	Q. You only did one plate and you have one
21	sheet that corresponds?
22	A. Right. The next page that you've got

notes beginning with I-706 in the top part.

is the back side of that sheet, the handwritten

Q.

23

24

1
т

Could I make a copy of that?

2

_

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

It might be easier if you just give us the whole file and then we can make sure we have

a copy of everything. It seems that there are a number of documents that have not been provided.

- A. If it helps you on those type of documents, they were part of a PDF that was sent with the file and there are many pages in the PDF.
- Q. I am confident we printed everything that we were provided. I think that for whatever reason we were not provided those documents.

I will want to ask you some questions about that, so you'll have to hold on.

Now, with respect to your library of standards, do you have an index to your library of toner standards?

- A. I have a logbook that has all of them in there.
- Q. And have you been asked for that in other litigations?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And have you provided that in discovery in other litigations?
 - A. No, I have not.

1		
_	•	

- 2
- Q. Why not?
- 3
- A. Because I don't feel it's fair to the companies that I deal with, the agreements that I made with them.
- 6

5

- Q. What agreements are those?
- 7
- A. To not disclose their information to public sources.
- 9

8

- Q. Is that a specific written agreement with those companies?
- 1011

12

- A. No. It's an understanding that we've had from very early days when I started the
- 13

library.

Α.

- Q. When did you start the library?
- 15

14

- sources. When I was at the Bureau of Alcohol,
- 17
- Tobacco and Firearms I was the person who got it

Well, the library came from many

- 18
- transferred from there to the Secret Service,

changes to the library, updated it and kept it

- 19
- that was done was around 1983 or 1984, and I made
- 20

- from that point forward until I left in 2005.
- 22
- Q. I see.
- 23
- And when you left in 2005 you took the library that was the Secret Service's library of
- 2425
- standards with you?

4		
L	_	
	_	

- 2
- A. No. I took the knowledge of how to build a library and I created my own.
- 4

3

- Q. I see.
- 5
- So you took the -- well, you just said that you had the samples and the standards as part of your library and then you took that with you when you left.
- 8

7

- A. No, I didn't say that.
- 10
- Q. Okay.
- 11

12

- So what specifically did you take with you when you left the Secret Service?
- 13
- A. The knowledge of how to do examinations and how to create a library.
- 15

16

17

14

- Q. After you left the Secret Service everything in your library was collected after that point?
- 18
- A. In my private laboratory, yes.
- 19
- Q. Nothing that's in your laboratory today in terms of an actual sample or standard comes
- 21

20

A. That's correct.

from the Secret Service?

23

- Q. And you have got no specific written agreement that prohibits you from disclosing that
- 2425
- information, that's just what you feel is fair;

L.	S

2 is that right?

1

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. That's right. It's a moral agreement in words that I've had with the industry.

tewart

- Q. And what specifically is there that is proprietary or confidential about the list of the materials that you have in your library?
 - A. Composition and formula information.
 - Q. I'm handing you back your notes.

There's some sort of, like, on the -- I see. This was the back of -- this is a color copy of a back of a page; is that what's going on here?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. SOUTHWELL: Let's just take a real quick break. I want to look at this document. Mr. Boland, you have to understand that these are documents you have not provided to us previously, so I need the opportunity to look at them. I understand you have travel arrangements, but let me look at them and let me see if we can do that and we will be right back.

MR. BOLAND: I'm not agreeing that we haven't provided them, but I understand

	1 age 3/2
1	L. Stewart
2	your position is that we haven't.
3	MR. SOUTHWELL: We'll be back as soon
4	as we can.
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
6	record. The time is 6:36.
7	(Recess taken.)
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
9	record. The time is 6:41.
10	BY MR. SOUTHWELL:
11	Q. Mr. Stewart, referring you to
12	Defendants' Exhibit 26, you did not take any
13	samples of ink; is that right?
14	A. I don't know what Defendants' Exhibit
15	26 is.
16	Q. That reflects that you did not take any
17	ink samples; right? Or is there some other
18	inventory sheet?
19	A. There should be a different one that
20	has ink on it. This one is just for toner and
21	paper.
22	Q. A different form, okay. I see.
23	Another form that we don't have.
24	Does it look like this form, the
25	worksheet form, but you're saving it includes ink

1	L. Stewart
2	samples?
3	A. Yes. It should
4	Q. It should look the same?
5	A. It should look the same, but it would
6	indicate that there's ink samples.
7	Q. You mentioned that when you were doing
8	the hard copy inspection, you used a digital
9	microscope, right, that was your testimony?
10	A. I believe I recall that I told you that
11	I would have to review the videotape to see, but
12	I think I recall taking one with me and using it.
13	Q. And what manufacturer is your digital
14	microscope that you used on that day?
15	A. I think I took a Pro Scope, but, again,
16	I would have to look at the videotape.
17	Q. And that would have been attached to
18	the computer; right? If it's digital, it's
19	attached to the computer to capture images; yes?
20	A. It would be attached to a laptop
21	computer, yes.
22	Q. And did you capture images using that?
23	A. If I had they would have been included.
24	I don't know if I did, I would have to look at

25

the videotape.

1		
7	_	

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

L. Stewart

- Q. You would have to check the videotape
 to reflect whether you had images? You don't
 have another record of them such as the images?
 - A. I provided that to you back in November. I would have to look at the meta tags of each of them to see if they were taken with that device or by a scanner.
 - Q. Now, you provided some expert opinion regarding the staple holes.

Did you ever ask Mr. Argentieri where the staple is?

- A. I don't recall asking him that.
- Q. Are you aware of where the staple is?
 Did you take the staple out?
- A. No. Based on the scanned images, we can track when the staple was taken out, but not exactly.
- Q. When was the staple taken out, in your opinion?
 - A. Sometime either as a result of the Aginsky or Osborn examination or sometime between then and when Mr. Argentieri brought it to Buffalo.
- Q. So prior to July 14, 2011, but after

1	L. Stewart
2	January 2011 the staple was removed from the Work
3	For Hire document; is that your opinion?
4	A. My opinion is that it happened sometime
5	prior to Buffalo. There is a scanned image from
6	the other experts showing that the staple was
7	still in the document, so at some point after
8	that the staple was removed.
9	Q. And by the other experts, you are
10	referring to Aginsky and Osborn; yes?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And you would agree that that's a
13	violation of all evidence collection procedures
14	to take a staple out of a questioned document and
15	not preserve the staple; correct?
16	A. Yes. I don't know who did that or why.
17	Q. But that would be a violation of all
18	generally recognized evidence collection
19	procedures with respect to questioned documents;
20	yes?
21	A. Yes. I can't imagine a reason to do
22	that.
23	MR. SOUTHWELL: Mr. Boland, I
24	understand that you have travel arrangements.

I have to say there are quite a few

R

L. Stewart

documents here that Mr. Stewart is relying on and is referring to that have not been produced and so, as an example, if we could just mark this as Defendants' Exhibit 29, these are his notes that we're seeing for the first time just a few moments ago, he's now revealed that there is an inventory of ink, so, you know, I would request that he produce his full file and that we will review that and we are going to hold the deposition open and see what other questions we have of Mr. Stewart.

I understand that you've got travel arrangements and I don't -- I want to be accommodating to that, and so short of us going through, making a copy and taking the time to review it, which I think is our due, I would request that you produce that to us or, if you want, you can give that to us now and we can resume on another day.

(Defendants' Exhibit 29, one-page photocopy of handwritten notes by Mr. Stewart, marked for identification, as of this date.)

1
т

2

3

4

5 6

7

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

MR. BOLAND: Either way you want it produced.

Do you have a list of the items you are saying he has not yet produced or --

MR. SOUTHWELL: Well, there is this item, Defendants' 29, which we just got, so I think we are entitled to some opportunity to review it and compare how it relates to Mr. Stewart's report and the other documents. There is his inventory of ink that he says exists that we have not seen and there's the information about the library of standards.

MR. BOLAND: I remember that request and he indicated there were some proprietary issues with providing that because Mr. LaPorte has attempted to sort of construct his own library on his back in several cases.

MR. SOUTHWELL: And the witness has testified that it is based on -- that he is not bound by any written agreements with respect to those, so, I mean, he can have that opinion, I don't know that that's worth

1		
L	_	

2 3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

very much weight, and we can litigate that opinion, if appropriate.

I don't think it contains proprietary information, it lists the different toners and the manufacturers. Maybe Mr. Stewart could explain what's in that index.

MR. BOLAND: Obviously, we have a difference of opinion. We say we've given you all of the documents, you say we haven't, that's fine, so if you want to finish out the deposition time, then make a motion.

MR. SOUTHWELL: Mr. Stewart is going to be here for other days, we can simply reconvene with him he's here on a day that we're deposing defendants' experts.

MR. BOLAND: I don't know if he's going to be here on other days, but if he is, certainly, if that's convenient.

MR. SOUTHWELL: So I would ask that you produce the documents either now or after you make your flight and then we arrange to reconvene to review those documents with Mr. Stewart.

_	
7	
_	

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15

16 17

18 19

21 22

20

23 24 25

Well, I think he's MR. BOLAND: produced everything.

Why don't you just finish up your time with him and then if you guys think he hasn't produced everything, he'll produce it.

MR. SOUTHWELL: I'm fine with stopping at this point based on what we have laid out and given the travel arrangements and we will --

MR. BOLAND: I'm going to make my travel arrangements because your deposition is going to be over in time, I mean, with the time that's left, I would have -- I mean, it is almost that time anyhow.

MR. SOUTHWELL: So let's go. I am trying to stop so you can make your travel --

MR. BOLAND: I don't want the record to reflect that you cut yourself off for my travel arrangements. I'm saying the allotted time you have left, you can conclude and I'll still be able to make my car because it's, I don't know, at this

1	L. Stewart
2	point, like 10 more minutes or something,
3	but I appreciate the consideration.
4	MR. SOUTHWELL: I am prepared to stop
5	at this point and use whatever remaining
6	time we have to question Mr. Stewart about
7	the additional documents that I am
8	requesting be produced.
9	MR. BOLAND: And for the record, we're
10	not agreeing you can use additional time and
11	bring him back here for 10 minutes of
12	questioning, but whatever happens happens,
13	okay.
14	MR. SOUTHWELL: Okay.
15	MR. BOLAND: Very well.
16	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
17	record. The time is 6:48.
18	(Time noted: 6:48 p.m.)
19	
20	LARRY F. STEWART
21	Subscribed and sworn to before me
22	this day of, 2012.
23	
24	
25	Notary Public

	Page 381
1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	STATE OF NEW YORK)
4	: ss.
5	COUNTY OF NEW YORK)
6	
7	I, CARY N. BIGELOW, Court Reporter,
8	a Notary Public within and for the State of
9	New York, do hereby certify:
10	That LARRY F. STEWART, the witness
11	whose testimony is hereinbefore set forth,
12	was duly sworn by me and that such
13	testimony given by the witness was taken
14	down stenographically by me and then
15	transcribed.
16	I further certify that I am not
17	related to any of the parties to this
18	action by blood or marriage, and that I am
19	in no way interested in the outcome of this
20	matter.
21	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
22	set my hand this 12th day of July, 2012.
23	
24	
25	CARY N. BIGELOW

		Page 382
1		
2	I N D E X	
3	WITNESS EXAMINATION BY	PAGE
4	LARRY F. STEWART MR. SNYDER	5
5	MR. SOUTHWELL	184
6	EXHIBITS	
7	Defendants' Exhibit 13, declaration of	23
8	Larry Stewart in support of	
9	plaintiff's forthcoming response to	
10	defendants' motion to dismiss for	
11	fraud	
12	Defendants' Exhibit 14, photocopy of	25
13	Work For Hire contract	
14	Defendants' Exhibit 15, two-page	61
15	printout from Internet of	
16	blancostewart.com Web site	
17	Defendants' Exhibit 16, curriculum	65
18	vitae of Larry F. Stewart	
19	Defendants' Exhibit 17, excerpt from	8 6
20	trial transcript in Vanderbilt	
21	Mortgage case	
22	Defendants' Exhibit 18, letter dated	93
23	May 21, 2004 from U.S. Attorney David	
24	N. Kelly	
25	Defendants' Exhibit 19, hard copy	117

	Page 383	
1		
2	document inspection protocol	
3	Defendants' Exhibit 20, excerpt from 129	
4	transcript of deposition of Larry	
5	Stewart held on March 15, 2010	
6	Defendants' Exhibit 21, two-page 135	
7	document entitled "STREET FAX" dated	
8	April 28, 2003	
9	Defendants' Exhibit 22, one-page 163	
10	document labeled "Exhibit F" with	
11	attached report by Peter V. Tytell	
12	dated March 25, 2012	
13	Defendants' Exhibit 23, declaration of 167	
14	Peter Tytell dated November 28, 2011	
15	Defendants' Exhibit 24, excerpts from 234	
16	Albert S. Osborn's book "The Problem	
17	of Proof"	
18	Defendants' Exhibit 25, one-page 343	
19	photograph of document	
20	Defendants' Exhibit 26, one-page 354	
21	document headed "TLC Worksheet Form"	
22	Defendants' Exhibit 27, photocopy of 357	
23	one page of handwritten notes by Mr.	
24	Stewart	
25	Defendants' Exhibit 28, one-page 366	

	Page 384
1	
2	photograph of TLC plate
3	Defendants' Exhibit 29, one-page 376
4	photocopy of handwritten notes by Mr.
5	Stewart
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 385
L	
2	ERRATA SHEET
	VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY
3	1250 BROADWAY
	NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10001
<u> </u>	212-279-9424
1	NAME OF CASE: CEGLIA VS. ZUCKERBERG
I	DATE OF DEPOSITION: JULY 11, 2012
5 1	NAME OF DEPONENT: LARRY F. STEWART
' 1	PAGE LINE(S) CHANGE REASON
3 _	1111
• _	1111
) _	[
L	11111
2 _	11111
3 _	11111
4 _	11111
5 _	11111
5 _	1111
7	1111
3 _	111
• [1
	1
ι	
	LARRY F. STEWART
2	
5	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME
3 7	THIS DAY OF, 20
4	
5 -	(NOTARY PUBLIC) MY COMMISSION EXPIRES:

[& - 2004] Page 1

&	101 331:7	159:2 160:2,3,8,12	1980s 71:8
& 1:19 2:10,22,23	10166-0193 2:13	160:16 162:18	1982 59:20 71:17
3:15 18:9,15 19:11	108 191:16,21	163:3,8 165:24	258:11,13,15
64:15 139:10,23	10:03 1:15 3:14	166:10 168:17	1983 369:19
0	11 1:14 3:13 254:18	169:14,16,23	1984 59:20 369:19
	285:11,12 332:15	170:13 171:22	1990s 71:9
0.00005 332:4,11	334:20 385:5	172:12,24 174:5	1991 70:18
0.0042 332:4,11	1100/3200 318:4	181:23 182:7,13	1992 71:12
0.0043 332:12	117 382:25	15 61:9,11 86:14	1993 70:19,22
00005 334:24 335:6	119 157:23 158:11	129:17 133:9	1996 70:14
336:2,7,16	11:01 61:2	145:15 265:20,23	19th 103:12 156:16
0042 334:23 336:6	11:15 63:9	266:20 382:14	1:10 1:4 3:22
0043 335:5 336:7	11:15:03 64:13	383:5	1:43 167:5
00569 1:4 3:22	11:25 61:6	150 195:24	1:53 167:8
1	12 23:25 32:13 65:5	15th 117:25 118:2	1st 103:4 117:24,25
1 23:15 24:19 25:21	66:5 92:11 246:23	118:12,13,21 119:2	2
61:3 100:3 116:22	311:3 354:21 359:5	122:17 131:25	2 5:20,21 40:16 61:7
136:12 149:11	123 151:6	145:6 160:10,20,25	132:7,10 134:22
163:8 167:22,23,25	1250 385:3	169:24 172:13	178:22 179:3
168:19 173:17	129 383:3	16 65:8,14,17 130:9	279:25 280:5 285:4
174:7,18 178:22	12:02 92:14	131:19 265:20,23	286:14 311:12
179:3 198:8,21,24	12:45 132:7	266:20 345:6,6	316:23 325:14,21
199:5,9 200:9	12:48 134:22	382:17	326:4,11,14 338:20
204:22 311:12	12:58 134:25	163 383:9	342:23 345:7,8,11
316:23 325:14,21	12th 381:22	165 338:14	351:21
326:4,11,14 334:13	13 23:17,18 26:6	167 383:13	20 87:4,11 129:10
338:3,8,18,19 339:7	94:11 213:17,20	16th 118:15 131:2	129:15 183:17
339:9 342:3,21	214:8 232:12 382:7	131:15 132:2	259:3,13 282:18,24
343:20 345:6,7,11	135 383:6	156:15	345:7,8 362:6 383:3
351:21 352:10,11	13th 118:4,18	17 86:5,10 156:18	385:23
359:15 367:12,18	14 25:2,3 128:12	186:16 382:19	20,000 75:16 199:16
1/100th 335:8	130:8 144:13	18 87:4 93:13,15	200 1:19 2:12 3:16
1/13/11 169:10	147:22 156:18	382:22	2000 1.19 2.12 3.10 2000 65:24 66:2
1/2 352:10	162:20 168:2,25	181 355:11,12	190:17,21
10 60:22 220:2	169:19 173:24	184 382:5	2003 24:21 26:4
246:23 258:25	174:23 374:25	189 149:20 176:20	38:11 102:2 135:7
285:5,8 359:18	382:12	19 70:22 117:12,16	135:14 230:8,10,11
360:18 367:6 380:2	1475 2:5	130:19 332:15	297:22 324:4
380:11	14th 93:10 118:6,18	382:25	
10,000 199:17	118:20 119:2,14,20	1903 200:21	338:19,20 383:8 2004 34:22 66:20,22
203:25 204:9	120:5,15 128:15	1910 234:5	66:24 67:8 70:4
10,000ths 329:18	146:16 147:11	1922 235:3,8 239:23	84:15 88:22 89:19
10001 385:3	148:3,16 149:24	1924 235:8	92:17 93:16 96:13
2001 200.2	150:18 155:14,21	1929 234:7	96:13 103:4 137:9
	155:22 156:9 158:6		70.13 103.4 137.9
1	1	I .	

212-490-3430

212-279-9424

[2004 - 5:46] Page 2

120 5 10 120 0 24	201 22 202 12	202.20	250 206 25 207 4
138:5,10 139:9,24	381:22 383:12	383:20	358 286:25 287:4
141:8,18,22 142:7	385:5	27 105:3 357:10,11	288:2,4,23,25
142:14 230:11	20th 103:7	357:15 358:8,21	289:11,15,24
276:24 382:23	21 70:18 93:16	383:22	290:23 292:3
2005 66:17,22,24	135:4,5 382:23	28 135:7,14 160:22	293:17
67:8 69:18 230:11	383:6	167:11,14 366:19	366 383:25
369:21,23	210 294:7 295:5	366:20,23 367:4	370 274:21
2006 230:11	298:19	383:8,14,25	376 384:3
2007 84:24 230:11	212-279-9424 385:4	29 167:19 376:5,22	388 157:11
272:7	218 35:14,17	377:7 384:3	3rd 139:9
2008 72:2,15 230:11	21st 92:17 93:21	291 87:3	4
288:10	22 163:22,25 383:9	2:13 182:23,25	4 183:6 190:17
2009 73:7 82:19	221 246:24 247:16	2:30 183:20	195:17 196:15,22
230:12 288:8	248:4,4	2:51 183:3,5	260:12
201 331:7	223 244:17 245:12	2:52 183:21	40 133:23 190:17
2010 86:14 129:17	246:14,16	2d 38:6,9	400 170:14 190:17
129:20 191:9	224 35:17	3	344:9
230:12 270:16	226 35:14,18	3 135:2 182:24	406 37:7
271:18 272:3,8	228 213:12	324:12	407 37:14 38:12
383:5	23 167:10,13 285:14	3.1. 324:15	408 39:10
2011 20:13 25:19	382:7 383:13	30 52:10 342:25	410 40:23
44:18,25 49:24 50:4	230 213:13	302 334:16	440 40:24
53:17 54:9 116:22	234 383:15	303 331:23 334:16	44107 2:7
117:25 119:20	235 214:7	336:16 340:3	4410 7 2.7 447 57:8
121:22 122:6	238 153:25 167:11	304 340:9,12	45 134:11
128:12 130:19	238-2 164:16,24	305 337:20,25	450 51:9
131:20 144:13	165:7,11,19 166:13	339:16 340:5,7	470 44:11,16
145:15,20,25 146:9	166:25 168:9,11	308 339:17	495 76:5
146:16 147:22	171:11 173:16	32 232:12 235:7,11	4:10 258:24 260:12
149:24 150:2	24 24:21 26:4	236:6	4:25 260:15
160:22 162:18,20	234:20,21 235:2	325 34:16	4th 184:21 185:5
167:11,14,24 168:2	383:15	326 34:16	
168:17,25 169:19	249 35:14	327 94:12,17 96:10	5
169:19 172:24	25 164:3 195:23	328 97:2 98:6 99:11	5 260:16 315:4,9,10
173:24 174:24	200:2 205:2 206:15	101:3,20	337:12 382:4
186:11,16 187:5	206:23 287:3	330 94:17 164:16	50 133:22
191:9 192:14	288:18 290:10	165:9 166:24	500 45:6
198:10 342:25	343:23 344:2	333 104:14	56 363:15,16
358:9 359:12	359:11 382:12	334 106:7	58 363:4,14 364:18
374:25 375:2	383:12,18	343 383:18	364:21 365:2
383:14	25th 89:19 358:9	350 51:8	5:20 259:3
2012 1:14 3:13	26 104:22 105:2	350 31.8 354 383:20	5:30 132:16,20,22
44:18 45:2 79:6,9	185:14 265:20	354 383:20 357 287:4,7,25	260:8
82:19 164:4 184:21	354:3,4 357:20	288:8 383:22	5:46 337:12
185:8,14 380:22	359:10 372:12,15	200.0 303.22	

[5:56 - adjective] Page 3

5:56 337:15	93 312:16 382:22	accelerate 217:16	acfe 78:25
	95 312:10 382:22 97 319:13 320:2	230:24 231:8	achievement 75:17
6	9:00 159:25 160:14		
6 320:2 337:15	160:24 162:19	accelerating 231:3 accentuated 236:24	acknowledge 195:5 229:25 230:20
359:15			
600 311:22 312:4,6	9:11:40 178:12	accepted 72:16	acquittal 67:16
312:8	9:11:51 178:19	111:10 296:3	105:13
61 382:14	9:18 167:25 168:25	access 48:7 196:24	acquitted 67:14
62 334:16	171:21 172:3	362:13,13	108:16
64 200:10	9:30 15:9	accessory 196:12	acronym 190:13
65 34:17 94:14	9:45 15:9	accidentally 237:14	action 381:18
382:17	a	accommodating	actions 136:21
67 130:8	a.m. 1:15 2:22 3:14	376:16	active 62:3,4 80:22
6:26 363:5	63:9 64:13 147:22	accord 155:2	80:25 82:12 83:8
6:36 372:6	148:3 149:4 150:7	account 75:6,11	actual 9:13,16 60:13
6:41 372:9	150:18 151:16	accounted 236:15	103:17 147:6
6:48 380:17,18	156:8,24 157:4	238:23	171:13 216:10
7	158:5 159:2,25	accounts 237:15	218:9 255:16
	160:14,24 162:18	accreditation	275:12 289:4
7 342:23 344:17	162:19,20 163:10	297:21	293:13 294:17
345:11,17 347:7,15	165:3 167:25	accredited 37:20	295:23 313:15,16
359:18 360:18	168:25 169:11	accurate 21:18 63:2	370:20
7/11/2012 64:13	171:21 172:3 175:7	63:13 65:12 74:20	add 200:23 226:15
7/15 160:14	ability 39:15	88:10 142:8 156:3	adding 332:11
7/15/11 159:25	able 119:18 120:22	217:2 240:14	addition 206:6
7/25 367:14	209:23 310:16	241:14 244:9,9	240:22
70 231:2	348:20,25 350:15	287:14 290:24,25	additional 32:12
706 367:24	379:24	291:2,2,3,7,10	44:24 45:4,9 136:23
74 260:19	absolutely 256:6,13	293:5,6,10,11,16	137:2 188:24
770724 2:6	268:12 360:17	294:9 295:12	202:12 240:9
79 257:15	abundance 199:16	299:22,24 329:16	263:17 306:9
8	203:25 204:9	334:25 339:12	342:12 345:7,8
8-1/2 254:18 363:6	244:19	347:21 350:2	355:20 358:5
80 231:2	academic 84:15,19	352:15	359:24 361:12
82 257:15	84:21 85:3,6,8,10	accurately 269:4	362:11 380:7,10
84 117:14	85:17	295:11	additions 22:23
86 382:19	academy 5:14,25	accusation 68:2	address 149:6
89 309:22	70:7,14 71:14,20,25	69:23 72:20 79:5	207:11 217:24
9	72:12 73:8,19 79:23	accusations 89:22	239:7 240:16 326:7
	80:8,10,13 81:2,7	97:19	327:12 348:23
9 342:24 344:17	82:2,20 83:2,4,13	accuse 109:23	addressed 78:15
345:12,17 347:8,16	83:21,25 84:6	accused 67:22 68:4	218:7 305:8 308:9
90 76:6	academy's 74:8 81:9	86:3 87:15 88:7,7,9	308:16,18
92a 320:21,23 321:3	83:10	89:24 97:8 108:24	adjective 123:12
321:10,16,23	33.10	109:5 110:14	124:21

	1	1	1
administrative	aging 214:4 215:24	183:15 364:10	america 123:22
300:17	216:3,5 218:13	369:9 370:24 371:3	american 5:13 70:6
administratively	230:24,25 231:11	agreements 369:4,6	70:13,25 71:14,20
12:8	231:20 243:14	377:23	71:25 75:12 76:13
administrator	aginsky 19:15 20:11	ahead 248:8 265:3	78:24 80:7 102:17
236:12	20:16 21:3 25:9,13	air 225:11	amorphous 352:14
admit 292:16	25:19 53:9,16	al 130:19 272:5	amount 199:10,12
admitted 60:6	145:14,19 146:7,14	albert 232:9,13	207:12 208:8,21,23
admonish 41:22	146:19 150:5	233:11 234:22	254:6 259:6 272:19
admonished 87:22	167:23 169:3,10,16	235:2 383:16	amounts 209:5
adopt 247:23	174:8 181:13,16,18	alcohol 257:14	244:18 331:18
advance 339:4,14	186:4 268:24 273:5	258:11 369:16	ampersand 18:10
advancing 338:17	282:20 304:10	alex 222:17 363:5	analysis 20:3 40:2
338:25	374:22 375:10	alexander 2:15 4:9	40:12,14,23 41:3
advertise 61:21	aginsky's 25:14	alford 127:4	56:13 59:5,22,24
64:23	52:15 145:24	alignment 146:21	60:4,8,14 88:18
advertised 82:5	149:25 186:8,24	alike 237:18	113:13,14,18,20
advertisement 65:2	269:6 273:7	allegation 11:3	114:9 138:17,19,22
advertising 18:12	ago 16:11 28:25	allegations 110:19	187:12,17,21 190:2
affect 141:9 207:12	29:11 31:7 70:18,22	alleged 114:3 237:3	201:5 202:2,4,7
208:8,21,24 209:3	98:8 112:19 130:5	allegedly 185:23	215:21 220:15
218:2 231:18,20	151:3 234:14 266:7	allotted 379:23	227:3 239:12
243:13 244:15	267:6 277:3 279:5	allow 255:23 278:16	254:22 255:16
248:25 249:3	280:8 361:11 376:7	281:9	256:25 257:20
affidavit 91:22	agree 3:10 11:13	allowed 101:4	261:8,22,25 265:24
afternoon 131:25	95:18,23 108:10	102:18 107:24	266:20,22 279:17
151:13 183:8	133:4 138:17,20	113:5 192:3 193:18	301:17 303:4
age 37:9 201:5 205:3	155:20 164:8	193:23 194:5,6	304:22,23,25,25
206:16,25 214:2	168:24 180:5 202:9	295:24 296:2	305:2,9 306:7,14,20
215:21 220:15	205:19 211:13	299:11 342:11	307:9 308:18
227:3 231:10 241:5	238:5,11 239:20	358:5 361:12,15,19	309:16,23,24,25
270:17,17 271:7	240:2,9 259:2	362:6,11	310:18 314:9,18
283:10 304:23	274:18 284:5,6,10	allowing 302:14	317:6 318:24 323:6
305:19,20 306:7,13	290:6 292:19	allows 82:21 281:13	323:11 328:19,20
306:19	308:16 311:20	283:18	334:8 339:15,20
agencies 125:10	316:19 318:17	almanac 237:11	340:8,10,13 341:3
263:24 273:2 276:6	321:21 325:7 355:9	also's 78:14	341:13,25 343:6
276:7	355:19 375:12	alternative 256:14	346:16,19,24
agency 261:11	agreed 222:8 242:3	256:21 324:22	349:25 358:4
262:21 263:25	262:5 286:11	amanda 2:17 4:7	359:22 360:4
276:4 277:20 317:8	308:19 341:18	amazon 322:7	362:15
agentieri 15:14	agreeing 136:19	amazon.com 81:17	analyze 141:4
agents 97:16,23	371:24 380:10	81:20	202:11 314:22
102:8 103:21 104:2	agreement 50:11	amended 142:17,24	348:20
104:7	73:22 101:10	143:4	

