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PROCEEDINGS
(The Court, counsel, and the parties convene.)
THE COURT: We're together on Zweizig and NDT and Mr. Rote. There's some -- I said that we'd get together and just kind of wrap up some questions that you all might have. Mr. Rote, you submitted a memo on the employment relationship issue. I read it. I don't know that we need to talk about it at this juncture. It may come up as a legal issue at some point during the course of a trial.

You did not submit anything on that issue?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I submitted jury instructions, Your Honor.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I cannot hear you.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I submitted jury instructions.
THE COURT: On that issue?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. I'll take a look at them.
Then, Mr. Rote, you had some questions about my rulings regarding some of the materials that -- I don't know whether you wanted in or the other side wanted in, but $I$ can give you again an outline of what my thoughts are regarding the arbitration.

I don't want to retry the arbitration. And to the extent that exhibits from your side trigger exhibits from their side so that we're now litigating the merits of the
arbitration, that's what $I$ want to avoid. It sounds like some of the things that they're going to introduce may trigger you being able to introduce some other things anyway, but generally I do not want to relitigate the arbitration. That goes for both sides.

So exhibits that trigger that kind of tit for tat, where, you know, this exhibit shows that there was retaliation, this exhibit shows there wasn't retaliation, that's what $I$ want to avoid.

Does that make sense to you, Mr. Rote?
MR. ROTE: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm not asking you to agree with it. I'm just asking you whether it makes sense.

MR. ROTE: I'm just still trying to mold this into my mind as to -- since -- since the blog went into great detail on the evidence --

THE COURT: And I'm not prohibiting you from talking about it. I just don't want all the exhibits so that we're ending up with another trial.

MR. ROTE: I understand.
So, for example, when I'm talking about forensic reports, you don't want me to introduce the forensic report, but I can talk about what $I$ wrote.

THE COURT: Right. If you want to talk about why it was an injustice --

MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: Because your theory of the case, as I understand it, is that your blog was not retaliation; your blog was merely a statement on arbitration and the problems with arbitration.

MR. ROTE: That's correct.
THE COURT: And if that's your theory of the case and you want to explain that to the jury, I'm going to give you the opportunity to do that. I'm not going to get in the way of you doing that.

But, again, you lost the arbitration. And so we're not going to relitigate whether you -- that part of it by introducing exhibits and trying to show the jury why you should have won at arbitration.

MR. ROTE: Yes, I understand.
THE COURT: Okay. And I don't know how that affects the Kugler materials or how that affects the Jones transcript. If they start introducing that kind of stuff, you will be able to respond to it.

MR. ROTE: Okay.
THE COURT: All right?
MR. ROTE: Could I make one comment on that, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.
MR. ROTE: The Kugler transcript specifically was
dismissed with prejudice in New Jersey. It was the basis of a defamation complaint and introduced into the arbitration again, and the arbitrator concluded that he was not going to award anything on it. So it's been tried twice.

And the introduction of it, for example, in this case, it would be tantamount to me introducing the forensic reports. And so I'm just -- they're, on the one hand, arguing to not litigate, which they prevailed on. On the other hand, they're relitigating with many of their documents. And so I'm just --

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Can $I$ answer that?
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: So we do intend to discuss that letter to Judge Kubler. I was going to raise it with you. But it's discussed in this website and it's misrepresented in this website and what actually was communicated to that judge. And we do want to bring that letter in on that basis.

Mr. Rote is representing to the public that one thing happened, and it was something completely different. And the thing that did happen was just awful. He accused my client of pedophilia with the judge's clerk.

THE COURT: Is somebody introducing all of the blog? Didn't we talk about that? The blog is coming in?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We did, yes. That particular chapter is marked as one exhibit, not just the whole website.

THE COURT: Okay. And as $I$ understand it, the arbitration had to do with retaliation for --
(Mr. Christiansen and Mr. Rote speak at the same time.)

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. One at a time. I couldn't hear.

MR. ROTE: Shall I speak?
THE COURT: No.
MR. ROTE: Okay.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: It was a whistle-blowing case, yes.

MR. ROTE: But he also sought emotional distress and other components. And the arbitrator refused to award those damages. So he considered the letter and refused to award damages for it.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We're seeking damages for something completely different. This is for representing to the public, because my client brought that case in the first place, that he was engaged in this porn ring with a judge and their staff, completely different.

And it's part of a bigger message here, which is Mr. Rote has taken my client's identity and smeared it all over the Internet, all because he brought an employment case against him.

THE COURT: Let me think about that one. I mean, I
think that's the basis of your claim is the problem, the -what your side claims to be untrue in the blog.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: And misleading and vile and terrible about my client. It goes right to the element of would this dissuade a reasonable worker from bringing a claim.

THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah. All right.
And Mr. Rote's position is that was litigated at the arbitration?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: That wasn't, though. The things that he's written on this website, that was years after this arbitration.

MR. ROTE: The arbitrator's opinion and award with respect to that letter specifically addresses the letter and refusing to award anything.

I don't introduce the letter. I describe what our time in New Jersey with Judge Kugler was about, in my opinion, but $I$ don't reinforce the --

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I mean, I'll read you the passage.
(Reading) In my somewhat emotional way, I fired off a letter challenging why the -- the why of dismissing our case with prejudice.

It goes on to say, By this time $I$ wondered if Max was --

THE COURT: Slow down.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (Reading) I wondered by -- by this
time I wondered if Max was setting up private websites for these judges to watch their porn, how that would have worked, that a private website would be set up for the exclusive use only, content provided by the hosting person. And the only thing the judge would need to do is access the site with his login and ID. But I digress.

THE COURT: What -- that's a portion of the blog? MR. CHRISTIANSEN: That's the blog.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: The actual letter that went to the judge -- what's misrepresented there is when the letter goes to the judge, it actually says a number of things.
(Reading) Note that the plaintiff has been downloading video from a pedophile site. Is it possible that plaintiff has some contact with your clerk? Plaintiff clearly received a great gift from the court. We have to ask why. Plaintiff's girlfriend graduated from law school a few years ago and manufactured this case. Is it possible your clerk knows her and sought to assist in their effort?

This is all in the world now. So I think Mr. Rote's letter to the judge, the jury gets the whole picture. THE COURT: The blog part comes in. I don't have any problem with that. In fact, I think he wants the blog -MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Right.

THE COURT: -- in.

The question is whether the letter to the judge comes in.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yeah, and it's not just that. It's a printout from some Discovery Systems place, with "older muscled guy fucks young twink mpeg."

THE COURT: That's a letter to the judge?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: It's attached to the letter to the judge, yes.

THE COURT: Hang on to the letter.
The blog I don't have any problem you talking about. I don't know about the letter to the judge, so $I$ have to think about that part of it.

MR. ROTE: The attachment he's referring to is out of a forensic report by one of our forensic experts that discovered this on a 120-gig hard drive. So --

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I mean, that goes to the heart of our case, Your Honor. There's this person who's controlling his version of reality for the public as it relates to my client, his former employee. And the jury needs to see how he's misrepresenting this.

THE COURT: What does the forensic report show us?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: The alleged videos that are smearing -- that my client -- somehow attributing them to my client, and these are the videos that he's putting on a website for judges to view through improper contact with their
clerks.

MR. ROTE: That's a misinterpretation.
THE COURT: What is it from your perspective,

Mr. Rote?

MR. ROTE: The attachment to the letter was a couple of pages from the forensic report on the $120-g i g$ hard drive. We provided that forensic image to law enforcement. And with the letter, that forensic image or that couple of pages was provided as an attachment.

But, again, Mr. Zweizig filed a defamation case against us. It was -- against me. It was dismissed with prejudice. And he litigated this issue with the arbitrator, who refused specifically to award any damages.

So, again, to the extent the forensic reports or portions of the forensic reports they want to bring in, it's kind of consistent with what $I$ wanted to do, but we haven't -you know, it falls within that re-litigation point, and --

THE COURT: Were you planning on introducing forensic reports?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No, just this letter to the judge, which included, as an attachment, one of these many forensic reports.

THE COURT: So will the forensic reports be -- were they part of the letter to the judge, then?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: One page, a snippet from that
forensic report.
THE COURT: And you want the rest of the report in?
Is that what you're telling me?
MR. ROTE: Well, yes. To the extent that they're going to use a snippet, then $I$ would want the entire forensic report to come in.

THE COURT: Was the entire forensic report attached to the letter?

MR. ROTE: No, it was not.
THE COURT: And is your retaliation claim based on the blog or on the letter to a judge?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: It's based on the website. And our argument is this website contains false, disparaging, terrible things about my client. It misrepresents what actually happened.

THE COURT: So why is the letter to the judge relevant to that point?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Because it shows all of the omissions and misrepresentations about what's in the website. THE COURT: The letter to the judge does?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No, no -- yeah, the letter to the judge shows why that website is inaccurate, misleading, and, yeah, harmful to my client.

THE COURT: And what was your way of introducing the forensic report?

MR. ROTE: The forensic reports are discussed at length in the blog. I specifically, for example, discuss the 120-gig forensic report in the blog. It's one of the chapters.

THE COURT: The blog is coming in, so you'll get to talk about it in the blog.

MR. ROTE: Yeah.
And I've attached links in those chapters to the forensic reports. They're part of the media. It's part of the -- part of the blog.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROTE: So --
THE COURT: Yeah. I don't know about the reports themselves, but you get to discuss everything that's in the blog, because the blog is coming in.

MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: Hold off on the reports themselves. I
don't know that you have the right foundation to introduce the reports as a legal matter. Okay?

MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: But you get to discuss them. If it's in
the blog, you get to talk about them.
Do you understand?
MR. ROTE: I do.
THE COURT: Okay.

You subpoenaed somebody from the Oregon State Bar?
MR. ROTE: No. I only -- I only reached out to her, that based on correspondence between the two, Mr. Christiansen and Carol Bernick, that she should be prepared. I expected that Ms. Bernick would respond to Mr. Christiansen about that. And a good chunk of the blog is about -- about the relationship between the PLF and Mr. Christiansen and Linda Marshall. And $I$ go into great detail about, you know, attorney collusion with respect to these issues. And this was simply additional evidence that somehow she's, for some reason, wanting to be actively communicating with

Mr. Christiansen on this case.
So there are several components that -- for example, Mr. Christiansen has added the Complaint, in his exhibits, that $I$ filed in Clackamas County for defamation. And the PLF hired representation for Mr. Christiansen and Ms. Marshall. And in response to all of that, I subpoenaed documents from the U.S. Marshals Service.

So we get into this -- this big cycle of things that have been previously precluded, but yet he still is interested in -- in somehow offering a Complaint that $I$ filed against him and Linda Marshall for defamation. This is all this Judge Jones stuff that you had --

THE COURT: Said no.
MR. ROTE: -- said no about. He still has his
defamation Complaint that he's going to introduce.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll take that out. We don't need it.

THE COURT: Okay. That solves that.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: And, also, Your Honor, I told you we talked about that stipulated protective order. We'll take that out, too, and the Judge Jones transcript.

THE COURT: Okay. Does that solve your problem?
MR. ROTE: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
Then there's a bunch of other exhibits that were offered late. Honestly, exhibits were due a long time ago. I haven't looked at any new exhibits.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: So I received -- in Mr. Rote's rebuttal exhibits, he sent part of an e-mail thread between he and I, suggesting he's going to say that Mr. Zweizig hasn't mitigated his damages because Mr. Rote has offered to have Mr. Zweizig edit his website.

And I've reached out to Mr. Rote probably a dozen times now offering to meet with a third party to do that. And if we go down that road, I intend to offer those e-mails, saying that I've made that -- that offer in response.

THE COURT: Yeah, I don't want to hear about negotiations between you.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yeah.

THE COURT: That's not appropriate for the jury. MR. ROTE: Aren't the offers to mitigate appropriate? THE COURT: Offers of settlement are not appropriate --

MR. ROTE: No.
THE COURT: -- between the parties.
MR. ROTE: I understand. But to mitigate?
I mean, if I reached out and said, "What is it you want? In order to stop demanding us taking down the blog, what is it you need?," and I get no specific response, it seems to me like that is a credible point for the jury.

THE COURT: Yeah, I don't know about that one. This is all emotional distress and punitive damages.

And so you want to let the jury know that you made an offer, Mr. Rote, to take the blog down?

MR. ROTE: Not to take the blog down. But I asked them to tell me what it is that they needed from the blog. They had earlier demanded that I take the blog down in its entirety. But, you know, only 25 percent of it is really about Mr. Zweizig and the arbitration. A good chunk of it is about things that happened afterwards or his attorney.

So I had offered to say, you know, "What is it you need to -- for me to -- for us to resolve this?" In response, they have offered to go through alternative dispute resolution.

And my argument on that is that's -- that's just litigating in a different forum. It's not -- it's not a response to "Tell me specifically what it is you need." And they haven't told me what they needed. So --

THE COURT: Was this made before or after the lawsuit was filed?