[analyzed - asked] Page 5

analyzed 236:22	apparently 83:25	282:10,15 284:3,12	arrangements
animal 78:8	237:8 273:20 307:4	284:22,25 286:5,12	371:21 375:24
animosity 112:13	appealed 72:23	286:14 299:19	376:15 379:10,13
animus 77:7 111:18	appear 172:12,14	approached 194:10	379:22
anna 2:23 183:10	177:24 327:19	194:16	arrest 93:23 95:22
annual 71:20 73:9	365:5	approaches 284:9	97:13,15
answer 7:19,21,21	appearance 146:2	approaching 194:18	arrested 69:8,12
9:9 12:3,5 13:17	150:13 154:14,24	appropriate 378:3	323:13
27:21 28:4 30:25	158:6 161:3 162:23	approve 301:23	arrests 106:9
31:2,16 36:10,20,22	164:10 168:24	approved 301:21	article 5:20 10:13,18
39:8 44:20 50:22	169:2 173:5 175:22	302:9	76:2,16 79:9 84:15
56:11,17 67:6 87:4	181:22 183:10	approving 302:4	84:18 91:12 270:24
87:8 112:2 120:7	190:5 236:11,17	approximately 3:14	271:2,5,18 272:6,12
123:7 130:9,10,16	238:12,21 240:6	15:9 53:17 88:22	276:24 282:20,23
140:9,23 150:11	appearances 33:17	92:20 133:8 160:24	283:8,9 285:2,6,7
155:16 156:12	appeared 20:17	183:17 184:21	285:17 286:2,4,16
157:5,19 158:20,21	32:4 79:7 169:12	185:2 258:24	286:19 287:2,9,20
179:6 204:4 205:4	174:18	april 79:6 135:6,14	287:25 288:6 289:3
206:21 222:17	appearing 238:12	185:8,11 219:25	289:14 290:4,5,7,10
242:24,25 243:8,17	appears 25:25 26:24	230:10 383:8	290:16,20,22 291:5
245:20 249:19	28:17,19,22 32:2	area 11:25 12:7,9	292:5,8,9,22 293:7
251:17 264:16,22	33:20 65:19 70:15	65:4 213:13 216:24	314:24 315:5,11
296:18 325:6	71:12 76:21 86:22	222:6 230:21	316:2,7
340:20	153:15 168:5,22,23	250:19,21 253:16	articles 70:6 79:7
answered 67:8	179:11,18 341:12	areas 50:19,23	211:6,8 270:15
89:21 125:20 207:2	343:18 358:6	351:24 352:9	275:4,6,8 280:17
253:10 277:23	appended 338:19	argentieri 20:15	284:10,14
answering 11:11	application 78:13	21:6 25:16 48:7	artificial 189:21
36:23 37:5 76:7,13	applications 201:3	49:23 50:7,11 51:18	ascld 297:21
125:18 157:18	applied 78:14	52:3,25 54:14	aside 213:5
206:18 219:8 228:6	209:21 211:25	116:15 144:11	asked 7:6 8:3 16:14
243:10	applies 38:20 107:3	148:8 150:8,17	17:4 19:23 28:6
answers 184:18	apply 73:24	156:24 168:15	29:2 31:7 35:21
antarctica 229:17	appreciate 380:3	169:11,18 170:4	56:24 63:10 64:6
anthony 89:16	appreciation 215:23	172:8,11,17 174:18	66:23 76:18 85:24
anticipate 297:6	apprenticeship	175:7 177:21 187:4	119:3,15 129:5
anybody 192:4	59:15	193:9 374:11,23	137:2 184:15
anymore 78:4 80:25	approach 194:5,6	argentieri's 116:14	202:20 205:6 206:6
80:25 307:15	194:12,20 256:18	162:4	206:7,17 224:7
apart 31:24 245:25	256:20 258:20	argue 197:7	265:6 277:9,22
329:11	273:2,24,25 276:5	arm 250:8 254:12	278:10 324:18
apologize 293:20	276:25 277:2,11,12	arouse 239:10,18	346:2 347:6,21
apparent 154:8	277:13 278:11,12	240:7	348:2,25 358:4
155:3	280:13 281:4,7,11	arrange 378:23	368:20
	281:16,23 282:2,5,9		

[asking - back] Page 6

asking 9:7 30:3	association 70:11,17	331:23	82:23 83:9 89:19
41:24 64:8 101:5	78:24 84:24 187:18	attest 25:12 147:15	91:12 92:21,24 93:2
111:20 128:8 129:6	187:22	attitudes 111:25	93:7,8,11 95:15,24
129:14 137:13	assume 6:2,9 8:17	attorney 55:2 93:16	98:13 104:8,11
138:15 140:5,10,13	8:20 11:15,20 14:24	145:5 382:23	105:7,11,11,14,23
140:24 141:3	,		
	56:17 77:5 83:6,7 86:23 117:24 138:9	attorney's 93:3	105:25 106:2,5
151:16 156:20		attorneys 2:4,11	107:2,4,7,9 109:18
157:14,24 158:8,18	138:10,14,15 166:2	3:24 15:17 32:24	114:17,18,20,24,25
159:15,18 196:18	176:9 196:15	34:13 75:5 102:6	115:3 117:4 118:17
201:8 206:10,11,11	223:25 224:4	119:13	120:19 121:13,17
206:19 209:2 216:8	225:18 241:10	audio 3:8	122:16 123:13,17
228:15 248:2	252:21 348:18	august 198:10	123:19,20,25
274:14,25 276:6	350:23 353:16	austin 139:10,23	128:10,22 130:18
300:12,13 306:18	361:10	authentic 8:16	135:22 138:2,6
319:3 324:19 325:4	assumed 133:16	114:15 135:23	139:8,13,21,25
339:25 341:10	assumes 231:11	136:13,18 137:7,17	142:16,22 143:6,16
374:13	assuming 9:3 83:24	137:23 138:12	143:17,21 144:21
aspect 113:4,12,14	155:6 244:8,12,13	142:3,6,13	144:25 145:4 154:6
214:22	321:22 350:17	authenticity 140:21	154:12,21 155:5,7,8
aspects 58:23 59:19	assumption 244:2,2	141:9,13 142:19	155:13 160:9,21
113:5 284:4	244:6 274:24	author 272:4 289:13	162:7 166:14,20
assert 100:13	atlantic 70:10,17	authorities 233:12	169:25 170:9,10
227:10 243:4 247:6	attach 285:8,10,13	authority 283:5,24	175:6,11,12 182:9
asserted 106:8	attached 8:15	359:23	182:12,14 184:20
166:21 243:18	136:14 139:8 164:2	authorized 294:18	188:14 189:8 190:2
asserting 179:25	282:24 287:3	362:14	197:22 210:23,25
242:17	362:23 373:17,19	available 81:20 82:2	211:10,24 238:18
assertion 109:15	373:20 383:11	82:3 164:20 187:3	238:19 253:12
110:8 240:2 242:13	attaching 141:21	242:18 320:24	262:20 263:3,23
243:25 247:12	attachments 152:21	321:4 322:7 324:3	304:12,15 318:19
assertions 247:8	attacks 123:21	avenue 1:19 2:12	321:3 330:16
asserts 223:22	attempt 289:4	3:16 255:15	333:18 374:14
assess 39:15 43:13	293:12	average 200:10	awful 237:23
43:22 323:19 327:4	attempted 377:18	222:10 331:16	aycock 2:17 4:7,7
327:13	attempting 157:19	334:23 335:2,5	144:25 259:10
assessing 108:11	attempts 324:20	aware 5:20 6:4,17	b
140:21	attend 73:6 121:2	8:13,18,20,22 14:20	
assessment 108:14	attended 71:19	14:23,25 35:5,19,21	b 166:12
142:15	101:24 131:25	53:5,5,9,12 55:4	bacanovic 34:22
assist 50:25	attention 23:25	56:5 61:22 62:2,4	89:6,8 90:22 91:8
assistance 107:10	25:20 29:25 32:9,10	63:18 69:6,10 71:25	91:15 95:2 96:3
associate 2:21,23	87:2 94:12 130:7	72:7,9,13,15,19,23	103:18
4:16 133:12 183:10	149:13 164:6	73:2 74:3,5 75:25	back 13:13,16 17:4
associated 10:12	167:18 168:11	78:7,11,23 79:6,9	26:5 28:9 32:9 47:7
147:14 319:11	235:6 245:11 275:4	79:17 82:7,11,13,20	48:12,15,16,17,21

[back - bit] Page 7

	1	1	1
49:17 57:2,6 61:5	45:5 47:11,17 92:16	bearing 135:13,14	203:6 208:5 211:17
67:3 69:22 81:5	97:7,19 102:21	137:23	220:8 229:24 233:9
92:13 100:20	106:8 109:15	bears 24:19 173:17	233:23 234:8,12
124:18 125:21	140:10 149:7 151:6	began 101:25 102:9	235:8,22 238:15
127:25 132:9	151:13 169:22	174:23 200:21	248:12 257:18
133:13 134:24	177:3 178:19 179:8	beginning 52:2 92:4	260:19 275:5,19
141:8 151:21	211:22 212:9	96:16 118:12 119:5	276:10,24 279:14
152:25 153:5	227:15 228:9 232:2	119:8 120:11 131:6	279:15 284:15
158:11 165:16	240:17 244:3,8	185:11 194:4	287:4 293:5,5,6,11
167:7 168:12	245:24 255:21	289:19 367:24	299:21 307:11
173:13 183:4,7,14	257:23 259:20	begins 32:11 158:11	310:20 311:9
183:19,22 186:11	260:23 273:12	288:8	312:22 313:12
193:18,24 194:4	277:18 286:10	beliefs 10:5	314:21 315:10
196:17 205:4 206:3	312:17 322:13	believe 10:12,18	320:3,6,21 321:13
206:5 246:7 257:13	323:23,25 328:3,16	11:21 17:12 18:7	322:6 324:8,10,12
258:15 259:12	328:22,24 331:17	19:23 20:14 30:16	325:3 326:12 329:3
260:14 261:14	332:6 340:21 350:3	33:15 40:8 47:10	329:6 330:5 331:9
275:8 285:21 287:8	350:7,14 374:16	49:10,23 51:8 53:15	339:12 344:11
288:6,10 297:17,22	377:22 379:9	53:18 54:25 55:12	345:18 349:18
313:20,22 315:20	bases 177:3 215:10	55:20 63:10,11,15	356:10,15 357:24
318:21 324:4 333:9	216:2,9 325:20	64:3,6,8 66:25	364:19 373:10
337:14 345:24	basic 113:9	70:19,23 72:25	believed 75:14 94:3
351:12 353:7	basically 217:18	73:25 77:18 79:13	273:17
354:19 355:2 356:4	basing 6:16 68:11	81:4 82:4 96:4,5,15	believing 64:7
357:8 358:25 359:7	110:7 146:20	98:16 101:11 102:2	bell 333:4
360:23 362:9	basis 10:22 64:3	102:4,9 103:13	benefit 183:16
363:15 367:23	74:6 109:23 145:18	104:4 105:22	benjamin 2:16 4:11
371:9,11,12,23	145:24 147:7	107:13 109:7	4:11
372:3,8 374:5	179:24 180:16	112:20 115:16	berger 287:2,9
377:19 380:11	198:4,7,12 227:4,5	116:2,8 117:21	best 16:13 26:19
background 76:4	227:10 231:14	118:23 121:16	31:5 55:19 125:20
99:18 101:19 189:5	242:16 243:3,24	127:7 128:14,17	164:20,24 344:7
331:3	244:5,11 311:15	129:2,7 130:16	better 50:24
backup 220:24,25	324:25 325:17	131:6,22 136:15	beyond 105:10
bad 79:19	326:3 329:24	144:23 145:3	201:16 209:8,11,24
balance 188:22	355:24	146:17 148:17	263:18 335:9
ballpoint 37:9 146:3	basket 237:10	149:5 150:11 151:4	big 262:16 352:15
154:25 164:11	238:24	151:21 154:19	bigelow 1:21 4:3
283:11 285:4	bathroom 60:23	160:8 162:12	381:7,25
bar 78:24	133:15,16,23 134:5	175:16 177:7 180:3	bill 80:21 83:7
base 127:21 128:16	bayesian 333:8,18	185:7,10,17 186:11	billion 90:23
151:17 157:15	334:2	186:13 187:2,4,7	bit 12:6 86:23
158:9 159:3	beach 168:16	189:2 191:6 192:13	119:18 121:12
based 10:5 14:11	169:12	193:9 195:17 196:3	149:21 170:13
31:4 32:6 40:16		197:10 200:12	184:25 272:22

[bit - called] Page 8

361:16	41:24 42:12,23 43:3	bound 5:13,17	brownish 168:23
black 146:3 147:21	52:5 54:13 58:5	305:5 377:23	brush 274:13
154:24 175:13,14	99:7,25 112:5	box 48:8 237:10	brushed 254:13
311:21 312:6 314:9	116:18 123:6 133:4	238:24	buffalo 118:10,24
314:18 315:14,16	134:19 137:20	branch 296:10	136:4 156:15
315:21 316:12,17	139:12 152:14	320:8	160:11 189:8,20
342:13 348:3	157:17 159:17	break 29:19 60:21	221:3,19 222:12
blanco 17:16,17	178:4,8 179:22	60:24 61:10 92:8	223:6 229:3 248:23
18:9,15 19:11 48:23	183:12 184:4,11	101:6 126:24 132:5	374:24 375:5
50:14,16,20 57:12	190:7 222:16 224:8	132:12 133:15,17	bugs 249:3
57:20,23 58:6,13,17	241:22 243:2	167:3 183:14 184:5	build 370:3
59:2 61:20 62:9	252:20 253:3,9	258:22 259:2,13	built 79:14
64:15,22 72:4,18,23	258:23 259:7,12,17	337:10,18 371:16	bulk 285:23
73:18 74:8,23 75:4	260:7 276:15	breaking 31:24	burden 105:9
75:7 119:4,13	292:18 333:15	104:4 245:25	bureau 257:14
120:19,21 126:12	335:17 337:18	breaks 100:12 133:6	258:10 369:16
126:19 128:14	363:5 371:17,24	134:5,7 251:25	business 17:19,21
131:23 303:13	375:23 377:2,15	brief 176:18	18:5,17,22,23 19:2
304:19,24 306:10	378:8,18 379:2,12	bring 107:25 128:5	19:5 65:2 73:9
308:9,16 330:17	379:20 380:9,15	265:6,17 274:23	77:18 83:21 84:2,7
364:20	bold 25:24 152:17	280:9 380:11	button 309:10
blanco's 57:17,25	172:16,23 173:18	bringing 109:8	buy 81:16,17 251:21
58:6 73:7 308:11	173:25 174:7	197:24	c
355:9,14 364:11	181:15	british 113:22	c 2:2 381:2,2
blancostewart.com	bomb 323:7,8	114:21	calculate 332:18
61:12 62:23 382:16	bond 351:7,8,14	broad 125:19 274:8	calculating 259:8
blank 13:25 14:3,8	bonus 52:6 260:9	274:13	calculation 133:18
43:18 60:16 84:11	book 82:11,15 89:12	broadway 385:3	134:6,8
125:16 179:15	89:15,19 94:7 104:8	brochure 195:22	calendar 120:3,8
253:20 254:19	104:11 232:12	broke 80:18	191:5
346:20	234:11,22 235:3	broken 343:11	california 106:8
blanks 253:14,18,19	237:11 239:23	brought 35:3 39:8	call 17:3,9,11,12,13
345:2,4,9,13 346:13	291:4 383:16	40:15 52:19 72:7	17:15 20:4,6,9,19
blind 271:9	books 81:6,8,9,13	73:4 76:14 78:20	57:10 83:11 86:4
blocked 206:18	81:16,24 82:7,22,24	87:17 98:12,14	87:13 102:11,13,13
blood 381:18	83:24 84:3 232:23	106:16 107:16	185:17,20 209:17
board 72:11,16	233:8,15,17,18	108:19 109:25	264:9 341:8,14,15
79:24 80:7,15,19,21	234:13 236:3	111:4,8,9,14 134:17	354:14,15
201:12	331:22 333:9,16	216:14 228:7,7	called 4:22 6:15
boland 2:3,8 4:17,17	335:14	236:14 263:14	20:12 24:9 33:20
7:6,20 9:4 13:16,18	border 261:11	356:15 374:23	49:8,17 54:8 67:16
15:5 17:16 21:5	262:21 263:24	brown 154:8,23	71:10 79:7 117:6
22:9,13,16,19,25	boston 267:4	155:4 164:19	128:2 143:25 196:8
25:6 27:15,19 30:24	bottom 63:17 64:11	166:22 170:25	197:12 248:14
40:25 41:7,14,17,19	287:19 364:24		197.12 240.14

[called - changeable] Page 9

340:21 354:11	85:21,23 86:7,12,18	cases 13:8 14:10	385:5
calling 357:23	87:21 88:11,18	37:15 38:25 39:2	ceglia's 11:19 17:13
calls 55:20	89:23 92:23 94:11	44:14 79:20 106:15	143:23 145:14
camera 173:15	95:15 99:18 101:19	106:20,24 112:9	192:6 217:2 220:17
188:7	101:24 102:15	120:10 123:17,20	220:21 221:10,13
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
canada 261:11	104:15 106:6,8	124:4 237:2 254:23	230:2 232:3 240:25
262:21 263:24	107:2,4,7,11,17,18	254:25 258:9	242:9 353:12
canadians 261:17	107:24 109:13	266:11,24 269:10	ceglias 252:5
273:4,19	110:5,13,15,24	274:2,5 289:5	celine 287:21,23
cantu 89:16,16	112:17,21,23 113:3	293:13 301:17,21	cell 3:6 83:11
314:21 315:5 316:2	113:22,24 114:21	302:15 307:17	central 223:24
capabilities 212:9	114:23 115:6,13,24	377:20	century 143:11
303:25	116:2,5,7,24 117:13	casework 51:9	certain 7:24 43:13
capability 335:9,21	119:22,24 126:19	69:19 255:17,24	43:22 114:9 198:14
capable 304:2	128:5 129:21,25	257:13,17 265:14	212:18 256:8
caps 24:14	136:10,20,23,25	270:6 272:23 274:3	264:25 284:4 300:3
caption 3:18 14:4	137:10,18 138:13	274:5 294:3,17,22	332:23 360:17
86:12	138:23 142:18	295:8,21 296:4	certainly 78:23
capture 373:19,22	143:17 154:7,16	297:8,12,25 298:8	96:19 101:17
car 363:9 379:25	160:23 184:5,7	298:20 299:8	108:13 112:11
career 13:24 36:25	186:12 191:8,11,11	303:23	129:23 153:12
40:19 43:9 105:5	191:12 196:18	cat 78:7,8	250:17 262:17
196:23	197:19 201:23,25	categorically 207:8	270:14 272:16
careful 21:23	203:8 205:11 206:3	cause 95:11,16	325:11 329:17
carefully 21:17	211:17 215:17	147:2 169:20	337:6 341:12
296:17	227:25 228:11	172:10 214:14	344:15 378:20
carpet 224:24	239:14 240:11	219:5,21	certainty 364:2
cartridge 316:10,11	242:14 243:15	caused 193:13	certification 78:25
320:14,19,20,23	259:21,23 261:19	216:11 226:18	certified 12:10 13:4
321:4,7,9,10,16,23	262:6 263:21	254:4,9 348:23	13:21 14:5 39:18
cary 1:21 4:2 381:7	264:13,15,20	ceases 211:4,16	59:22,23,25 66:10
381:25	266:20 267:3,7,12	ceglia 1:5 3:18 4:18	75:18,23 76:4 78:8
case 3:18,20,22 5:18	267:15 268:20	7:7 10:10,15,25	certify 381:9,16
6:14 7:4,13,15,16	269:10,20 273:15	11:16 16:7 17:2	cetera 134:5 331:7
7:18 8:6,9,10,14	277:3 291:24	34:3 46:17 49:21	chain 146:10
9:10,20 10:3,4,10	298:10 300:20	51:20 75:5 116:20	challenged 330:20
10:22 13:11,21 14:4	301:9,13,24 302:4	135:24 137:8,18	chance 252:16,21
21:4 33:6,11 34:4	302:19 304:8,13,16	138:2,9,25 139:9,22	change 22:13,16
35:4,10,12 38:11,14	305:19,21,25 306:4	141:7,17,25 142:16	23:2 44:4,7,9
38:14,17,21,23 40:6	306:9 307:19 323:2	144:4,6 169:17	170:18 192:25
40:10,15 43:20	323:5,6,10,14 335:4	179:5 184:14	245:20 272:22
49:21 50:17,25	337:17 352:18	185:16,21 216:13	278:6,12 281:9,13
53:21 54:5 57:10	363:2 364:11	217:5,7 219:24	282:6 348:24 385:7
62:19 67:25 76:25	382:21 385:5	226:2 231:14 241:8	changeable 334:6
77:22,23 83:16,18		350:20,25 361:5	
		DTING COMPANY	

Page 10 [changed - come]

1 22 0 02 10	204 22 200 22	205 7 207 7 20	1. 4. 46.16.50.11
changed 23:8 83:19	304:22 309:23	285:7 287:7,20	client 46:16 50:11
163:13 264:10	312:18 316:17	315:4,5 319:25	134:2,10 205:11
265:12 269:12,15	326:19,20 328:19	339:3	clients 205:11
changes 22:24 49:12	329:16	cited 38:15 39:25	clip 176:15,17 182:5
49:14 77:20 265:14	chemically 46:6	43:12,21 106:20	182:9,12,14 196:6,8
266:8 277:11 278:4	202:11 310:17	107:15 247:9 275:6	197:12
282:3 286:10	chemicals 210:13	284:4	clips 196:6 197:6,7
369:20	278:23	cites 285:2	close 276:23 294:8
changing 9:5 272:18	chemistry 58:23	citing 285:16 320:3	closed 83:25 189:20
272:21 276:17	215:13 248:13	citizen 123:18,24	coach 41:12,18
277:24	chest 223:3,15,19	city 222:20	42:10,17
characteristics	225:14 226:19	civil 42:4 289:5	coaching 42:20,23
281:8,12 316:5,7	227:19 238:25	293:13	code 5:14,16,21 6:4
319:12 326:13	242:5 252:6	claim 6:16 104:14	6:9 72:5 74:8
351:14	chicago 118:11	223:14 275:13	cold 215:15 218:12
characterized	131:6 145:10	314:4 327:25	218:18,22 219:4,13
316:14,15	189:15 194:22	claimed 219:24	221:2,19 223:6
characterizing	362:16	334:10	229:14 230:24
148:18	chief 88:16 98:20	claiming 88:3	colder 229:11
charge 93:5 129:13	99:17,22 100:17	claims 223:2 225:14	collected 370:16
157:13 294:6,12	102:5,9 297:20	clarification 100:3	collection 233:9
charged 90:4,11,18	chin 93:4	clarified 360:14	318:23 375:13,18
90:20 91:2,6,15,19	chlorophyl 200:22	clarify 92:9	college 75:12,22
92:16 93:22 94:5	choice 76:8	clark 15:23	76:13 79:8 331:5
95:7,12,20 96:12	choose 38:23	class 236:9	color 147:25 148:16
103:4 107:4 108:15	chose 36:24 46:23	classes 37:21 81:3	156:22 159:21
109:19,21	46:24 120:10,12	122:9,10	160:17 161:22
charges 69:21 92:22	chosen 305:19	clause 52:9	162:6,17 165:10
94:17 95:7 109:2,4	chromatography	clear 25:6 72:3 80:5	174:13,17 190:5
109:8,24	200:18 282:21	104:16 132:17,25	310:6 315:13,22
chart 319:16,18,21	308:22,24 310:11	143:2 147:5 160:25	371:11
319:22	319:11,24	163:4 197:16	colorado 73:7
chase 2:23 183:10	cia 127:2	200:13 203:20	coloration 149:24
check 128:13 131:4	circles 348:22	250:22 259:24	177:8
165:18 223:25	circumstances	279:9 360:14	colored 196:9
224:3 284:16	74:19 93:23 237:22	clearance 66:13	197:14
345:19 360:23	238:2	68:20,25 69:7,15,17	colors 310:7 315:18
374:2	citation 106:21	cleared 87:24	columbia 113:23
checking 96:17	107:17 272:4 320:5	361:18	114:21
241:14	citations 38:5 39:3	clearer 170:17	column 367:7
checks 51:17,20	124:10	360:11	columns 272:19
chemical 20:2 59:5	cite 37:14 38:11,23	clearly 244:21	combination 355:25
128:25 202:4,7	232:12 233:5	245:13 246:17	come 39:3 55:19
209:7 251:9 256:2,8	234:10 282:23	328:5	106:15 108:4
261:8 279:17 282:6	283:25 284:4 285:6		120:12 121:11

195:15 235:23	319:21 320:10,12	concern 144:6	conditions 16:15,16
251:11 276:18	compensation 52:7	concerned 98:18	207:16 208:2,20
278:13 307:6,8	compensation 32.7	concerning 7:18 8:4	213:7,12,23 214:4
344:17,19 355:2	69:12 92:17 93:9	8:6 14:21 37:9	214:10,12,22 215:2
comes 76:10,19	94:5 136:14 142:18	107:16,25 111:23	215:11,22 216:3,10
205:24 240:5	142:24 143:4	111:25 159:8	216:24 217:15,22
252:22 370:20	362:23	184:14 205:22	218:13,18 219:5
comfortable 124:13	complete 65:12	207:3 270:16	220:12,13 224:12
124:16,20 242:10	132:18,23	concerns 272:6,7	231:17,19 232:4
coming 178:5	completed 132:23	concert 143:20	241:9 242:15,19
183:13 246:10	347:2	concise 205:21	243:13,21
329:8 349:16	completely 104:17	conclude 137:11,14	conduct 5:15 18:23
comment 127:13	136:25 161:24	149:10 292:3 349:4	19:2 37:24 42:5
241:8 248:21	163:6 165:7 227:2	349:8 350:4,8,11	49:8 56:13 69:19
365:22	238:2 255:15	379:24	103:17 122:18
commentary 287:8	350:19	concluded 137:4,6	128:23 131:3 199:7
comments 58:18	compliance 115:20	137:17 138:11	199:18,21 201:22
310:15	complied 115:12,16	177:14 288:5	204:2,9 251:12,17
commercially	116:3	325:13 338:3 339:6	303:5,6 309:13
320:24 321:4	component 51:11	339:9 348:6,17	316:21
commission 385:25	149:16 209:13,15	concludes 240:3	conducted 7:12,17
commissioned 105:3	210:8 247:6	concluding 328:7	8:4,8 39:25 40:22
committee 72:2,10	components 149:5	348:12	55:16 56:6,7,10
72:17 74:3,20 75:7	246:2,22 281:15	conclusion 6:7 23:9	57:10,11 74:18 94:6
committing 10:16	317:3,14,20	155:9 169:15	198:17 201:20,24
11:3	composition 284:8	180:18 203:15	207:23 208:3,19
common 9:9 229:7	329:7 339:15,19	214:2 239:16,21	215:18 244:24
237:2	340:8,10,13 341:3	244:24 245:17	245:5,16 246:20
community 123:4	341:13,25 347:7,15	246:21 301:8	255:22 258:7
129:24	347:16 371:8	311:16 312:10	271:11,12 275:19
companies 190:13	compositions 251:9	318:12,14,17	300:19 309:16,23
369:4,10	326:20	322:10,12 323:17	328:17 359:12
company 190:14	comprehensive	324:2 325:18	conducting 19:5
238:8 385:2	62:10	327:23 328:2	199:12 200:7
comparator 190:12	computer 11:22,24	339:16 341:22	201:14 244:20
309:4	12:3,11,19,21 13:5	342:3 350:3,17,24	conference 108:21
compare 319:8,9	13:7,10 14:5 63:19	355:25	175:13 185:17,20
377:9	139:6 141:18	conclusions 47:16	189:9,14,20
compared 151:9	303:14 304:20	48:13 176:23 307:6	confidence 221:25
165:8 222:4 236:25	373:18,19,21	307:9 348:11	333:7 334:3
319:14	computers 64:2	condition 149:3	confident 368:10
compares 167:21	concede 299:14	168:4,18 172:16,23	confidential 371:6
comparison 180:24	concept 57:6 143:13	174:14,17	confidentiality
310:9 312:25	235:24 236:3	conditioning 225:12	101:9
318:20 319:4,6,17			

[confine - correct] Page 12

confine 42:15	contains 40:11	continuing 30:25	conversations 3:5
confirmed 114:15	44:11 378:4	66:11 134:15	127:22 184:4
congress 82:8,10	contaminant 250:9	contract 8:15 9:2,14	conviction 105:23
connection 10:16	contaminant 230.9 contaminants 208:2	11:14 16:15 20:13	106:2
50:7 101:10 103:17	208:14,15,18	25:4 33:19,24 34:5	convictions 106:10
305:24 306:3,6	246:25 247:5 251:3	34:8 135:13,23	convincing 72:3
consciousness	251:6,13,19 252:11	136:12,14,18 137:7	coordinate 56:22
143:13	251.0,13,19 232.11	137:7 138:4,10,20	119:3
consider 5:13 12:2	contaminated	138:24,24 139:5,23	coordinated 119:4
12:13,24 21:23 59:2	226:14,17 254:14	138.24,24 139.3,23	copeland 80:21 83:7
59:9 88:8,9 129:3	254:20	141:10,13,17,22	copeland's 84:4,8
130:14 205:17	contamination	141:10,13,17,22	copier 170:15 312:2
231:5 233:14 241:6	244:16,23 245:8,15	168:14 178:18	copies 43:25
consideration 40:16	244:10,23 243.8,13	214:13 238:6	copy 23:14 25:7
380:3	254:4,9 342:12	244:19 286:21	58:11 65:9 86:21
considerations	contaminations	338:4 345:5 348:8	116:23 117:14,16
271:7	207:19 271:8	350:21 355:7,22	121:14 128:12
considered 218:18	contemporaneous	356:3 359:6 382:13	265:5 344:6 345:21
245:10 249:6	358:12 360:8	contradict 161:25	351:13 353:22,25
250:24 254:8	contemporaneously	contradicted 156:6	362:23 368:2,5
consistency 347:7	359:11	156:22,25 158:4,24	371:12 373:8
347:14,15	contend 135:23	159:13,20 160:16	376:17 382:25
consistent 174:6	content 179:21	161:21	cordoned 193:24
195:25 277:13	290:2 291:10 293:4	contradicting	core 136:24 295:7
318:3,6,7,11,16	351:17	154:16	corner 193:25
329:8 342:10	contention 136:10	contradiction	correct 5:6 8:20
349:15 350:7,8,15	136:22 138:23	160:20 166:18	12:4,18 13:5 15:3,4
350:19,25	211:9	contradicts 341:21	18:11 21:18,21 24:9
constantly 229:18	contents 236:18	342:2	24:12 26:12 35:16
230:2	238:6,9 240:6	contrary 155:9	35:23 37:15,16
constitutes 330:22	349:15	166:15 282:9	38:18 40:13 44:12
construct 377:19	context 143:7	contrasted 304:19	44:17 45:16,19,22
consultant 75:19	158:15	contributing 95:16	45:24 46:8,12,18
76:5	contingency 51:11	95:21	47:2,5,9,23 48:8,9
contact 82:15 83:4,7	continuation 289:21	contributor 110:3	49:3,4,6,7 50:9
349:6	continue 3:9 42:14	217:25	52:13,14 54:3,9,19
contacted 49:20	42:17 133:18 134:9	control 143:23	56:3,4 57:12,13
50:13 53:2,6	134:18,20 136:19	252:5	58:4,8,15,16,22
contain 316:12	137:9,18 138:12	controlled 217:23	59:7 60:8 65:3,11
contained 45:10	157:6 183:20 203:8	controversy 303:23	66:18,21,22 67:9,12
143:24 198:21	continued 69:14	convenient 378:20	67:14,20,23 68:5
199:6 204:13	306:10	conversation 100:11	69:21 70:7,11,14,15
213:12	continues 214:18	103:2 128:4 184:14	70:18,22 71:2,5,9
containing 143:18	344:4	184:23 185:16	71:13 73:14 75:20
211:19		216:20	77:3,24 86:12,13,15
	I.		,

[correct - created] Page 13

86:16,18 87:7 88:12	220:3,7 225:9 228:2	corroborates 223:6	30:10 31:17 36:14
88:15,19 89:7,13,14	228:3,24 229:12,15	corroborating	36:18 38:18 39:19
89:17,20 90:5 91:20	229:20 230:4,7	142:19	40:11 41:11 42:18
91:23,25 92:18 94:8	232:7 233:13	corroboration	42:20,21 43:20
94:9,17,25 95:3,7,8	240:19 242:6,7	221:17,20 223:14	44:24 45:8 48:24
95:23 96:14,20	244:7,12,13 247:4	223:18,22 242:4	58:15 60:6,10 66:3
101:14 103:4,7,10	250:25 251:4,19,20	cosmetics 247:3	87:22,23 90:5 92:23
103:12,19,20,24	255:4 256:17 257:6	cotton 351:17	93:21 94:22 95:11
104:11,22 105:5,21	257:18 258:5,16,17	counsel 46:17 89:11	100:3 101:18
107:19,20 110:20	259:6,20 260:21	100:6,7,10 111:6	107:21,25 108:4,19
111:11 112:12,22	261:8,9 262:15,19	118:25 183:22	109:22 111:3
113:16 114:4 117:7	263:5 264:3 266:3	count 94:18 133:20	112:21 113:7,10,15
118:22 120:15	268:25 269:18	259:6	113:20 114:8,12,21
121:22 122:19,23	273:8 276:2,12	counted 238:22	115:19 124:24
129:2 130:2,5,6	281:21,22 282:8	counter 262:2 312:9	138:3 146:6 151:12
131:2,20 135:24	283:2,5 286:17,18	322:9	152:12 153:2 156:5
141:22 142:3,10	287:10,11 288:2,6	countered 322:12	157:14 158:2,8,23
143:5 144:16 148:9	289:8,25 290:10,19	country 230:21	159:12 160:15
149:2 150:18	290:23 292:13	county 381:5	164:25 171:14,17
155:24 156:13	295:18 297:13,25	couple 49:18 70:6	173:15 182:19
160:13 161:5,23	298:6,14 301:2	80:16 147:8 185:21	183:16,18 203:3,13
163:16 164:11,14	302:10 308:25	262:10 272:2	205:9,17 210:16
166:10 171:11	309:24 314:7 316:5	276:18 277:3,25	226:12 236:14
174:14,24,25 175:4	316:18 317:11	278:4	240:11 248:16
175:5,24 176:12,15	318:5 322:5 325:18	course 21:9,22	249:22 259:13,21
176:21 177:4,15	326:2 327:2 330:19	33:22 40:19 43:9	266:11 274:10
178:2,3,10 179:16	336:4 342:4 347:25	66:9 68:21 85:19	285:20,21 289:12
179:21 180:9,20	349:17 350:22	87:12 143:24	291:7 292:7,23
181:15,19,20,23,24	351:23 356:9	153:22 169:21	293:18 295:23
185:24,25 186:21	358:10,11,14 359:3	179:2 187:16,20	296:5 298:10
187:9,12,25 188:4,5	359:8,13,14,19	191:14 194:10,16	299:23 319:18
189:6,7 191:25	370:22 375:15	197:2 205:12,15	322:22 341:11
193:6 194:8,12	corrected 153:14	227:15 232:20	381:7
195:7,12,13 197:19	correctly 24:23	236:15 238:22	court's 108:14
197:20,25 198:10	104:19 140:9 155:7	239:13 240:23	113:11
198:11,14,15,18	185:10 245:2	253:15 256:22	courts 40:3,16 60:11
199:14,24 200:5,15	271:21 283:14	300:2 317:12,25	111:12
201:11,15,25	correspond 166:24	361:7	cream 207:19
203:16 204:10,23	corresponds 166:23	courses 65:4,21 66:4	creams 247:2,14
207:16,17,24,25	367:21	331:4,6	create 35:8 81:6,6
208:10,17 210:18	corroborate 222:25	court 1:2,21 3:21	332:3 362:22
212:6 213:2,17	224:17	4:2 10:4,11 11:4,6	363:17 370:14
214:11,23 215:7	corroborated	13:4,21,22 14:2,3	created 25:19 64:22
216:7,17,18,22	222:12,22	15:2 22:15,20 26:21	197:24 198:5
217:6,13 218:19		27:9 28:10 29:3,10	338:19,20 350:20

[created - defendants] Page 14

350:25 363:19	currently 127:6	283:6,11,21 359:11	369:4
370:3	272:24	382:22 383:7,12,14	dean 2:8 4:17 99:5
creating 17:25 80:2	curriculum 65:14	dates 88:25 93:11	death 235:23 237:13
creation 80:4	382:17	96:17 118:8 131:4	decade 71:5
182:17 313:2	curve 333:4	324:8	decades 123:14
credentials 188:14	custody 146:10	dating 199:7 226:4	231:21
credibility 108:5,11	cut 112:11 115:22	263:20,21 264:3	decelerate 230:25
108:14	379:21	265:24 266:19,21	december 102:2
credible 110:22	cutting 283:15	266:25 268:24	decide 42:21 108:20
333:8 334:2	cv 1:4 3:22 65:10,18	281:4,9,13 284:13	216:25
credited 105:3	d	286:5,10 294:3	decided 112:24
crediting 176:22	d 1:5 110:17 382:2	295:15,21 296:11	113:4 202:3,15
crime 5:10 10:16	d.c. 17:24 18:13,25	296:13,15,21,25	306:7,13,16,17,19
11:10,12 69:8	61:21 62:13 64:23	298:4,13 299:16	306:23 329:6
criminal 10:11 11:4	dab 254:2	300:25 301:18,22	deciding 75:4
69:12 92:17,22 93:9	damage 145:12	301:23 305:15	decision 37:8 72:21
101:13 109:8,24	147:2 348:7	307:7	111:2 133:20
289:4 293:13	damaged 144:15	daubert 13:2 39:11	declaration 7:4 14:9
criminally 90:4	214:15 327:11,21	39:16 43:12,14,21	17:5 23:18 39:7
107:3	328:17 329:16	43:23	40:7,11 43:20 44:18
critical 213:8	dangers 271:6	daubert's 37:11	44:23 45:2,10,15
224:12,13	daniel 2:24 3:11	dave 127:2	57:14,18,21,25 58:7
criticism 114:18	dark 164:11 181:15	david 69:13,14	140:16 145:25
270:24 272:11	data 6:6 72:6 75:8	93:16 382:23	153:18 157:9
criticisms 275:12	333:12	day 86:17 88:3	160:22 162:5,8,9
criticize 269:19	date 3:12 19:24	90:10,17 92:23,24	167:10,13,19
275:16 337:4	23:22 25:5 53:25	93:22 103:7,9,12	168:13 184:16,21
criticized 78:25	61:14 63:16,18,19	118:24 119:14,16	185:5 186:16
330:13,15	01.14 03.10,10,19		
	63.21 23 25 64.4 12	120:18,20,22,24	216:14,21 217:8,12
criticizes 269:17	63:21,23,25 64:4,12	120:18,20,22,24 121:4,15 122:16	
criticizes 269:17 criticizing 79:7	65:16 69:3 86:8,14		216:14,21 217:8,12
	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3	121:4,15 122:16	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23
criticizing 79:7	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19 cropped 163:11,15	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19 281:20 324:8 338:5	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16 360:8 373:14	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20 192:15 263:16
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19 cropped 163:11,15 163:15 165:12,14	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19 281:20 324:8 338:5 339:7,10 342:4	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16 360:8 373:14 376:21 378:16	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20 192:15 263:16 declarative 36:5
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19 cropped 163:11,15 163:15 165:12,14 165:22 168:8 173:3	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19 281:20 324:8 338:5 339:7,10 342:4 343:25 354:6	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16 360:8 373:14 376:21 378:16 380:22 381:22	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20 192:15 263:16 declarative 36:5 defendant's 6:13
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19 cropped 163:11,15 163:15 165:12,14 165:22 168:8 173:3 crown 127:2	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19 281:20 324:8 338:5 339:7,10 342:4 343:25 354:6 357:14 358:9	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16 360:8 373:14 376:21 378:16 380:22 381:22 385:23	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20 192:15 263:16 declarative 36:5 defendant's 6:13 8:11
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19 cropped 163:11,15 163:15 165:12,14 165:22 168:8 173:3 crown 127:2 crutcher 1:19 2:10	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19 281:20 324:8 338:5 339:7,10 342:4 343:25 354:6 357:14 358:9 366:22 376:25	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16 360:8 373:14 376:21 378:16 380:22 381:22 385:23 days 52:10 97:12,15	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20 192:15 263:16 declarative 36:5 defendant's 6:13 8:11 defendants 1:10
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19 cropped 163:11,15 163:15 165:12,14 165:22 168:8 173:3 crown 127:2 crutcher 1:19 2:10 2:22,23 3:16	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19 281:20 324:8 338:5 339:7,10 342:4 343:25 354:6 357:14 358:9 366:22 376:25 385:5	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16 360:8 373:14 376:21 378:16 380:22 381:22 385:23 days 52:10 97:12,15 103:13,15 118:22	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20 192:15 263:16 declarative 36:5 defendant's 6:13 8:11 defendants 1:10 2:11 4:6,8,10,12,14
criticizing 79:7 269:23 289:14 292:23 337:2 critique 262:17 263:19 cropped 163:11,15 163:15 165:12,14 165:22 168:8 173:3 crown 127:2 crutcher 1:19 2:10 2:22,23 3:16 cryptic 268:4 280:7	65:16 69:3 86:8,14 92:3,19 93:18 102:3 117:18 129:18 135:8,14 145:22 151:19 162:25 164:5 167:15 191:4 234:24 281:17,19 281:20 324:8 338:5 339:7,10 342:4 343:25 354:6 357:14 358:9 366:22 376:25	121:4,15 122:16 128:14,22 130:18 131:15,16 160:6 161:8,11 163:5,5 170:21 175:3 191:18 350:12,16 360:8 373:14 376:21 378:16 380:22 381:22 385:23 days 52:10 97:12,15 103:13,15 118:22 205:21 315:24	216:14,21 217:8,12 220:18 222:23 226:2 240:25 265:4 271:25 382:7 383:13 declarations 43:16 43:25 90:4 151:20 192:15 263:16 declarative 36:5 defendant's 6:13 8:11 defendants 1:10 2:11 4:6,8,10,12,14 4:21 7:7 8:7,13 9:8

65:14 86:5 93:13,15	degraded 161:2	205:23 263:16	determine 74:19
114:2,6,14 117:16	202:9	266:12,14	99:8 100:12 136:18
129:10,15 135:3,5	degree 231:2 331:10	describe 24:11	157:10 251:12,18
135:23 139:17,21	331:10 364:2	31:23 94:16 95:5	271:10 310:4
142:22 144:11	delay 121:6 236:17	124:21 146:4	316:22 347:6,13,14
145:11 146:8,15,24	delays 112:4	168:21 260:19	347:16,20
147:2,10,21 161:21	demjanjuk 110:17	264:8,18,19 265:3	determined 198:20
163:25 166:9	demonstrate 310:23	269:3 338:14,15	199:5 200:10 202:8
167:10,13 174:22	demonstrated	340:22 356:12	349:14
175:24 185:13	137:16	described 24:8	determines 333:19
186:18 192:20	demonstrates	186:13 196:19	develop 237:16
194:11,17 197:18	339:20	232:15 286:19	272:13
197:22 213:16,19	demonstrating	367:7	developed 311:6
213:20 214:8	319:17	describes 150:12	314:2 315:16,19
232:11 234:20,21	denominated	333:25 334:22,25	318:21
234:25 242:17	360:18	describing 146:2	deviated 276:25
243:4,19 310:14	denver 73:6	302:3	277:4
311:21 327:24	department 78:5	description 94:2	deviates 277:5
329:10 338:23	272:24,25	237:21 260:23	deviation 331:14,17
339:2,3 340:11,13	depending 77:21	310:21	331:21 334:11,24
341:3,13,21 342:2	depends 12:20 86:2	design 24:20 26:2	335:3,6,12,16 336:4
343:23 344:2 354:3	87:13 126:8 204:3	26:18,25,25	336:11,13,18
354:4 357:10,11,15	deponent 385:6	designed 236:16	device 197:10
357:20 358:8,21	depose 252:17,19	designer 26:2,18,19	314:10,19 334:6
359:10 361:5	348:19	designing 26:3,19	356:17 374:8
366:19,20,23 367:3	deposed 14:17	desk 352:3	devices 143:18,22
372:12,14 376:5,22	262:14 277:4	destroyed 143:19	144:5 313:11
377:7 378:17 382:7	deposing 100:6	destruction 143:15	dictated 117:2 299:7
382:10,12,14,17,19	378:17	detail 325:8	differ 269:6
382:22,25 383:3,6,9	deposit 48:8	detailed 307:23	differed 150:5
383:13,15,18,20,22	deposition 1:17 3:8	308:2 310:21	difference 137:22
383:25 384:3	3:14 27:10 29:11,22	detect 286:17	139:2 141:5 151:11
defense 89:11 91:11	42:5 76:10,22,24	detectable 348:13	166:3 190:16 281:3
145:7 156:6,25	100:5,12 108:9	detecting 200:23	301:14 326:4
159:21 160:17	129:16 132:18,22	detection 212:10	329:20 330:23
183:21 193:20	133:18,25 159:20	detent 356:3	331:20 332:2 333:6
define 217:18 268:8	183:9,21 184:6,11	deteriorated 55:21	333:12 365:23
defines 236:7	213:21 252:22	deterioration	378:9
defining 341:16	253:2 259:11,24	307:11	differences 190:18
definition 100:4	260:4 291:19	determination	310:23 317:14,19
152:19	337:18,23 363:8	205:3 206:16,25	364:7 365:15,17,21
definitively 328:6	376:12 378:12	214:13 270:17	365:24
defunct 84:6	379:13 383:4 385:5	305:19,20 310:5	different 8:19,23
degradation 145:12	depositions 15:3	determinations	9:11,21 10:5 32:5
348:15	51:10 76:3 100:2	215:21	33:16,16,17,19,25

17.17.70.00.40.10			1.00
47:15 50:23 63:13	directed 303:3,4	disconnected 306:2	dissimilar 169:2
77:21 88:25 123:8	304:21,24 305:10	306:6	dissolve 311:4
136:25 144:8	318:15	discovered 240:18	distinct 179:19
146:16 148:20	directing 29:24	286:23	181:25
152:19 153:4 163:6	direction 295:25	discovery 25:10	distinctly 181:21
165:3 168:5 173:2	297:20 301:7	173:13 186:17	distinguishing
181:22 190:3,8	305:18	237:23 238:2	302:7
192:23 201:3 205:7	directly 51:21	368:23	distribution 333:2
209:11 226:13	153:14 165:6	discretion 132:14	333:19
238:4 246:8 248:11	266:15 317:18	133:21	district 1:2,3 3:21
255:15 259:16,18	353:10,11	discrimination	3:21 14:20,24 34:23
268:6 285:18,22	director 88:15	283:9,18	87:21 145:5
288:7 292:12	277:19 294:18	discuss 74:12 101:6	docket 117:13
301:11 302:2 305:6	directors 72:11,16	112:12 128:6	167:12
310:24 311:11	79:24 80:7	184:10 213:3	doctor 19:22
312:11 321:11	directory 85:5	238:17 321:20	document 6:15,25
322:11 323:24,25	disagree 134:13	337:17 358:7	7:9 9:25 10:3,6,23
325:15 326:11,14	282:12,16 308:11	discussed 74:24	18:11,16 19:12
326:20 327:25	322:18,20 324:5	87:18 90:3 98:15	20:17,20,22 24:9,16
329:19 331:18	disagreeing 176:22	104:5 127:23	24:19 25:2,7,13,18
336:19 343:14	176:25	174:22 279:20	25:21 26:7,14,22
360:7 364:3,5	disagreement 67:18	280:16 298:14	29:22,25 32:17,22
367:16 372:19,22	discipline 59:3,10	330:8	32:25 33:4,21 34:9
378:5	59:16	discusses 158:13	34:14 47:8 48:6,12
differentiate 46:4	disclaiming 247:15	159:8 286:4 316:4	48:16,18,22 54:8
310:17 349:24	disclose 101:5 369:7	discussing 90:15	58:23 59:19 62:11
differentiated	disclosed 92:22	117:20 157:22	64:4,9,10 66:2,6
310:22	98:21 99:18 115:25	191:23 289:22	70:25 76:12 81:10
differently 291:9	268:16,20 269:9,16	337:23	89:4,9 116:23 117:2
293:4 311:4,6,7	286:23	discussion 132:8	117:4,6,13,14,17,21
differing 211:5	discloses 37:8	266:21 361:16	117:23 121:24
differs 261:12	disclosing 93:4	dismiss 10:21 23:21	122:25 131:19,24
difficult 269:8,15	370:24	382:10	135:4,6,10,15,19,22
281:2 316:20	disclosure 91:13	dismissed 110:22	136:2,6,8,10,22,24
diffuse 311:7	264:23 269:10	disparage 129:5,11	136:25 137:23,24
digital 313:12 344:8	discoloration 151:5	disparaging 124:17	137:24 138:11,23
356:15 373:8,13,18	166:4 348:7	127:13	139:19 141:4,24
dimensions 195:14	discolored 144:19	disposal 196:15	142:6,12,20 144:7,8
direct 23:25 25:20	149:12 151:8 157:4	disposed 143:19	144:12,14 145:13
32:10 36:13 87:2	158:6,25 159:25	dispute 180:22	145:19,21 146:8,11
94:11 130:7 149:13	161:3,7 165:25	181:3 259:5 267:11	146:15,16,18,22
164:6 167:18	166:17 170:2 172:3	332:20	147:3,10,14 148:2
168:11 235:6	172:4 176:5 177:2	disputed 140:25	149:11,20 150:6,17
245:11 275:4 286:6	177:15,16 180:23	disputing 312:5,7	151:2 152:5 153:24
315:7 321:14	181:14		153:25 154:2,14

[document - earlier] Page 17

155 00 156 0 157 0	240 10 20 22 240 2	100 10 10 100 04	207.22
155:23 156:8 157:3	248:19,20,23 249:2	122:12,19 128:24	307:22
158:7 160:6,10,16	249:8,14 250:5,7,10	130:20 131:14	downstairs 363:10
160:24 161:2	250:16 251:3,6,23	137:3,21 140:18	dpi 311:22 312:4,6,8
163:13 164:2,12,15	252:3,10,13 254:20	151:8 153:13	dr 20:11 21:3 25:14
164:16,21,23 165:7	256:4 265:25 273:8	159:24 161:7	25:19 48:17 52:15
165:8,9,24 166:4,13	281:8,12 282:3	175:13 179:15,15	53:9 130:19,22
166:16,22,23,24	286:10 291:20	180:6 219:19,21	145:14,19,24 146:7
167:3,11,22 168:9	296:10 302:21,25	220:3 226:4,6,13,19	146:14,19 149:25
168:15,22 169:10	304:19 305:2,4	226:23,24 227:19	150:23 151:23
169:13,19 170:7,14	309:18,20,21 310:4	233:3,10,11,22	152:12 166:14
170:23,25 171:13	310:18 311:13	234:4 235:19	167:23 169:3,10
171:14,16 172:5,15	313:15,16,22	236:18 237:4 255:8	171:3,6,8 181:13,16
172:20 173:2,4,7,16	314:11,13,20 318:3	261:13,14,16	181:18 186:4,24
173:22 174:11,14	321:6,24 322:4	263:10,17 275:3	268:24 269:6 315:5
175:8,8,23 176:20	323:23 325:15	320:7 327:21	draft 22:14
177:2,7,12 178:5	326:25 327:11	329:10,17 343:17	drafting 117:9
179:25 180:18,19	328:18 330:18	360:3 361:6,7	draw 324:2
180:23 181:10,14	342:12,22,24	362:13 364:15	drawing 301:15
181:21 185:23	343:13,14,15,24	366:11 368:6,8,12	drawn 189:9 237:7
186:14,19 194:5,7	344:22 345:3,5	371:18 375:19	duces 263:13
194:10,13,16,19,20	347:9 348:9,20,24	376:2 377:11	due 376:18
194:21,24 195:4,6,9	349:2 351:2,22,24	378:10,22,24 380:7	duly 4:23 381:12
195:11 196:10	354:5,12,15,16,16	doing 18:24 41:2	dumain 15:19 52:4
197:11,19,23 198:4	355:6 356:8,19	45:4,11 119:20	dumain's 51:19
198:21,25 199:6	357:24 358:15,17	120:4 133:24,24	dunn 1:19 2:10,22
200:9 202:24	358:18,19,20,23,24	202:3,6,12 212:10	2:23 3:15
204:14 207:13	359:2,11,16 360:15	219:9 253:5 255:15	dusak 127:8
213:24 214:2,15	360:19,22 361:20	265:12 271:8	dyes 316:13
215:2,24 216:5,11	361:21,23 362:3,7	273:20,23,23 274:7	dynamic 281:4
217:21 218:20	362:18,19,20,22,24	286:9 292:25	282:2,5,10,14 284:2
219:25 220:6 221:7	362:25 365:13	294:25 306:11	284:8,12,22,25
221:22,24 222:4	367:2 371:17 375:3	315:16,17 352:4	286:4,7,11,14
223:2,14,18,23	375:7,14 383:2,7,10	373:7	e
224:21 225:15	383:19,21	dollar 94:24 95:19	e 2:2,2 4:22 27:2
226:3,14,16 227:2	document's 9:22	97:17,24 238:8	49:23 50:5,8 52:22
227:13,18,24 228:2	24:11 140:25 166:8	dollars 90:23	110:17 139:9 141:7
230:9,16,21 231:15	240:8,17	doorstep 236:12	141:21 142:17,23
231:20,25 232:5,9	documentation	dot 37:10,10,10	143:3 183:2,2,23
232:16,20 235:15	154:4	170:14 332:4,5,5	186:6,9 238:16
235:21 236:8	documented 59:12	344:9 358:25,25,25	272:5,5 287:16
237:22 238:14,17	documents 9:19,23	double 199:11,17	381:2,2 382:2
239:3,10,19 240:4	34:2,4 46:13,16,17	244:20	e.g. 289:6 290:9
240:10,24 241:2,4,6	54:19 59:5 60:2	doubled 358:3	e.g. 289.0 290.9 earlier 13:7 44:23
242:5 243:6,7,14,16	78:21 100:5,20	doubt 22:21 81:18	52:20 53:15 108:9
243:21,23 245:7	114:3 121:14	105:10 128:5	52.20 55.15 100.7

[earlier - exactly] Page 18

112.22.12.10	10001010		
112:25 155:10	192:24 240:13	223:10 230:17	establishes 229:2
169:3 184:13 186:2	275:2 300:20	249:11 278:15	283:25 342:7,9
195:6 197:21 205:4	326:22 374:21	entirely 237:12	estate 236:13
238:16 247:18	377:2 378:22	348:16	esteemed 70:9
272:5 273:11	elaborate 115:21	entirety 180:3	232:19
286:11 287:12	elaborated 222:24	254:18 345:17	et 134:5 272:5 331:7
315:25 322:15	elapsed 132:24	entitle 238:7	ethics 5:14,16 6:4
early 13:23 14:10	election 267:12	entitled 135:4,6	72:2,5,9,17 74:3,8
25:16 52:24 53:16	electronically 58:10	377:8 383:7	74:20 75:7
71:8 78:11,16 79:3	58:12	entries 283:11,12	european 273:3
191:6,9 192:22	element 105:9	entry 283:21	europeans 273:19
196:23 236:2 246:7	eliminate 173:4	envelope 148:9	evaluate 274:11
369:12	elliot 1:8 3:19	150:7,18 155:23	evaporate 209:16
easier 285:19	ellson 113:23,23	156:23 168:16	210:9 211:25
288:16 315:23	114:7	172:8,12,18 174:19	212:13 215:15,16
368:3	embedded 149:20	175:9 177:22 178:2	218:5,17,22 219:6
easily 334:6	176:18	178:10	evaporates 211:2,14
easy 77:6 223:25	emphasize 152:17	envelopes 177:25	212:4 218:3
225:18 271:13	emphasizing 292:4	environmental	evaporation 211:3
316:20	employee 67:23	207:15 208:19	211:15 217:16
ed 127:3	69:6,8 104:25	217:14 220:12	219:7,16 231:9
edges 250:4 352:10	employees 300:18	224:12	event 5:23
edit 22:9,11	employment 69:9	equal 332:6	events 67:2 93:20
edited 188:11	143:12	equally 262:5 332:5	eventually 323:12
editing 182:17	enables 149:10	equipment 335:21	everyone's 134:4
edition 234:3,5,6	encompasses 14:24	339:23 340:2	evidence 68:11 72:3
editorial 22:24	ended 262:4	eric 54:4	91:5,9 109:14 110:7
education 66:11	ends 33:11 61:2	errata 385:2	124:25 143:15,18
effect 10:9 55:24	132:7 134:22	erroneous 72:4 74:9	147:16,23 151:14
140:21 184:16	182:23 337:12	74:15 328:16	164:24 197:16
207:23 215:3,5	enforcement 104:21	329:20	241:16 243:20
218:9,11 219:13	104:23 187:17	erroneously 292:22	355:19 375:13,18
226:23 232:5	277:20	error 334:10	evident 348:7
236:11 246:4,9	engage 100:11	errors 21:13,20	ex 127:2,3,4
248:21 271:6	engaged 52:12	especially 256:22	exact 22:19 92:3
effects 213:11	157:20	esq 2:8,14,15,16,17	146:11 161:14
219:16,18	engineer 109:3	2:18	175:10 177:17
effort 120:25 157:20	engineering 108:25	essentially 133:25	191:4 196:20
eight 147:14 154:25	enjoy 69:14	193:15 196:8	234:16
199:2	enjoyed 69:16	338:16	exactly 88:5 142:9
eighties 229:23	ensure 188:18	essex 69:13	153:23 157:10
either 26:16 29:6	entered 213:18	establish 229:4	159:8 162:22
31:4 48:13,18 96:7	entire 45:3 72:24	established 103:3	191:22 195:16
106:10 118:21	73:3 133:14 163:19	143:14 361:24	221:4 254:3 269:23
178:18 179:7 191:9	164:12 172:4,19		270:9 272:11

[exactly - experts] Page 19

273:22 274:4 275:7 examiners 18:11,16 354:3,4 357:10,11 108:11 111:13 279:9 306:5 331:2 78:10 79:8 232:20 359:10 366:19,20 121:2,7,24 122:2, 361:24 374:18 273:8 297:7 366:23 367:4 122:13,25 123:3,1 exam 75:21 131:3 examining 355:15 372:12,14 376:5,22 123:23 124:3 examination 4:25 example 35:14 382:7,12,14,17,19 126:12,13,15,17 31:5 55:18 58:24 217:15 218:20 382:22,25 383:3,6,9 127:9,14 129:24 59:19,25 62:11 235:16 250:8 383:10,13,15,18,20 136:19 137:9 74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 383:22,25 384:3 138:13,15 141:12 117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 154:16,18 156:6,2 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 excerpt 235:2 383:15 25:21 274:22 154:16,18 168:10 17	7 5
352:15 356:23 78:10 79:8 232:20 359:10 366:19,20 121:2,7,24 122:2, 361:24 374:18 273:8 297:7 366:23 367:4 122:13,25 123:3,1 exam 75:21 131:3 examining 355:25 372:12,14 376:5,22 123:23 124:3 examination 4:25 example 35:14 382:7,12,14,17,19 126:12,13,15,17 31:5 55:18 58:24 217:15 218:20 382:22,25 383:3,6,9 127:9,14 129:24 59:19,25 62:11 235:16 250:8 383:10,13,15,18,20 136:19 137:9 74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 117:5 118:2,10,11 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10 <	7 5
361:24 374:18 273:8 297:7 366:23 367:4 122:13,25 123:3,1 exam 75:21 131:3 examining 355:25 372:12,14 376:5,22 123:23 124:3 examination 4:25 example 35:14 382:7,12,14,17,19 126:12,13,15,17 31:5 55:18 58:24 217:15 218:20 382:22,25 383:3,6,9 127:9,14 129:24 59:19,25 62:11 235:16 250:8 383:10,13,15,18,20 136:19 137:9 74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 383:22,25 384:3 138:13,15 141:12 117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 128:17,20,24 119:8 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	7 5
exam 75:21 131:3 examination 4:25 372:12,14 376:5,22 123:23 124:3 31:5 55:18 58:24 217:15 218:20 382:7,12,14,17,19 126:12,13,15,17 59:19,25 62:11 235:16 250:8 383:10,13,15,18,20 136:19 137:9 74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 383:22,25 384:3 138:13,15 141:12 117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 118:17,20,24 119:8 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	7 5
examination 4:25 example 35:14 382:7,12,14,17,19 126:12,13,15,17 31:5 55:18 58:24 217:15 218:20 382:22,25 383:3,6,9 127:9,14 129:24 59:19,25 62:11 235:16 250:8 383:10,13,15,18,20 136:19 137:9 74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 383:22,25 384:3 138:13,15 141:12 117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 118:17,20,24 119:8 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 excluded 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17	5
31:5 55:18 58:24 217:15 218:20 382:22,25 383:3,6,9 127:9,14 129:24 59:19,25 62:11 235:16 250:8 383:10,13,15,18,20 136:19 137:9 74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 383:22,25 384:3 138:13,15 141:12 117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 118:17,20,24 119:8 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 excluded 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	5
59:19,25 62:11 235:16 250:8 383:10,13,15,18,20 136:19 137:9 74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 383:22,25 384:3 138:13,15 141:12 117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 118:17,20,24 119:8 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	5
74:18 81:10 89:5 281:14 285:5 376:4 383:22,25 384:3 138:13,15 141:12 117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 118:17,20,24 119:8 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	5
117:5 118:2,10,11 examples 267:23 exhibits 24:6 57:15 143:3 145:14 146 118:17,20,24 119:8 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	5
118:17,20,24 119:8 exams 56:15 57:21 58:2,7 154:3 148:7 150:15 120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	5
120:11,13 122:18 excerpt 86:5 129:15 265:21 274:22 154:16,18 156:6,2 128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	
128:24,25 131:8 382:19 383:3 285:18,22 314:25 158:3 159:12,19 144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	
144:22 152:22 excerpts 234:21 382:6 160:15 161:20 153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	:8
153:22 174:23 235:2 383:15 exist 144:5 162:14 168:10 175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	:8
175:3 182:7 183:25 excited 102:12 existed 90:25 143:23 169:5,8 176:2 187 186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	:8
186:13 191:19 exclude 318:6 exists 225:17 377:12 187:11 189:25 193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	.0
193:12,17,20 excluded 111:12 exonerated 104:17 192:20 193:10	
+ 10/1·13 1/105·7 / $+$ 113·7 1/70 overoot 133·75 700·1/1703·71 73	
194:13,17 195:2,7	
239:11 240:23 excuse 27:17 41:8 218:5,22,24 205:14,14 210:17	
241:3 261:19 41:15 expedited 25:10 224:6,9 232:9 241	.5
302:19,21,25 excused 134:10 186:17 243:4 254:22	.5
304:19 307:21 executed 57:18 expelled 72:11,18 255:19 257:23	
309:3,6 310:4 executor 236:12 expenses 18:24 269:17 319:20	
311:24 313:5,18 exhaustive 208:15 experience 59:4,12 322:16,23 323:5	
352:4 356:18 312:17,24 260:24 328:11 341:10,14	
359:12 362:14 exhibit 23:17,18 experienced 43:6 355:6 364:25 365	8
374:22 382:3 25:2,3 26:6 61:9,11 122:2 365:14,22 374:9	Ü
examinations 19:25 65:8,14 86:5,10 experiment 207:23 expert's 341:21	
52:12,16 56:3,21 93:13,15 94:11 208:3,19 244:24 342:2	
131:11 194:11	
370:13 117:16 129:15 experimentation 65:5 66:10 124:18	
examine 56:16 135:5 140:16 227:21 141:19	
130:20 160:10	
203:9 226:11 289:4	
293:12 356:7 167:13 213:17,19 experiments 215:17 53:25 85:4 119:9	
examined 4:24 213:20 214:8 219:9 121:14,17,21	
20:18,20 32:3 54:7 232:12 234:19,20 expert 5:23 11:23 122:22 123:4 125	3
160:7,13,16 203:10 234:21,25 282:17 12:4,12,14,19,21,24 125:25 126:6,19,2	3
220:3,4 226:6 282:24 285:5,8,10 13:5 14:5 32:21 127:12 128:11	
239:22,24 248:23	
272:23 305:3 308:6 288:18 290:10 40:19 45:6,21 47:6 147:2,11,12,19	
examiner 130:23 315:4,9,10 320:2 59:22,24,25 60:7 148:6 149:4,8	
181:13 323:23 343:22,23 344:2 84:23 107:5 108:4 150:20 151:21	