MR. ROTE: It was made about a year after the lawsuit was filed.

THE COURT: All right. I'll think about that one as well.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Your Honor, I'd ask, if Mr. Rote does bring that -- that e-mail in, that my client at least be allowed to say, "I offered to sit down with a third party to talk about this."

My client's testimony will be "I didn't want to have anything to do with him. If I did, I wanted a third party there."

THE COURT: I understand.
I mean, he doesn't just get to do it one way. The whole conversation comes in.

All right. So on the offer to mitigate or take down a portion of the blog, hold off on that one, Mr. Rote. Let me think about that, whether that's actual mitigation in the context of this case or not. Again, this is emotional distress and punitive damages. It might be relevant to
punitive damages. I have to think about that.
As regards everything else, we've decided we're staying away from all of the things that have to do with the arbitration.

The Kugler materials having to do with some salacious allegations by Mr. Rote against Mr. Zweizig in the blog -everything in the blog is coming in. We've already decided that. The question, then, is whether or not there is an additional letter that was sent to a judge. I need to -- I'll take a look at that. I'm not sure that that's coming in.

And whether or not there are forensic reports that -Mr. Rote's position is that helps show what was in the blog is true?

MR. ROTE: Correct.
THE COURT: But if all materials in the blog are coming in anyway, and that includes references to the forensic reports, what else do you need?

MR. ROTE: I don't know that I need anything else. But if they're going to -- again, if they're going to introduce -- start introducing pages from the forensic reports or from a forensic report, then $I$ think that my argument is that whole forensic report should come in, because it's bigger than just that topic that they want to introduce. So --

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I will cross that bridge when we get there.

If you introduce the letter, I don't know what that's going to do about any additional reports or not.

Is there anything else that we needed to resolve this morning or do you all understand where we are?

From the plaintiff's perspective, Mr. Christiansen?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Rote, is there anything else we need to talk about?

MR. ROTE: Just one other exhibit related to, I think, this conversation that we just had.

The -- many of the forensic reports are already public. They're -- so part of the Complaint, argument in the Complaint, and, of course, originally the proposed media order was that we didn't have a right to have those in or that he was harmed by our publishing of those forensic reports.

If that component of his Complaint is now gone in terms of their argument, then -- then $I$ do understand it. To the extent that it comes in as an argument by reference, then I have an exhibit here that shows the -- that many of these forensic reports are already in the public space. They were filed with the motion to vacate in 2011, Exhibit 602 .

THE COURT: I'll take a look at it.

MR. ROTE: Okay.
One other exhibit, Your Honor, that $I$ had offered was Exhibit 599, which was the Secretary of state -- showing the
date of dissolution of Mr. Zweizig's employer, NDT. And that was -- that's Exhibit 599. And that exhibit shows that the company was administratively dissolved in April 30th, 2000 -or April of 2005 .

The blog was -- the first blog post was started after it was suspended as a corporation, before the administrative dissolution. And all subsequent blog posts were after his employer was administratively dissolved, and so the first blog post before, but after it was suspended, and the other 95 chapters all written after.

THE COURT: And that was in response to my point about his employment relationship?

MR. ROTE: That's correct.

THE COURT: You figured out that NDT actually was dissolved before the blog?

MR. ROTE: That's correct.

I think $I$ represented to you at the time that I thought it was just inactive. In fact, it had been administratively dissolved.

THE COURT: Okay. If you want to introduce that exhibit, you can.

Anything else?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Rote, you understand on those things where $I$ said $I$ don't want it coming in, that means you
don't mention it in opening statement, you don't raise it during cross-examination, unless you get permission from me because you feel that a door has been opened and you'd like to explore a particular area.

Do you understand?
MR. ROTE: I think so. Let me restate and make sure
I do.
In my opening statement, $I$ can talk about what I've written in the blog --

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ROTE: -- including making reference to forensic reports, but $I$ can't explain more than what I've talked about in the blog.

THE COURT: Correct.
MR. ROTE: I can if $I$, for example, talked a great deal about a forensic report. I can't, however, use the forensic report language specifically.

THE COURT: Anything that's in the blog, I will let you use --

MR. ROTE: Okay.
THE COURT: -- because the blog is coming in. I'm not limiting you in that way at all. But I don't want you referring to exhibits that aren't coming in, by way of example, because I've already ruled they're not coming in. MR. ROTE: Right.

So if I were to refer to that, $I$ would simply refer to the forensic report not as an exhibit that I discussed, but -- because some of the chapters, Your Honor, are actually the forensic reports and the 120-gig hard drive report and other things that are specific. And so if -- if during my opening statement $I$ talk about what $I$ discussed in detail in the blog --

THE COURT: That's okay.
MR. ROTE: -- I'll end up saying -- talking about the forensic reports.

THE COURT: And I'm okay with that.
Again, I don't want you referencing exhibits that aren't coming into evidence because I've ruled they're not coming in --

MR. ROTE: Okay.
THE COURT: -- or I've reserved ruling on that point.
MR. ROTE: Okay. I get it.
THE COURT: All right.
Go get the jury.
THE CLERK: I don't think they're ready yet.
THE COURT: The jury is not ready yet?
THE CLERK: They're going to message me when they're ready.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.
THE CLERK: Judge Mosman has a trial, too, so they're
seating theirs first.
THE COURT: Oh, okay. They're seating Mosman's case
first and then seating ours?
(The Court and the courtroom deputy confer off the record.)

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
(A recess is then taken.)
(The Court, counsel, the parties, and the panel of prospective jurors convene.)

THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.
THE CLERK: Your Honor, we're here today for a jury

## record.

 trial in the case of Zweizig versus Northwest Direct Teleservices, Inc., et al., Case No. 15-cv-2401.Do you want me to commence with calling the jury?
THE COURT: Members of the jury, I need eight of you today, so that means most of you are going home. And the way we do jury selection is we're going to put eight of you -- or 16 of you in the jury box right now, and we need to do it in a particular order.

So what's going to happen is Jennifer is going to call your names, and then you're going to be seated in the jury box. You will begin being seated by going to the back row to my left is where Juror No. 1 will be, through 8. And then Juror No. 9 will be in the front row, through 16.

And then we're going to put those of you in the back
in order as well. Okay?
Go ahead, Jennifer.
THE CLERK: Juror No. 1 is Kevin Ladd, L-a-d-d.
THE COURT: Come on up, Mr. Ladd.
THE CLERK: No. 2, Renee Cameron.
THE COURT: You can come up along the front. It's a little easier.

THE CLERK: No. 3, Kenneth Kauffman, $K-a-u-f-f-m-a-n$.
No. 4 --
THE COURT: Mr. Kauffman, you can enter from that side.

THE CLERK: -- Kenneth Harwood, H-a-r-w-o-o-d.
No. 5, Mark Youso, Y-o-u-s-o.
No. 6, Cameron Thiemann, T-h-i-e-m-a-n-n.
No. 7, Joann Parsell, P-a-r-s-e-l-l.
No. 8, Bret Walker, W-a-l-k-e-r.
No. 9, Erin Schaefer, S-c-h-a-e-f-e-r.
No. 10, Ronald Rutter, R-u-t-t-e-r.
No. 11, Timothy Ackley, A-c-k-l-e-y.
No. 12, James Bolin, B-o-l-i-n.
No. 13, Andrea Estrada, E-s-t-r-a-d-a.
No. 14, Stephen Thompson, T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n.
No. 15, Rachael Highton, H-i-g-h-t-o-n.
No. 16, Rachel Friedstrom, F-r-i-e-d-s-t-r-o-m.
And No. 17, Robert Taylor.

No. 18, David Erdt, E-r-d-t.
No. 19, Linda Wells, W-e-l-l-s.
No. 20, Brandon Fillis, F-i-l-l-i-s.
21, Karen Jones, J-o-n-e-s.
22, Michael Evans, E-v-a-n-s.
Actually, Ms. Jones --
THE COURT: That's okay, Jennifer. Let them be where they are. That will work.

THE CLERK: Okay.
Ann Hart, $H-a-r-t$.
Eric Payne, $P-a-y-n-e$.
Daniel Wagner, $W-a-g-n-e-r, ~ o r ~ D a n i e l l e . ~$
Raymond Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n.
THE COURT: Move down to the last row, towards the left side of the room.

THE CLERK: And No. 27, Carol Gossett, G-o-s-s-e-t-t.
THE COURT: Members of the jury, the parties want to get to the place in the process where we get to talk to you about your qualifications to act as jurors in this specific case. The way that works is I ask you a bunch of questions and you answer the bunch of questions, and they get to know a little bit about you and then exercise challenges.

But before your questions, you must take an oath to answer the questions truthfully. So I need all of the potential jurors at this time to stand up, all of you, please,
raise a hand, and take an oath.
(The panel of prospective jurors is then sworn.)
THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.
We are selecting a jury for the case of Zweizig versus Northwest Direct Teleservices, Incorporated, et al. My name is Marco Hernandez. This is Jennifer Paget. Jennifer is my courtroom deputy and acts as the bailiff in this case, which means she takes care of you. She swears witnesses and takes control over the exhibits which are introduced into evidence.

The plaintiff this morning, Mr. Zweizig, is being represented by Joel Christiansen.

You can introduce yourselves. Go ahead and stand up and tell everybody who you are.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Hi. I'm Joel Christiansen, and I represent Max Zweizig.

THE PLAINTIFF: Hi. I'm Max Zweizig.
THE COURT: Be seated.
The defendant, Mr. Rote, is representing himself.
MR. ROTE: My name is Tim Rote, and I am one of the defendants in this action.

THE COURT: Your job as jurors is to apply the facts to the law which I will give to you.

This is a civil case. It's not a criminal case. You may have seen criminal cases on television or in the movies.

And you know that in a criminal case, the prosecutor must prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Civil cases are different. In civil cases the party who has to prove something only has to prove it by a preponderance of the evidence or that it's more likely true than not true.

In a few minutes I'm going to be asking you some questions. The purpose of the questions is not to argue the case or embarrass you, but, rather, to determine your qualifications to act as jurors in this case. Please respond to my questions honestly and sincerely. If you do not understand a question, ask me to repeat it or to ask it in another way.

Since you are in an unfamiliar setting among strangers, it might be a little uncomfortable for you to be completely open and honest in your answers to my questions. The process requires you to overcome that discomfort and do your best to be open, honest, and complete when you answer questions. It's extremely important, and the fairness of the trial depends on it.

If you're asked a question that involves something you consider very sensitive or private, please tell us so. I do not anticipate that happening during the course of my questioning this morning in this type of a case.

In the event that that does happen, however, I can
arrange for you -- to receive your questions outside the presence of the other jurors.

When the questioning is completed, the lawyers or parties will be allowed to exercise challenges. If you're not selected for this jury, please do not feel that your attendance has been without value. We need a substantial pool of potential jurors so that an impartial panel can be selected. And all of you who are here today provide an important contribution to this process. Your presence assures fairness.

Before we get to my more specific questions, I want to provide or have each of you provide some biographical information by answering the questions that appear on the screen. For those of you that can't see the screen, we'll give you a little piece of paper that has the exact same information on it that you can look at.

By the time we get to those of you in the back, you will have memorized the points and you won't need the screen in any event, but we'll give you a piece of paper anyhow so you feel more comfortable.

After we get this biographical information, I will ask you some questions that are more specific about this case. And then after that, we will move on to taking challenges.

With that, if you look at the screens there in front of you on your display, there should be on there biographical
points. I don't know if they're really questions. And if you would -- we're just going to go down the row.

And we'll start with you. You happen to be in chair
No. 1, Mr. Ladd, so we'll start with you. And we'll just go down the row, and just briefly, Reader's Digest version of the points that are on there, so that the parties can learn a little bit about you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: My name is Kevin Ladd. I live in Astoria or near Astoria, Oregon. My wife and my mother-in-law lives with me.

My occupation is $I$ work retail, marine and industrial. I have an associate's degree. My wife has had a little bit of college experience. My mother-in-law is retired.

I belong to Viking Nordic Scandia dancers. I'm one of the instructors. That's one of my hobbies. I also like to hunt. I like shooting.

And, yes, I have appeared as a juror about 30 years ago.

THE COURT: Is there anything about your experience 30 years ago that left you any questions about the justice system, whether it's good, bad, neutral about it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: No. It was interesting.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Next.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: My name is Renee Cameron.
I live in Irvington with my husband. We -- let's see. I am a -- strategic planning is my occupation. He's the director of a nonprofit.

Let's see. I have a bachelor's and an MBA in marketing. I belong to a gym and am involved with a -- CHAP, Children's Healing Art Project, so not really something I belong to, but am involved with, that organization.

I enjoy travel, reading, gardening, and painting.
I've been a witness, but never a juror or a party.
THE COURT: How long ago were you a witness?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: Fifteen years.
THE COURT: Do you remember what type of case it was?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: It was -- there was -- I think it was civil. There was a traffic accident, and I witnessed the traffic accident.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that experience that left you a bad taste in your mouth about the justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 2: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: My name is Kenneth
Kauffman. I live south of Canby, in Clackamas County. I live with my wife. We are both retired. She was a registered nurse. I was an environmental health specialist. I worked
for the State of Oregon for 40 years.
We don't have any other living companions. I'm not a member of any clubs. I'm a member of our local church. I'm a hobby locksmith. I also like to build things out of steel. I weld.

I've been in court quite a lot because of my work with the State of Oregon, as a witness. And I actually was party to a lawsuit.

THE COURT: What did you do with the State of Oregon? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: I worked for the Oregon Health Authority in environmental health. We did a lot of inspection work, licensing.

THE COURT: And you said you were in court a lot. What type of cases were you in court a lot?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: The health division cases had to do with license suspension, license denials, those kinds of cases.

THE COURT: So those weren't -- not this kind of court. That's more of an administrative setting; is that correct?.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: They were often in circuit courts.

THE COURT: Oh, they were?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Yes. There were administrative hearings as well.

THE COURT: Okay. So when was the last time you were in Circuit Court as a result of something with the Oregon Health Authority?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Oh, my goodness. It was probably -- it would have probably been in the eighties.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about your experiences in court, whether as a witness or as a party to a case, that would cause you difficulty in being neutral in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: No.
THE COURT: You said you were a party in a case as well. How long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: That would have been in the early seventies.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: You have me listed at Kenneth Harwood, but I go by my middle name, Wesley, preferred.

Area of residence, I'm in Happy Valley, and I live with my wife, the only other person in our household at this time. We both work at Portland Community College. I'm an education coordinator, continuing education programs for health care. She is a job specialist at the college. We both have our master's degree in adult education.

The organizations I belong to, I'm affiliated with
the National Association of Nutrition Professionals, because that's one of my passions is food and cooking and nutrition. My other hobbies include golf. And I'm teaching myself the guitar, and so I'm a very early musician of interest.

Have I ever been involved in court proceedings? Well, $I$ was a witness 40 years ago in a case in -- I believe it was Circuit Court in Oregon City. I was a grand jury member in Circuit Court a couple years ago in Clackamas County as well. And $I$ was a successful litigant in a case, oh, probably 15 years ago against a private party.

THE COURT: What kind of a case was it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: It was regarding a piece of property that it was falsely represented to us that he owned it, and we ended up in court over that. It was a non-jury situation.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about your experiences with the court system that would cause you difficulty in being neutral in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Not at all.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 5: Hello. My name is Mark Youso, and I live out in Hillsboro. I'm residing with a girlfriend, and she's a medical assistant.

And what $I$ do for a living is, since $I$ was in my twenties, is owning an apartment complex, so I guess it would
be real estate investor, mainly in rentals. Let's see. Oh, I live with my Labrador retriever.

What organizations do $I$ belong to? No organizations.
I do play the guitar.
And I have been a juror. I was picked as a juror in Washington County around two years ago, and it was a criminal case, sexually -- sexual abuse type of a case.

THE COURT: Anything about your experience with the criminal justice system that would cause you difficulty being neutral in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 5: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience that left a bad taste in your mouth one way or another?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 5: No. It was enlightening. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 6: I'm Cameron Thiemann. I
live in Newberg, Oregon, with my parents. I don't have a job. I'm a student at Oregon state University. My parents are an IT specialist for Providence and my dad is a salesman.

I do not belong to any organizations or clubs.
Hobbies, I like to play sports with my free time.
And I have never appeared in a court before. THE COURT: Are you missing school to be here? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 6: Yeah, THE COURT: Do you have school tomorrow?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 6: Yeah.
THE COURT: I don't want you to miss college, so I'm going to excuse you so that you can go back to school and do well.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 6: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right.
I take it they don't need him downstairs.
THE CLERK: They do want him to return.
THE COURT: Okay. So there is another trial
downstairs. You might not find a judge that thinks as much about education as I do.

Go to college. Do well. Go downstairs. Return down there. There's another trial.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 7: Hi. I'm Joann Parsell, and I live in Oregon City with my husband. And I'm a special education instructional assistant, and my husband is a tooling technician for a local company. I have an associate's degree plus, and my husband has some college.

I don't -- I'm not involved in any clubs or organizations. I love to read and garden and crochet and things like that and walk.

I have served on a jury four times, and it's always been a positive experience.

THE COURT: How long ago was the last one?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 7: Probably five years ago.

THE COURT: Do you remember what type of a case it was?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 7: It was a -- well, it was, I assume, a civil case. It dealt with a father being able to see his children.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 8: Hi. My name is Bret Walker. I live in outer Northeast Portland. I live with my daughter. I'm a schoolteacher at David Douglas.

I'm a member of the United States Tennis Association. I like to play golf and all water sports, snowboard.

I've never appeared either as a witness, a juror, or
a party.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 9: Hi. I'm Erin Schaefer. I live in Sherwood. I live with my husband, two daughters, and a son. I am -- work in food service at an elementary school. My husband is a project manager in IT for Nike. I have an associate's degree. My husband has a bachelor's degree and is an Army and National Guard veteran.

I don't belong to any clubs or organizations. I enjoy reading and watching my children's sports activities. And I've never appeared in a court proceeding. THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: Ron Rutter. Inner East

Burnside. I live alone. I'm a carpenter. I finished high school. No organizations or clubs. I like to read and go to movies.

And I've been a juror a couple of different times. THE COURT: When was the last time you were a juror? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: Last time was Multnomah County back in '07 or '08.

THE COURT: Anything about your experiences that would cause you difficulty being neutral in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 10: No, sir. THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 11: My name is Timothy Ackley.
I live over by Mt. Tabor with my wife and five-year-old daughter. I have my own construction business, with four employees.

I don't belong to any clubs or organizations. We do a lot of family camping in the summertime.

I have never appeared in court.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 12: My name is James Bolin. I live in Tigard with my wife. I'm an aircraft mechanic. My wife is an administrator at a hospital. I have some college and vocational training; my wife, some college.

I'm a union member for my job. I belong to a car club. I enjoy car clubs and RC boats.

I've been a witness in a court case.
THE COURT: How long ago were you a witness?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 12: Forty-six years ago.
THE COURT: All right. Anything about any of your
experiences that would cause you difficulty being neutral -PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 12: No.

THE COURT: -- in this case?
Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 13: I'm Andrea Estrada, and I
live in Northeast Portland. I have a roommate and her son that lives with me. We both work in energy efficiency consulting. I have some college.

I don't belong to any clubs. I do like to run and exercise and crafts at home.

And I've never appeared in court.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: I'm Steve Thompson. I live in Lake Oswego with my wife, Vicky. She is retired, was a property manager when she retired about 20 years ago. I'm a lawyer here in Portland. I have a bachelor's degree in economics, as does my wife. And I have a J.D. degree.

Organizations, obviously I belong to the Oregon State Bar, the Washington State Bar, the bar of this court, the bar of the Western District of Washington and the Eastern District of Washington, the Ninth Circuit. I'm also a member of the

Panner Inn of Court.
Hobbies, I ski, both snow and water. I ride bikes, mountain and road. I windsurf in the Gorge in the summer. And I'm a helicopter pilot.

I have never been a witness and $I$ have never been a juror. I have been a party to litigation, but I have never appeared in a court proceeding in connection with my party status.

THE COURT: What kind of law work do you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: Primarily, Your Honor, I represent injured railroad workers against the railroads under the Federal Employers Liability Act. I have done some other work, including grade crossing collisions, aviation, some Jones Act work. And I've also done some business fraud cases and some medical malpractice.

THE COURT: Have you ever done any employment work? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: In this connection, I've tried several Railway Labor Act cases with respect to my railroad employees against the railroad, under the Railway Labor Act, which is a pretty narrow focus.

THE COURT: Have you ever done any whistleblower claims or anything like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: Yes, sir. Under the Federal Railroad Safety Act, I have done a number of whistleblower claims.

THE COURT: Have you done any retaliation claims as well --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: Yes.
THE COURT: -- on the whistle blowing?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. $14:$ Yes.
THE COURT: Is there anything about your experience
that would cause you to be -- cause you difficulty in being neutral in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: I don't know anything about the case. I don't really believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll talk about the case and what its nature is a little bit more.

This is a claim of employer retaliation. So if you know that much about the case, is there anything about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: No.
I think it's -- I think it's probably important for
the Court and both the parties to know that, obviously, I primarily do plaintiffs' work --

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: -- and I have in respect to those retaliation claims. But I don't think that that's going to impact my judgment in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 15: My name is Rachael

Highton. I live in Northeast Portland, and I live with my husband and 14-year-old son. I am a pharmacist, and my husband is a real estate broker. And we both have bachelor's degrees, and I have a doctor of pharmacy.

I don't belong to any organizations or clubs. I enjoy gardening and watching and playing soccer.

And I appeared as a juror in Multnomah County court a little less than two years ago.

THE COURT: What kind of a case was it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 15: It was a criminal case, a trespassing claim.

THE COURT: Anything about any of your experience that would cause you difficulty being neutral in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 15: No. THE COURT: Thank you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 16: My name is Rachel Friedstrom. I live in Northwest Portland. My husband and daughter reside with me. My husband is a maintenance technician. We have some college.

We do not belong to any clubs. I enjoy cooking and reading.

And I have served on a grand jury. THE COURT: How long ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 16: About 10 years ago. THE COURT: All right. Anything about your
experiences that would cause you difficulty being neutral in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 16: No.
THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 17: My name is Robert Taylor.
I live in Southwest Portland. I am currently living with my mom, my brother, and my girlfriend. As for my occupation, I'm a test associate. My brother is a software developer. My mom is a writer, editor. And my girlfriend works at the YMCA with organizing activities for children.

For education, my brother and I have a bachelor of science in computer science. My mom has a master's in writing. My girlfriend has a little bit of college.

Organizations and clubs, none currently. Hobbies, activities, competitive gaming, streaming, and programming.

As far as appearing in court, have not.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 18: My name is David Erdt, and I live out in Scholls, Oregon. I live with my wife and three children. My wife has a bachelor's in business and child development, and I have an associate of science. I currently work at UPS as their tech support group.

I don't belong to any organizations. My hobbies are Legos, computer gaming, and Facebook programming.

And I've never appeared in court before.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 19: My name is Linda Wells, and I live in Southwest Portland with my husband. We are both retired. We both have bachelor's degrees, mine in social sciences, and my husband's was in mathematics. I worked for the State of Oregon in the Department -- for the Department of Human Resources. My husband was a software engineer.

I belong to a church. I enjoy reading, travel, walking.

I have been a juror in a civil case, and I also served on a grand jury in Multnomah County.

THE COURT: How long was your jury experience?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 19: Oh, probably both of them at least 20 years ago.

THE COURT: Okay.
Keep going. Anything else?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 19: No. I don't think so.
THE COURT: You said that you worked with the
Department of --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 19: The Department of Human Services, the Oregon State Department of Human Services -- or Human Resources, excuse me. I was a vocational rehabilitation counselor.

THE COURT: Okay. And that job never brought you into the court system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 19: No. Only sometimes, not -- not this kind of court. I mean, they were administrative law court perhaps, but not --

THE COURT: How often did you go into the
administrative law --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 19: Oh, not very many times.
THE COURT: Okay. Anything about your experiences that would cause you difficulty being neutral in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 19: No. THE COURT: Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 20: My name is Brandon Fillis.
I live in Tualatin. I live with my parents. I'm going to school at PCC right now and have a job at Fred Meyer.

My hobbies, I have a membership to LA Fitness, and I play video games and teach a class at my church.

And I've never been a juror, witness, or a party. THE COURT: Thank you.

Let's stop there. Just hang on to the microphone.
I don't think we're going to get any deeper into the jury pool. So it's not that $I$ don't want to hear about all of you, but $I$ want to save a little bit of time and try to get everybody on their way as quickly as possible. So let's just stop there for the time being. If we get that deep, then I'll have you introduce yourselves.

We're going to move to now some more questions about
the case itself. So the first question $I$ have at this point is whether any of you know any of the parties in this case, if you think you might recognize them. And, if so, please raise a hand.

The lawyers -- and if you wouldn't mind getting your witness lists together, I'm going to have you tell us, tell the jury who your potential witnesses are.

I want you to listen to the names of the potential witnesses, and I'm going to ask the same question: Do you think you might know those people or recognize their names?

I'll start with the plaintiff. Who are your possible witnesses?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Our possible witness is Mr. Max Zweizig.

THE COURT: And for the defense?

MR. ROTE: Just myself, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Oh, okay. So we've already answered that question. We can move on.

This case involves the following: The plaintiff in this case is Mr. Zweizig, and the defendant is Mr. Rote.

The following are business entities that are related to the case: Northwest Direct Teleservices, Incorporated; Northwest Direct Marketing of Oregon, Incorporated; Northwest Direct Marketing, Incorporated, a Delaware for-profit corporation; Northwest Direct of Iowa, Incorporated; Northwest

Direct Marketing, Incorporated, an Oregon for-profit corporation; and Rote Enterprises, LLC.