[experts - federal] Page 20

152:10,23 156:21	extremely 286:20	factor 95:21 213:8	falsely 42:24 110:14
156:22 159:13,21	eye 179:14 313:11	224:12 227:14	familiar 94:7 115:5
160:17 166:9	eyes 32:6	241:25 244:14	116:22 117:2
169:23 175:24		factors 207:12 208:7	121:20,23 122:5,7
185:12,14 186:3,25	f	208:20 213:3 246:9	121.20,23 122.3,7
	f 1:17 4:22 38:6,9		143:13 190:9 232:8
192:12,20,23 242:14,17 243:19	65:15 163:23 164:2	270:4,11	
/	183:2,23 380:20	facts 74:19 93:9,22	234:11 235:24
253:5 304:20	381:2,10 382:4,18	109:14 110:6 125:5	236:3 268:23
310:14 311:21	383:10 385:6,21	184:15 240:15	282:17
327:24 328:21	fabricated 142:24	factual 109:22	familiarity 89:12
339:4 362:25	338:18	145:17,23 147:7	famous 190:14
363:20 375:6,9	face 175:15,15,16	179:24 180:16	far 62:19,25 77:18
378:17	179:25 180:4	215:10 216:9 227:4	80:22 102:19
expires 385:25	facebook 1:9 3:19	227:10 228:15	112:14 127:6
explain 56:11 112:6	7:25 8:5 9:18 16:15	231:13 242:16	153:17 201:2
153:11 202:14,19	33:24 136:13	243:3,24 244:5,11	215:23 216:14
202:23 203:3,12,13	138:23 214:13	factually 242:20	227:2 228:10
203:16 204:3 209:6	244:19 338:4 348:7	faded 144:18 148:8	231:11 241:8
209:8,12 236:16	355:7,22 356:3	149:12 151:24	264:13 290:25
261:10 275:18	facility 222:19,20,21	153:8 154:8,23	291:10 304:4,9
300:16 331:20	249:2	155:4 156:10 157:4	328:19 337:23
344:19 359:21	fact 11:13 18:16	158:6,25 162:18	362:15
378:7	33:19 52:17,18 54:7	163:9,13 164:10	fault 271:13 274:9
explained 294:11	74:16 78:18 84:2	166:22 168:22	274:17
365:25	87:19 88:2 90:8	169:20 170:2 172:3	fax 135:4,6,14 137:3
explains 344:16	91:18,24 96:12	172:10 174:7 176:6	137:6 138:11,20
explanation 100:4	103:16 104:16	177:17	139:3,5,19 140:3,20
206:7,8,10 236:4		fading 169:23 213:8	141:6,13,17,22
256:15	107:10 108:10	faint 161:4 164:10	359:6 383:7
explanations 255:12	109:6 112:7 114:24	fair 142:15 190:6	fbi 102:8
256:21	124:18,24 136:12	212:13,15,21	feasible 256:10
explosives 257:21	161:20 166:21	217:17 229:3	306:8,14,20
exposure 105:4	174:4 197:17	240:18 261:20	feature 210:8,25
347:17 348:9,12	199:10 201:24	369:3 370:25	211:11,13
expulsion 5:22	214:6 220:20 223:2	fairly 124:11	features 179:19
72:24 73:2,8,14,23	223:22 229:21	fairness 133:19	316:5,8
74:2	235:23 268:23	134:6	february 73:7 88:22
extent 308:15	279:7 286:9 288:22	fake 8:16 9:15 10:7	89:19 92:3,4,5
externally 314:17	289:14 290:20	84:23 85:17 136:14	96:13,16
extract 268:15	292:24 299:12	143:4	federal 14:23 34:21
272:20	300:23 301:7 302:2	fall 223:9 229:3	38:14,18 42:4 69:6
extractible 316:13	320:23 321:3,10	falls 5:24 298:5	69:8 127:7 256:16
317:2	334:2,5 336:3,17	299:9 332:23	256:17 275:23
extraction 265:10	362:5 364:11	false 5:9 78:13	276:4 317:8
267:16		89:23 90:4 239:25	2/0.T J1/.0
207.10		09.43 90.4 439.43	

[fee - forgery] Page 21

fee 19:9,10 51:11	find 82:16 155:11	49:20,23 50:5,7,13	followed 27:5 94:4
feedback 58:18	202:22 225:18	86:11 110:2 117:23	216:21,23 244:3
feel 9:22 277:14	235:20 251:2 273:3		317:7
351:18 369:3		119:14,16 120:22 121:15 125:4 127:2	
	317:14 321:14,19		following 90:2 follows 4:24 76:12
370:25	348:18	128:21 131:16,18	
feelings 77:12,15	finder 108:11	136:2,3,4 137:11	183:24 332:25
feet 133:22 194:24	finding 68:10 72:10	138:14 150:13,19	333:5 341:16
195:5,8,12	74:3,20 105:7,19,20	159:5,18 160:6,13	font 323:11,11
feline 78:7	105:24 106:3	160:23 167:18	fonts 33:16
fell 299:9,10	113:11 114:13	173:25 175:23	footnote 332:14,15
fellow 71:14	161:14 174:6	181:9 187:3 191:18	332:17
felt 10:5,6 102:22	214:16,17 245:9	192:11,14,17	forces 62:9
female 287:18	256:23 307:25	194:20 209:20	forearm 250:11
fiber 328:20 329:7	308:4 330:15	211:25 215:4	forensic 5:14 11:22
349:14 351:17	340:14 355:19	216:12 220:4	12:4,12,19 18:11,16
fibers 348:14	findings 19:24 39:6	267:24 276:16	19:12 36:13 39:5
field 12:14 85:2	44:17,25 45:5,9,16	283:8 286:15	40:2 43:13,22 52:12
122:14 124:11,11	45:18,19 46:25 47:4	287:17 288:19	62:10 70:7,11,14,17
126:20 215:19	48:18 52:23 114:20	297:21 300:22	71:8,10,15,21 72:2
218:8 231:21	114:24 115:4 159:8	310:14 311:20	75:13,15,18 78:10
232:24	224:10 255:7,12	322:25 334:22	79:8 80:8 84:22,23
fifth 248:13	256:9 257:4 288:9	349:10 354:24	85:16 88:16 89:4
figure 251:15	307:18 323:23	361:14 376:7	112:16 117:5
342:11	finds 335:6	firsthand 98:18,23	121:24 122:12,25
figures 336:23	fine 101:17 121:9,11	99:15 100:24	129:4,8 130:15,23
file 171:19 177:20	132:16 134:17	155:22 225:8	143:8,10 181:12
353:9 368:4,9	212:11 273:18	227:12,17,20,23	187:11,17,21
376:10	338:11 341:19	fit 42:5 129:12	224:10 232:8,16
filed 3:20 9:20 38:17	378:11 379:8	five 21:11 28:25	239:6 240:12
69:12 92:17 117:25	fingerprints 84:23	60:20,23 91:18,23	272:16 273:8 289:3
142:18 171:14,17	85:17	94:25 96:9,19,21	293:8,12 294:16
173:16 184:20	fingers 249:11	101:23 133:8,16	302:21,24 303:3,7
185:4,12,14 186:11	finish 31:2 156:12	245:22	304:18 306:11
186:16 217:8	260:4 378:12 379:4	flight 363:8 378:23	323:22
318:23	finished 26:3,11,17	florida 129:20	forensically 141:4
files 40:15	29:4,13 30:14,17	fluorescence 319:12	365:19
filing 10:3 295:23	31:9,20,21	348:24	forensics 13:5,10
296:5	firearms 257:14	fluorescent 189:22	14:5 63:19 76:4,5
fill 84:11	258:11 369:17	190:3 193:13	201:2 302:22
filled 78:13	firm 15:17 16:3,5	fluorescing 351:20	304:20
film 187:9,25	116:11 139:11	focus 266:19 269:22	forest 112:17 129:24
final 104:3	183:11	folks 303:14	129:25
financial 51:6	first 24:2,5,11 27:9	follow 95:5 243:14	forgeries 114:3,10
financially 62:19	30:16 31:18 33:20	304:23 335:20,21	forgery 8:16 114:13
	36:21,25 40:21	335:22	197:23 323:22

[forgotten - go] Page 22

forgotten 237:12,16	foundling 235:17,19	funded 24:21 26:12	gerry 4:20 260:19
form 42:9,12,16	235:25 236:7,10	26:13,17 29:4,13	285:3
343:20 347:3	237:24 239:21	30:14,20 31:9,20	getting 66:9,10 88:8
	four 92:6 94:15,19	furnish 236:18	gianatto 162:11
	96:18 101:23 196:2	furnished 14:6 44:2	gianatto's 162:13
354:5,7 359:9			0
372:22,23,24,25	248:12 315:22	60:18 84:12	gibson 1:18 2:10,22
383:21	331:10	further 11:17,18	2:23 3:15
	fourth 102:4 130:18	138:10 199:25	give 5:18 14:12 44:5
· ·	fragrances 210:6	200:6 218:10	78:22 84:4,8,11
forming 162:14	247:2	307:13 381:16	125:15,17 127:16
	frame 179:23 185:9	furtherance 11:10	155:12 156:3,12
283:13 284:2 371:8	186:21,22	furthered 313:20	159:18 163:22
	frank 121:18 131:10	furthermore 331:25	208:11 221:17,24
	frankly 275:11	future 256:11 297:7	264:23 271:22
	fraud 8:15 9:3 10:10	g	281:14 344:7 368:3
forth 5:24 198:4,7	10:11 11:4,17,19	gain 264:25	376:20
198:12 214:10	23:21 142:12	gained 59:3,11	given 146:19 194:3
381:11	291:20,21 382:11	gas 200:18 308:24	214:16 274:23
	fraudulent 9:22,25	gc 200:21,23,25	284:24 302:24
382:9	10:23 11:14 197:25	255:14,21 279:24	303:2 359:23 378:9
fortunato 93:10	256:23 322:4	gcms 198:17,19	379:10 381:13
97:20	350:20 351:2	200:14,16,17 201:9	giving 343:3
forward 72:8	free 129:12	201:14,20,22	glass 356:14
216:14 283:19	freeman 190:15	253:14 255:19,21	glasses 32:7
369:21	195:19,22 196:12	256:25 257:5,8,16	gloves 248:22 249:8
foschio 41:20	196:16 197:9	257:24 258:6,16	249:13 250:3,16
foschio's 99:25	freeze 178:15	261:5 268:3,11	go 3:10 13:18 23:16
foster 190:15 195:18	freezing 229:15,18	278:20,22 286:16	26:5 28:9 34:16
195:21 196:12,15	frequently 191:13	305:12 326:19	35:20 45:3 47:7
197:8	fresh 211:19 212:16	general 23:4 201:8	48:12,16,17,21 52:4
found 67:13,15 72:3	283:10,18	203:22 215:13	57:6 65:17 83:6
75:7 81:23 90:6,7	freshest 212:23	228:14 298:23	85:21 92:9 133:22
91:11 95:2 104:18	front 6:9 60:12	299:5 305:2,4	134:7 147:16
105:15 108:2	102:11,20 128:18	338:21	152:25 153:5
110:21 112:21	144:9 148:18	generalizations	156:13 160:4
113:15 135:16	190:19 194:22	274:8	162:23 164:23
159:9 199:11	195:4,20 235:9	generally 208:16,18	166:5 168:12
202:21 205:24	266:5 309:9 325:23	219:20 375:18	193:18,23 214:7
207:12 208:9,22	342:14 351:21		240:23 241:3 246:7
210:18 244:18	frye 12:22 112:22	gentleman 303:22 genuine 239:11,19	248:8 259:21 260:3
248:10 253:19	113:8		260:3 263:18
275:11 318:9	full 165:16 214:12	240:8,17 338:19,20	264:11 265:3 275:2
323:12 334:11	215:21 264:23	gerald 2:21	275:8 277:9 280:6
342:13 351:10	376:10	germany 110:15	284:16 285:21
356:4			297:8 305:18

[go - heating] Page 23

317:17 321:22	government 88:12	170:3 238:7 267:5	happen 110:23
329:2 340:22	88:17 92:21 93:8,14	halfway 177:9	happened 42:24
343:10 360:23	93:21 94:24 95:19	hall 133:22	69:2 78:16 94:3,16
362:9 363:15	97:6,7 105:2,8	hand 24:25 86:9	95:25 96:4,24 169:9
379:17	109:25 123:14,22	102:20 167:17	172:7 216:17
goes 44:21 62:25	125:10 126:9,22	210:6 265:4,8 266:4	276:22 375:4
196:13 201:2 205:4	127:2,7 143:12	288:18 313:17	happening 239:7
227:3 228:10	256:16,17 275:23	357:8 381:22	291:25 292:2
236:22 285:4	graduate 76:3	handed 171:16,18	happens 380:12,12
325:10 336:14	grammatical 293:3	237:11	happy 75:3 102:14
337:8	grammatically	handheld 330:14,17	259:22
going 11:20 13:25	290:2 291:8,9,12,16	356:10,12,21	harassment 67:23
14:11 23:16 37:6	291:22	handhelds 356:22	hard 58:11 77:4
40:9 43:18,24 44:4	grand 109:16 110:9	handing 29:21	116:23 117:14,16
60:21,25 61:8 63:15	grandfather 232:16	351:12 371:9	121:14 128:12
80:24 92:10 111:16	gratuitous 111:17	handle 251:22	140:23 162:21
112:7 132:5,6	great 122:3 127:18	handled 67:19 237:6	
134:21 141:2	308:15 339:13	249:7	382:25
158:15,21 163:20	greatly 130:24	hands 237:6 248:25	hardens 209:22,23
165:19 167:2,4,9,17	group 102:14 303:5	250:15 251:22	hargett 127:3,17,18
168:11 170:16	groups 60:4 365:16	handwriting 25:24	128:2 297:20
182:19,22 196:17	guess 39:17 63:11	29:25 30:4 51:4	harris 168:16
209:22 213:25	216:8 220:18 229:8	59:6,7,11,11,15,18	169:12
215:15,16 226:15	233:25 273:12	59:22,24 60:3,7,13	he'll 128:3 379:6
235:6 256:22 260:4	279:8 298:22	114:9 122:22 123:4	head 80:21 263:11
260:5,11 265:8	guessing 297:22	123:16,23 124:3	280:25
266:4 273:3,12	guidebook 248:14	125:3,25 126:6,11	headed 354:5
274:24 319:2,4	guilt 106:11 143:14	126:12,15,17,22	383:21
326:9 329:23 333:9	guilty 67:13,15 90:6	127:9,12 138:17,19	headquarters 80:13
357:24 360:24	90:8 95:3 104:18	138:22,24 155:3	heard 90:14,18
363:3,9 371:12	105:8,12,13,13,14	167:21 168:5,19	98:19 124:23 125:8
372:5 376:11,17	105:20 108:3	173:17,25 179:21	125:9,23 126:2,3
378:14,18 379:12	gun 32:18,22,25	180:12 304:25	232:18 235:18
379:14 380:16	33:3,7,11 34:10,14	308:18 364:2,5,12	259:15,16
good 3:2 5:3,4 51:5	gus 122:17,21 123:2	365:2,3,9,10	hearing 162:21
79:15,15 325:12	123:15 127:13	handwritten 24:19	298:23
google 7:12,17,25	guy 259:8	25:20,23 28:7,14	heat 209:17 210:9
8:4,9,11 81:24 82:5	guys 108:20 127:5	29:2,12 30:15 146:3	heated 16:21 199:23
gotten 18:22 64:25	154:2 163:12 192:3	153:3 163:7,16	215:14 222:20
79:18 87:20 304:5	221:7 263:17 379:5	165:21 169:20	224:16 267:19
315:23	h	178:24 357:12	heater 224:9
govern 15:2	h 2:15	361:23 367:23	heaters 241:11
governed 117:5	half 17:12 92:6	376:23 383:23	heating 16:22
governing 100:2	133:9,23 134:10	384:4	223:24
	155.7,25 157.10		

[held - immediate] Page 24

held 1:18 3:15	226:3 227:18,25	hours 132:18,19,24	identify 3:25 55:16
129:17 197:10	230:9 231:24	133:19 259:3,10	55:22 56:8,24
202:11 313:17	237:22 239:3 243:6	260:5,8 363:6,7	281:15 282:13
383:5	245:7 248:20 251:3	house 16:23 78:8	284:2,7,11 307:10
help 43:7 315:3	265:25 286:21	223:23 224:16	314:9,18,23 317:18
_	291:20 310:18		320:13 323:11
helping 15:25 helps 368:7	311:13 325:15	230:2 241:12,13	348:2 357:20
-	326:25 327:9	hp 318:3 hr 190:21	
hereinbefore 381:11	342:22 345:5		366:24
hereunto 381:21		http 64:12	identifying 279:18 316:4.9
hewlett 317:17	351:21 354:12,15	huh 291:2 293:10	/
320:4 324:13	355:5 356:8 358:16	humidity 217:24	identity 81:10
hiding 237:15	358:20,23 359:6	218:6 219:15,18,20	ignored 243:20
high 20:21 123:16	361:7 362:7,20,24	227:13 228:7	illustration 167:20
151:8 181:11	375:3 382:13	231:12	319:16 320:10,12
190:21 198:25	hired 77:5	hundred 76:7	image 136:5 146:21
199:7 204:22	hires 123:22	336:15 351:9	163:12,14,19
211:20 214:14	historic 90:8	hundreds 233:8,18	164:20,20 165:6,12
216:11 217:20	histories 237:3	hypothesis 333:2	165:14,22,24
244:22 245:6,14	history 140:17	hypothetical 11:15	167:21,23,25 168:9
246:3,18 344:8	141:23 262:8	11:16,18	168:13 170:9,12,16
348:9,13	hold 18:4,15 149:22	hypothetically	170:17,17,19
highest 211:22	202:3,6 334:19	137:13	171:21 172:2,21,22
212:23 363:25	343:8 347:14	i	173:21 177:13
highlighted 94:22	352:19 367:11	i.e. 294:21	180:13 313:10
highly 75:6 122:13	368:14 376:11	idea 6:22 80:2 81:7	364:16 375:5
123:11 124:21	holding 206:3,5	94:23 107:11,18	images 20:11,21
125:19 132:20	233:3	147:25 246:24	47:11,25 48:15
198:13 302:13	holdings 89:6	identification 23:22	143:25 144:3
highs 229:22	holes 355:5,7 356:2	25:5 56:14,18 59:7	147:18 148:6 149:7
hire 6:15,24 7:9	356:9 357:2 374:10	59:11 60:7,13 61:13	151:15 154:4 160:4
8:14 9:14,25 11:14	home 16:19,20,21	65:16 86:7 93:17	161:18,18,25
20:12,17 24:9,25	62:8 220:10	117:18 129:18	162:10,24 166:6
25:4,7,18 26:7	honest 176:10	135:7 164:4 167:15	169:22 170:11
33:21 54:8 117:6	hope 6:2 223:3,15	187:22 234:23	171:15 172:12,19
131:19,24 138:24	223:18 225:14	285:3 307:9 315:6	173:9,12 174:2
140:22 141:10	226:19 227:19	343:25 354:6	176:13 181:2,7,12
142:2,6,20 144:7,12	238:25 242:5 252:5	357:13 366:22	187:2,3,5 313:14
145:19 147:3,10	hot 217:15,18	376:24	363:13,16,17,18,19
150:16 166:8	229:22 230:23	identified 138:25	363:21 365:4,16
167:22 168:14	231:3,6	170:2 213:4 219:11	373:19,22 374:3,4
175:7,22 178:18	hour 17:13 51:9,9	316:13 320:16	374:16
180:19 185:23	60:22 133:5,9,23	323:8	imagine 113:17
197:23 198:21	134:6,11	identifies 367:2	170:17 375:21
199:6 200:9 204:14	hourly 51:8	307.2	immediate 176:8
215:2 220:6 224:21			300:6

[immediately - ink] Page 25

immediately 69:7	319:20 320:22	indicates 50:8 200:3	287:17 303:10
148:19 151:5,7,23	321:2 325:3,8	244:18 270:4,11	311:24
154:8,13 155:2	included 36:15	indicating 24:20	initialed 361:23
157:3 158:5 159:24	59:19 66:8 151:19	30:10	initially 31:25
161:6 168:14 176:4	152:9,21 153:25	indication 142:11	209:22
imparts 329:19	154:3 208:5 210:20	indicted 67:11	initials 24:22 26:4
impeached 107:6	233:19 295:22	indictment 94:4	30:11
impeachment	296:4 303:12	indifference 237:5	initiate 64:18
106:11	306:24 312:23	individual 109:16	initiated 10:4
imply 95:10	322:6 330:10	112:14 127:24	ink 25:24 37:9 46:2
importance 242:22	373:23	141:8 209:3 246:2	46:6,25 47:3 54:24
important 102:23	includes 293:14	344:25	55:11,14,16 56:8,13
119:8 123:16,20	343:20 372:25	individual's 143:14	56:19,24 88:18 94:6
140:19 205:10,13	including 5:22 14:4	individually 1:9	144:18 146:2,3
213:23,25 226:11	30:10 38:6 116:15	individuals 53:24	147:20 148:2,8,16
241:25 284:7 306:8	263:24 285:17	127:10 133:13	148:21,23 149:3,11
308:19	308:10	136:9	149:23 150:5,13,16
impression 35:9	inclusive 208:11	industry 371:4	151:14,24 153:9
improbability	inconclusive 113:16	inference 289:17	154:8,14,22,25
235:16 236:24	inconsistent 329:9	influence 346:21	155:3 156:9,23
improbable 236:23	incorrect 47:10,24	information 14:12	157:4 158:7,25
improper 41:4,6	96:11 164:14	23:5 60:12,17 74:13	159:21 160:17
42:19	269:24 291:16,22	98:19,24,25 99:16	161:4,22 162:6,17
improperly 207:22	291:23,25	99:19 100:24	163:7,10 164:9,9
208:3,18 244:24	incorrectly 26:9	101:19 107:25	165:10,25 168:19
245:5,16 246:20	292:11 293:21	115:25 156:3	168:25 169:2,20
inaccurate 62:21	indentations 47:18	192:12,15,16,22	170:2,22,24 172:3,7
289:25 290:19,23	305:3 308:7	205:6 216:13,15	172:16,20,23 173:5
291:10,12 292:13	independent 101:23	217:4 220:6 224:14	173:8,17,21,25
293:23,24 336:13	221:17 222:5	225:19 228:16	174:6,11,14,18
360:6	224:15 240:12	242:15,18 243:5	176:5 177:15
inadmissible 106:10	261:22,25 333:12	253:6 263:11	179:10,12 180:24
inappropriate	339:24	276:20 307:13	181:15,25 198:8,9
350:10	index 248:14 368:16	316:17 320:3	198:20,24 199:5,7,9
incentive 52:6	378:7	323:18,20 343:4	199:22 200:3,8,11
inch 170:14 196:2	indicate 9:24 34:20	369:7 370:25 371:8	201:4,15,24 202:2,4
329:18 334:7 335:9	40:10 43:19 95:14	377:13 378:5	202:9,11,15,16,24
337:8 344:9 352:10	148:7,10 153:8	informing 94:22	203:4,14,14 204:14
352:11	170:12 268:22	infrared 279:17	204:18 207:13
inches 196:3 332:4	373:6	ingredients 310:24	208:9,22,24 209:3
336:7	indicated 33:5,13	inherent 235:16	209:18,19,20
include 38:5 39:4	133:7 151:5,25	271:5	210:12,14,17,23
81:9 173:8 205:13	195:19 203:7	inherently 236:23	211:2,14,19 212:16
289:5 290:8 304:10	377:16	initial 64:22 163:3	213:5 214:5 215:4
308:8,14 309:17		177:6 180:22	215:20 216:12

[ink - journal] Page 26

217:21 218:17,23	inspection 97:18	308:6	268:25 300:20
219:5,10,11,14	110:10 116:23	interlineations	305:25
220:15 226:16	117:15,17 118:4	47:15 178:25 305:8	ions 200:22
227:3,6,15 228:17	119:2,14,16 120:6	internally 314:15	issue 37:5 39:2,21
230:24,25 231:4,11	122:17 128:12,23	international	51:5 54:17 55:23
245:7 250:18,20	130:19 131:14	187:21	106:3 108:5 238:3
253:17,20,24 254:3	132:2 149:12	internet 10:8 61:10	239:6 240:11
254:14,25 255:3,7,8	155:14 156:8	61:12,23 64:16 96:6	256:23 300:19
255:11,15 257:6,20	176:23 177:3	100:20 382:15	304:12,16 306:9
263:20,21 264:2	182:13 188:4	interpretation 330:3	329:13
265:9,24 266:19,21	189:15 191:11	333:25	issued 22:10 40:18
266:25 267:15	195:3 358:9 373:8	interrupt 41:10,20	47:4 151:20 257:4
268:2,10,15,24	383:2	interval 333:7,8	257:22 274:22
270:17 279:18	inspections 120:14	334:2,3	301:24
281:16,17,19,20	instance 70:5	interview 101:10	issues 95:6 147:6
282:14 283:11,12	instances 114:13	103:15 256:3	262:16 305:9
283:13 284:2,7,12	123:9,10 125:11	interviewed 103:11	377:17
284:12 286:5,10,17	301:25 302:6,9	interviewing 104:7	italics 288:21
294:3 295:15,21	304:3	interviews 109:17	item 377:7
296:11,13,15,21,25	institute 122:8	110:9	items 32:12,16
298:4,13 299:16	322:19	introduction 281:20	251:2 377:4
300:25 301:18,22	instruction 76:7	invalid 180:18	iterations 22:22
301:23 304:22	194:3	inventory 360:6,7	ivan 110:16
201.22 2022			
305:8,15,19,20	instrument 212:10	372:18 376:8	i
	instrument 212:10 278:23 337:7	372:18 376:8 377:11	j
305:8,15,19,20			j j 110:17,17 january 20:13 25:10
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9	278:23 337:7	377:11	january 20:13 25:19
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19	377:11 investigation 52:19	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18 interest 237:7	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18 interest 237:7 interested 381:19	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18 interest 237:7 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7 insert 106:22 291:5	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:15 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5 236:19	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22 106:23 124:5 182:4	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3 127:18 297:20
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7 insert 106:22 291:5 291:6	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18 interest 237:7 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5 236:19 interfere 3:8	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22 106:23 124:5 182:4 182:16 255:3 267:5	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3 127:18 297:20 joined 62:9,13,16
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7 insert 106:22 291:5 291:6 inserted 281:21	insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:15 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5 236:19 interfere 3:8 interlineation 24:20	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22 106:23 124:5 182:4 182:16 255:3 267:5 273:15 323:2	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3 127:18 297:20 joined 62:9,13,16 joint 129:25
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7 insert 106:22 291:5 291:6 inserted 281:21 290:4,15 291:21	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:15 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5 236:19 interfere 3:8 interlineation 24:20 25:21,24 28:7,14	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22 106:23 124:5 182:4 182:16 255:3 267:5 273:15 323:2 involvement 104:2	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3 127:18 297:20 joined 62:9,13,16
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7 insert 106:22 291:5 291:6 inserted 281:21 290:4,15 291:21 inserting 41:3	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5 236:19 interfere 3:8 interlineation 24:20 25:21,24 28:7,14 29:3,12 30:15 47:8	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22 106:23 124:5 182:4 182:16 255:3 267:5 273:15 323:2 involvement 104:2 191:10,12 303:15	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3 127:18 297:20 joined 62:9,13,16 joint 129:25 journal 71:7,10 78:24 84:15,19,21
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7 insert 106:22 291:5 291:6 inserted 281:21 290:4,15 291:21 inserting 41:3 inspected 194:21	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18 interest 237:7 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5 236:19 interfere 3:8 interlineation 24:20 25:21,24 28:7,14 29:3,12 30:15 47:8 47:22 146:3,22	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22 106:23 124:5 182:4 182:16 255:3 267:5 273:15 323:2 involvement 104:2 191:10,12 303:15 involving 102:15	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3 127:18 297:20 joined 62:9,13,16 joint 129:25 journal 71:7,10
305:8,15,19,20 306:7,13,19 307:6,9 307:10 372:13,17 372:20,25 373:6 376:9 377:11 inks 46:4 198:17 203:9,10 210:19,21 212:19 227:21 265:25 281:5 285:4 inquire 191:24 192:2 inquiry 136:17 insect 208:12 210:5 247:3 252:2,7 insert 106:22 291:5 291:6 inserted 281:21 290:4,15 291:21 inserting 41:3	278:23 337:7 insulated 223:19 insulation 225:3 integrity 160:25 intend 35:8 intending 80:6 intense 347:17 intensity 348:10 interact 307:15 interacted 307:18 interested 381:19 interesting 11:5 236:19 interfere 3:8 interlineation 24:20 25:21,24 28:7,14 29:3,12 30:15 47:8	377:11 investigation 52:19 89:25 101:14 103:18 110:19 investigators 80:3 90:16 97:10 99:14 102:24 103:25 invoices 51:23,25 involve 351:16 involved 15:25 35:11 39:2 43:20 44:21 49:21 52:7 74:11 80:24 103:22 106:23 124:5 182:4 182:16 255:3 267:5 273:15 323:2 involvement 104:2 191:10,12 303:15	january 20:13 25:19 145:15,19 150:2 167:24 169:19 174:8 182:2 187:5 375:2 jennifer 15:21 jet 121:5 jim 17:17 139:10 364:10 job 107:13 john 110:16 127:3 127:18 297:20 joined 62:9,13,16 joint 129:25 journal 71:7,10 78:24 84:15,19,21 85:4,6,9,11,18