Have any of you heard of those entities or had any relationship with those entities? If so, please raise a hand.

The liability of the business entities is not a part of this trial. The plaintiff claims that the defendant, Mr. Rote, aided and abetted the business entities in retaliating against the plaintiff, in violation of state law.

Is there anything about the nature of the claim that would cause any of the potential jurors difficulty in being neutral in this case? If so, please raise a hand.

Have any of you --
THE COURT REPORTER: Judge, there's a hand.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Sir?
Can you say your name first, please.
And pass the microphone back.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 22: Michael Evans.
THE COURT: Sure. Mr. Evans, tell me.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 22: Well, I mean, I just have a -- kind of a bias against employers, just straight up against employers.

So if it's like a -- if it's like a beef between an employer and an employee, I'm automatically siding with the employee, like, every single time, not -- you know, I'm just saying that that's what happens in my head.

THE COURT: Yeah.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 22: When I heard it was against -- it was like an employer against an employee, then I'm already very, very biased against the employer.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we don't really want a biased jury, so I'll go ahead and excuse you at this juncture. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 22: Okay.

THE COURT: You can go downstairs there where you were before on the second floor. There is another jury waiting for you. I don't think it has the same topic, so it might be a better fit for you.

Thank you very much for your honesty. I appreciate it.

Anybody else?
Have any of the potential jurors heard or read about this case? If so, please raise a hand.

This case is going to take two days to try. We should be done by tomorrow. When I say we're going to be done, that means that the jury will begin their deliberations by tomorrow. I don't control how long deliberations take. That's entirely up to the jury.

Does the fact that we're going until tomorrow create any particular problems for anybody? If so, please raise a hand.

Hang on a second. Let me start with the people in
the box.
After I tell them, now everybody is going to keep their hands down.

Back row. Start with the back row, please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Actually, I don't have
tomorrow, but --
THE COURT: Can you say your name, please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: Oh, I'm sorry. Kenneth
Wesley Harwood.
I don't have tomorrow as a problem, but my wife just found out she has a surgical appointment on Thursday that I need to take her to. So if it goes any longer than tomorrow, then I have an issue.

THE COURT: The jury will be deliberating tomorrow.
Again, I don't know how long they will deliberate for.
I'm going to hang on to you right now, okay?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 4: That's fine.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: Your Honor, more as a precaution -- Steve Thompson -- I have initial disclosures due in the District Court of Idaho on Friday. And, more importantly, I have an oral argument before Judge Rice in the Eastern District of Washington on Monday on a very important matter that is potentially case dispositive.

THE COURT: You'll be done by Monday. There's no way
that we'll be --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: That's what I thought, but I thought I'd, in an abundance of caution --

THE COURT: All right. And as far as your disclosures, I'm going to hang on to you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: They're pretty easy in this particular matter.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 14: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anybody else?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 20: I'd be missing two days of community college to participate in this.

THE COURT: Oh, you're in community college? I'm sorry. I missed that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 20: Yeah, Portland Community. THE COURT: Yeah, we'll go ahead and excuse you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 20: Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Yeah. Good luck with your schooling.
Anybody else?
Although I think you'd learn a lot more here.
We already spoke about prior jury experience. Have any of you been involved in a lawsuit, in particular -- well, let's just start there. Anybody been involved in a lawsuit before? Some of you have raised your hands.

All right. In the back.

Any of you that raised your hands, have you ever been involved in a lawsuit that involves employment, whistle blowing, that kind of an issue? If so, please raise your hand.

There's a hand up here.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: This doesn't involve whistle blowing, but $I$ was fired by the County commissioners of Lincoln County in the seventies, and $I$ sued them in federal court because I claimed they had no cause and provided no due process.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience that would cause you difficulty being neutral in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: Not that $I$ can think of. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Anybody else?
There's a hand in front.

THE COURT REPORTER: Would you state your name first. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 12: James Bolin.

It wasn't a court case, but it was a union arbitration about employment.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that experience that causes you difficulty --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 12: No, sir. THE COURT: -- being neutral? PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 12: No.

THE COURT: All right. And I think there was a hand way in the back.

Yeah, we're never going to get to you. If you want to tell your story, you can feel free to let us know.

Say your name first.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 27: I'm (inaudible.)
THE COURT REPORTER: And I'm sorry. Wait for the microphone. I can't hear you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 27: Carol Gossett.
I owned a business for 27 years, and I had a contract dispute with a -- with a client, and so we went to court over that.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Somebody talked about arbitration, and one of the issues in this case that is going to be litigated is, in fact, about arbitration.

Have any of you been involved in arbitration before? I know we've already spoken to one. Anybody else been involved in arbitration before? If so, please raise a hand.

For those of you that raised your hand on arbitration, is there anything about your experience in arbitration that would cause you difficulty being neutral in this particular case? If so, please raise a hand.

This case also involves a blog. I don't blog, so I'm not really that savvy about what blogs are, other than $I$ think
they're communications on social media that is available for pretty much anybody in the public to view.

The alleged retaliation took place on a blog. Is there anything about the fact that $a \operatorname{blog}$ is involved in this particular case that causes you difficulty being neutral in this case? If so, please raise a hand.

Have any of you ever been in a position where someone has written something unfavorable about you in a blog? If so, please raise a hand.

One of your jobs as jurors, should you be chosen to sit in this particular case, is that you will be required to make a decision based on the evidence and only on the evidence, not on any experience outside. This is a contained setting, and you need to decide it based on the evidence and the law that $I$ give you.

Is there anybody that has difficulty with that notion? If so, please raise a hand.

Is there anybody that has difficulty with the notion that you must follow the law, whether you agree with it or not? If you have trouble with that idea, please raise a hand.

Having heard a little bit about what the case is about, kind of reflecting now, is there anybody sitting as potential jurors at this time that would have difficulty being neutral and fair in this case? And, if so, please raise a hand.

I'm going to take a minute just to confer with the lawyers for a minute, and then we'll get back to talking to you.

Come on up over here, please.
(The Court, counsel, and Mr. Rote confer off the record.)

THE COURT: Are there any challenges for cause on the part of the plaintiff?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: For the defense?
MR. ROTE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then you may exercise your peremptory challenges. Jennifer will be over to visit with you.

This is the part of the process where we just look at each other while they're exercising their challenges.
(The challenges are then taken.)
THE COURT: She's just going to double-check, to make sure you agree with our selection.
(There is a brief pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: I'm going to read eight names. If I read your name, please stand up.

Kevin Ladd, Renee Cameron, Wesley Harwood, Joann Parsell, Bret Walker, Ronald Rutter, James Bolin, Andrea Estrada.

I need for you to raise a hand and take an oath.
(The jury is then sworn.)
THE COURT: Please be seated.
For the rest of you, your service in this courtroom is complete. I know that there's another trial going on somewhere else, and I don't know what's going on with that one, but they still haven't selected their jury. So I need you to go ahead and go back down to the second floor jury assembly room and see what happens next.

Thank you for your service. Thank you so much.
(The remaining prospective jurors leave the courtroom.)

THE COURT: So those of you in the front row, slide on down. Those of you in the back row, slide on down, except for we're going to want -- yeah, come on down to the front. One of you comes up to the front row, so we have four and four. And the idea is $I$ want you to be as close as you can to the people that are testifying.

Note where you are seated. We're going to take a 10 -minute or so, 12 -minute recess at this time.

When you come back, I will give you what's called the preliminary precautionary instructions. We'll do opening statements, and we will begin the trial. So things are going to move quickly after now.

So Jennifer will escort you into the jury room. She'll show you where your home base is, and I'll see you in
just about 10 or 15 minutes.
(The jury leaves the courtroom.)
THE COURT: We are in recess for 15 minutes. Thank you.
(A recess is then taken.)
(The Court, counsel, the parties, and the jury reconvene.)

THE COURT: You are now the jury in the case, and I want to take a few minutes to tell you something about your duties as jurors and give you some instructions. At the end of the trial, $I$ will give you more detailed instructions. Those instructions will control your deliberations.

It's your duty to decide what the facts are from the evidence. You, and you alone, are the judges of the facts. You will hear the evidence, decide the facts, and then apply those facts to the law which I will give you. And that is how you will reach your verdict. In doing so, you must follow the law, whether you agree with it or not.

The evidence will consist of the testimony of witnesses, documents and other things received into evidence as exhibits and any facts on which the parties agree or which I instruct you to accept.

You should not take anything $I$ say or do during the trial as indicating what $I$ think of the evidence or what your verdict should be.

The following things are not evidence and you must not consider them as evidence in deciding the facts in this case.

Statements and arguments by the parties are not evidence. Questions and objections are not evidence. Testimony that $I$ tell you to disregard, not evidence, and anything you may have seen or heard when the court is not in session.

Do not communicate any private or special knowledge about any of the facts of this case to your fellow jurors. Decide the case only on the evidence received here in court.

Some evidence may be admitted for a limited purpose only. When $I$ instruct you that some evidence is admitted for a limited purpose, you must consider it only for that limited purpose.

Evidence may be direct or circumstantial. Direct evidence is testimony by a witness about what that witness personally saw or heard or did. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence; that is, it is proof of one or more facts from which one can find another fact. You are to consider both direct and circumstantial evidence. The law permits you to give equal weight to both, but it is for you to decide how much weight to give any evidence.

There are rules of evidence which control what can be received into evidence. When a lawyer asks a question or
offers an exhibit into evidence and the other party or lawyer on the other side thinks that it is not permitted by the rules of evidence, the other side may object.

If I overrule the objection, the question may be answered or the exhibit received. If I sustain the objection, the question cannot be answered and the exhibit cannot be received. Whenever I sustain an objection to a question, ignore the question and do not guess what the answer would have been.

Sometime I may order that evidence be stricken from the record and that you disregard or ignore the evidence. That means when you're deciding the case, you must not consider the evidence which I told you to disregard.

In deciding the facts of this case, you may have to decide which testimony to believe and which testimony not to believe. You may believe everything a witness says or part of it or none of it.

In considering the testimony of any witness, you may take into account the opportunity and ability of the witness to see or hear or know the things testified to; the witness's memory; the witness's manner while testifying; the witness's interest in the outcome of the case, if any; the witness's bias or prejudice, if any; whether other evidence contradicted the witness's testimony; the reasonableness of the witness's testimony in light of all the evidence; and any factors
that -- any other factors that bear on believability.

The weight of the evidence as to a fact does not necessarily depend on the number of witnesses who testify. You're to weigh evidence, not count witnesses.

From time to time during the trial, it may be necessary for me to talk to the parties outside the hearing of the jury by having a conference at the bench when you're present in the courtroom or by calling a recess.

Please understand that while you're waiting, we're working. The purpose of the conferences is not to keep relevant information from you, but to decide how certain evidence is to be treated under the rules of evidence and avoid confusion and error.

We will, of course, do what we can to keep the number and length of these conferences to a minimum. I may not always grant a request for a conference. Do not consider my granting or denying a request for a conference as any indication of my opinion of the case or what your verdict should be.

Regarding your conduct as jurors, keep an open mind throughout the trial. Do not decide what the verdict should be until you and your fellow jurors have completed your deliberations at the end of the trial.

Second, because you must decide the case based only on the evidence received in the case and on my instructions as
to the law that applies, you must not be exposed to any other information about the case or to the issues it involves during the course of your jury deliberations.

Thus, until the end of the case, unless I tell you otherwise, do not communicate with anyone in any way and do not let anyone else communicate with you in any way about the merits of the case or anything to do with it.

This includes discussing the case in person, in writing, by phone or other electronic means, by e-mail, text message, Internet chat room, blog, website, or other feature.

This applies to communicating with your fellow jurors until I give you the case for deliberation and it applies to communicating with everyone else, including your family members or your employer or the media, press, and people involved in the trial.

Although you can tell your family and your employer that you've been selected to be seated as a juror in the case, if you are asked or approached in any way about your jury service or anything about the case, you must respond that you've been ordered not to discuss the matter and report such contact to the Court.

Because you will receive all of the evidence and legal instructions you properly may consider to return a verdict here in court, do not read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case or
anything to do with it.
Do not do any research, such as consulting dictionaries, searching the Internet, or using other reference materials. Do not make any investigation or in any other way try to learn about the case on your own.

The law requires these restrictions to ensure that the parties have a fair trial based on the same evidence that each party has had an opportunity to address. And if you violate these restrictions, that jeopardizes the fairness of these proceedings. If any juror is exposed to outside information, please notify the Court.

At the end of the trial, you will have to make your decision based on what you recall of the evidence. Although you will have all the exhibits which have been admitted with you in the jury room, you will not have a written transcript to refer to, so I urge you to pay close attention to testimony as it's given.

If you wish, you may take notes to help you remember what a witness said. If you do take notes, keep them to yourself until you and your fellow jurors go to the jury room to decide the case. Do not let your note-taking distract you from hearing answers or watching witnesses. It's important that you watch witnesses, as their appearance may assist you in deciding whether you believe their testimony and how much weight to give their testimony.