[journals - l] Page 27

	1.50.10.100.55	10.7.00.10.6.16	
journals 70:3	158:10 190:22	125:22 126:16	343:2 346:11
judge 14:3 41:20	269:14	128:7 133:12	352:24 353:14
87:21 93:4 99:25	kelly 69:14 93:17	135:15 136:3	354:18 365:25
110:21 260:3	382:24	138:16,22 139:4,6,7	366:2,5 372:14
291:18,20	kept 31:24 215:15	140:17,19 141:23	373:24 375:16
judicial 74:10	219:4 223:2,14,18	143:9,10 144:16	376:9 377:25
july 1:14 3:13 19:19	223:23 237:6	146:18 149:15	378:18 379:25
54:8 116:22 117:24	317:16 369:20	153:2 162:22 163:2	knowing 115:18
117:25,25 118:4,6	khorassani 2:21	163:18 164:22	215:8 271:6 286:22
118:20 119:2,14,20	4:16	165:12 171:8,8	knowingly 5:8 72:6
120:4,15 121:22	kind 55:13 85:6	174:2,3,9,10 175:10	75:8
122:6,17 128:12	102:17,21 112:9	175:17 176:4,9	knowledge 9:13,16
130:19 131:2,14,19	154:23 175:14	177:8,9,10,16	11:25 12:6 81:3
131:25 132:2	179:21 188:7	180:25 181:6,11,16	97:3 98:3,4,5,6,11
144:13 146:9,15,16	190:20 197:11,17	181:18 188:6,8,9,11	98:22 99:12 113:21
147:11,22 148:3	220:25 226:23	188:17,21,24	215:16,19,22 225:8
149:24 150:18	236:9 248:24	190:16,18 192:2	227:12,17,21,23
155:14 156:15	268:14,17 304:7	195:14 196:17,20	264:25 274:23
158:5 160:3,16	kissed 68:4	197:8 203:9 210:14	370:2,13
162:18,20 163:3,8	knew 20:22 63:4	210:18,20 213:18	known 90:5 210:8
165:24 166:10	120:14,17 121:10	213:23 219:11	210:25 211:10,13
168:2,16,25 169:19	141:6 262:13,16	220:21 224:24	211:24 214:6
171:22 172:23	know 6:19 8:25 10:2	225:4,11,13,17,20	219:20 247:13
173:24 174:23	13:23 15:22,24 21:2	225:23 226:25,25	248:10 281:20
181:23 182:7,13	26:10 27:3,11 28:8	228:8,8,10,19	304:2,3
258:13 358:9	34:7 38:10,16,17,20	230:16 233:4	kole 139:10
359:11 374:25	44:20 50:14 54:11	237:25 238:3,16	l
381:22 385:5	55:8,10,15,16,17,23	249:4,10,23 250:12	1 4:22 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1
jumbled 28:16	57:5 58:9 62:5 63:7	250:14 251:5,8,25	9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1
june 19:19 44:18,21	63:12 64:24 68:15	252:9,10,12,15	13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1
45:2 49:24 50:4	69:16 71:18,22 76:9	253:18 254:6	17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1
53:17 69:18 145:25	77:9 78:18 79:2,3	256:10 257:10	21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1
184:21 185:5	80:22,23,25 81:18	259:4 260:7 265:9	25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1
186:11,16	82:2 83:16,20,22	265:14 268:14,17	29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1
jury 68:9 104:16	84:20 85:7,8 86:19	268:19,21 273:9,20	33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1
105:15,19 109:16	88:5 89:8 91:9	273:22 274:10,16	37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1
110:9	92:19 95:16 96:6	280:23 284:17	41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1
justice 78:5 272:24	99:5,10 101:4 106:5	286:13 287:15,24	45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1
k	107:13 108:14,17	288:14 300:7,9,11	49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1
k 110:17	109:5,14,20 112:14	301:19,19,20	53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1
karen 93:2 100:22	115:10,12 116:25	303:13,15 305:21	57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1
karin 287:2,9	119:24 120:24	307:14 325:24	61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1
keep 41:3 62:5	122:24 123:2,9,10	330:24 332:21	65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1
150:22 156:3	124:4,4,11,11,22,22	333:17 334:10	69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1
	124:23 125:12,17	335:13 338:10	

[l - larry] Page 28

73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1	213:1 214:1 215:1	348:1 349:1 350:1	199:4,10,20,25
77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1	216:1 217:1 218:1	351:1 352:1 353:1	200:6 205:2 206:15
81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1	219:1 220:1 221:1	354:1 355:1 356:1	206:24 207:9
85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1	222:1 223:1 224:1	357:1 358:1 359:1	214:20 243:12
89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1	225:1 226:1 227:1	360:1 361:1 362:1	244:18,25 245:17
93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1	228:1 229:1 230:1	363:1 364:1 365:1	246:21 247:8,18,24
97:1 98:1 99:1	231:1 232:1 233:1	366:1 367:1 368:1	252:13,19 260:20
100:1 101:1 102:1	234:1 235:1 236:1	369:1 370:1 371:1	260:20,24 261:12
103:1 104:1 105:1	237:1 238:1 239:1	372:1 373:1 374:1	261:18 262:6,18,23
106:1 107:1 108:1	240:1 241:1 242:1	375:1 376:1 377:1	263:5 264:9,19
109:1 110:1 111:1	243:1 244:1 245:1	378:1 379:1 380:1	265:10 266:23,25
112:1 113:1 114:1	246:1 247:1 248:1	lab 88:14 300:15	267:20 268:2
115:1 116:1 117:1	249:1 250:1 251:1	label 323:7	270:20,25 273:5
118:1 119:1 120:1	252:1 253:1 254:1	labeled 164:2	275:19,24 278:3,19
121:1 122:1 123:1	255:1 256:1 257:1	363:14 383:10	279:23 280:18
124:1 125:1 126:1	258:1 259:1 260:1	laboratories 273:4	285:3 286:20
127:1 128:1 129:1	261:1 262:1 263:1	277:17	289:15 292:23
130:1 131:1 132:1	264:1 265:1 266:1	laboratory 12:7	294:2 296:20,22,25
133:1 134:1 135:1	267:1 268:1 269:1	32:3 36:14 39:6	298:4 300:4,25
136:1 137:1 138:1	270:1 271:1 272:1	40:2 43:17 277:19	310:16 315:15
139:1 140:1 141:1	273:1 274:1 275:1	294:18 313:20,22	325:13 330:21
142:1 143:1 144:1	276:1 277:1 278:1	314:13 346:17	332:2 334:3,12
145:1 146:1 147:1	279:1 280:1 281:1	370:18,19	336:3 338:2 377:18
148:1 149:1 150:1	282:1 283:1 284:1	laden 179:15	laporte's 46:8 76:11
151:1 152:1 153:1	285:1 286:1 287:1	laid 170:7 180:7	106:24 108:21
154:1 155:1 156:1	288:1 289:1 290:1	325:17 379:9	203:24 204:8
157:1 158:1 159:1	291:1 292:1 293:1	lake 52:3 112:17	242:20 248:12
160:1 161:1 162:1	294:1 295:1 296:1	116:6,10 129:24,25	253:13 261:21
163:1 164:1 165:1	297:1 298:1 299:1	193:9	262:3 263:19 269:7
166:1 167:1 168:1	300:1 301:1 302:1	lakewood 2:7	269:9,18 272:9
169:1 170:1 171:1	303:1 304:1 305:1	lanes 366:25 367:3,7	275:17 278:7 279:5
172:1 173:1 174:1	306:1 307:1 308:1	language 33:19	279:7 290:9 293:9
175:1 176:1 177:1	309:1 310:1 311:1	117:10	293:15 312:9
178:1 179:1 180:1	312:1 313:1 314:1	laporte 2:21 4:20	330:13 332:15
181:1 182:1 183:1	315:1 316:1 317:1	34:20 35:5 45:22	333:25 334:20
183:23 184:1 185:1	318:1 319:1 320:1	46:25 47:4 53:2,6	336:2 339:22 340:2
186:1 187:1 188:1	321:1 322:1 323:1	76:17,25 77:8,12,16	laptop 373:20
189:1 190:1 191:1	324:1 325:1 326:1	78:20 85:24 87:16	large 120:9
192:1 193:1 194:1	327:1 328:1 329:1	89:16,24 97:20	largely 67:21 309:25
195:1 196:1 197:1	330:1 331:1 332:1	106:16 107:15	310:2
198:1 199:1 200:1	333:1 334:1 335:1	109:7,18,23 110:11	larger 178:2
201:1 202:1 203:1	336:1 337:1 338:1	111:9,15,19,20,24	largest 75:14 78:9
204:1 205:1 206:1	339:1 340:1 341:1	112:3,14 128:23	larry 1:17 3:23
207:1 208:1 209:1	342:1 343:1 344:1	129:3 130:14 131:3	23:19 65:15 129:16
210:1 211:1 212:1	345:1 346:1 347:1	131:5 198:3,16	380:20 381:10

[larry - long] Page 29

382:4,8,18 383:4 learned 138:7 leveling 84:25 link 82:21 90:14 385:6,21 143:22 219:23 levels 204:21 212:7 lion's 306:11 laser 311:11,22,23 leave 13:25 40:9 212:9,23 213:4 liquid 209:20,21 311:25 312:2,3,6 43:18 60:16 125:16 214:15 215:3,12 list 65:20 81:11,13	
laser 311:11,22,23 leave 13:25 40:9 212:9,23 213:4 liquid 209:20,21 311:25 312:2,3,6 43:18 60:16 125:16 214:15 215:3,12 list 65:20 81:11,13	
311:25 312:2,3,6 43:18 60:16 125:16 214:15 215:3,12 list 65:20 81:11,1	
	3
laserjet 324:12	5
late 96:7 102:2 251:24 345:20 244:16,22 245:14 140:16 208:12,1	τ .
121:12 128:14 led 47:12 239:23 246:3,18 210:4 246:25	,
191:9 left 16:24 44:22 lexis 38:2,4 321:18 324:7 37	.6
law 36:14 37:20,21 67:17 122:11 library 82:8,10 377:4	.0
37:21 38:20 104:21 189:17 236:11 233:17,19 234:4 listed 65:24,25 6	·7
104:23 105:25 237:7 352:10 367:7 282:11 310:9 66:12 208:12,14). <i> </i>
106:5,14 107:14	2.2
108:18 139:11 370:8,12,15 379:15 315:19 318:22 358:2	,
187:17 259:21 379:23 319:2,5,15 368:15 listen 231:22 276	.7
277:20 legal 2:3 37:19,24 368:16 369:13,14 296:17	. /
lawsuit 6:16 10:17 38:5 39:5,11,19,22 369:15,20,24,24 listening 98:17	
10:21 98:4,11 143:7 39:25,25 40:12,14 370:3,7,14,16 371:7 102:25 242:23	
143:24 197:25 40:22 41:2 76:13 377:14,19 266:17	
361:8 78:21 105:5 107:22 lie 68:2 106:6 listing 89:5	
lawyer 37:17,23 143:9,9 lied 67:25 68:8,10 lists 83:10 322:7	
38:22 101:7 132:12 lesnevich 47:7,11 68:14,15 94:5 108:8 378:5	
139:10,23 140:13 122:17,21 123:3,15 108:9 literary 82:11,15	
170:8 123:23 124:2 125:2 life 230:17 237:3 literature 254:7	
lawyers 53:7 91:11 125:14,24 126:14 251:15 litigate 378:2	
91:16 106:23 127:19,24 151:7,25 light 154:9,22 litigations 368:2	24
107:23 109:13	
110:4,6 116:2	
146:14 192:5 193:5	
220:8,11 224:5 160:9,21 163:5 347:18 348:10,15 196:8 254:3 288	
253:6 273:14	
307:13 353:12 363:25 364:20 lighting 188:25 lived 222:19	
layer 308:22 310:10 366:5,8 189:5,21,22 190:3 living 222:11	
319:10,23 lesnevich's 47:20 lights 170:6 llc 2:3	
layperson 319:23 48:3 124:17 127:13 likewise 308:17 llp 1:19 2:10,22,3	3
365:6,18,21 131:11 364:16 limitation 274:21 local 42:7	
leading 41:25 93:9 365:4 limitations 273:24 located 3:16	
93:23 94:16 97:12 letter 93:2,5,7,13,15 limited 202:10 location 222:21	
97:15 101:22 93:25 382:22 line 40:9 47:21 87:4 log 359:16,17	
122:22 125:3,24 letting 259:4 260:7 87:4,10 130:8,9 logbook 368:18	
126:6 232:23 level 198:25 199:7 286:15 288:17 long 17:11 37:3	
245:24 277:19 203:25 204:9 300:22 343:19 46:12 68:18 132	16
leafing 271:24 211:20,22 212:18 364:22,22 385:7 157:10 200:24,2	
learn 63:6 81:19,22 212:25 245:6 linen 351:17 218:25 219:6	
82:14 83:10 120:21 246:10 317:6 lines 179:12,18 236:16 237:14	
349:24 180:11 262:8	

[longer - mean] Page 30

	1		
longer 16:4 82:12	lot 112:11 237:23	285:21 309:20	91:14,19 92:23 95:2
86:24 133:21 144:5	271:16 272:6,22	344:6 376:17	96:2 99:23 100:18
218:16 219:7	274:2,5	male 287:13,18	101:16,22 102:15
look 26:13 46:24	lotion 210:6 248:25	males 287:23	103:18 105:18,21
47:3 63:16 64:9	251:21	man 83:12 125:12	110:13
128:20 136:24	lots 321:11	125:22	mass 200:18 255:14
140:5 141:3 149:9	loud 29:16 30:4,6,8	manipulated 64:2,4	279:24 308:25
149:17 163:4,21	30:9,13 31:22 87:3	manufacture 190:13	master 129:24
176:17,18 177:19	love 252:16,23	manufacturer 209:4	match 171:2 312:14
180:2 189:10	lower 212:25 331:10	210:15,22 281:21	317:9,21,23,24
220:15 235:4 236:5	ludicrous 332:5	314:10,19 316:9	365:5
239:6 246:13 248:4	luis 190:25	373:13	matched 308:7
251:7,8 264:12	lunch 132:13 134:16	manufacturers	314:4 316:23 317:4
279:24 280:5,21	182:20,25 184:4	378:6	317:5
288:14,17 292:3	lying 31:12	march 129:17,20	matches 317:22
314:25 319:13	lyter 130:19,22	137:8 139:9 151:21	365:3,10
333:16,23 334:8,21	131:5 306:17,24	153:18 164:3	mate 72:18,19
335:13 339:5	lyter's 48:17	185:11,14 383:5,12	material 5:9 23:5,6
344:14 348:25	m	marching 134:9	49:14 106:4 155:4
353:17,20,23	m 110:17 272:5	margins 33:16	160:5 250:14
354:18,23 356:24	machine 191:2	mark 1:8 3:19 6:14	materiality 105:24
357:25 359:4,21	192:25 193:12	22:6 23:15 25:2	materially 6:6
362:9 363:13	196:25 256:25	61:8 65:7,9 86:9	materials 251:10
364:21 365:18	257:8,17,24 264:25	93:12 117:12 129:9	257:7 371:7
366:15,23 371:16	265:22 279:3	135:3 167:9 179:5	math 334:5 339:23
371:20,22 372:24	305:13 309:8 310:7	343:21 354:2	340:2
373:4,5,16,24 374:6	311:22 312:3,6	366:18 376:5	mathematics 333:22
looked 20:22 47:25	318:4 336:14 337:7	marked 23:21 25:4	335:18
52:20,21 102:13	machines 321:17,19	61:13 65:15 86:7	matter 67:20 74:11
150:16 163:2	magnification 28:18	93:17 117:17	93:25 105:12 108:2
180:25 181:6	28:24	129:17 135:7 164:4	137:4 173:8 381:20
216:25 305:4,7,7	magnifying 356:13	167:14 234:19,23	matters 19:4,6
355:18	mail 49:23 50:5,8	343:24 354:5 357:9	90:15 107:15
looking 24:2 104:2	139:9 141:7,21	357:13 366:21	matthew 2:16 4:11
163:17 165:4	287:16	376:24	maximum 361:18
180:23 200:22	mails 52:22 142:17	markedly 168:5,25	mcclutchy 2:24 3:11
222:7 272:3 301:10	142:23 143:3 186:6	marker 281:21	mean 8:22 23:7
309:18 335:19	186:9 238:16	markings 356:3	34:11 58:9 63:19,21
366:3,6 367:5	maintain 120:9	marks 193:13	85:7,8 91:9 98:21
looks 23:24 26:18	maintained 69:18	351:20	105:8,15 122:24
26:25 345:6	making 5:9 23:3	marriage 381:18	146:10 173:3 176:9
lose 68:19,24 202:13	103:22 124:13,16	martha 34:22 35:6,9	192:2 203:8 210:10
loss 200:2,10	176:14 206:16	35:11 67:19,25	222:15 254:20
lost 199:22	215:20 241:8 244:6	85:21,23 87:6 88:11	306:5 317:5 318:13
		89:5 90:2,21 91:7	318:16 331:16

[mean - moment] Page 31

			1
334:12 349:19	megabyte 170:16	277:23,24 278:8,20	mine 123:12
351:8 377:24	melissa 15:23	279:5,18,23 280:18	mini 170:16
379:14,16	member 5:17 6:5	286:19,20 289:6	minus 292:9 332:4
meaning 137:7	71:17 75:22,23	292:24 293:9,14	336:7,8,10
143:8,9,10,10 176:4	77:25 79:10,12	295:15,21 296:12	minute 60:20,23
182:2 228:22	members 5:21 75:16	296:13,21,22,25	92:8 133:15,16
266:12	80:19,22	297:2,3,11,14,15,25	148:8 156:18,18
meaningful 23:10	membership 72:24	298:4,14 301:2	165:19 216:20
means 63:24 107:19	73:3,13,24 78:14	315:25	259:13
136:13 143:6 236:4	memorialized 217:8	methodology 207:9	minutes 17:14 21:12
253:21,22 268:7	memory 161:16	270:18,19 272:10	28:25 29:11 31:7,20
277:12 298:3	mention 111:19	272:12 279:25	60:22 76:6 98:8,9
318:16 334:7	246:24 316:8,11	280:3,14,16,20	133:8,9,24 134:11
349:23	355:14	methods 122:15	157:9 170:3 172:9
meant 77:17 153:11	mentioned 6:8	270:18 276:10	172:17 183:17
285:23	30:22 31:3 43:15	289:5 290:8,9 293:9	185:21 259:3 279:5
measurably 212:12	56:7 64:21 87:13	294:3 296:15 297:6	380:2,11
measure 195:23	96:9,25 127:11	298:24	miscolored 164:12
329:17 331:15	158:14 164:15	micrometer 330:14	misinterpreting
352:5	207:15,18,22 208:7	330:17	104:6
measurement	208:20 209:10	microphones 3:4	mislead 80:6
334:12 335:2	219:15 220:16	microscope 32:4,7	misleading 72:4
352:15	222:18,19 227:13	47:2,4,22 48:4	74:9,15
measurements	273:4 279:4 301:25	279:15 313:7,13,17	misplaced 237:4
328:17 330:18,21	312:20 355:18	356:9,10,13,16,17	misrepresent 6:6
332:6 334:9,22,23	366:13 373:7	373:9,14	misrepresented
352:7	mentioning 85:14	microscopic 31:5	75:8 78:12
measures 199:21	merck 248:14	254:16 310:3	misrepresenting
282:5 333:11	mere 251:10	313:11	72:6
measuring 332:3	message 102:16	microscopy 309:13	misspoke 340:6
336:6	met 90:10,16 109:19	I '	misstated 151:3
meat 218:21	109:20	mics 3:7	mistake 366:8
mechanical 348:13	meta 170:10,11	mid 46:12 70:10,17	mistaken 102:5
medium 326:15	374:6	middle 41:9 236:5	116:9 192:24 320:8
327:20	method 112:21,24	291:15	324:14 326:7
meet 12:22 15:5,16	199:7 214:20	midstream 303:9	mistakes 271:13
112:22,24 113:8,9	260:20 262:18	milberg 15:17 16:2	model 192:23 323:8
meeting 71:20 73:6	263:20,21 264:2,9	16:2 116:11	models 196:24
73:9 80:15 98:24	264:19,24 266:8,10	milder 229:9	moistened 227:13
99:2,16 100:25	266:22,23 267:20	mill 79:2,8 342:8	227:14
101:15 102:10	268:24 269:3,6,7,9	349:16,20 350:18	moisture 219:21
125:13	269:18,18,19,25	millimeters 195:24	mold 219:21
meetings 70:7	270:4,10,17,25	195:24	moment 69:24 151:3
101:23 102:3 125:9	272:9 275:17,24	mind 77:20 345:20	155:12 178:7 180:7
125:15	276:14,16,18		234:14 245:5 265:9

[moment - number] Page 32

	T		
266:7 267:10	382:2,24	neither 58:6 256:18	notations 89:10
271:22	nader 2:21 4:16	never 6:14 18:2,22	309:20 354:24
moments 361:11	naked 179:14	19:8,10 37:19 39:18	note 3:3 133:6 183:9
376:7	name 3:11,23 8:2,11	46:5 54:15 59:17,23	244:15 258:24
money 119:11	10:2 16:4 99:23	62:18,18 69:22	noted 151:10 183:3
monochromatic	100:19 110:16	73:24 80:4 90:16	351:6 380:18
315:18,21	153:2 159:12,13,18	104:23 109:3,18	notes 20:4 118:14
month 262:14 280:8	159:19 267:7,12	111:10 115:3,15	128:13,17,19
months 16:11 91:18	278:5 287:17,21	125:4 180:21 194:9	131:22 147:18
91:23,24 92:6 94:25	299:16 314:8 358:6	194:15 239:22	148:5,7,10,20 149:7
96:9,13,18,19,22	359:25 360:12	244:4 255:14,18,19	150:23,24 151:15
185:3,4 211:7 220:2	362:2 385:5,6	276:22 280:2	151:16,17,18 152:8
222:11,18 277:3	named 139:10	299:11 323:15	152:13,13,18,20
283:10 306:2	181:13 190:14	new 1:3,20,20,22	153:3,8,17,21 154:5
moral 371:3	232:9 287:23	2:13,13 3:12,16,17	156:2 176:8 261:19
morally 77:24	names 17:22 18:10	3:21 14:21 16:20	352:3,8,13,18
morning 3:2 5:3,4	125:11,15 126:7	34:23 38:18 61:21	353:18,18,22 354:9
64:5 132:2 133:7	narasimhan 2:18	145:6 160:11 207:4	354:19,19,24 357:9
144:13 147:11	4:13,13	212:16 220:9,9	357:12,15 358:8,12
149:24 166:9	natural 190:3	229:13 246:10	358:21 360:8
174:23 258:25	nature 191:19	272:13,14 297:14	367:24 371:9 376:6
mortgage 86:6,12	338:21	297:15,24 315:23	376:23 383:23
382:21	nearly 94:25 200:25	381:3,5,9 385:3,3	384:4
motion 23:20	necessarily 282:10	newer 211:20	notice 1:20 21:13
163:23 186:17	284:5	news 91:12	noticeable 154:13
378:13 382:10	necessary 44:9	newsletter 71:23	158:5
motions 176:19	282:13	nice 303:22	noticeably 174:7
mouth 350:14	need 27:15 35:20	nine 220:2	noticed 148:19
move 111:16 339:13	40:13 43:6 48:9,16	nineties 229:23	151:23 153:8 176:5
moved 10:21 363:8	53:20 92:7,9 100:3	nomenclature 360:7	192:8 193:4
moving 106:7	102:16 118:13	non 319:8	notified 93:21
multibillion 94:24	132:5,23 134:4	nonclimate 217:23	noting 114:12
95:19 238:8	142:8 153:5 161:15	nonoriginal 32:16	310:22
multimillion 97:17	161:17 203:11	nonspecific 275:11	notion 124:25
97:24	217:18 221:5 260:5	normal 147:13	notoriety 97:8
multiple 27:7 44:15	274:6 283:11,20	231:4,7,9,11 300:21	102:22
76:7 277:17 310:7	284:2,11 302:16	333:2	november 44:18,25
351:2	313:23 323:18	northeast 217:22,25	86:14 160:22
munich 110:18	328:11 354:23	229:8	167:11,14 173:13
mutual 67:18	371:19	northerly 220:9	353:7 374:6 383:14
n	needed 331:13	notary 1:22 4:23	null 333:2
n 1:21 2:2 93:16	needs 218:9 272:22	380:25 381:8	number 3:22 14:10
110:17 183:2,2,2	negative 77:12	385:25	22:23 61:3,7 66:12
272:5,5 381:7,25	125:14	notation 89:7,9	79:4 82:9,17 83:11
, ,		288:8	83:11 84:5,9 97:21

[number - opinion] Page 33

117:13 120:10	159:17 179:22	204:6,20 262:2	380:13,14
132:10 135:2	190:7 222:16 224:8	office 3:15 17:23,25	old 147:14 198:9
152:23 153:25	241:22 243:2	18:24 32:8 51:19	199:2 200:4 237:10
157:23 176:20	252:20 253:3,9	61:21 62:13,17	237:10 238:24
182:24 183:6	276:15 292:18	64:23 69:22 72:18	258:8 283:10
209:11 222:18	333:15 335:17	72:19 80:12 93:4	315:24
232:23 246:8	objections 43:5	98:20,25 99:3,17	omitted 66:4
248:22 249:7,16,18	observation 23:9	100:21,25 102:6	once 98:12 194:9
249:24 250:3	158:4 161:9,10	103:7 116:14 189:5	202:8,8 237:14
251:11 254:8	177:11 180:17,22	190:23 261:14	276:18 306:7
260:16 263:24	340:23	324:7	one's 106:19
270:4,11,15 306:2	observations 23:4	officer 104:21,24	ones 284:19
318:21 331:4,8	130:25 176:3,8	offices 1:18 19:13	online 76:6 85:4,15
332:13 335:25	177:6	103:9 168:16	182:14 322:2
336:16 337:12	observe 46:11	169:12	opacity 46:7 326:10
342:22,24 361:16	130:25 131:7,10,13	oftentimes 205:24	327:9,11,13
361:19 362:8 368:6	195:11	239:25	open 87:22,23
numbered 44:16	observed 131:2	oh 79:24 122:7	102:11 189:9,17
numbers 44:13	166:21 348:3	252:18 262:24	203:5 376:12
83:19 271:2 302:11	351:20	325:3	opened 110:18
334:5 335:19,20,22	obtain 241:11	ohio 2:7 38:11,20,24	opening 177:21
337:5	obviously 378:8	okay 24:17 28:2,4	178:2
numerous 114:3	occasional 237:17	34:15 70:21 112:18	openly 102:12
237:18 239:24	occasions 255:10	159:14,22 178:12	operated 309:8
245:25	occur 95:20	195:10 201:18	operating 296:8
nutshell 45:5	occurred 88:22	223:12 229:5 233:7	299:6,7,14,15
0	118:11,18,20	234:9 235:13 243:9	314:12 320:7
o 183:2,2,2	169:23 177:10	243:11 247:10,20	opine 174:21
o'clock 92:11	189:15 277:18	248:6 252:18	opining 177:15
258:25	278:17	253:11 258:14	215:6,9 241:5
oath 5:10 34:4 57:25	occurs 160:20	263:8 264:15,21	opinion 5:18,23
130:9 146:5 153:20	october 60:5 192:14	265:3,7,18 266:18	6:11 9:11 32:21
159:20 164:25	342:25	267:14 269:21	36:5 37:9 68:13
166:21 171:20,21	offer 35:15 155:21	270:7 273:10,16	74:7 138:18,21
173:14 194:14	201:13,19 204:12	278:9 288:11	141:9,12,16,20
220:18	204:24 206:14,22	292:15 293:22	142:5,9,11,13 143:3
obispo 190:25	offered 111:9	295:6 297:5 298:18	147:9,20,23 148:21
object 42:8	132:12 161:21	307:2 313:4 327:7	148:23 149:23
objected 42:12	255:6 261:20	327:17 330:7	150:3,4,15 151:13
objection 7:20 9:4	324:11,13	337:24 338:13	151:17 155:22
27:15 30:24 40:25	offering 141:12,16	339:11,13 340:4	158:24 162:5,14,17
41:6 42:16 99:9	141:20 142:5,10,12	341:5,17 344:10	166:7,11 169:6,8
112:5 123:6 137:20	143:2 169:5,8	345:23 346:7 348:4	172:6 174:16
139:12 152:14	174:16 200:13 201:10 203:21,23	355:2 364:14 370:10 372:22	175:22 177:2 180:16 198:4,7,13
	74 1 4 4 4 4 1 4 1 7 4 7 4 7 1 1 7 7 7	2 (11) 1 (1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 2 1 1 7 1 7 1 7