When you leave at night, your notes should be left in the jury room.

If you do not take notes, you should rely on your own memory of what was said and not be overly influenced by the notes of other jurors.

If at any time you cannot clearly hear what the witness or a lawyer or party says or you can't see the documents that are on the evidence presentation system, please speak up and let the Court know that.

If you need to communicate with me in other circumstances, you simply give a signed note to Jennifer, and she'll give it to me.

In a few moments we're going to have -- start the trial. Each side may make an opening statement. An opening statement is not evidence. It's simply an outline to help you understand what that party expects the evidence will show. By the way, a party is not required to give an opening statement.

The plaintiff will then present his evidence, and counsel for the defendant may cross-examine -- or the defendant may cross-examine. Following plaintiff's case, the defendant may present evidence and the plaintiff's counsel may cross-examine.

After all the evidence has been presented, the attorneys are going to make closing arguments to summarize and interpret the evidence for you. I'll then instruct you on the
law, and you'll return to deliberate.
The plaintiff in this case is Max Zweizig. The defendant is Timothy Rote. We've talked about the business entities involved in this particular case. The liability of the business entities is not part of this case.

The plaintiff claims that the defendant aided and abetted the business entities in retaliating against the plaintiff in violation of state law, by publishing disparaging statements about the plaintiff on the Internet because the plaintiff previously enforced his employment-related rights.

The plaintiff has the burden of proving these claims by preponderance of the evidence. The defendant denies those claims and contends that the publications at issue in this case were not retaliatory, but rather were a private citizen's account of the justice system.

The plaintiff seeks damages against the defendant for aiding and abetting the business entities in retaliating against the plaintiff. To prove retaliation, the plaintiff has the burden of proving each of the following elements by a preponderance of the evidence: one, that the plaintiff engaged in or was engaging in an activity protected under state law; two, that the business entity subjected the plaintiff to an adverse employment action; and, three, that the plaintiff was subjected to the adverse employment action because of his participation in the protected activity.

An action is an adverse employment action if a reasonable employee would have found the action materially adverse, which means it might have dissuaded a reasonable worker from making or supporting a charge of whistleblower retaliation.

A plaintiff is subjected to an adverse employment action because of his participation in protected activity if he knows that an unlawful motive was a substantial factor in the adverse employment action or, in other words, that the plaintiff would have been treated differently in the absence of an unlawful motive.

The plaintiff seeks damages against defendant for aiding and abetting an unlawful employment practice. The plaintiff has the burden of proving each of the following elements by a preponderance of the evidence in addition to proving the retaliation claim: one, that the defendant aided, abetted, incited, compelled, or coerced retaliation by the business entities against the plaintiff; and, two, the defendant acted outside the scope of his employment with any of the business entities, i.e., not for the benefit of the businesses.

In determining whether a defendant acted outside the scope of his employment, relevant factors include whether the act occurred substantially within the time and space limits authorized by employment and whether the acts -- the act is of
a kind which the employee was hired to perform.
I will give you copies of those last couple of jury instructions, because it kind of tells you what it is you need to be listening for during the course of this trial. I'll give them to you during the break.

Please understand that the instructions may change a little bit at the end of the trial, and it is the instructions at the end of the trial which will control your deliberations.

With that, opening statement for the plaintiff.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
Fourteen years. It's been 14 years. And my client, Mr. Zweizig, wants to move on with his life.

As the judge has instructed you, this is an employment retaliation case. And what you'll learn today is that the employer involved in this case is a business called Northwest Direct -- it's a series of businesses, but I'll call them Northwest Direct today -- and its owner, Mr. Timothy Rote. Mr. Rote, you'll hear, owned Northwest Direct and was actively involved in running the business. It was his business.

Northwest Direct was in the business of telemarketing. They ran call centers in Beaverton, Eugene, Iowa. And they had plans to outsource to call centers in the Dominican Republic. And they employed about 150 to 175
employees, who made outbound telemarketing calls. These are folks who sit at the desk, pick up the call when it tells them to make the call, and make sales.

You'll hear that the company made millions of dollars and, on the testimony here from Mr. Rote and what he's written, a \$100,000-per-week business.

Mr. Zweizig worked for Northwest Direct. He's the plaintiff in this case. And he worked for them a long time ago. He started -- Mr. Zweizig is from New Jersey, just across the Delaware River from Philadelphia. And he found the job through a friend, who connected him, and he went to work as their director of IT. He was in charge of all of their computers and writing the scripts that would import some of the call logs and get the business to do what it needed to do. And he went to work in 2001 and worked there until November of 2003.

And what you'll find out is that toward the end of his employment, Mr. Zweizig came across some information that suggested that Northwest Direct was fraudulently overbilling clients. And after consulting with an attorney, he made a report to the Oregon Department of Justice and to the Lane County District Attorney's Office. And because of that, he was -- he lost his job.

Now, that, what $I$ just told you, is not going to be a dispute in this case. And as you'll hear, this case -- that
part of it is already done. Mr. Zweizig filed a Complaint in New Jersey; and as a result of an arbitration agreement he signed in his employment contract, that case came back here to Oregon in a private arbitration.

At that arbitration, Mr. Zweizig was represented by a different attorney. Her name is Ms. Linda Marshall. And an arbitrator named Bill Crow, whose name you'll see on some of the things we'll go over, issued a decision in that case.

And as part of that, Northwest Direct, after
Mr. Zweizig brought his claims, asserted a whole laundry list of its own claims against Mr. Zweizig. They accused him of destroying computers, withholding code, altering software applications, shutting down their business, putting people out of work for a week, a whole laundry list of things. And the arbitrator also ruled on that.

And what you'll see is that the arbitrator found in Mr. Zweizig's favor on that claim, on both his claim and all of those things that Northwest Direct had accused him of.

And after that, you'll hear that Mr. Rote and his company challenged that result. They took it to court. And the Court looked at that, at all the materials, and they confirmed it. They said, This is final. This is it. And they issued a judgment in Mr. Zweizig's favor for $\$ 75,000$.

And what you'll find out next is that Mr. Zweizig wasn't paid. And to this day, he's still trying to collect
his judgment in that case.
And in the midst of collecting that judgment, that brings us to what our case is about today. What you're going to see happened is Mr. Rote, on behalf of the corporate entities, signed over the rights to all of his business -businesses's information to himself and took it upon himself to write a blog. And we'll see that blog today, and that blog is what we're here about, and what he's done with that blog and how he's used it.

And I'm not going to go into all of the details of that. In fact, even in Mr. Zweizig's testimony, he's not going to go into all of the details of that. But over the last two years -- this blog was first published in February of 2015, and Mr. Rote has been consistently publishing on that blog up until today -- or not today, but last week. And that blog has some awful, vile allegations about Mr. Zweizig.

And what you'll see today is that Mr. Rote has, because that case -- because that earlier case his company lost, he's now publishing all this stuff about Mr. Zweizig. And it's the same stuff that he's already lost; namely, that Mr. Zweizig destroyed all the computers and shut down the company. It uses extensively Mr. Zweizig's name, and you'll see that.

What's worse is you'll see that Mr. Zweizig actually discovered this blog when he Googled his own name. And so
what this thing has done now is assumed an identity for Mr. Zweizig on the Internet that he -- he never wanted.

And so it's been 14 years. And when Mr. Zweizig Googles his name now, he is being accused of being a criminal. He's being accused of downloading and sharing pornography. We'll go through it, but it's some of the most vile things that you can imagine.

And it doesn't stop there. It's also his family. You'll learn that Mr. Zweizig is engaged to an attorney -- has been for a long time -- in New Jersey. Her name is Sandra Ware. So what you'll hear today is that Mr. Rote and this information on the Internet also focuses on Ms. Ware. And so not only does Mr. Zweizig have to live with the horror of finding this and knowing that this is out there about himself, it's also his fiancee.

You'll also see that this website also disparages anyone who has tried to help Mr. Zweizig with his claims. And we'll go through it, but the sheer content of this thing and the breadth of how long this has gone on, that's the reason Mr. Zweizig is here today. He's here today to get a ruling in this case and to reclaim his identity. And at the end of this case, I'll stand up and ask you to help us with that.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Opening statement for the defense.
Mr. Rote.

MR. ROTE: Thank you, Your Honor.
Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the blog was written. It's a personal product of mine, and I've maintained that from the very beginning. I did license information from my former employer. Only one of the corporate entities that they've identified was Mr. Zweizig's employer, only one. And after that company was out of business, $I$ began the blog.

I began the blog because we were subjected to very unacceptable behaviors by an arbitrator and an attorney who represented Mr. Zweizig. The arbitrator worked with Mr. Zweizig's attorney for 14 years, seven years as a partner. Neither one of them disclosed that during the course of the arbitration.

We discovered that during the course of the arbitration. And, ultimately, when we brought that to the attention of the arbitrator, he resigned. He recused himself. He was convinced by Mr. Zweizig's attorney to reverse that recusal, which he did. And when he returned to the case, he summarily dismissed all of our evidence.

Eight witnesses testified. We had three forensic experts testify, thousands of pages of evidence, all dismissed in retaliation for having brought up the fact that he did not raise this issue of independence, and it is an issue that he is required to raise on an ongoing basis.

We have a long history. This may -- this has not
been going on for 14 years. Mr. Zweizig was terminated in 2003, and there was a great deal of question argued with the arbitrator as to whether or not he was terminated before his complaint to the Department of Justice or after.

But, most importantly, the issue for the employer and one of the key issues that $I$ raise in this blog is that Mr. Zweizig withheld key evidence, key programming code, that resulted in the company shutting down after his last day for 10 days, as we hired and recreated the programming. 150 people were laid off a week before Thanksgiving.

And part of this blog -- part of this blog addresses the fact that $I$ don't think he should be able to hide behind a whistleblower claim and avoid that issue. None of that issue, though, would raise what had been risen had we not had this difficulty with the arbitrator.

I'm going to show you evidence of the fact that his retaliation claim, while serious in his mind, was addressed in 48 hours. It was open and closed by the Oregon Department of Justice in a week. And that even a day before his last day, I had reached out to him and said, "Let's put together a public statement. Let's put together something that you find compatible, that we find compatible." This was all before. I was happy to help him with his career. I didn't want him in the company.

After the shutdown, obviously that didn't happen
anymore. He hurt a lot of people. He cost us a great deal of money.

We spent two years in New Jersey, eventually got back here in 2005 to an arbitration. The arbitration went on and on and on, for five years. An arbitrator charges a great deal of money, charged Mr. Zweizig a great deal of money. It was unfair to both of us.

But an issue today is whether or not his employer, the corporations, did this. And I can assure you that I did this. Using the material and my experience from it, I did it, I wrote it, because I don't think that perjury and destruction of evidence should be looked the other way just because he prevailed with an arbitrator who didn't disclose his relationship with the attorney that he worked with, who didn't disclose his lack of independence, and then became angry when we brought it to his attention. He became so angry that he took independent forensic reports confirming our positions and rejected them out of hand.

Now, the blog goes into a great deal of detail, meaning I examine the forensic reports in great detail. I examine Mr. Zweizig's lack of evidence in great detail. I go through and talk about the evidence that we provided and the evidence that he did not. I go through the arbitrator's actions, his retaliation, and the lack of disclosure.

It's difficult to summarize what $a \operatorname{blog}$ is about in
a single word, a paragraph, or even a page, because it's 96 chapters, 96,000 words. Only about 25 relate to this, Mr. Zweizig's time with us, and what happened in the arbitration.

The rest is an evolutionary component of behavior that -- that was caused in part by his attorneys. I certainly attacked his attorneys for their honesty.

An attorney has a duty to a tribunal, to you, to this Court, to be honest under a code of ethics even when it's not favorable to his or her client's position. And his attorney, Linda Marshall, in the arbitration, perpetrated a fraud on that arbitration.

I published 17 counts of perjury and destruction of evidence. I outline in great detail what happened.

At the end of the day -- at the end of the day, this issue, in part, spins off not just what $I$ outline in the blog, because that's my representation of the truth. Not every blog post is going to be polite to Mr. Zweizig. Much of it is just an evaluation of the evidence. Some of it, though, is an attack on him personally. I don't deny that.

But at end of the day, the sum of the blog is about evaluating the risk of being in an arbitration where an arbitrator doesn't disclose his relationship with the attorney that represents Mr . Zweizig, and all that follows when that happens. It compromises justice, and I set out to expose
that.
I will testify that $I$ met with the arbitrator a year ago, and he conveyed to me what was in his mind, what was on his mind at the time. And $I$ will convey to you now that he confirmed many of my concerns about his ability to comprehend the evidence, his ability to -- his ability to reread the evidence and understand it.

And so he followed the path. He followed the path that was outlined for him by his former partner, someone he trusted, someone who misled him. And that is a substantial part of what this analysis is about, this blog is about.

I consider it a risk to the public to be involved in an arbitration when the arbitrator and the attorney both do not disclose that they worked together for 14 years.