[opinion - paper] Page 34

199:11,25 200:14	opposite 194:19	outlines 276:25	236:6 238:6 251:13
201:10,13,19	options 250:23	outlining 283:17	251:19 260:19
203:19,21,23 204:7	orangeish 164:19	outset 213:21	265:23 283:8
204:12,21,24	order 115:6,10,13	outside 60:4 116:2	286:14,24 288:19
205:16,18 206:11	115:15,17,20,24	147:11 295:3	310:17 311:3,12,12
206:12,14,23 207:5	116:4,4,7,12,16	296:14 299:10,10	325:21,21 326:13
210:17 213:7,11	117:10 196:16	299:19	332:15 334:13,14
214:9,22,25 215:11	199:21 203:25	overall 327:23	334:16,20 338:3,3,8
214:3,22,23 213:11	204:9 268:2,10	overlays 47:14,17	338:18,19,20 339:7
226:11 228:22	270:5	overrule 73:13	339:9 342:3,14,21
238:4 241:7 245:24	organic 316:18,22	oversee 52:12,15	342:23 343:9,19,23
247:15,21 248:2,3	316:24,25 317:20	186:3	344:3,4 345:6,7,7,8
248:15 255:6,11	organization 70:10	overseeing 56:2,20	345:25 352:10,11
256:17,19 262:2	75:6,15 78:9,10,12	119:9 186:25	352:23 354:4,21
273:21 274:11	78:15 79:4,11,13,14	302:22	356:4 357:12,23
301:9,11 303:21,24	79:16,21,25	oxymoron 85:7	358:15,18,19,24
310:12 321:15	organizations 70:3		359:5 360:3,15
323:19,21 324:5,20	79:17,20	р	363:4,14,15 364:18
324:22 325:2	origin 238:4 311:7	p 2:2,2	364:21 365:2
326:24 327:3,8,18	original 9:19 10:3	p.m. 2:24 182:25	366:20 367:22
328:13,14,16,22,24	47:8 48:6 54:7 57:9	183:3 258:24 363:5	371:12 376:22
328:25 329:3,12,14	117:6 131:19 148:2	380:18	382:3,14 383:6,9,18
329:15,25 330:4	181:10 244:8	package 323:11	383:20,23,25 384:3
333:25 339:11	313:21 354:23	367:10	385:7
340:16,19 341:6,7,8	356:8,18	packages 324:3,6	pages 33:16 45:6
341:11,15,16,19	originality 237:17	325:8	86:24 157:11
348:8 355:6,9,15,16	originally 208:23	packard 317:17	178:14 179:8 180:6
355:21 360:25	219:12 264:11	320:4 324:13	265:16,19 266:20
363:25 364:25	303:19	page 17:25 18:7,9	274:21 305:5
365:9,12,14,22	orin 2:14 4:5	18:20 23:25 24:19	312:10 316:23
366:7 374:9,20	orlando 129:25	25:21 32:13,16	322:10 323:24
375:3,4 377:25	osborn 20:23 21:2	33:20 34:17 61:11	325:14 326:4,11,24
378:3,9	53:10 232:9,13,15	61:21 62:24 63:3,6 63:17 64:19,22	327:5,10,14,19
opinions 39:22	233:11 235:14	86:11 87:2 94:14	329:4 332:3,3 336:6
147:6,7 161:21	236:7 238:22 239:8	130:7 135:5,13	339:20 342:7 344:6
205:14 206:2 211:5	240:3 304:11	136:8,12 139:4	351:21 352:9,22
311:18 355:4	374:22 375:10	149:11 163:8,25	358:2,2 368:9
opportunity 44:5	osborn's 234:22	167:22,23,25	paging 140:8
132:13 252:24	235:3 239:16,20	167.22,23,23	paid 52:10 62:5
371:20 377:8	383:16	174:7,18 178:22,22	64:24 241:12
opposed 77:24	outcome 381:19	179:3,3 198:8,21,24	paint 274:13
164:11 285:21	outline 270:18	199:5,9 200:9	palm 218:4 250:10
344:8 351:9	outlined 266:20	204:22 215:4	paper 37:10 46:8
opposing 39:8	272:6	216:12 235:7,9	54:21,23 55:7 56:15
		210.12 233.1,7	56:17 144:19 146:8

[paper - period] Page 35

161:2 166:8 176:5	355:12 359:5	329:12 345:3	286:17 289:6 290:9
178:19,21 209:21			293:15 294:21,24
211:25 212:23	paragraphs 35:14 39:14 40:23 44:11	particularly 190:4 parties 3:9,25 142:3	300:25 301:17
237:5 253:13,18,19		142:7,14 183:15	305:15
	44:14,15 94:15,17	1	
253:20,24 254:13	94:21 95:5 158:12	361:24 381:17	peculiar 236:13
254:14,17,17,19	158:12 213:12	partner 17:17,18	peer 49:2,5,9,17
271:6 305:10	214:18 245:23	330:17	57:6,17 85:12,17
325:14,20 326:20	246:23 334:16	parts 36:20 279:11	276:21 296:3 297:9
327:24 332:2	339:16 341:16	279:21	297:11 314:14,15
339:15 340:8,10,12	parameter 333:20	party 239:5,14	peers 85:13 215:19
341:2,12,24 345:2,4	parameters 272:18	pass 13:2	218:8 231:21
345:9,13,15 346:13	parentheses 289:20	passed 160:5	277:15 278:14
346:20,21 347:7,15	290:21 292:10	password 38:3,4	294:18
347:16,18 348:12	park 1:19 2:12 3:16	patton 93:3 100:22	pekin 69:13
349:5,19,20,24	part 13:20 16:20	101:7	pen 161:3 164:9,11
350:4,11,18,21	17:13 52:13 53:10	paul 1:5 3:18 10:15	173:18
351:3,7,7,8,10,11,15	57:9 68:18 89:25	16:7 139:9,22 141:7	penalties 5:22
372:21	97:7,18 98:17	175:7 179:5 217:4,7	penalty 52:9
papers 139:17	109:10 112:10	220:16 221:9,13	pendency 69:20
227:21 236:13	113:18,20 118:10	361:5	pending 30:23
237:2 327:25 328:6	122:8,9 165:18	pause 270:8 271:15	people 79:14,15,19
330:2,5	166:18 174:11	paying 76:5	79:21 80:24 102:17
paperweights	175:25 186:2 199:9	payment 51:14	102:22 106:8,17
193:11,16 195:15	214:17 230:12	payroll 62:20	107:21 110:10
195:23	241:15 261:2,25	pdf 368:8,9	125:9 126:24,25
paragraph 24:3,5,8	275:18 276:9	pe 39:15 40:16	127:6 145:8 248:22
24:18 32:10,11,11	278:19 279:7,23	198:21,25 199:7,8	249:7,13,15,18,22
34:16 37:7,14 38:12	285:10,12,13	199:12,18,21,22	250:3 251:24
39:10 57:8 94:12	289:20 290:21	200:2,7,11 203:20	276:20 278:16
96:9 97:2,5 98:2	291:21 292:10	204:2,10,13,17,21	284:15 303:4
99:11 101:3,20	293:2,3 298:16	207:6,12 208:8,21	percent 200:2,11
104:14 106:7 151:6	304:11 307:20	209:4 210:12,23	205:2 206:15,24
157:23 167:19	344:18 362:14	211:2,11,14,19,20	351:9
191:16,21 214:7	367:24 368:8 370:7	212:12,17 213:4	percentage 199:22
232:12 236:5	partially 264:22	214:10,15 215:3,12	perfect 324:11,15
244:17 245:12	participated 89:4	216:12 217:16,21	perfectly 242:9
246:14,16 248:4	particles 342:13	218:17,22 219:5,17	perform 47:14
286:25 288:4,23,25	348:3	244:15,18,20,22	317:11 342:15
289:12,24 290:23	particular 100:2	245:6,14 246:4,10	347:24
293:4,17 294:7	136:11 174:9	246:18 247:6	performed 146:25
295:5 309:22	180:13 190:14	250:14 251:10	323:6,10 342:17
312:16 319:13	202:18 206:12	253:14 260:20	349:25
331:23 334:22	236:7 243:6,21,23	266:22,24 270:17	perfume 207:19
337:20,25 338:14	258:19 272:15	272:10,12 275:13	period 211:14
340:3,4,7,9 355:11	282:14 328:14	275:18 284:22	216:24 258:2
7 7 7			

[periods - portion] Page 36

periods 230:22	102:11,13 128:3	placed 170:5 175:12	plugs 313:23 342:21
perjury 35:2 66:20	phones 3:6	175:16 180:4	342:23 344:19,23
67:11 90:5 91:20	phonetic 162:11	placement 23:4	358:5 359:24
93:4 105:23 106:2	photo 348:14	49:14	360:21 361:12,15
108:15,25 109:4	photocopied 171:18	places 154:9 237:16	361:16,24 362:6,11
110:19	361:21	plaintiff 1:6 2:4	362:15,17 367:13
permanent 251:14	photocopier 164:22	6:16 21:3 32:17	plumber 224:9
permitted 41:12,25	photocopies 344:22	34:9,12 51:7 53:3,7	plural 71:11
42:3,8,10 111:13	photocopy 25:3	121:15 143:20	plus 253:24 261:23
perpetuating 10:11	344:9 357:11	146:6,14 242:18	332:4 336:6,8,10
person 50:25 56:20	376:23 382:12	plaintiff's 23:19	point 20:20 22:22
58:8 67:24 77:9,23	383:22 384:4	32:24 52:13 53:6,25	36:17 48:10 55:21
131:7,13 176:10	photograph 181:22	56:3,21 100:10	73:5 80:17 91:4
256:4 287:16	343:24 366:21	118:25 120:18	95:9,14 125:16
348:21 369:17	383:19 384:2	121:7 128:11	165:23 166:5
personal 77:7	photographed	144:14 147:12	172:15 174:15
personally 63:3,5	150:6 169:3,11	176:19 186:3,25	177:12 180:24
77:17 89:4 94:6	172:9 361:19	193:5 273:7 382:9	181:4,24 193:21
182:4 188:3 190:20	photographs 343:11	plaintiffs 53:10	202:3,9,12 203:10
224:20 258:7	344:5,8 356:25	plate 311:6 319:11	203:11 211:9 212:7
perspective 259:19	357:4	366:21 367:3,12,18	212:13,24 220:14
259:20	phrase 49:5	367:19,20 384:2	226:17 249:11
pertain 44:13	physical 19:25	plates 103:23 314:2	265:12 267:13
245:23	80:13 128:25	366:15,16 367:16	271:4 273:25
pertinent 66:9 98:15	186:13 202:2 282:6	play 117:9	284:18,21 306:10
99:18 101:19	309:16 310:8	playbook 112:10	308:10 311:7,24
102:19	312:17 313:16	played 177:20	317:8 334:9 336:17
peter 2:20 4:20	329:16 361:6	playing 84:25	349:7 361:17
34:22 89:6,8 90:22	362:22,24	please 3:3,6 13:13	369:21 370:17
91:7,14 95:2 96:3	physically 160:11	28:4 41:9 43:4	375:7 379:9 380:2,5
103:18 121:18	197:10	63:16 67:3 84:9	pointed 192:5 193:4
131:8 163:24 164:3	pick 3:4	87:3 101:18 126:7	340:3
167:10,14 383:11	picture 77:22	130:11 152:25	pointing 246:9
383:14	pictures 344:12	163:21 178:16	297:13 335:25
ph 342:11	piece 91:4 124:24	234:19 235:4	points 333:13
phase 25:10	178:21 197:14	243:10 248:5 270:2	policies 294:5
phenoxyethanol	216:15 224:13	271:4 274:15,19	policy 294:6,13,15
198:22 209:6	254:3	276:7 279:13	294:20 296:19
253:19,21,24	pieces 151:14	295:19 296:18	297:10,18,24 298:9
268:25 279:25	178:19 217:4	315:8 334:18	298:12,23 299:5
280:5 285:4	326:19 360:20	343:22 352:19	poor 351:10
phone 15:10 17:3,9	pillar 237:8	354:3 367:11	portion 81:8 150:25
17:11 20:9 41:21	place 3:6 175:15	pleasure 132:14	163:16 167:24
42:18 55:20 82:16	203:17 345:24	plug 254:17 344:25	284:25
83:12,19 84:5,8			

- antions 205.17	doorgon 207.10	155.17 210.0	270.10
portions 285:17	predecessor 297:19	155:17 218:8	370:18
posed 36:18 104:13	predicated 10:22	previously 70:24	privilege 42:9 99:9
posing 36:5,22 37:5	preparation 15:11	356:2 371:19	100:13
position 6:13 7:7	91:10 101:24,25	primarily 310:10	pro 373:15
8:14,17 9:2,7,14,21	prepare 16:2 268:2	primary 123:15	probability 333:11
9:24 10:15 11:8	268:10	principal 82:16	probable 198:14
74:12 139:22	prepared 134:19	principles 6:7	probably 12:23 13:6
142:23 144:11,16	183:20 241:13	113:10	19:19 37:3 50:23
144:17 145:12,16	249:21 263:9 380:4	print 311:12 321:6	96:18 119:23
145:18,24 146:25	preparing 101:16	321:24 322:4	133:14 196:7
147:4 148:15	109:13 110:4	printed 63:9 179:13	244:22 245:7,14
197:22 213:22	268:13	180:8 195:18	246:18 289:18
245:6 251:14	presence 147:12	322:10 350:21	290:12 321:25
284:11 312:13	251:10	351:3 368:10	343:12 360:13
361:5 362:21	present 2:20 3:24	printer 311:25	problem 42:16
363:12 372:2	4:21 25:17 62:22	316:9 318:19	133:2 134:15,16
positive 144:24	72:21 76:21 102:6,7	320:16,24 321:12	191:18,20,23,25
possession 143:23	118:3,6,9,21 119:2	323:9	192:9 201:16,17
possibilities 249:5	119:7,13 120:5,18	printers 311:11	233:5,11,22,23
possibility 193:11	120:22 121:8	318:8,22 321:8,11	234:10,22 235:3
231:17 232:4	128:11 133:17	322:11 324:12	256:5 383:16
250:17 256:2 318:7	144:14,22 145:2,6	printing 122:15	problems 330:8
318:10,18	145:10 155:14	171:12 179:18	337:22
possible 121:4	160:11 162:10	180:12 310:15	procedure 42:4
146:13 214:3	163:15 193:16,19	311:19,21 312:5	261:10,12 262:22
217:25 248:21	261:3,7	314:10,19 322:17	263:4,25 264:4,5
254:11 255:12	presentations 69:25	322:23	283:16,18 299:6,7
256:8,14,21 300:19	presented 32:17,23	printout 61:9,12	299:14,15
317:13 320:15	34:9,11 40:23 68:12	264:24 265:21	procedures 296:9
357:6	70:4,5,9,13,16,24	322:6 382:15	314:12 320:7 330:9
possibly 254:4 262:5	71:4 108:18 131:14	prior 7:13,18 8:8	375:13,19
post 237:8	146:7 147:10,21	15:10,12 40:2 70:4	proceed 4:4 39:15
postal 127:2 175:9	149:4,11 160:23	76:3,22,25 91:15	182:21 332:10
177:25	163:9 166:9 240:4	93:10 96:2 97:5	proceeding 108:8
potential 123:21	presenting 224:10	108:8 109:19,20	proceedings 5:10
191:17,23,25	preserve 375:15	121:21 122:6 136:5	15:2 106:4
219:13 304:22	press 10:12 79:18	176:14 191:8,10,11	process 74:10
potentially 213:4	pressure 197:11	191:12 194:24	218:13
244:15	prestigious 70:2	220:5 253:14	produce 43:25
practice 126:9,10,13	pretty 80:17 111:18	274:23 297:20	314:11,19 376:10
262:11	231:4 269:4	374:25 375:5	376:19 378:22
practitioners 232:19	prevented 120:5	private 3:5 80:2	379:6
preceded 27:6	previous 36:4 39:2	100:11 121:5	produced 25:8
precisely 42:13	85:24 103:12,13	123:18,24 126:9,10	76:12 121:15 122:9
239:8	106:15,20,24	126:13,20 262:11	144:5,12 146:8

II and I and I			
147:17 163:12	properties 282:6	181:18 185:22	publishing 81:14
164:21 170:12,14	proposal 89:12,15	187:2 241:16,18	284:15
174:5 175:23 180:7	89:20 94:7 104:8,12	254:21 298:9	publishing's 82:15
180:20 186:10	propose 255:25	341:11 343:18	pull 280:21
342:20 346:4 350:5	proposition 107:22	346:4,5,9,10 348:22	pulp 348:13
350:11 362:25	proprietary 81:11	352:20,24 353:6,7	punctuation 22:6
366:12,14 376:4	371:6 377:16 378:4	353:10,12,13,14,19	purchase 82:21
377:3,5 379:3,6	propriety 203:24	353:24 367:6,10	191:2 322:3
380:8	204:8,25 206:15,23	368:6,11,12,23	purchased 81:23
producing 361:25	prosecution 10:17	371:19,25 374:5,9	purport 26:6 288:2
production 145:13	90:21,25 91:7,14	providentially	289:2 292:4
329:8 342:8 349:16	95:10 97:7 102:21	237:15	purported 39:5
349:21 350:5,19,22	102:25	provides 199:25	43:12,22 142:17,23
351:3	prosecutor 98:20	235:16 242:4	185:22 199:2
products 248:18	99:18,20,22 100:17	310:21 334:3	214:14 227:25
professional 32:21	102:5,9	providing 24:20	341:21 342:2
70:10 303:24	prosecutor's 98:19	26:2 168:10 210:16	purportedly 89:10
professor 122:6	98:25 99:2,17 103:6	224:13 231:16	238:13
311:10 322:9	prosecutors 90:9,10	247:16 248:15	purporting 238:7
323:17 324:21	90:13 98:17 109:19	252:23 269:17	288:22 290:3,16
proffered 361:6	110:18	321:15 328:14	purports 293:17
proficiency 60:3,4	protective 115:5,10	377:17	purpose 39:7 51:2
profile 123:17	115:13,15,17,20,23	public 1:22 4:24	134:12
prohibit 294:12,14	116:3,4,7,12,16	18:4,15 91:13 369:8	purposely 320:11
294:21 295:13,20	protocol 116:23	380:25 381:8	purposes 197:24
298:21	117:15,17,19	385:25	pursuant 1:20 42:6
prohibited 294:2,5	253:13,15 317:7	publication 71:11	42:6
294:8,25 295:8	361:22 383:2	85:4,12,16 272:8,8	pushed 309:10
296:24 298:7,20	proud 79:10,12	288:10	put 11:5 14:9 24:14
299:3,12,21	provenance 238:17	publications 69:25	107:8,14,17 174:19
prohibits 296:20	provide 5:23 54:11	269:5	178:14 183:13
297:24 298:4,12	57:20 58:17,20 60:7	publish 276:19	184:16 197:11
370:24	60:17 62:10 84:10	284:14	203:17 209:4,5
projecting 149:19	100:25 111:6	published 70:3 71:7	216:21 241:11
promptly 183:20	221:23 223:13,17	81:14 82:19 84:14	248:24 250:9
pronounce 271:20	223:21 253:5	84:17,18,22,24,25	254:10 255:19
proof 105:9 106:10	255:11 319:16	85:16 214:19	260:9 270:21
233:5,12,22,24	320:9 324:20,22,25	215:18,20 242:21	272:16,23 277:14
234:11,23 235:3	326:3 344:13 346:6	243:12,22 261:17	278:5,14 280:6
383:17	347:2 352:25	261:18 264:12,13	291:15 297:21
proofread 23:11,13	provided 34:14	269:12 270:3,10,16	303:3,7,9,10,18
proper 7:11 74:21	73:22 98:23 99:15	272:5 293:7 314:16	308:20 320:12
properly 270:5	118:9 140:2 151:19	331:13	350:13
348:23	153:18 171:2,3,6,13	publisher's 82:12	putting 182:5
	173:12 181:13,16		202:21 206:4 213:5

[putting - reading] Page 39

240 4 5 201 12 12	206 10 10 21 207 2	111 211 25	240 11 262 10
249:4,5 301:12,12	206:18,19,21 207:3	quickly 211:25	348:11 362:18
q	207:4 220:3 222:17	218:2	rantanen's 45:15
q1 24:3 354:9,10,14	228:6 231:23,24	quite 12:6 86:23	328:23 329:24
357:20 358:2,15,19	240:24 242:23,24	170:13 184:25	330:2 339:14,19
358:22 359:5,17	242:25 243:3,10,17	229:14 255:3	341:24 350:14
363:14 364:3,13,17	243:18 249:19	259:24 262:22	rate 51:8 214:4
364:23 365:3,9	263:3 264:17,18,20	263:4,6 322:25	216:3,5
q2 32:11 354:9,15	268:9 275:14 276:8	338:15 361:15	reach 214:2 327:3
357:20,23 358:3,24	276:9,13 278:10	375:25	reached 244:25
359:6,18 360:18	284:24 296:17	quotation 290:13,16	245:17 246:21
363:14 364:3,13,17	298:21 325:6	quote 26:7,9 39:10	301:8,9,10
364:23 365:3,10	334:18 340:20	191:17 236:8	reaching 6:7 169:15
q3 363:14 364:3,13	364:19 365:8,11	286:25 288:2,12,13	302:16
364:17,23 365:3,10	380:6	288:20,22 289:2,3	reaction 136:7,11
q4 363:15 364:3,13	questioned 60:2	289:18 290:3 291:4	reactions 342:10
364:17,23	70:25 95:6,12 97:3	291:5,6,14 292:4,5	read 7:3 9:23 10:8
qualified 39:21	97:9,16,23 98:2,6	292:7,9,13,21	10:12 13:13,15
322:22 323:4,22	98:10,13 99:12,13	293:18,23,24 294:8	21:10,11,17 22:10
324:22	101:13 122:18	294:8 312:17	24:23 25:23 26:2,11
quality 47:21	128:24 130:20	331:25 333:17	26:14,16,19,22,24
181:11 188:18	233:3,10,21 234:3	338:8	26:25 27:8 28:6,13
344:7 351:10	235:15 236:8 240:5	quoted 26:24 28:19	28:17,18,19,22,23
	255:8 283:13 296:9	32:4 142:16,23	29:2,4,7,11,12,16
quarter 143:11	314:11,13,20 319:7	143:4 294:9 330:10	30:3,9,9,13,14 31:4
queried 78:19	320:7 364:15	335:10	31:5,6,22,24 32:2,5
question 9:5 12:16	375:14,19	quoting 40:15	41:21 42:18,19 62:7
13:9,14,17 28:3	questioning 97:21	r	67:3,7 87:3 91:17
29:17,18,19 30:23	101:2 201:4 380:12	_	97:25 104:19
30:25 31:16 35:17	questions 27:21	r 2:2 4:22,22,22	130:10 139:16,18
35:17,18 36:6,22,23	35:15,22,25 36:9,10	183:2,23,23,23	142:8 148:12 152:5
41:4 45:12 50:22	36:15,19,25 39:8	272:5 381:2	153:6 158:16,18
56:16 67:4,5,6	41:25 42:19 44:22	rag 351:17	159:7,15 161:13
73:16 76:14,18,21	49:19 76:8 100:4	raise 27:16 152:15	162:9,12 233:15
77:2 83:14 85:3	111:22 112:3	raised 27:18,19	234:15 245:2
87:4 88:4 89:18	129:14 147:8	raising 152:16	246:15 248:9 275:5
99:8 102:20 104:12	184:17 202:20	ramps 272:19	283:3,14 286:2,8
111:19 112:25	205:7 252:23,25	ran 55:4 253:18	295:5,11 328:25
123:7 125:18,19	253:8 275:2,10	261:3,5,7 268:5,6,6	347:10,11
129:6 130:8,10	302:18 339:25	307:23 346:23,23	readable 37:4
140:23 150:11	368:13 376:12	366:16	reading 13:16 28:15
153:5 155:17,19	quick 258:22 337:9	range 332:24	30:6,8 155:6 156:13
156:20 157:18,19	344:14 345:21	rantanen 303:14	159:14 236:2
157:25 158:20,22	371:16	328:4,12 330:11	245:22 266:16
158:22 193:19	quicker 218:5 286:8	341:20 342:16	310:25 352:8,17
201:8 203:5 206:13	347:10	345:17 347:3,22	360:11,14
	517.10		500.11,11

[reads - reflect] Page 40

24.10.26.12	1061500116	270.16	
reads 24:19 26:12	196:17 234:16	reconvene 378:16	references 111:17
26:17 32:5 214:11	236:2 249:12 258:8	378:24	112:3 285:20
245:13 347:13	267:8,10,12 301:4,6	record 3:3,10 4:20	referral 252:4
ready 133:17 182:21	302:12 303:19	13:15 20:6 29:16	referrals 288:7
183:22 248:7	309:10 321:18	42:25 61:2,6 67:7	referred 19:6 32:24
249:25	326:16,18,22	92:11,14 120:3	33:3,7 117:22
real 10:6 83:21	332:16,17 335:15	132:7,8,10,11,15	153:13 154:20
110:16 143:4	356:11,20,23	134:22,25 140:7	155:10 164:19
371:15	361:22 362:2,3,5,8	149:18 150:9 153:6	192:23 197:6
reality 243:12	373:10,12 374:13	157:7,17 158:19	220:23 233:20
realized 222:5	recalled 31:21	162:2,16 167:5,8	271:21 287:12
really 77:9 129:21	recanted 88:2	172:15 178:6	288:10 294:24
279:8 339:8	receive 71:23	182:23 183:5,8,13	295:2 296:21 338:7
reason 48:21 105:10	263:13	186:16 260:10,12	358:20 359:2
119:17 136:15	received 20:15	260:15 271:23	referring 40:14
152:15 171:23	25:15 34:13 51:14	337:11,15 372:6,9	47:18 61:19 79:19
180:22 181:3	57:25 78:20 102:10	374:4 379:20 380:9	84:20 99:21 101:20
202:18 325:4,5	192:12,17 222:23	380:17	128:19 131:22
327:6 340:22	recess 61:4 92:12	recorded 188:6	152:20 153:16,24
368:12 375:21	134:23 167:6	recording 3:9	154:5 161:6 164:16
385:7	182:25 260:13	188:19	186:19 192:16,19
reasonable 363:7	337:13 372:7	records 241:10	195:2 196:5,6,11,21
reasons 295:7	recipe 278:15	259:25	196:22 197:5
rebuttal 89:11	recites 316:16	rectangular 197:14	214:21 220:19
261:21,23 262:2	recognize 65:18	redundancy 120:12	235:22 247:14
recall 16:13 17:2,10	145:9 333:24	redundant 119:10	266:10,22 271:19
19:24,25 20:8 23:3	recognized 145:9	redweld 169:13	280:20 295:16
28:13,15 29:5,10,15	375:18	refer 12:20 17:5	296:7 299:2 315:13
29:21,24 30:3,6,8	recollection 14:11	19:4 86:2,19 101:2	316:3 331:22
30:13 31:10,13,19	43:16 44:10 49:13	118:8,14 140:15	334:14,15 338:16
36:8 54:22 55:3	50:9 93:19,24	155:11 156:2,17	340:4,6 343:3
73:18,21 88:21,24	127:15,17 128:8	197:9 199:8 231:2	354:22 356:13
92:3 100:19 112:18	140:11,25 175:18	233:23 241:7	357:16 358:16
114:11,12 115:2	175:19 189:3,4,23	246:23 261:13	359:10 361:13
116:9,17 117:11	195:25 196:3 222:6	280:17 286:14	364:16,18 367:8
119:21 120:23	229:16 250:2	287:25 295:14	372:11 375:10
129:19,21 139:15	302:14 352:13	296:11 329:21	376:3
139:18 140:12,13	353:6 361:14	338:10,11 354:20	refers 288:5 295:15
151:22 152:3	recommend 50:16	355:12 357:19	296:13,15 367:18
154:10 167:20	51:2 75:4	359:5 367:16	reflect 44:5 140:7
168:4 177:17	recommendation	reference 33:24	149:18 150:9 157:7
184:17 185:10	72:17	95:9 136:13 272:9	157:18 271:24
186:7,9,12 189:13	recommended	283:12,21 330:10	359:15 374:3
189:17 194:18,19	72:10	referenced 142:17	379:21
194:23 195:16	, 2.10	1 12.17	3,7,121
171,23 173,10			

212-490-3430

[reflects - report] Page 41

reflects 359:16,17	reliability 37:11	renowned 328:21	204:6,11,13,25
372:16	331:18 332:22	repeat 99:7 334:18	205:5,8,14,18,22,22
refrain 43:4	reliable 201:4 207:6	363:3	205:25 206:4,7,9,13
refresh 93:19,24	233:12 283:5,6,24	repeated 88:6 348:9	206:17,22 207:2,11
161:15 189:22	331:19,19	repeatedly 151:12	208:6,8,21,25
refrigerator 218:21	reliance 241:23	repeating 269:15	209:11 213:13,16
refute 205:6 206:20	relied 240:22,25	repellent 208:12	213:18 214:8
324:21	relies 281:7,11	210:5 252:3,7	218:12 220:15
refuting 203:24	282:2	repellents 247:3	221:2,5,15,16,23
204:7,25 206:14,23	rely 45:19 140:24	rephrase 298:15	222:5,22,25 223:5
323:16	141:2 162:4 175:21	report 11:2,6,9,12	223:13,17,21 227:7
regard 6:23 85:10	176:2 242:14,18	11:17,17 16:2 19:16	227:8 228:25
126:5 162:5	243:5	21:7,14,16 22:2,13	231:16 232:2,11
regarded 122:13,21	relying 162:13	22:18,20 23:2,10,11	233:6 241:10,21
122:25 123:3,9,11	168:10 176:11	23:14,23 26:5,12	242:4 245:12
regarding 88:18	177:12 180:16	28:19,22 30:19 31:4	247:11,12,22
98:24 99:2,16	217:11 220:16	32:10 33:13 34:17	254:10 255:19
100:24 141:9	242:10,22 328:13	35:13,22 36:7,9,14	257:23 260:18,24
187:25 207:5 241:2	329:13,14,24 376:2	36:17,24 37:4 38:24	261:20,21 262:3,17
241:11 308:15	remain 14:8 53:24	39:6 40:7 43:17	265:16 269:17
327:23 355:5	212:24	44:11,19,21 45:4,9	271:21 275:3,5,11
374:10	remaining 380:5	45:14,21,23 46:9	279:7 280:7 282:18
registering 76:6	remains 61:22	47:6,13,21 48:3,19	282:24 285:2,6,11
registration 82:12	remember 31:10	48:23 49:3 50:6	285:14,18,23,24
regroup 80:17	52:21 99:23 113:24	52:11,20,22 54:12	286:25 287:3,21
reiterate 178:4	114:5,8 128:4,7	54:17 55:24 57:9	288:4,23 289:2,16
reiterated 272:7	132:3 189:11,16	72:5 74:9,15 94:10	289:24 291:11,14
reiteration 360:4	191:3 377:15	104:15 106:22	293:25 294:10
rejected 114:22	remembered 31:8	107:8,18 128:20	295:16 298:14
rejecting 114:8	remind 28:10 99:24	140:6,8 148:12	301:12,24 302:4,8
related 69:8 77:18	194:14	149:2,6 150:10,12	302:16 304:13,16
255:19 381:17	removal 310:8	151:6,24,25 152:13	307:21,24 308:2,8
relates 15:3 190:4	remove 64:15,17	152:21 153:5 154:6	308:14 309:15
214:9 377:9	removed 68:21 69:7	154:11,13,15,20	310:16 311:3,10
relating 203:22	150:17 155:23	155:9 156:2 158:19	315:4 319:14,20,23
213:11 235:17	168:15 170:4 175:7	159:11,16 161:17	320:14,22 324:9,17
236:10,25	175:11 367:13	163:14,18,24 164:3	324:18 325:2,9,14
relation 186:17	375:2,8	164:7 165:23	326:23 329:2
254:19	removing 124:20	166:15 170:19	331:24 332:2,6,15
relative 134:7 137:3	177:24 178:9	172:22 173:4,10	333:22 334:4,15,21
relatively 211:20	renamed 359:24	176:12,14 186:5	337:20,25 338:8
relevance 341:24	render 74:6	191:16,21 193:10	340:9,18 348:6,19
342:6	rendered 51:23	198:3,16 199:4,20	351:19 354:14,21
relevant 88:18	rendering 36:4	200:6 202:14,19,20	354:22 355:12
108:10,13 143:18	162:6 226:11	202:21,23 203:6,16	359:4 360:2,13

[report - right] Page 42

363:4 364:11,18	reproduced 277:16	130:22,24 134:4	retainer 50:10
377:10 383:11	reputable 75:7	161:22 186:4	retention 51:7,12
reported 37:8	181:12	227:24 231:14	52:7
231:21 241:4	request 43:24 46:19	255:7 270:24	retired 66:17 67:10
246:11 247:17	347:3 348:5 349:11	302:24 329:4,23	68:20,22,23 69:3,18
255:22 264:11		348:5 349:10 351:6	126:25
265:13 336:2	353:8 376:9,19 377:15	355:4,6 360:6	retirement 68:24
		368:15 375:19	
reporter 1:21 4:2 28:10 153:2 182:20	requested 46:21 263:17 347:13	377:24	retracted 68:6,16 revealed 326:19
	348:20		376:8
183:16,18 259:13		respectable 129:4,7	
381:7	requesting 380:8	130:15	reveals 93:8
reporting 304:7	require 240:8	respected 124:6,9	reverse 356:4
333:21 335:24	required 59:15	124:22 125:2,5,20	reversed 73:3 75:9
336:12 385:2	276:14	responded 87:24	review 21:7 22:19
reports 12:9 21:24	requires 105:24	response 11:3 23:20	25:14 47:7 48:10,23
36:4 40:2,18 43:10	106:3 239:11	217:2 228:9 348:10	49:2,6,9,18 52:23
43:11 45:6 69:20	240:11	382:9	57:7,11 58:11 69:20
151:20 152:10	requiring 32:7	responses 45:5	177:4 216:23
153:19 161:12	res 344:8	responsible 76:17	249:10,20 300:18
185:12,14 192:20	research 37:8,24	rest 241:10 251:15	301:16,21 373:11
205:20 217:5	39:5 106:14 201:16	343:10 344:11,12	376:11,18 377:9
220:19,24 222:13	210:5 215:18 218:8	346:12,17	378:24
223:11 229:9 232:3	219:13 228:9,13	restate 257:3	reviewed 12:8 32:16
243:22 255:8 257:4	231:6,10 241:24,24	restroom 248:24	45:21 47:6,11 57:14
274:22 289:6 300:3	242:21 244:3,9	251:25	57:17 58:2,10 85:12
300:7,11,13,14,19	246:12 248:13	result 106:9 196:18	85:17 152:8,10,12
300:24,24 301:4	255:22 261:17,18	226:15 258:7 348:8	152:23 153:21,23
336:3,10 339:6,8	264:12 265:13	374:21	175:3 176:15 186:5
represent 4:2	269:12 270:3,10,21	resultant 356:2	186:20,24 249:23
137:18 292:22	271:9 283:17	results 39:4 55:17	276:21 277:15
representation	301:25 331:12	55:20 104:3 219:16	294:17 296:3 297:9
292:7	researched 218:10	255:20 256:3	297:12 314:14,15
representative	247:17 250:13	257:23 308:12,17	reviewing 45:23
102:8	270:5	308:19 314:5	46:8 47:20 48:19
representatives	resign 73:23	318:24 322:13	150:10 157:8 186:7
133:11	resins 316:18,22,24	328:23,25 329:24	186:12 249:12
represented 58:5	317:2,20	330:2,11 332:19	revolved 33:15
365:2,9,15	resolution 20:21	346:21	rhetorical 35:15,22
representing 3:12	151:9 190:21	resume 65:10 75:18	36:5,15,19,21
4:3 63:8 224:6	resources 62:18	81:14 376:21	richard 127:7
289:12 293:18	respect 7:8 22:9	resumed 183:23	riddled 271:12
reprimand 68:18	114:14 115:14	retained 49:25 50:3	274:9,17
reprimanded 68:3,7	121:25 122:3 124:2	50:9 114:2,5,6	ridiculous 327:15
68:17	126:11,12,14,20,23	123:15	right 14:15 18:12
	127:4,8,11,18		22:16 23:23 27:5

[right - saw] Page 43

28:12 29:7,9,14	254:15,23 256:15	350:6,9,12 351:4,22	run 17:19 253:13
30:23 32:7 33:9,25	256:21,25 257:5	352:11 354:8,13,17	308:3,21 319:7
35:7,10 39:12,16	258:12,18 260:25	355:2,8,13,17 356:5	329:9 342:8 346:25
43:18 46:19 56:6	261:6,21,24 262:14	356:6 360:20 361:3	349:16,21 350:5,19
65:25 68:6 71:15	262:18,23 263:12	363:2 364:9,13	350:22 351:4
75:2,15,19 76:9	263:20 266:2	367:13,22 371:2,3	running 25:25 56:22
79:2 80:11,19 83:23	267:20 270:22	371:23 372:13,17	363:10
85:20 86:25 88:4	275:17 276:11	373:9,18	S
92:20 94:20 95:4,13	278:2,20 281:9,13	rja 1:4 3:22	s 2:2 4:22 183:2,2,2
96:4 98:12 100:23	281:16,17,24 282:3	road 2:5	183:23 232:9
101:17 102:2	282:7,11,15,25	rochester 122:8	233:11 234:22
103:14 104:20	283:23 284:19,20	322:18	235:2 383:16 385:7
112:19 127:20	284:23 285:6,8,11	role 115:14 117:9	safe 48:8
129:22 131:15	286:5,21 287:3,6	186:3,24 218:6,7	sample 199:22
148:14 156:5	288:18 289:15,23	253:4 304:18	202:13 254:17
162:21 173:5,7	290:7,14,17 291:13	romano 47:12	317:16 319:7,8
181:9 184:24	292:17 293:19,23	121:18,21,24 122:6	370:20
185:12 187:6	294:4 295:17 298:5	157:2 158:24 160:7	samples 54:18,21,22
191:20 192:21	298:10 299:4,25	161:8,13 311:10	54:24 55:2,5,6
193:14 198:5,17,22	300:5 301:18 303:8	324:21 338:2	56:25 200:8 202:5
199:2,8,13,18,23	303:13 304:6	romano's 131:10	202:15,24 203:4,14
200:4,11 201:21	305:11,13,16	156:7 158:4 322:10	202:13,24 203:4,14
203:2 204:2,15,18	310:19,24 311:8,13	323:17	267:15,19 268:2,6
204:19,22 205:3,11	311:16,22 312:11	room 90:13,17	268:10 286:17
207:7,13,20 208:16	312:14,18,21	108:22 133:21	342:17,19 345:15
208:22 210:9 211:4	313:17 314:2,6	175:13 183:19	345:16 347:19
211:16,21 212:2,5,8	315:6,14 316:4,10	189:9,14,20 194:2	348:12 349:5,15,20
212:18,25 213:6,9	317:6,7,15,16,21	197:18 217:23	349:24 350:4,11
213:14,24 214:5,16	318:4,8 319:21	223:19 224:20,25	359:17 370:6
214:24 215:4 216:6	320:2,2,10,14,17	225:6,12 242:6	372:13,17 373:2,6
217:5,9,12,23	321:12,24 322:11	251:24 259:23	sampling 358:3
218:14,23 219:21	322:17 323:19	rope 193:24	san 190:25
221:14,22 223:7	324:23 325:9,15,22	roughly 185:8 211:2	sanctions 176:19
224:7 225:12,21,24	325:25 326:5,21	216:20 219:25	sanford 15:19
228:5,17,21,23	327:5,10,14,20	220:2 230:14	sat 133:13
229:11,15,17,19,23	328:6,15 330:14,18	route 304:24	satisfies 37:10 43:13
230:3,6,12,25	330:23 332:9,12	rub 209:23	43:23
231:10,18 232:6,9	333:14 334:17	rubbed 250:20	satisfy 39:16
232:13,17,21,24	335:7,12,23 336:9	rule 12:22 100:3	save 45:13
233:6,22 234:11	336:11,19 338:5,9	133:5 255:11,25	saw 26:22 30:10,11
235:10 239:12,19	338:24 339:2,17	256:7,14,20	81:8 131:18 136:3,4
241:2,17 242:2	340:11 342:8,16	rules 14:21,23,25	136:6 144:23 145:3
244:16 245:8 247:3	343:15,16 345:24	41:11 42:4,6,7	145:8 151:5,7
247:6 249:25	347:4,8 348:15	100:2	155:22 157:4
250:24 253:23	349:9,13,21,25		

[saw - sent] Page 44

150.24 161.6	20.21 47.11	sacrabable (1.02	100.4 0 10 102.2 16
159:24 161:6 173:16 181:10	scanned 20:21 47:11	searchable 61:23	180:4,8,10 193:2,16
	47:25 48:15 136:4	searches 8:11	193:19,22 203:11
251:24	145:22 146:20	searching 81:23	217:16,20 237:19
saying 28:16 31:10	154:4 161:18,18	seasons 230:5	241:14 245:18
92:2 102:9 151:23	162:24 164:19	second 24:18 122:16	246:8 251:21 252:2
185:6 226:20	167:23,25 168:13	234:6 236:6 245:12	253:25 260:3
228:19 239:5	169:22 171:15	246:15 318:25	262:12 267:17
242:12 246:3,5	172:12 173:2,9	334:19 348:5	273:6 275:6,6
247:23,24,25 254:7	176:13 177:11,13	secondly 36:21	277:21 278:16
254:15 256:6,9	181:2,7 313:10,14	120:10 125:5	287:19,22 288:20
270:9,13 274:2,4,12	374:16 375:5	seconds 156:18,19	288:25 289:9,11
275:25 278:3,19,22	scanner 139:6 374:8	secret 60:2 66:14,16	291:17 301:10
278:24 279:10,11	scanning 309:19	67:10,17,18,23 78:2	302:17 305:4 308:6
279:22 280:4	scans 25:9,14 47:15	78:4 88:15 90:15	322:14 330:12
283:22 289:3	149:25 151:9,10	97:10,15,23 98:10	332:14,23 334:21
291:11 297:4,10,16	168:6 181:14 357:3	99:14 102:7 103:9	343:8 349:3 357:25
299:13 323:18	scenario 218:4	103:16 127:3,4,8	359:22 360:2,20
326:16 335:20,25	scheduled 128:23	196:24 197:3 258:4	363:16 365:20
337:5 339:18,22	scheduling 337:21	272:25 294:4 295:9	366:4,10 369:22
344:3,4 364:7	scheme 272:16	295:24 296:9 300:3	370:4 371:11,22
372:25 377:5	303:4	314:13 315:12	372:22 373:11
379:22	school 37:20,22 80:2	320:6 322:20	374:7 376:12
says 6:9 18:8,9 35:7	122:9	369:18,24 370:12	seeing 222:8 227:22
80:10 108:18	science 5:14 13:7	370:15,21	237:21 238:14
128:21 161:6	70:7 84:22 85:16	section 5:20 24:5	362:3 376:6
166:14 169:14	293:8	75:17 208:24 246:8	seek 240:15
221:18 224:21	sciences 70:14 71:11	265:23 288:21	seen 9:19 25:11,13
228:13 232:2 235:8	71:15,21 72:2 80:8	295:16 320:6	93:5 173:23 224:20
236:8,20 238:22	scientific 6:6 37:11	340:15,17	225:15 287:16,23
239:8 248:10 254:7	84:14,18 113:9	sections 21:11 44:16	377:12
267:17 268:4,12	scientist 88:16	security 66:13 68:19	segment 158:17
283:17,20 296:24	112:16 129:4,8	68:24 69:7,15,17	173:2 180:3
297:2 299:19	130:15	see 21:20 24:4 26:17	segments 104:5
310:23 311:4,14	scientists 70:11,17	32:13,19 34:18,24	selected 304:11
323:24 332:17	71:8 239:6 289:3	37:12 38:7,12 42:5	sell 81:7
352:8 359:20	293:12	46:3,19,21 48:10	seminar 187:16,20
367:12 377:12	scope 159:10 160:19	56:8 61:16 63:18	send 51:25 102:16
scaling 323:25	174:10 284:24	65:20,23 76:15 77:2	328:11 362:17
scan 25:11,18 139:5	295:3,23 296:2,14	106:12 111:5	sending 305:10
145:18 150:19	296:16 297:8 298:5	117:23 129:12	sense 9:9 136:22
163:3,19,20 164:7,9	373:15	136:2 137:2 141:11	155:25 229:7
164:24 165:2,3,5	screen 149:19	156:9 165:21	333:22
168:19 169:25	search 7:12,17,25	168:13,18 170:19	sensitive 3:4
171:4,7,10 173:24	8:4,9,12	172:2 178:17 179:7	sent 52:22 58:6,10
174:4,8		179:10,11,17,19	58:12 93:4 139:9,22

[sent - sir] Page 45

141:7,21 328:20	347:3	178:24 179:4 221:2	signage 19:11
342:20,23,24		241:24 271:12	signature 179:4
343:11 362:19	session 2:22,24 set 5:24 18:21	272:15 274:9 275:3	signatures 179.4 signatures 114:9,14
	188:21 214:10		114:16 136:9
368:8		275:8 277:16	
sentence 24:18	381:11,22	278:15 280:22	179:20
41:18 62:25 236:6	sets 24:21 26:4	332:10 334:20	signed 6:14 7:8 11:9
245:13 246:13,15	30:11 198:3,7,12	341:3 347:9	34:5 48:24 69:13
283:15	settlement 73:21	showed 17:25	73:22 115:15,16
sentenced 91:21	seven 132:18,19,24	107:24 128:14	116:4 137:8 138:3
96:3,5,8	133:5,19 134:6	181:14 295:25	138:10 142:7,14
separate 67:2 90:13	230:14,14,18,23	showing 62:24	230:9 238:13 300:3
137:21 246:22	238:12,15 259:3,10	88:10 164:18 165:8	300:7,12,14,24
302:22	260:5,8 363:7	170:25 234:25	significance 332:19
separated 316:14	seventies 229:22	273:24 319:23	significant 326:5,6
separately 303:6	severely 161:2	330:5 336:5,22	330:22 333:13
separation 319:10	sexual 67:22	344:2 353:15 375:6	significantly 325:21
319:24	seymour 93:3	shown 67:24 68:2,8	signing 116:9 301:4
september 72:15	100:22 101:7	68:13,15 76:2 77:19	similar 44:19
sequence 31:15	seymour's 100:25	77:20 89:22 104:9	167:24 236:25
93:20	shades 189:9,16,20	173:20,22 181:2,7	262:22,24 263:4,6,6
sequentially 23:16	shape 197:14	218:10	264:2,6,7 286:20
series 35:15,21	shaped 333:4	shows 94:2 151:7	similarities 237:3
226:4 318:4 320:16	share 306:11	172:3,16,23 221:2	simple 129:6 156:20
320:18,24 321:12	shared 17:23 18:2	244:21 245:13	244:6 272:13
serious 157:13	19:9,10 62:18,18	246:17 339:15	333:21 335:18
serve 11:18 137:9	shares 17:21	340:10,13 341:13	336:21
138:12	sharing 18:24	344:21,24	simplified 43:17
service 60:2 66:14	shed 323:12	side 10:5,6 33:5 45:7	simply 36:22 112:6
67:10,17,19,23 78:2	sheet 190:19 195:18	76:11,20 77:2,22	216:13 221:18
78:4 88:15 90:15	196:16,19 254:18	93:25 106:25	228:17 254:18
97:10,16,23 98:10	344:12,16 367:17	120:18 133:7,20	272:10 291:22
99:14 102:7 103:9	367:19,21,23	140:24 145:7	323:17 329:13,14
103:16 127:3,3,4,8	372:18 385:2	147:17 154:17	334:5 335:16 337:5
175:9 177:25	sheets 367:15	156:6 192:6,13	344:6 378:15
196:24 197:3 258:4	shoes 184:8	239:4 240:13	single 84:14,15 91:4
272:25 294:4	short 46:11 376:16	288:18 306:16,17	91:12 124:18
295:10,24 296:9	shortly 150:20	347:18 348:25	127:12 138:4
300:3 314:13	184:23	353:12 356:4	165:23 174:4 256:4
315:12 320:6	shortwave 326:14	360:21 367:23	310:6
322:20 369:18	327:20	sided 239:13	sir 5:13 6:12,22 8:25
370:12,15,21	shoved 237:10	sides 238:3 242:11	9:12 10:9,20 11:2,7
service's 369:24	show 23:14 65:7	sidley 139:10,23	11:8,13,23 12:18
services 51:15 62:11	93:12 140:17	sign 6:24 7:8 21:16	13:9,14 14:2,15
241:12 261:11	161:12 163:20	101:9 116:6,12,15	16:18 22:2 23:23
262:21 263:25	165:20 172:22	300:11	26:14,23 27:5,10,14

[sir - specifically] Page 46

27.20.21.20.7.11.25	-: 105.10.106.20	225:8	272.2 10 275.22
27:20,21 28:6,11,25	size 195:19 196:20	325:8	372:3,10 375:23
29:15,17,21 30:19	312:8 352:14	sold 82:3	377:6,21 378:14,21
34:19 35:13 37:7,17	skeptical 242:8	solely 59:24	379:8,17 380:4,14
37:18 38:9,23 39:22	skills 127:13	solid 240:15	382:5
41:24 42:3 43:9	skin 207:19 247:2	solvent 209:19	southwell's 353:8
44:5,17 64:15 65:3	247:14	268:17,21 311:5	space 17:23 18:2,13
68:20 71:13 74:6	slightly 329:19	solvents 272:20	18:24
75:25 78:23 81:12	352:9	somebody 78:12	speak 15:16 19:15
85:3 91:5 92:16	sloppy 304:6	250:15 254:11	20:24 41:16 128:3
93:20 103:3 105:24	slow 218:13 219:7	something's 256:23	131:23 133:2 162:2
111:11 112:18	slower 215:16	soon 185:15 192:8	speaking 41:5,9
123:2,17 126:5	218:25	372:3	43:5
130:16 137:13	slowly 209:23 212:5	sorry 35:18 105:18	speaks 42:25 147:24
139:4 140:11	218:23 219:6	118:13,19 130:12	spec 190:19 255:14
143:22 146:6,13	small 124:11 196:9	219:2 286:24	279:24
147:25 148:3	197:5 312:7 348:22	289:17 316:15	specialities 58:25
150:24 151:12,22	smaller 196:4	320:5 347:14	specialized 50:20
153:7 154:21 155:5	285:24	349:12 358:22	65:4,21 187:24
155:15 156:20	smoking 32:18,22	361:20	specialty 58:22 59:6
157:14,24 158:18	32:25 33:3,7,11	sort 37:2 190:4	specific 14:25 59:3
158:21 159:15	34:10,14	371:10 377:18	59:10 127:16
160:2,3,6 161:12,20	snacks 134:17	sound 186:18	157:24 216:9 219:9
165:4 166:14 169:9	snyder 2:14 4:5,5	195:24 237:23	228:15 250:19
169:25 170:22,24	5:2,19 7:22 9:6	239:2 325:25	269:25 270:12,18
171:3,16 172:15	13:13 27:17,20 41:5	sounds 92:19 100:23	271:17 274:6,10,11
173:5,11,14 174:17	41:8,15,19 42:3,15	104:20 186:21	274:14,15 275:14
176:21 182:4	42:25 43:4,8 60:20	239:4 266:5 326:2	278:10 279:13,25
282:19,22 345:20	61:8,15 67:3 92:7	source 244:23 245:8	280:3 283:16
357:17 366:17	92:15 99:8 114:19	245:15 246:19	295:20 296:18
371:14	117:12 124:15	sources 207:18	298:6 302:23
sit 6:22 8:25 9:12	132:4,11 133:5	247:9 251:11 305:6	308:21 315:18
134:2 196:9 278:12	134:13 135:3,9	309:19 369:8,16	320:10,13 325:5,5
280:11,24 284:20	137:5,15 138:8	southern 34:23	342:19 369:9
site 61:13 62:3,22	140:7 144:2 148:22	southwell 2:15 4:9,9	370:23
64:15 81:9 82:4,22	148:25 149:18	4:15,19 144:21	specifically 8:10
83:6,10 309:5 313:8	150:9 152:15,16,25	183:7,12 184:2	51:3 59:16 141:21
313:9 356:11 357:3	155:18 157:7 162:2	192:18 210:24	199:15 203:23
382:16	167:2,9,16 169:7	211:12 219:2	204:5,7,25 206:14
sitting 28:12 195:4	176:24 177:19	234:18 250:6	206:23 214:9,11,21
situation 42:22	178:7,15 182:11,19	258:21 259:5,15,18	270:23 277:9
80:23 239:3 301:7	382:4	260:17 271:23	279:22 280:19
situations 304:5	society 12:11 70:25	337:9,16 341:23	289:14 294:20,24
six 170:3 357:23	softer 351:18	343:21 349:12	295:19 296:6,19,24
358:18,24	software 184:8	354:2 357:7 363:11	297:2 298:13
	323:10 324:3,6	366:18 371:15	300:13 311:3

312:20 316:6 319:9	springs 218:4	369:14	311:15 363:25
323:16 331:6	spurious 236:14	started 81:2 89:24	static 281:4,7,11,16
344:24 370:11	square 335:11,16	195:6 258:25	281:23 282:9
371:5	sripriya 2:18 4:13	369:12	stating 42:24 327:9
specification 195:18	ss 381:4	starting 236:6	statistic 332:25
196:19 359:7	stage 80:4	startling 236:17	333:18
specifications 175:8	stamp 63:16,18,24	238:6,8 240:6	statistical 332:19
354:16 359:2	64:4	starts 24:3 310:3	334:9 336:21 337:3
362:18	stamps 63:19,21,25	state 1:22 37:7	statistically 326:5,6
specificity 45:8	162:25	38:14 57:8 191:17	330:22 333:13
296:12 299:17	stand 38:9 104:9,13	206:13 207:5,6,8	336:24,25
specifics 125:21	330:25 341:4	214:25 218:12	statistics 326:9
220:10,12	standard 12:22	244:17 312:16	330:3 331:2,7
specified 293:9	39:11,11 112:22	326:24 327:8,18	332:23 335:19
specifies 195:22	113:8 214:19	328:5 331:25 340:8	336:19 337:2,4
specify 200:16	253:13 276:2 296:8	351:19 355:24	status 62:6 64:25
324:16	299:6,7,13,15	356:8 381:3,8	83:23
speckin 54:4,15	314:12 331:14,17	stated 109:6 151:4,7	stay 92:8 193:25
303:17,21 304:15	331:21 334:11,24	152:2 159:24	194:4
304:20,21 305:12	335:2,6,16 336:4,11	293:25 309:15	stays 61:24 209:20
307:4,5 309:5	336:13,18 370:20	310:16 311:11	stenographically
specs 354:16 360:19	standards 5:24	statement 5:9 57:24	381:14
360:21	37:11 39:25 279:20	62:12,15,16,22	step 125:21 264:8,8
spectral 190:12	282:11 310:9 313:2	87:23 124:14,17	264:18,19
309:4	315:19 318:15,22	127:16 138:3	steps 63:5 64:14
spectrometry	319:15 368:16,17	164:15 174:10	66:16
200:19 308:25	369:25 370:6	240:25 289:13	stereo 47:2,3,22
speculate 191:7	377:14	292:20,21 293:16	48:4 313:6
speculating 216:4	stands 107:12,22	298:6,19 299:22	steve 69:13
228:4,18 244:6	137:24	341:15	stewart 1:18 3:23
249:17 250:23	staple 51:4 304:25	statements 10:9	5:1,3 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1
speculation 216:16	305:7 355:5,7 356:8	145:25 156:7 157:2	10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1
227:5 228:17	357:2 374:10,12,14	162:14 220:17	14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1
spell 324:9	374:15,17,19 375:2	241:19 274:16	18:1,10,16 19:1,12
spelled 307:21	375:6,8,14,15	329:25	20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1
spend 133:23	stapled 355:8,22	states 1:2 6:5 35:6	23:15,19 24:1 25:1
spoke 53:13 54:15	356:2	66:14 78:2,4,5	26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1
185:21	staples 308:15	87:21 93:3 105:2	30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1
spoken 54:5 287:15	321:22 352:21,21	109:25 123:13,22	34:1,22 35:1,6,10
spoliation 143:6	starch 342:10	130:14 143:12	35:12 36:1 37:1
spot 222:7,13,15	start 24:2 45:4,11	145:5 154:7,11,13	38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1
spray 252:2	94:22 126:10	154:21 160:21	42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1
sprayed 249:3 252:7	130:12 159:14,23	175:9 198:16,19,24	46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1
spring 223:9 229:2	213:5 272:18,21	199:4,20 200:7	50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1
229:10	277:12 288:5	217:23 283:9	54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1

58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1	185:1 186:1 187:1	318:1 319:1 320:1	215:11,22 216:2,10
62:1,9 63:1 64:1,15	188:1 189:1 190:1,9	321:1 322:1 323:1	220:13 224:11
64:20 65:1,15 66:1	191:1 192:1 193:1	324:1 325:1 326:1	231:17,19 232:4
67:1,20,25 68:1	194:1 195:1 196:1	327:1 328:1 329:1	240:24 241:2,4,9
69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1	197:1 198:1 199:1	330:1 331:1 332:1	242:15,19 243:5,13
73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1	200:1 201:1 202:1	333:1 334:1 335:1	243:20
77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1	203:1 204:1 205:1	336:1 337:1 338:1	stored 16:19 185:23
81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1	206:1 207:1 208:1	339:1 340:1 341:1	217:21 218:17,21
85:1,21,23 86:1	209:1 210:1 211:1	342:1 343:1 344:1	219:24 220:7,9
87:1,6 88:1,11 89:1	212:1 213:1 214:1	345:1 346:1 347:1	221:21,24 222:3
90:1,2,21 91:1,7,14	215:1 216:1 217:1	348:1 349:1 350:1	223:10 224:22
91:19 92:1,23 93:1	218:1 219:1 220:1	351:1 352:1 353:1	225:15 226:3
94:1 95:1,2 96:1,2	221:1 222:1 223:1	354:1 355:1 356:1	227:18 230:17,19
97:1 98:1 99:1,23	224:1 225:1 226:1	357:1,13 358:1	230:21 231:15
100:1,18 101:1,16	227:1 228:1 229:1	359:1 360:1 361:1	242:5 249:2
101:22 102:1,15	230:1 231:1 232:1	362:1 363:1 364:1	stories 235:15 236:9
103:1,19 104:1	233:1 234:1 235:1	365:1 366:1 367:1	236:16,23,25
105:1,18,21 106:1	236:1 237:1 238:1	368:1 369:1 370:1	237:18 239:9,17,21
107:1 108:1 109:1	239:1 240:1 241:1	371:1 372:1,11	story 185:22 221:20
110:1,13 111:1	242:1 243:1 244:1	373:1 374:1 375:1	221:21 240:5,17
112:1 113:1 114:1	245:1 246:1 247:1	376:1,2,13,24 377:1	241:14 242:9
115:1 116:1 117:1	248:1 249:1 250:1	378:1,6,14,25 379:1	strangely 237:18
118:1 119:1 120:1	251:1 252:1 253:1	380:1,6,20 381:10	stranger 237:12
121:1 122:1 123:1	254:1 255:1 256:1	382:4,8,18 383:5,24	streak 311:5
124:1 125:1 126:1	257:1 258:1 259:1	384:5 385:6,21	street 135:4,6,14
127:1 128:1 129:1	260:1,18 261:1	stewart's 89:6 183:8	137:3,6 138:11,20
129:16 130:1 131:1	262:1 263:1 264:1	377:10	139:3,5,19 140:3,20
132:1,15 133:1	265:1 266:1 267:1	stick 206:9 276:17	141:6,13,17,22
134:1 135:1 136:1	268:1 269:1 270:1	277:24	321:22 359:6 383:7
137:1 138:1 139:1	271:1 272:1 273:1	stiffness 326:25	streetfax 32:17,22
140:1 141:1 142:1	274:1,7 275:1 276:1	327:4	33:19,23 34:8
143:1 144:1 145:1	277:1 278:1 279:1	stilled 179:23	358:25
146:1 147:1 148:1	280:1 281:1 282:1	stipulate 90:7	strength 198:13
149:1 150:1 151:1	283:1 284:1 285:1	111:21,24,25	strictly 172:20
152:1 153:1 154:1	286:1 287:1 288:1	stock 89:6	206:9
155:1 156:1 157:1	289:1 290:1 291:1	stop 249:20 318:25	strike 111:16 192:18
158:1 159:1 160:1	291:18 292:1 293:1	339:5 379:18 380:4	210:24 211:12
161:1 162:1 163:1	294:1 295:1 296:1	stopped 53:10,12	219:2 250:6 318:11
164:1 165:1 166:1	297:1 298:1 299:1	317:8	341:23 349:12
167:1 168:1 169:1	300:1 301:1 302:1	stopping 156:4	357:7
170:1 171:1 172:1	303:1 304:1 305:1	158:10 379:8	striking 237:17
173:1 174:1 175:1	306:1 307:1 308:1	storage 16:14,16	strong 239:10,18
176:1 177:1 178:1	309:1 310:1 311:1	207:15 208:2,19	240:7 318:12,13,17
179:1 180:1 181:1		212 = 12 = 2 = 1 : : =	
182:1 183:1 184:1,3	312:1 313:1 314:1 315:1 316:1 317:1	213:7,12,23 214:3 214:10,12,22 215:2	structured 291:9