Again, at the end of the day you have to consider whether or not $I$ was acting by myself or $I$ was acting on behalf of an employer. The employers are out of business, long gone, having suffered three cybercrime attacks. After the last and after the last litigation on that in 2014, these companies were shut down systematically. I shut those companies down because I couldn't protect them.

Mr. Zweizig was the second of those cybercrime attacks, and he hurt us a great deal. What we didn't care about what his complaint to the Department of Justice. It's not that we didn't take it seriously. It's just that we dealt
with it very quickly. No evidence was provided, and I'll show you that.

So our position -- my position today is that it is, in fact, just a product of my own doing, not of the employers that were out of business. It is, in fact, a position that it is about arbitration and the compromise and the perjury and the decision by his attorney, Linda Marshall, knowing that she could put that information on, that evidence on, that perjury on, and not be hurt by it.

The arbitrator is -- was, at the time of the arbitration, 79 years old, 85 or so today. And he -- his cognitive skills were deteriorating at the time. And ultimately it is a critique of the failure of the system to -- to remove him even from offering his services at arbitration.

That's my story, and I'll put on evidence to support all of those positions.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.

Jen, can you move the lectern.
(There is a brief pause in the proceedings.)
THE COURT: Call your first witness.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Call Max Zweizig.
THE COURT: Step forward and be sworn.

THE CLERK: Go up the stairs here. Raise your right
hand.

## MAX ZWEIZIG

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been first duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please have a seat. State your name and spell it.

THE WITNESS: Max Zweizig. M-a-x, first name; last name is $Z-w-e-i-z-i-g$.

THE COURT: Thank you.
You may inquire.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
Q. Mr. Zweizig, where do you live?
A. I live in Woodbury, New Jersey.
Q. Can you describe for the jury just a little bit about Woodbury. Where is it?
A. Woodbury, New Jersey is about, depending on traffic, about 15 minutes from Philadelphia, over a -- over one of the bridges. You have to go over a bridge to get there.

But other places near me that you might have heard about, Cherry Hill, maybe, New Jersey. It's a long way from here.
Q. How long have you lived in Woodbury?
A. Well, since I was 15.
Q. All right. And who do you live with?
A. I live with Sandra Ware, my fiancee.
Q. How long have you been with Ms. Ware?
A. Twenty-six years.
Q. Okay. What do you like to do for hobbies or fun, Mr. Zweizig?
A. Computer stuff, almost anything computers, computer programming for sure, also very big into music. I've been playing guitar for -- it's about 30 or 32 years now, at least that. I've played out, been with bands, and done some recording, things like that, and also have taught guitar for many years.
Q. And what's your profession?
A. IT specialist.
Q. How long have you been doing IT?
A. I'd say about 30 years, 30, a little less.
Q. How did you get into technology?
A. I was working -- I was much younger. I was working in a machine shop, and we built flatbed trailers that would haul, like, heavy equipment down the road, you know. That's what you would put it on and it would go. If you've ever seen something that says "Eager Beaver" on the side of it -THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I'm going to have
you slow down. "If you see something that says" -- and I couldn't hear you.

THE WITNESS: The model name of the trailer is -- I think the name of the company was Eager Beaver. And some of them are still around. Once in a while I still see one, so we must have done a good job on some of them.

But that company closed down at my location. And it was in Thorofare, which is very, very close to Woodbury, one town over. And it was a union job, and they tried to find a lot of us work. They were unable to find me work. And when they were unable to find me work and unemployment ran out, I took a job telemarketing. That was also in Woodbury, New Jersey.

And this was before companies -- call companies, anyway, had computers. And we did our job off of labels and made calls, and it was very old school. And the scripts we had were kind of to sell the product on the phone. It was kind of on the fly. And I felt more comfortable if $I$ put that together into something.

And I had what was called a Sharp Wizard organizer. I don't know if anybody is going to know what that is, but it's a little kind of organizer that you could do things. It also had basic programming in it. I started my programming, actually, on that.

But I kept my scripts in there. I found it easier to
just read the same thing every time, practice the inflection, get it right, and not really have to think about, you know, the job.

So I did that. And then we got computers into place, the old, like, monotone -- these were these gold screen computers, not the green, but the orange. And somebody said, you know, "Well, Max is always playing with that computer thing he has" -- which is totally not really a computer, but -- "Maybe he could do the computer stuff."

I asked if it was more money. It was a little more money, so I took the job. And that then -- I took a job as a data processor. I wasn't a programmer. I was running primarily other people's programs to process data. And that's where $I$ got into the field of computer technologies.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. And what was your job with Northwest Direct?
A. I was director of IT.
Q. And at that point, how long had you been in information technology?
A. I guess that would be around 20 years or so.
Q. Can you describe for the jury what -- what Northwest Direct did for their business?
A. Northwest Direct set up call centers for the purpose of telemarketing and accomplished telemarketing, a telemarketing company.
Q. What were your duties as IT director?
A. My duties were to manage myself and one -- $I$ think two other people were all they had there. There were other jobs I had a larger staff, but this one, just two people at a maximum, usually one. And so I managed that person and his job.

My personal job, my daily duties, were import and export of data from our clients, the call data that would be accomplished at the end of the day, to produce that into reports, and to produce that into client files that they would then put into their system to accomplish the sales, remove people from the list, decide who is not interested, those kinds of things.
Q. How many call centers did Northwest Direct have while you were employed there?
A. When I started there, I believe they had three. I think they still had one -- I think it was in Beaverton. I'm not sure. That closed down shortly after $I$ worked there. And I don't believe $I$ was ever at that call center. So most of the time they had two: one in Eugene, Oregon; and one in Dyersville, Iowa.
Q. How many employees did Northwest Direct have?
A. It fluctuated. That type of industry generally does. But I would say between 150 and 175 I would say is about accurate. Q. Okay. And can you turn to Exhibit --
A. Support staff included, not just telemarketers.
Q. Sure.

Would you turn to Exhibit 1 in the binder. Do you have a binder?
A. No.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Approach the witness with a binder?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (Handing).
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 1.
A. I have it.
Q. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What is that?
A. This is my employment agreement.
Q. Is that an accurate copy of your employment agreement?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'd offer Exhibit 1 into
evidence.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. When you -- when your employment at Northwest Direct
ended, to whom did you report? Who was your boss?
A. I'm sorry. Would you restate the question?
Q. When your employment at Northwest Direct ended, who was your boss?
A. Oh, I'm sorry. Tim Rote.
Q. All right. And where was Mr. Rote?

You don't need the exhibit anymore.
Where did Mr. Rote work?
A. Mr. Rote worked at an office away from the call centers. It was in Oregon. I'm not sure. I don't remember the city that it was in.
Q. But in Oregon?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What were Mr. Rote's roles for the company at that point?
A. Day to day?
Q. And generally.
A. I mean, he managed the business. It was, you know, definitely his company. He was the only one that, you know, did any of the business. There was no board of directors or anything. He was president, listed as CEO. Any top-level title was his.

I'm not familiar what his daily duties were. I know what, you know, mine were and the people that $I$ worked with, but as far as up at that level, I -- I can't answer that.
Q. Did you have any relationship whatsoever with Mr. Rote outside of work?
A. No, none at all.
Q. Let's turn to the end of your employment. Can you tell the jury how your employment ended?
A. I was terminated for -- for whistle blowing. I had found a report that -- that was e-mailed to me inadvertently. And I found it, and it in fact showed that we were overbilling
clients. I looked into it to make sure it was true and real as to the data. And I informed Mr. Rote of that via a letter to him from me, an e-mail to him. And I, in fact, found that we were doing that.

And I was very concerned because whoever was making those decisions was not only implicating themselves, but was implicating other people in the company and me, and -- because I'm sending the reports, I'm sending the data, I'm sending everything to the client. So if they're going to get something that's not right, you know, my name is going to be attached to it somewhere.

And I did call an attorney and find out how I separate myself from that, from that activity, what am I supposed to do. I didn't know what to do. And he said that I need to file a complaint with the Department of Justice, which I did.

And at the same time, or before that -- I'm not -- I
don't remember the events exactly, but -- as far as the timeline, but $I$ did inform Mr. Rote that, you know, I had found this and I believed it to be true.

And shortly after that -- some things happened at work, but shortly after that $I$ was terminated, definitely for that.
Q. What did you do after you were terminated?
A. I filed a wrong suit for -- a lawsuit, I'm sorry -- a
lawsuit for wrongful termination.
Q. Where?
A. In Oregon.
Q. You filed a lawsuit in Oregon?
A. Oh, no. I'm sorry. I filed a lawsuit in New Jersey. We ended up trying it in Oregon.
Q. Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit 2 in that binder. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What is it?
A. Yes. This is the New Jersey lawsuit that $I$ filed.
Q. Is that an accurate copy of the Complaint you filed?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll offer Exhibit 2.
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Can you just briefly -- you don't have to get into the details, but describe for the jury what your lawsuit was about.
A. I was -- I was let go for, you know, filing this complaint. I had, you know, done nothing in my job duties that I was let go for. I had good reviews. There was really no problem with my work.

I, you know, worked, I'd say -- I'm not kidding you -- 60 to 80 hours a week there, which was okay. I knew what I signed on for. I knew what my position was going to be and that $I$ was going to be doing most of the work, and that was fine.

But I didn't do anything to warrant my termination, with the exception of filing that report to the DOJ. And Mr. Rote had some conversation with me about that, and it was clear I was fired for that.
Q. So that lawsuit you filed, did that case stay in New Jersey after you filed it?
A. No, it didn't. It was moved to Oregon.
Q. Why?
A. In my contract -- a large part of my contract is dedicated to dispute resolution, which I did fight. I did not want to have to travel all the way to Oregon to handle this. And it stood up, you know. I had to -- I fought it, but, you know,
it was found that I did have to come to Oregon and I did have to follow the arbitration clause in the contract.
Q. Northwest Direct also has made legal claims against you, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you describe those?
A. I'm not going to remember all of them, but --
Q. Just generally.
A. Destruction of property, failure to turn over, you know, programs.

Without looking, I'm not going to -- there was three or four of those things filed against me.
Q. Did they file those claims against you before you started your lawsuit or after?
A. After.
Q. Can you describe for the jury what arbitration is.
A. Arbitration is -- it's a -- it's a dispute resolution, you know, vehicle. It's not -- nothing like this. You know, it's in a single room, you know, table, a conference table, a conference room like you would see at work. And the arbitrator sits at one end. The parties sit on either side of the table with their attorneys, if they have attorneys.

And you go through everything pretty much like I believe we're going to do here. And you put on your case, you put on evidence, you have witnesses; and the arbitrator makes
a decision and makes a ruling.
Q. Before you went to that arbitration, did you provide documents to the other side?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you provide testimony before the arbitration itself, like a deposition?
A. Oh, yes. Sorry, yes. Yes, there was a deposition process before that.
Q. Who were the -- who was the attorney that represented you at that arbitration?
A. That was Linda Marshall.
Q. And what was the name of the arbitrator?
A. Bill or William Crow, Bill Crow.
Q. And can you describe for the jury the outcome of that arbitration?
A. I won all my claims against Northwest Direct, and Northwest Direct lost all of their claims against me.

We put on evidence. I did not destroy any property, and none of that did I do. And, you know, all my claims were found for me and all the claims against me were thrown out, dismissed.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 3, please.

Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes. Sorry. This is the order, yeah, at the end of that.
Q. So this is the order that the arbitrator issued?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And is that an accurate copy of that order?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll offer Exhibit 3.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. So what happened after you found out you -- you had won that arbitration?
A. NDT fought the ruling.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Repeat.
THE WITNESS: Northwest Direct Teleservices fought the ruling.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Where did they fight the ruling?
A. They fought that in Oregon, I believe.
Q. Was that in the court?
A. I believe it was.
Q. And what was the outcome of that challenge?
A. It -- you know, they were not allowed to fight the ruling. Eventually the opinion and order, that was, I believe, called confirmed and, you know, it stuck.
Q. Okay. Have you been able -- how much did you -- how much were you awarded in that arbitration?
A. It was for a few things. It was somewhere around $\$ 75,000$ total.
Q. When you say "a few things," can you describe what you mean?
A. Yes.

I'd have to look at them. Is that okay?
Q. That's fine.
A. Okay.
(Pause) I'm sorry. I had to get to the right spot. $\$ 67,500$ for a period of nine months of employment. That would have been equivalent to what $I$ would have made in nine months at ND -- Northwest Direct. And also included -- I had two weeks' vacation. That also included one week vacation pay for that period of 1,875 .

Also, during all this -- or before this, actually, sorry -- Mr. Rote fought my unemployment. He claimed at that time that $I$ was fired for fraud, a different reason. And I had to go to an unemployment hearing, with which to recover my unemployment. He lost that hearing as well, and $I$ was able to receive unemployment. For expenses to do with that, the arbitrator also awarded me a thousand dollars for that.

There was, I believe, one other -- yeah, and then I mentioned there were some things right before the end of the actual end of my employment. Tim Rote had sent letters to coworkers and, as the arbitrator puts it, was done solely in
an effort to embarrass respondent, me.
He said (reading), Such actions were done in
retaliation for claimant's perceived misconduct by respondent, by Mr. Rote, and his apparent anger.

He awarded me $\$ 5,000$ for that.
Q. So does the total number of $\$ 75,375$ sound about right to you?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Have you been able to collect any of that money?
A. No, sir.
Q. And have you taken any efforts to try and collect that?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. What?
A. My attorney tried to collect that money. I'm not sure specifically, you know, what you do to do that. But, you know, we entered, you know, requests, judgment requests. I believe we sent things to Mr. Rote to try and collect that.
Q. Are you still trying to collect that today?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How?
A. Well, we have a case for that. We -- you did open a case for that, and that is a fraudulent transfer case, and -- to try and collect the money. Tim had done something with the corporations and himself -- I don't understand at all -- to
not pay this.
Q. Okay. And that case is not what we're here about today, right?
A. No, not at all.
Q. All right. So what are we here about today?
A. A couple years ago I -- like you said, I Googled my name, and I found an incredibly disparaging website was put up about me and clearly about the arbitration that I had already gone through.
Q. Approximately when did you discover that website?
A. A couple of years ago now.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 534, please -- or, sorry. Let me get you a copy of that. It's a defense exhibit (handing).
A. Okay.
Q. What is that document, Mr. Zweizig?
A. This is a letter from my attorney, Linda Marshall.
Q. What's the date on that letter?
A. October 3rd, 2015.
Q. Is that an accurate copy of the letter?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Move to offer Defense Exhibit 534.
THE COURT: Any objection to 534?
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: It's received.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Okay. Permission to publish a
demonstrative of this, this exhibit to the jury? THE COURT: You may. (Defendant's Exhibit No. 534 is then published to the jury.)

THE WITNESS: I see it here.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Oh, you do?
THE WITNESS: I do.

THE CLERK: I think we're toggling each other. Give it a second.

THE COURT: Do the jurors have it on their screen yet?
(There is a pause in the proceedings.) MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I see it on my screen. THE CLERK: There it is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Oh, there we go.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Can you describe for the jury what -- what this letter is about.
A. This letter is from my attorney, Linda Marshall, to take -- to Mr. Rote, asking him to please take the website down.
Q. And what's the name of the website?
A. This website is called Sitting Duck Portland.
Q. Do you know who is writing that website?
A. Yes, sir: Tim Rote.
Q. And what, generally, was that website about?
A. That website was about the arbitration that we went through and considerably, you know, about me.
Q. Okay. What was your reaction when you discovered this website about you?
A. I -- I was -- you know, angry, of course, confused. I didn't think anybody could possibly do this. I had already gone through, you know -- we're all in agreement that this was a very lengthy arbitration, not an easy process for somebody to go through, cost a lot of money. And, you know, I won. I thought it was over.

I thought that my -- it was horrible. It was a -- it was not a good process. It was not something that, you know, felt like you think it would. It was very convoluted, confusing. Awful things said during that as well.

And the biggest thing $I$ wanted out of that was to be done with Tim Rote, and $I$ thought that $I$ was. And, you know, this was a job that $I$ had for a year and a half, and it was over. And I filed a lawsuit for that. It was terrible. That was over. I thought this was done.

And here it is, and it's coming up again, and not just for me to see, but with a great bunch of revisionist history for anyone to see.
Q. After this letter on October 3rd, Mr. Zweizig, did the website come down?
A. No, sir.
Q. I'd like you to turn to Exhibit 9, please. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes, sir, I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is a Google search I did for my name October 4th, 2015.
Q. And that exhibit that you're looking at, is that an accurate representation of what you saw when you Googled your name on October 4th?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I'd offer Exhibit 9 into evidence. THE COURT: Any objection to 9?

MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Publish to the jury?
THE COURT: You may.
THE WITNESS: After you're up, I think you hit the clicker.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I'm just going to give it a second.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm guessing, too.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 9 is then published to the jury.)

THE WITNESS: Again, I see it. It's here.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Can you describe for the jury what you saw when you Googled your name on October 4th?
A. I saw that the first, you know, result was this Sitting Duck Portland website.

And, you know, it says right there, (reading) It's a story about an arbitration involving one of my companies and a former IT manager by the name of Max Zweizig.
Q. And what was your reaction when you saw this?
A. That it just -- absolute distress. I mean, you know, I -you know, after $I$ clicked on it, I saw it was a bunch of revisionist history.

You had asked me what was my reaction when $I$ saw this. I already said that. Sorry.

When $I$ saw this -- you know, when we went through the arbitration, there was a lot of talk about confidentiality and things of that nature and that that would be -- you know, that things were only supposed to be used at the arbitration. When the arbitration was over, it was over.

And I couldn't believe that somebody could just go
ahead and -- just go ahead and publish all that stuff, you know, to the Internet, when I've already been through this and won. It was over.
Q. I see a date, February 27th, 2015. Did you know, until you came across this, that someone had been writing about you
on the Internet?
A. I'm sorry. I don't see that date.
Q. It's in the --
A. Oh, yes, I see it. Sorry.

No. No. I mean, I believe this is when $I$ found it and printed it out.
Q. Okay. I'll have you now turn to Exhibit 4, please.
A. I have it.
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is this?
A. This is the -- this is the website. This is the first, it looks like, three chapters of the website.
Q. And when you say "chapters," what do you mean by that?
A. The website is organized into these chapters. There's a chapter, a chapter number, and then Tim talks about what he wants to talk about on that page or for that group of pages for that chapter.
Q. And how many chapters are you seeing here?
A. Did I say three? Four.
Q. And what date did you print this?
A. This was October 2nd, 2015.
Q. And is this an accurate copy of what you saw on that date?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll offer this as Plaintiff's

Exhibit 4.
THE COURT: Any objection to 4?
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
THE CLERK: Go ahead and hit "publish."
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Publish? Yeah.
What's that?
THE CLERK: Do you have 4 up?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No, not yet. I'm going to.
Sorry. I misunderstood.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. All right. So I'd like to go through kind of the dates of these and what you saw at which date, without going through all the content at this point.

So you just said on Exhibit 4, printed on
October 2nd, 2015, that there are four chapters. Based on what you see, are these -- these dates of publication correct in Exhibit 4?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. I'm going to have you turn to Exhibit 5. Do you recognize this?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is a chapter. It's called Chapter 5, and it says "Our History With Max Zweizig." And now not only my name is
on here, but there's a picture of me on here as well.
Q. And what date did you print this?
A. This was November 6th, 2015.
Q. Can you take a second look at that date?
A. I'm sorry. October 6th, 10-6. Sorry. A couple days later, a few days later.
Q. And is this an accurate copy of what you saw on the Internet when you printed it?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: All right. We're going to offer Exhibit 5.

MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. So on Exhibit 5, Mr. Zweizig, it's just that one chapter on October 5th, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. Turn to Exhibit 6. What's this?
A. This is Chapter 6. This one is titled "So Why Am I

Blogging?"
Q. And what date did you print this one?
A. I printed this one on the 6th.
Q. And this is what you saw --
A. Yes.
Q. -- when you printed it?
A. Yeah. October -- sorry, October 6th, yes.
Q. Chapter 6 -- I'm sorry. MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll offer No. 6. MR. ROTE: No objection. THE COURT: Received.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. So is this accurate, Mr. Zweizig, on October 6th, you see a new chapter published on October 6th --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- that same day?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 7, please. What date -- or what
is this document?
A. This is -- these are more chapters on the website now.
Q. And what date did you print this?
A. This was printed October 12th, 2015.
Q. Okay. And that's what you saw on the Internet when you printed it?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll offer Exhibit 7.
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, is this a correct summary of the chapters
that you saw published on October 12th?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Just one more for you. Can you turn to Exhibit 8?
A. I have it.
Q. All right. What's this document?
A. This is the website as I printed it out on October 23rd, 2015. Again, two more chapters are up.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: All right. I'll offer that exhibit, Exhibit 8.

MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. So, Mr. Zweizig, this summary shows that from October 2nd to October $23 r d$, you had printed this website five times, and in that time you had seen 15 chapters appear; is that correct? A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 10, please.
A. I have it.
Q. And what is this document?
A. This is a Google web search for my name again on

November 9th, 2015.
Q. Is this an accurate copy of what you saw when you Googled your own name on November 9th?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll offer Exhibit 10. THE COURT: I'm sorry. Is that --

THE CLERK: 10.
THE COURT: Any objection to 10?
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: It's received.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Permission to publish this to the jury?

THE COURT: Sure.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 10 is then published to the jury.)

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. So, Mr. Zweizig, can you describe for the jury, using this demonstrative, what you saw when you Googled your name on November 9th?
A. Yeah. I'm sorry for turning away, but it's much easier if I read it here. It's small.

Yeah. This is a representation of my Google search. And this shows that the top two -- not just one now, the top two results for my name come up. And in the top result now my, yes, girlfriend, but my fiancee, Sandra Ware, is also coming up in the search results.
Q. That first result uses the word "profiteer." What's that about?
A. I don't know. It's alleging something, you know, horrible that I'm not. I'm not a profiteer. I was his employee. Q. Okay. And I'd like to fast-forward, Mr. Zweizig, to
today. As you sit here today, to the best of your knowledge, how many chapters are written on the Internet on this website?
A. There are now 97 chapters and one other document.
Q. Mr. Zweizig, I'd like to go through and offer some documents.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: And I guess to expedite things, we'd offer Exhibits 11, 12, 18, 19, and 20 into evidence.

Mr. Rote, any objection to that?
MR. ROTE: Perhaps.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: That's 11, 12, 18, 19, 20.
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, without going through all of this material, I'd like to talk generally with the jury about what you saw on these websites. And I'd like to go through it by categories. A. Okay.
Q. So the first question $I$ have for you is: What did you see on this website that related to your identity?
A. I'm sorry. Just in general?
Q. In general.
A. Yeah. Well, the website talks about -- first of all, like I said, you know, I was employed by Mr. Rote. There were events that happened. We went through those events at the arbitration, and that's what we did.

What was on this website was something very different than that, also peppered in a bunch of personal attacks on me of some pretty bad nature.

I feel, you know, clearly a lot of the things that were on the website were of an employment nature, which should be in an employee file and should not be published out to the Internet. I believe he should have maintained his responsibility for any confidentiality to that.

I'm not afraid of anything in my employment file. I just don't think people want it out on the Internet. I know I don't need it out on the Internet for somebody to do -especially when they have their opportunity to use their voice to make their commentary and I have not.

And, you know, I mean, there's a lot that $I$ saw on that website. I'm sure we're going to go through some of it. Q. What did you see that related to your family, Mr. Zweizig? A. Well, my fiancee, Sandra Ware, you know, is mentioned in this website. In a lot of ways, some very disparaging remarks towards Sandra were, you know, alleged on this website. You know, if people believe these remarks about her, it could affect her, it could affect her career.

Her chosen vocation, she's an attorney. You know, any attorney that's caught in any improprietous acts, you know, they're going to get called on it, you know, greater than any other individual would, you know, by -- there's
different mechanisms to do that than for you and I.
You know, so $I$ watched it really affect my family. You know, Sandra Ware never worked for Tim Rote. There was no reason for him to be publishing anything about her on the Internet.
Q. How about your profession, Mr. Zweizig? What does this website contain with respect to your profession?
A. It -- it speaks to, you know, again, things that are completely untrue, saying that I'm willing to hold on to work product, you know, that I'm not going to turn over work product.

And, again, this is so unfair. We went through a proceeding about this. Evidence was offered. You know, there's e-mails that clearly show that not only did I turn over that work product, that work product was received and someone said, "Thank you." I mean, this is complete revisionist history. That's just an example of that.

I certainly was never doing anything bad at work, like downloading porn. This pornography stuff that he's alleging, I don't know where he got it. He says it's on one of the hard drives. When we wanted to analyze one of the hard drives, instead of providing us with that hard drive, he provided us with an empty CD-ROM drive. We never got a chance -- my experts never got a chance to look at that, you know, evidence that he says that stuff was on.

And, of course, in 97 chapters of this, all that stuff is left out. He gets to just try this with whoever, with the public, in any way he wants to, after we had done a proceeding that was structured, where I did have a voice, where, you know, I could have some degree of parity. And during that process, it was found that all of his claims were baseless and mine were not.

> MR. ROTE: Your Honor, I just wanted to --
> THE COURT: Your objection is sustained.
> You need to just answer the question.
> You may go ahead and ask your next question.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, what did you see on that website, just generally, what kinds of content that related to your morals? A. Well, he said, you know, $I$ was downloading pornography. He said that $I$ was distributing pornography. He said that I was doing that with other people in the world. He said I was bad at my job, you know.
I'm sorry. Morality?
Q. Morality.
A. Yeah. I mean, that's the worst of it, I think.
Q. Okay. How about publicity for this website, Mr. Zweizig? What did you come to learn about -- you know, was it -- was it just the website or was it more?
A. No, it wasn't just the website. Tim was reaching out to
coworkers, you know, about this. He was proliferating this through LinkedIn, through some other, you know, different places, you know, telling people to go to this site and to look at this material.