[student - taken] Page 49

student 76:3	substantive 49:15	supporting 57:15	systems 315:22
students 332:18	substituted 338:4,18	suppose 343:20	t
studied 113:10	339:7,9 342:3	supposed 40:12 96:8	t 4:22,22 183:2,23
studies 235:15	substitution 338:8	237:23 262:13	183:23 332:18,21
236:19 271:9,9,9,11	subtle 180:11	supposedly 142:18	333:7,11 334:3
272:14 273:23	subtract 346:20	229:8 230:9,10	381:2,2
274:9,16 276:21	subtracting 332:11	341:20,25	tab 193:13 351:20
277:15	subzero 230:2	sure 8:12 21:17	351:24
study 200:21 232:20	succeeding 39:14	35:24 56:9 61:24	table 170:5,8 174:20
277:10 314:8,14,16	sued 73:18	67:6 69:4 76:2 84:5	175:13 180:8
315:12	sufficient 239:9,18	182:15 194:15	tags 170:10,12 374:6
stuff 271:16	276:20	213:19 241:13	take 14:14 20:4
subject 12:6 55:13	sufficiently 199:6	253:7 258:9 260:6	
97:3,4 98:5,7,22	suggest 49:12	270:9 273:14	54:21,24 55:2 60:20 60:23 63:3,6 75:5
99:12 101:13	142:11	287:17 300:8	75:11,21 92:7 132:5
107:16 203:22	suggested 20:2	326:17 345:23	157:11 167:2 188:3
230:5 280:17 325:5	49:13 50:24 303:20	347:12 362:12	
subjected 230:10	suggesting 42:11	368:4	218:16 258:21 260:5 275:2 287:8
subjects 5:21	suggestion 245:4	surprise 81:19,22	330:18 331:16
submission 220:17	suggestions 22:25	82:14,18 83:9,14	333:23 335:11
submissions 45:2	suggests 338:17	surprised 123:19,25	337:9 342:19
submit 21:16 74:14	suit 90:21,25 91:7	156:9	344:14 345:2,4
submitted 11:2,6,9	94:24 95:10,19 97:6	surprising 154:22	356:25 357:3
11:16 22:15,18,20	97:17,24	surprisingly 244:21	359:23 361:12,15
22:23 23:12 36:14	summer 2:21,23	245:14 246:18	362:6,11 366:23
36:17 40:3,11 43:11	4:15 133:12 183:10	surrounding 205:22	370:11 371:15
43:21 46:25 48:24	223:9 229:3,10,21	suspended 134:2	372:12,16 374:15
49:11,22 50:6 58:3	summerlike 217:22	suspicion 239:10,18	375:14
58:14 65:9 72:4	summers 230:11,14	240:7,16	taken 9:13 20:12,21
104:15 136:23	sunscreen 250:8	suspicious 242:8,11	25:9 37:21 48:2
138:2 142:2 154:2,7	251:22 254:3,12	sustained 105:9	61:4 63:5 64:14,17
160:22 162:9,24	sunscreens 247:2,2	swear 4:3	64:18 65:4 66:4
165:6,17 166:12	supervised 11:24	swore 5:5 171:20	73:8 80:4 92:12
170:11 205:8 300:4	12:7,15 294:4 295:9	sworn 4:23 6:21 7:3	134:8,23 145:19
363:20	supervisor 300:6,15	19:8 22:8,12 28:11	147:18,19 149:8,25
submitting 19:16	300:22	28:21 29:9,14 34:4	150:7,20 151:15
74:9	supp 38:6,9	53:22 69:11 77:11	156:23 158:15
subpoena 263:13	supplied 111:23	90:19 97:14 119:12	163:20 165:24
subpoenaed 128:7	support 23:19	138:3 156:7 173:18	167:6,22 170:3,10
subscribed 380:21	124:25 216:16	220:18 380:21	171:21 181:12
385:22	221:8,13,24 227:5	381:12 385:22	187:16,20 254:17
subsequent 35:3	231:16 315:5	system 16:22 105:5	260:13 290:12
substance 184:5,10	360:25 382:8	188:8,9 294:12	331:4 337:13
substantial 105:4	supported 333:3	315:16,17	342:21 352:3
230:22			

[taken - testified] Page 50

2.50.1.5.10.20		55.00.1.	
359:17,18,23	tape 60:22 61:2,6	66:3 84:17 101:18	terrible 110:16
361:17 367:13	132:4,7,10 134:22	102:23 103:21,25	terrorism 123:21
372:7 374:7,17,19	134:25 182:23	104:7 107:21	test 13:2 40:17
381:13	183:5 188:11	109:22 110:6	43:13,23 45:23,24
takes 133:22	249:11,20,24	115:19 120:4	46:2,7 47:15 48:13
talk 15:10,14 16:7	260:12,15 337:12	124:24 125:13	48:18 55:7,9,11,13
45:15 52:11 53:21	337:15	127:16 139:14	61:20 104:3 202:22
69:24 70:2 94:18	taping 188:8,9	149:9 150:24	203:15 204:2,17
99:5,6 112:17	tardy 236:10 238:12	153:23 156:5	207:7 244:4,10
113:22 149:3 159:9	238:21 240:5	157:14 158:8	251:12 252:10
159:10 164:23	target 101:13	159:12 160:15	253:16 268:5
192:3 193:10	task 56:2	163:11,12 178:17	271:10 272:14
210:11 211:6,7,8	tasked 56:20 302:20	178:21 179:2,12	284:22 293:15
214:18 244:14	tasking 57:10	180:11 186:15	294:21,22,24 295:2
245:4 264:15	tasks 302:23 303:2	189:19 193:7	295:8,14,14,15,21
265:15 266:8,9,11	taught 322:18	195:21 206:8 221:5	298:20,22 299:3,16
266:15 267:23	team 53:11 76:13	221:9,12 222:2	299:22 302:15
274:24 280:10	78:21 102:25	225:5 249:22 268:5	328:24 329:16
310:12 311:18	110:10 121:7	274:20 291:18	332:21,22,25,25
337:21,22	149:21 303:3,8,10	307:5	333:7,11 334:3
talked 9:18 15:12	303:10,12,16,18,18	telling 19:24 20:2	342:18 347:3,13
30:16 53:16,18	303:20 304:11	31:13,14,18 87:10	testator 237:13
87:17 184:7,8	330:9	131:21 152:7,11	tested 46:6 60:3
332:24	tear 147:13	161:19 164:25	198:9 202:5 226:17
talking 76:9 99:10	technical 57:11	171:24 176:7	243:16 252:12,13
112:15 126:8	300:18 301:16,20	220:22 221:10,18	253:24 289:7
150:22 157:22	359:7	221:25 224:17	293:14 297:11
160:2 163:7 166:19	technically 12:8	277:11 291:7 292:6	testified 4:24 13:8
170:22,23,24	technique 200:19	302:12	13:11 34:20 35:2,9
174:11,13 207:9	201:2 256:5 264:14	tells 240:13	53:15 86:17 87:11
208:25 229:14	272:14,15 276:23	temperature 229:18	87:19 88:17,24 89:3
235:14 243:22,22	277:17 278:13	231:12	90:3 92:2 96:15
247:10,21 254:16	279:14,16 281:2	temperatures 190:5	98:8 104:16 105:16
263:15 266:13,16	295:25 299:9,19	222:6,10 229:15	105:20 110:24
275:7 278:7 283:16	301:6,10 304:8	230:3 231:3,5,7	112:23 113:3
313:15 316:3 340:7	techniques 213:8	272:19	114:23 129:23
365:6 366:2,6	technology 122:8	ten 336:14 337:8	153:3,7,20 158:2
talks 97:5 242:21	315:24 322:17,19	tensile 325:21	160:18 171:20
271:2,5,7,8 272:10	322:24 323:9	tensility 327:2	180:10 183:24
286:7,9,16 314:22	tecum 263:14	term 235:18 336:21	184:13 186:2
316:7,12	telephone 58:21	336:22 337:3	197:21 217:14
tan 154:9,23 166:22	tell 5:5 14:2 20:11	terms 23:2 51:7	219:23 224:11
tanned 177:7 180:23	20:14 25:18 26:3,21	73:25 115:18	234:14 242:13
181:3	27:12 29:3 31:17	302:20 326:23	245:21 254:21
	44:24 45:8 52:25	336:19 370:20	255:14,18 258:6

[testified - time] Page 51

264:5 266:7 267:21	198:17,19 199:8,12	things 8:23 66:12	thousand 336:15
269:11 270:20	199:18,21 200:7,14	88:20 97:21 98:10	thousands 40:20,22
273:11,13,17 277:7	200:16,17 201:9,15	98:14 112:4,9	43:10,11 254:22
279:6 280:8,15	201:20,24 202:16	124:12 125:8,9	thousandth 334:7
291:19 301:3	201.20,24 202.10	152:21 156:13	335:8
306:13 361:11	240:12 244:21	190:5 198:20	thousandths 336:14
377:22	253:14,14 254:19	200:23 208:9 209:2	337:8
testifies 77:20	255:20 257:5 258:7	209:11 238:16	threat 90:20,25 91:6
testify 34:25 35:6	258:16 260:20	245:25 246:5	91:13 94:23 95:10
105:17 111:13	261:4,5 266:25	248:11 254:9	95:11,18,21 97:2,17
129:12 146:5	275:19 276:14	272:19,21 279:19	97:24 98:11
249:21 263:9	277:22 278:23	323:25 339:24	threatened 98:4
266:17 280:23	300:25 301:18	think 7:23 8:3 13:9	three 28:25 91:24
323:14	305:10,15 312:18	13:19 23:3 44:13,14	92:5 96:13 133:15
testifying 15:6	312:24 328:23	60:21 66:23 76:17	151:14 208:9 209:2
110:14 129:19	342:16	83:17 111:22 112:8	246:22 265:16
231:8,25 298:3	tests 55:5,6,15 56:5	128:3 133:19 142:8	285:18,22 315:22
360:9	56:7,9,22 103:17	151:4 171:23	331:9 343:12
testimony 6:21 7:2	201:22 202:12	172:25 176:7	threshold 199:12,17
13:20 14:13,21	251:18 275:13	179:17 181:9	203:24 204:8 205:2
15:11 16:8 18:14,18	276:9 294:16 296:4	183:14 185:15	206:15,24 244:20
19:8 21:8 22:8,12	307:23,25 308:3,21	186:6 216:19	throw 274:15
26:23 27:5 28:6,11	316:21,25 317:2,10	226:10 233:25	throwing 271:16
28:21 29:9,14 31:3	317:14 326:19	234:17 253:10	274:8
39:24 40:4 43:6	332:18 347:25	254:22 259:2,19	thrown 237:9
44:6,8 50:3 53:22	text 179:7,15 180:8	267:10 269:24	238:24
54:3 63:23,25 69:11	textbooks 81:11	273:17 276:19	tiff 164:20 170:17
77:11,13 85:15,23	thank 30:21 100:16	278:13 280:12	till 148:11
86:20 87:5 88:2	134:13 164:13	284:7 287:16	time 3:13,24 12:17
90:19,24 91:25	235:5,10	290:24 293:10,15	16:9 19:16 22:14
96:14,21 97:14,22	theft 81:10	304:4 307:3 308:5	27:9 36:18,25 40:21
98:18 106:3 109:16	theoretical 256:2	313:13 322:15	45:13 48:21 50:2
110:9,25 113:5,6,8	theory 329:10 338:8	326:7 330:4 336:20	53:3,13 59:21 61:2
113:15 114:22	338:17,22,23 339:2	341:18 356:21	61:6 63:2 65:13
119:12 129:13	339:4	360:24 366:8	70:23 71:19 76:19
132:19 153:9	therefrom 255:20	367:25 368:11	78:20 89:18 90:9,20
157:15 158:9 159:3	thereof 285:17	373:12,15 376:18	91:2,5,15,17 92:11
168:10 173:14,18	thickness 326:4	377:8 378:4 379:2,5	92:14 98:16,18,21
181:8 194:9,15	334:12	thinking 80:6	99:24 101:12,15
205:21,23 221:13	thin 308:22 310:10	third 128:22	110:12 111:9,14,18
277:5 279:9 360:5	319:10,23	thought 51:5 121:9	113:19 118:10
360:10 362:10	thing 18:23 102:17	121:11 153:12	121:5 127:23
373:9 381:11,13	112:12 165:16	221:7 263:14	131:18 132:7
testing 39:15 94:6	223:5 245:24 284:6	285:19 289:21	133:14 134:16,22
146:25 170:5	313:3 342:9 351:18	297:7	134:25 136:5 150:5

[time - trying] Page 52

150:6 156:12,17 314:22 316:14,15 316:5 317:15 318:2 transparent 1 167:5,8 172:7,9 317:6 343:5,19 318:3 320:19 322:4 155:4	34.9
107.3,8 172.7,9 317.0 343.3,19 318.3 320.19 322.4 133.4	
175:10 177:18 346:23,24 351:12 346:16,18,22,24,24 travel 371:21	
	1
181:9 182:23 183:3 353:23 354:5 359:9 366:16 368:17 375:24 376:14	
183:5 185:8,19 366:15,16,21 367:3 372:20 379:10,13,19,	
186:22 193:8 367:9 383:21 384:2 toners 310:17,22,24 trial 34:21,21,	
194:21 195:17 tobacco 257:14 311:4,5 312:13 35:2,3 51:10 6	
200:24 211:15 258:11 369:17 314:9,18 315:18 68:9,12 85:25	
212:4 216:24 today 3:13 6:21,22 316:8,12,17,22 86:11,21 87:6	-
223:10 226:5 7:13,18 8:8 9:2,12 317:4,21 318:22 88:21 90:2 91	:19
230:22 250:21	
257:12,13,16,19,22 21:8 28:12,21 57:24 tony 89:16 101:16,22,25	
257:25 259:6,9,17 61:23 97:22 108:9 top 66:16 123:4 102:16 104:10	0,18
259:19,25 260:12	,21
260:15 265:14 155:11 159:20 334:21 343:9,19 205:23 258:9	
266:8 275:2 276:23 165:2 173:15,19 352:10,21 364:23 323:15 325:10	0
277:19 282:3,7	
283:7 286:11 202:5 203:9 256:11 tossed 237:8 trials 266:12,1	14
300:15 301:5 270:4,11 280:11,24 total 154:25 tried 55:16 67	' :11
309:11 313:19 319:19 320:25 totally 329:20 82:15 206:8	
322:25 324:10,14 321:4,6,22 322:3,8 toto 344:25 trier 107:10 1	12:7
331:11,12 337:12 353:24 370:19 touch 250:19 trouble 85:22	86:3,4
337:15 346:25 told 16:19,25 25:15 touched 249:14 87:6,14,20 88	8:8
355:8,22 358:4 31:25 32:2,3 33:5 250:3,4,16 256:4 true 13:6 58:8	8 60:9
361:14 363:8 372:6 78:21 88:6 91:16 touching 250:7 62:12,15,16 8	7:5
372:9 376:7,18 103:16 106:17,19 tough 50:22 247:19	
378:12 379:4,14,15 109:10,12 110:4 track 14:11 374:17 trust 239:14 2	240:13
379:16,23 380:6,10 115:4,8 119:13 trained 322:19 247:18	
380:17,18 121:3 125:6,7 training 37:20 59:4 trustworthy 7	7:19
time's 363:10 151:12 152:12 59:12,17,18 187:24 truth 5:5 18:8	31:13
times 14:18 15:12 158:23 172:25 232:21 31:14,18 87:1	0
15:15 56:15 70:6 185:13 194:19 transcribed 381:15 152:7,11 171:	:24
108:24 111:12 206:8 217:5,7,12 transcript 14:2 176:8 220:22	
164:21 205:20 220:8 221:14 222:3 40:10 41:21 43:19 221:10,25 224	4:18
277:2 222:10 223:16 60:16 76:25 86:6,22 truthfully 104	1 :17
tiny 254:2 231:14 291:20 86:23 129:16 130:8 105:16,21	
title 24:12,15 135:13 307:4,8,10 362:3 382:20 383:4 try 101:21 123	3:7
178:17 234:17 373:10 transcripts 76:22 156:11 243:10	
340:12,14,17,21,24 toner 45:23 55:9 266:16 251:15 274:18	8
titled 116:25 265:24 305:9 309:23 310:5 transfer 227:16,22 357:22	
358:24 310:6,6,7,8,13,15 228:19 250:17 trying 7:23 31	:16,23
titles 233:2,4 311:19,22 312:6,8 transference 226:22 37:4 56:14 80	-
tlc 103:22 309:24,25 312:10 313:6,18 227:6,24 228:14,16 81:6 112:6 11	5:21
310:18 311:6 314:2,5,5,23 315:6 transferred 369:18 140:9,15 155:	:16
312:20 314:2,5,9,17 315:13,14,17 316:4 156:2 157:5,1	

[trying - uploaded] Page 53

		I	
158:10 159:7	342:7 343:12	177:6 180:17	81:25 83:2 84:6
235:20 243:8 248:9	349:15 352:9	u	91:3 95:25 107:23
249:19 269:22	356:22 358:2,2,15	u 110:17	115:23,24 214:12
274:20 275:7,10	358:19 360:3,15	u.s. 3:20 93:16	215:13 229:7
285:24 313:13	361:6 364:8,15	97:15 177:25 295:9	267:18,25 369:11
325:6 340:20 344:7	382:14 383:6	382:23	understood 88:3
347:19 359:21	type 79:18 236:8	ultimately 95:12	unexploded 323:7,7
379:18	313:2 316:3 338:21	ultraviolet 46:12	unfortunately
turn 3:6 32:9 94:10	351:7,8,16,17 368:7	279:16 347:18	359:25
96:23 286:24	typed 64:11	unanimously 72:16	unheated 267:19,23
331:23 363:4	typeface 322:16,23	unanswered 44:23	unibomber 323:2
turns 237:14	323:3	unbeknownst	uninsulated 242:6
twice 41:2 268:5,7,7	types 208:13 235:18	102:24	union 267:11
358:6 363:9	239:17		unit 2:6 191:18
two 8:19,22 10:5	typical 115:23 116:3	uncertainty 333:19	225:12
17:14,22 24:21 26:4	typically 195:23	unclear 218:9	united 1:2 35:6
30:11 32:5,16 33:15	209:17 210:10	unconcern 237:9	66:14 77:25 78:4,5
33:25 36:20 53:24	231:11 351:16	undamaged 147:13	87:21 93:3 104:25
59:14,17,18 61:11	typography 322:16	underlying 95:6	109:24 123:13,22
66:25,25 88:25	322:23 323:3	underscore 152:18	143:12 145:5 175:9
90:23 92:8 98:9	tytell 2:20 4:21	understand 5:8 6:13	217:22
102:6,8 103:13	121:18,21,23,25	10:14,20,25 11:7	units 195:15
112:18 120:7	122:4 126:11,18	16:23 27:23,24,25	universal 299:18
121:13 123:14	131:8 147:18 151:4	29:17,18 33:18,23	unknown 90:14,17
126:19,21 130:4	151:10,23 152:3	34:3 46:16 73:16	191:20 219:17
133:6 135:5,13	153:4 154:21 155:2	100:8,14 109:6	unmanipulated
136:8,9 137:21	157:2 158:24 160:7	111:17 119:16	165:5
139:4 145:9 168:6	161:8,13 163:21,24	124:7,8 141:25	unqualified 323:21
177:25 178:14	164:3 165:2 166:11	144:10 145:11,16	unreliable 200:15
185:18,18 197:15	166:12,14,20	145:17,21,23	201:10 227:2
198:9 200:3 205:7	167:11,14,21 170:3	146:24 147:4 201:6	294:16
211:2,8 214:18	170:12,20 171:8,9	205:10 208:13,14	untested 294:15
216:20 217:4 233:9	171:17,20,24 172:9	215:25 228:12	297:25 298:24
233:9,20,21 238:3,6	173:17 174:5 176:3	229:6 231:22 263:2	unusual 236:17
262:7 267:5 268:6	176:4,7,10 181:5,17	268:9 269:14,16	300:10 301:5
277:6 280:8 285:22	181:23 338:2	270:9 272:17 281:3	302:13
288:7 301:17,21	383:11,14	281:18 297:4	unusually 198:25
302:8 303:14 305:5	tytell's 48:13 148:10	298:16,17 301:14	214:14
305:6 310:23 311:4	148:12 150:23,23	329:22 333:6	unvalidated 289:6
311:5,11 312:10	151:14 152:8,12	343:16 357:5 361:4	290:9 293:15
320:16,18 321:16	153:7,17,24 154:6	361:9 363:11,24	upcoming 93:25
322:10,11 323:24	154:12 156:7 158:4	364:4 371:18,20,25	updated 369:20
326:19 332:3,5	163:3 167:19	375:24 376:14	uploaded 182:6,10
333:12 336:6,18	168:12 171:3,5,6,10	understanding 6:18	182:13
338:3 339:20,24	173:24 176:23,25	33:2,10,12,14 69:17	
		1	l .

[upper - want] Page 54

upper 229:22	valid 176:3 180:20	343:20 345:11,11	violated 72:5 74:8
367:12,13	277:14 278:22	345:11,12	violation 375:13,17
usb 143:17,22 144:4	validate 277:10,10	vials 344:16 345:9	virtually 198:14
use 27:4,8 28:5 29:5	278:11	345:14,17 347:7,15	visible 61:22
30:18 113:4 152:17	validated 275:14,20	359:15,18 360:18	visibly 164:17,18
191:13,15 196:25	275:25 276:3,5,10	vice 50:20	visual 156:8 174:6
201:4 222:7 248:22	276:14 277:23	video 76:6 90:14	176:3,23 177:3
250:8 256:20	278:25 279:6,8,11	148:6 149:20,22	180:17
257:10 263:4,19	279:12,15,18,19,22	151:15 156:17	visualizing 309:18
264:4,5 267:16	280:2,4,12	157:10 162:23	visually 157:3
270:5 272:17,20	validates 314:8,17	173:15 175:3,21	194:21
273:2 274:3,5	validity 275:16	176:11,13,15,17	vitae 65:15 382:18
282:10 296:3	valuable 237:5	177:4,19,20 178:19	voice 27:16,17
297:24 301:21,23	value 199:16	178:25 179:8 180:2	152:15,16
313:6,9 314:9,17,22	vanderbilt 86:6,12	180:5,13,15 182:5,6	volatile 209:13,15
320:18 322:4	87:21 382:20	182:12,14 187:8,11	209:17 210:8,11
330:13,25 336:15	vantage 193:21	187:17,21,25 188:3	215:14
336:16 339:23	variance 331:21	188:7 190:2,12	volatilizes 218:2
346:18 350:14	332:7 335:12,15	309:3 344:21	voluminous 66:6
360:12 380:5,10	336:2,17,18,20,22	videographer 2:24	vote 73:11
useless 113:16	337:3	3:2 60:25 61:5	vs 1:7 385:5
uses 205:2 206:16	varied 66:15	92:10,13 132:6,9	vsc 190:9,11,17,17
206:24 262:21	variety 246:4	134:21,24 162:10	190:17,17,21
263:25 265:10	various 5:22 246:25	167:4,7 182:22	191:18 193:12
268:14,18,20,21	309:19	183:4,18 187:14	195:15,17 196:13
270:20,21 278:20	varying 209:5	188:12,15,17 259:8	196:14,14,22,25
310:7 360:7	venture 129:25	259:14 260:11,14	309:6,8 313:10
usual 199:12,17	verb 26:11	337:11,14 372:5,8	w
218:16 244:20	verbally 16:16	380:16	w 4:22 183:23 272:5
usually 39:4	verbs 8:19	videos 179:20	wait 134:3
utilize 302:16	verdict 105:14	videotape 144:23	waiting 363:9
utmost 237:9	verification 224:15	147:17 149:7,9,10	walter 45:15
utter 237:4	veritext 3:12 4:3	149:16,17 150:14	want 5:12 6:12
uv 326:13 327:20	385:2	175:20 189:10	12:20 42:14 44:4
348:10,11,15,23,24	versa 50:21	356:24 359:22	49:18 67:6 84:11
349:6	version 139:22	360:24 373:11,16	99:24 111:24 113:4
v	171:19 173:16,23	373:25 374:2	125:21 132:17,25
v 164:3 383:11	versions 351:2	videotaped 1:17	147:7 164:22 183:9
vacate 73:23	versus 3:19 35:6	121:10	183:13 191:7
vacated 72:8,14,22	106:9,17 107:21	view 47:21 239:14	203:19,20 205:17
73:5,15,17 74:2,4	113:23 173:7	339:21 342:6	240:15 242:25
74:16 75:3	254:17 261:18	viewed 131:24	245:20 249:11
valery 19:15 25:9,12	310:6	150:13 326:14	252:19,25 259:21
145:14 282:20	vial 265:11 267:16	327:19	260:2,2 270:8
	268:7,14 342:22,24		

[want - work] Page 55

271:16 284:15	369:11 378:9	170:20 172:13	witnessing 24:22
286:6 315:7 328:25	wear 147:13	173:7 174:12 177:9	wonderful 132:21
331:19 338:11	weather 216:23	180:19 181:25	wood 351:9
341:9 345:23 347:9	217:5 220:19,24	188:21 196:9 197:5	word 14:14 22:4
347:10,11 350:13	221:2,5,15,16,23	351:20	26:21 27:4,5,6,8
353:17,20 368:13	222:5,12,22,25	whiter 170:13	28:5,13 29:4,4,8,13
371:16 376:15,20	223:5,8,9,11,13,17	whitish 197:14	29:15 30:9,14,18
377:2 378:11	223:21 228:25	widely 122:21,24	31:8,19,21 62:8
379:20	229:7,9 231:15	123:3 231:20	108:25 109:3
wanted 78:22 81:16	232:3 241:9,20,21	246:12 247:13	125:14 152:18
83:5 132:14 260:9	242:3	248:11	324:10,15 350:7,15
wants 7:21 42:21	web 17:25 18:7,9,20	wider 352:9	words 8:22 22:13,17
77:23 149:21	24:20 26:2 61:13,21	williams 106:9,18	27:7 28:16 31:15,22
warmer 229:9,10	61:25 62:3,22 63:3	107:2,22	31:25 100:4 105:19
warn 215:20	63:12 64:15,19,22	wills 235:17,19,22	159:6 177:17 195:4
warren 2:5	81:9 82:4,22 83:6	235:25 236:7,10	203:13 216:4 290:4
wash 75:10	83:10 382:16	237:16 239:22,24	290:8,11,22 291:6
washed 180:6	week 49:10 93:10	win 77:23	291:15 300:14
washington 17:24	185:18 353:8	winter 221:19 223:7	301:8 330:24 341:2
18:12	weekly 191:15	223:8 229:2,11,15	341:4 350:13
waste 48:20 119:11	weeks 185:18,18	241:13	363:18,21 371:4
water 227:15	276:18 277:6,25	winterize 16:23	work 6:15,24 7:9
wave 46:12 326:15	278:4	winters 230:13,15	8:14 9:14,24 11:14
327:20	weight 214:16 256:7	withdraw 29:19	20:12,17 24:9,25
way 11:5,11 12:5	378:2	45:12 155:18	25:4,7,18 26:7
14:12 18:22 26:16	weighted 196:5,7	withdrawn 5:19	33:21 53:2,7 54:8
31:4 39:17 53:23,25	weights 196:9	114:19 124:15	57:11 66:9 78:3
67:19 73:11 74:7,13	197:17	137:5,15 138:8	117:6 125:10
77:4,6,21,21 82:6	weiss 16:2,4	144:2 148:22,25	131:18,24 138:24
109:4 115:19 123:8	wellsville 229:13	169:7 176:24	140:22 141:10
136:4,21 146:4	went 48:15 52:2,3,4	182:11	142:2,6,19 144:7,12
182:5 189:11	69:22 102:2 133:8,9	witness 3:23 4:4,23	145:18 147:3,9
200:22 215:8 219:8	139:19 248:24	40:25 41:12 42:10	150:16 166:7
222:7 225:20	258:9 304:23	42:17 43:5 84:23	167:22 168:14
228:19 236:16	313:20 323:15	88:12 99:4,25 104:9	175:7,22 178:18
238:22,23 248:19	western 1:3 3:21	108:5 112:8 115:14	180:19 185:23
256:8,13 286:22	14:20,24 145:5	132:12 133:10	191:14 197:2,23
292:12 337:3	westlaw 38:2	134:14 140:8	198:21 199:6 200:9
338:10,12 349:4	weyermann 272:4	150:10 157:8	204:14 215:2 220:6
377:2 381:19	272:12 287:10,12	183:19 237:11	224:21 226:3
ways 120:7 237:18	288:6 290:17 293:7	259:14 271:24	227:18,25 230:9
241:14	whereof 381:21	377:21 381:10,13	231:24 237:22
we've 19:10 74:24	whispering 3:5	381:21 382:3	239:3 243:6 245:7
133:6 174:22	white 163:3 164:17	witnesses 107:5	248:19 251:3
337:23 358:16	165:7 166:3,8,13,16		257:23 265:25
	, , , , ,		

	I	
277:16 278:17	111:2 283:12	yellow 166:3 170:20
286:21 291:19	284:19 297:19	172:14 173:7
300:2 306:9,12	369:9 370:23	174:12 177:9 348:6
307:12 310:18	377:23	360:21
311:12 325:15	wrong 161:24	yellowed 347:19
326:24 327:9 328:3	201:14 269:25	yellowing 163:4
337:6 342:21 345:5	292:17,19,21 293:2	yield 308:4
351:21 354:11,15	293:5 327:25	yielded 307:25
355:5,20 356:7	339:16,18,23,23	york 1:3,20,20,22
358:16,20,22 359:6	340:11,13 341:3,13	2:13,13 3:12,17,17
361:7 362:6,20,24	wrongful 90:21,25	3:22 16:20 34:23
375:2 382:13	91:6,14 95:10 97:7	38:18 145:6 160:11
worked 297:12	wrongly 88:7	220:9,10 229:13
315:15 323:2	wrote 232:23 297:18	381:3,5,9 385:3,3
working 79:20	www.blancostewa	york's 14:21
82:16 119:22,24	62:3 64:12	young 15:21
120:9 143:20 203:8	X	youtube 182:6,9,10
331:12	x 1:5,11 382:2	182:13,15
works 271:10	xerox 344:6 351:10	z
272:15,24 276:19		z 81:14 82:11,15
278:13,17 321:10	y	zuckerberg 1:8 3:19
321:16	y 4:22 183:23 272:5	6:14,19,23 9:19
worksheet 89:5	yeah 209:9 210:3	34:6 135:24 137:8
343:5,6,19 351:13	299:24 364:6	138:4,9 139:2 144:4
353:23 354:5	year 7:24 14:4 16:20	179:5 385:5
357:25 360:15	19:20 59:14,17,18	zuckerberg's 7:3
361:2 367:9 372:25	68:18 147:14 169:3	Zuckerberg 5 7.5
383:21	191:3,5,5 211:7	
world 12:11 75:15	219:25 222:11,19	
78:10 122:23 125:3	230:6,8 267:5	
125:25 126:6 210:2	331:10	
328:21	years 13:23 14:10	
worth 205:21 256:6	65:5 66:5,15 70:18	
377:25	70:22 78:16 79:4	
worthy 127:11	80:16 81:4 104:22	
write 22:2 32:15	105:2 112:19 125:8	
34:8 35:25 51:20	127:25 130:5	
338:2 340:24	154:25 198:9 199:2	
writer 21:24	200:3,20 211:3,8	
writing 21:24 37:10	230:18,23 238:12	
154:14 158:7 161:3	238:15 239:24	
164:9 239:23	262:10 264:10	
265:24	267:5 315:20,20	
written 50:10 51:17	318:21 329:11	
51:18 55:24 62:7	331:9	
	VEDITEVT DEDOI	1