He was -- he recently had, you know, a press release. I'm talking like a week ago. You know, I mean, I don't know if he was here with us, but, you know, maybe reporters. I don't know. But he had a press release, you know, saying -- where he sent this out to about 40 people. There were senators in there. There were news agencies in there. There were -- you know, there's all kinds of things like this.

On this blog at some point he said that he was going to send out a million e-mails about this to try and drive people to this site to take a look, you know, and would be able to look at these things that he's said about me.

I may have missed some.
Q. And the last thing $I$ want to ask about is the volume -the sheer volume of the content on this website. And we'll give the jury some exhibits to look at it, but can you describe generally how much was there?
A. I don't remember the number that Mr. Rote said in his opening of words or pages or whatever this was. But this is voluminous. It's huge, you know. And, you know, one of my concerns is, you know, what part of this is somebody going to read? Are they going to read something this huge and then
make a determination for themselves whether it has any merit or not, or are they going to just read some horrible part somewhere and go, "Oh, wow, that person is a horrible person," and just move on.

We're not in an attention-span society where we're going to read 97 chapters of something and then determine what's true.
Q. Mr. Zweizig, would you turn back to Exhibit 4, page 7 . And what I'd like to do is put up an excerpt from this.

Let me know when you're there.
A. I'm sorry.
(Pause) Okay.
Q. So, again, this is Exhibit 4, page 7, paragraph 2.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What -- do you recognize this passage from there?
A. Yeah. After I went to the Google page to Google my -- or went to Google to Google my name, this is in the first chapter that came up after $I$ clicked on that link.
Q. What jumped out at you about this?
A. Well, that my name is, you know, prominently bolded there. It's the only thing bold in the chapter. That's not added for here. That's the way that it looked.
Q. Okay. And down at the bottom there -- so each of these, as we go through them, the bottom has a block that looks similar to this. Can you describe for the jury what -- what
that is?
A. That -- at the bottom, that is an actual -- sorry. I'm too close to this.

The bottom of that is an actual link that will link you back to that page. In this case it has a path and then the file name of Chapter 1, "The Seven-Year Bitch or Arbitrators in Action." It's actually a folder name. So I don't know what was trying to go on there. And that was not the title of this chapter. Maybe it was the title of a chapter and then he revised it. I don't know. I don't know why that's down there, really.

You asked me what jumped out at me about this. In addition to my name being bolded, it said that $I$ was terminated for a variety of job performance reasons. By this time, you know, it's not only me that's saying $I$ wasn't terminated for that reason, but, you know, an arbitrator said I wasn't terminated for that reason.

And then he goes on to say -- and this was -- this was right away. This was first, you know. He goes on to say my fiancee practiced as an attorney for a time.
(Reading) During his employment with us, they lived together in a small town in New Jersey.

That's true.
(Reading) A year or so before my false complaint -which was not false -- he was caught conspiring with another
employee of ours to set up a competing company.
That's not true. That, of course, was a violation of our noncompete agreement, so none of the -- none of this stuff is true.
Q. On the third line there, it says, "During his employment with us." Who is "us" in this context?
A. "Us" would be Tim Rote and all of his companies. It wasn't just Northwest Direct Teleservices. There were a number of other companies.
Q. Throughout this blog, did you notice Mr. Rote using the term "us," or is he representing that he's writing on his own? A. No. It's usually "us," "we," all those -- that kind of terminology, maybe exclusively. I'd have to look through it. Q. Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit 5.
A. I have it.
Q. Okay. I'm looking at the -- it's going to be the first page.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm going to put up a demonstrative for you here.

Do you remember seeing this?
A. Yes.
Q. What jumped out at you about this when you saw it?
A. Well, like I said before, you know, here's Chapter 5, "Our History With Max Zweizig." My name is up there again.

You know, as I read through it, it's a bunch of,
again, revisionist history of what happened. But now also my picture is up there, you know, on this.
Q. And did you have any particular concerns with him using your name in the title of a chapter like that?
A. Certainly, because $I$ had -- you know, by what I looked at so far, $I$ knew it was probably going to follow that it wasn't going to be anything flattering, for sure. It was going to be, you know, again, a bunch of lies about me. I was concerned, you know, also that my picture is there.

You know, in dealing with Mr. Rote, unfortunately, the only way I can mitigate -- my thing is to keep a low profile. And in seven or eight years or more, the only picture I've ever put up on the Internet is that picture. And that was on my biography to -- you know, to get guitar students out on the Internet. It's called PrivateLessons.com. And I put that picture on that, and he took that and put that on this website.
Q. And I want to ask you about that, Mr. Zweizig.

Prior to this whole thing, how much of an Internet presence did you have?
A. I had a little bit of an Internet presence for, you know, guitar students, but also a pretty decent Internet presence in the IT field.

Anybody who is in computers or has ever had a problem with a computer -- you don't necessarily need to be in them --
is probably going to be familiar with tech support forums and things like that. You have a problem; you go up and see if somebody else has had it so, you know, you're not beating your own head against the wall for the first time, you know, ever with this problem. And usually there is.

And I was involved, you know, pretty decently in the community with not only looking for stuff when I'm having problems, but also helping others. If they had an issue, you know, I would post up there.

And when $I$ was doing that posting, I was using my real name, you know, before, you know, the stuff with Tim Rote started. And then from then, not so much.
Q. Okay.
A. In fact, on my Private Lesson site, I had taken my last name, Zweizig, off and just had Max after that.
Q. Did you take any other efforts to not use your name?
A. Oh, sure. Not -- I mean, not just on the Internet, but, you know, I mean, this is out there about me. If somebody Googles my name -- and I have a unique name, unfortunately, for this. If somebody Googles my name, they're going to run into this stuff.

So not only that, but also at work. You know, sometimes whatever job I was -- you know, I had at the time, you know, you come in, and they say, "We're going to set you up with an e-mail address." And a lot of times the
nomenclature is your first name, dot, last name, at whatever company it is.

And I would try and do some finagling, you know, "Is
it okay? I'm kind of known out there as just Max. Is that okay? Do you mind if it's Max at whatever company, you know, we're at?" And I was able to get that done in all cases.

But, you know, I did that for my signatures. On
e-mails I would send out, I would -- a lot of times I would not put my name. I'd put my address and, you know, where I'm at. But, you know, trying -- the only way for me to combat this was to anonymize myself.
Q. Okay. I'd like to move on.

I'm going to show you a demonstrative of the same chapter, but $I$ made it really small, and I don't expect you or anyone to be able to read that. But $I$ want to do something here. And I've highlighted all the times your name is used on this.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Did that show up on your screen?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. All right. So what was your reaction to seeing your name in an article like this so many times?
A. You know, through -- you know, my reaction to a lot of this stuff is, you know, what you usually hear in the world is that if somebody wants to talk about something or do whatever
they want to do, they don't use people's real names to do that stuff, you know, especially if they're going to editorialize, you know, what they're doing.

So, you know, I really took it as a personal attack with my name being used there. And this being used so many times like this, this is going to very easily cause a search engine to find me when anybody searches for me. And it's going to -- it's not going to find me, but it's going to find this content associated with me, not anything else that $I$ might be on the Internet for.
Q. I'd like to move forward and have you turn to Exhibit 18.
A. Empty.
Q. I have a copy for you (handing).
A. Thank you.
Q. Thank you.

So I prepared another blowup of this Exhibit 18 that shows the pertinent dates. But up there on the top of page 1 of the exhibit, is this correct, it's published on August 30th, 2017?
A. Right.
Q. That's just a few months ago --
A. Right.
Q. -- or six months ago, I guess now.

And, again, that's your name on there, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so this is going to come up later. At some point -or $I$ guess was there any point where there wasn't your full name on there?
A. Yeah. There were times where there would be "MZ" or "Max Z" or "M" or my first name spelled wrong. And then, you know, if $I$ would go back two days later, my full name would be back in the same place where those things were, or then taken off and put back.
Q. So how often was this thing being changed?
A. It felt like it was being changed quite a bit, you know, sometimes daily, sometimes, you know, a couple weeks. Then I'd go back to a chapter that I had, you know, looked at before and it was different, saying different things.
Q. Okay. Turn to Exhibit 12, please. And this is a big one. It's page 341.
A. Okay. I believe everything that we've looked at so far has been the second website.
Q. Oh, let's talk about that. So --
A. I just wanted to --
Q. Yeah. When you said "second website," what do you mean?
A. Yeah. This started -- actually, I guess that's -- I guess that's not so. The first exhibits you looked at were the first website. He had one at Sitting Duck Portland. And then at some point Tim Rote had taken that entire website down, and it was gone. I was very happy about that.

And then a short time later, he started up another website called The First Duty Portland at WordPress.com. Q. And do you know where the name for The First Duty Portland came from?
A. I'm not sure. I saw it downstairs when I walked in, on the wall. I'm not sure what that relates to.
Q. Okay. So Exhibit 12 that you're looking at, is this -this is The First Duty Portland website?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. I'll put up a blowup of the first paragraph of that. So it says (reading), As noted in many preceding chapters, our IT managers' withholding of our programs caused us to shut down.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you know who the IT manager here is?
A. I believe he's talking about me. He has that plural. I don't know why.
Q. It says (reading), It cost us dearly. It cost our employees, some 175 of whom had to be laid off for part of the week just before Thanksgiving.
A. Yes.
Q. To the best of your knowledge, is that true?
A. No, I don't think that's true.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 13, please.
A. I have it.
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. Without going into its contents, what is it?
A. Well, this is an e-mail from Chris Cox. That was -- when I said I had one gentleman working for me most of the time, that was Chris Cox. And this is an e-mail from him to me on April 25th, 2017.
Q. Is that an accurate copy of the e-mail you received from Mr. Cox?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 13.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. ROTE: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, I'd like to put up a copy of this for you.

Do you recall receiving this e-mail?
A. I do.
Q. And what -- what is this about?
A. This is an e-mail from Chris to me, like I said. It says (reading), Have you been hearing from Tim at all?

It says, He called me at work about a month ago. He went on and on about how there was a complete shutdown of the company after you left -- meaning me.

He claims I lied during the questioning at the
arbitration. He's claiming Chris is lying, too.
Then he said some dude had to fly out of Chicago --
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I really need you to
slow down when you read and in general.
THE WITNESS: I apologize. I will. I'll do my best. (Reading) He said he had some dude had to fly out of Chicago to save the company.

And then he tells me, It gets even crazier. He says he is writing a play about the whole situation and wants to meet with me.

I do not -- Chris says he doesn't remember a shutdown at all.
(Reading) Then he texts me that he needs a deposition and that he is going to subpoena me. I am not sure what the hell he is going to subpoena. I received a registered mail the other day. The post office left me a notice. Unless they bring it to my door and put it into my hand, I am not going to bother. I know it is probably from him. I think he has lost his final screw. Chris.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Did you -- did you respond to Chris about this?
A. I don't believe $I$ responded to him at all.
Q. Why not?
A. If I did, it was to tell him I couldn't respond to him because there is ongoing litigation about this and I can't
talk to people about this.
Q. I'm going to have you turn to Exhibit 12, page 26. Are you there?
A. I think so.

No. One moment.
(Pause) Yes, sir.
Q. All right. And I'm going to put up a blowup of -- there's a box in the middle there called -- with a title "Gay Older Men."
A. I see it.
Q. What's this?
A. This is -- this was on the website. Tim had this on the website. And he's referencing this -- I don't know even know what that means. I know what "gay older men" means. I don't know what that next word means.

And then he's talking to my fiancee and saying,
"Sandra Ware, I thought you were engaged to Max."
Q. What -- how did you feel to see this?
A. Very upset, very, very upset, because this is terrible. There is -- there is no reason to be doing this. Somebody says they're mad at arbitrators or something. This has nothing to do with that. This is a direct attack on me instead. This is a direct attack on my family. This is just awful.
Q. Did you talk with Sandra about what you saw on this
website?
A. Yeah, sure.
Q. And, like, what happened when you talked with her about that?
A. She was beside herself. She's like, I can't believe that somebody keeps getting to do this, you know.

This is -- how hard I worked for this. This is
disgusting. It's shocking and it's, you know -- you know, why attack my family? Why?
Q. I'm going to have you turn to Exhibit 11. We're going to go to page 2.
A. Yeah, I'm there.
Q. And I'm going to look at the second paragraph here, blow this up for the jury.
A. I have it. I'm sorry.
Q. All right. Can you describe -- or I guess read through this and tell us what this is.
A. What you have on the screen?
Q. The paragraph, yeah.
A. Tim says (reading), I received a call from an investigator that told me Sandra Ware, Max's girlfriend, went to law school with one of the federal judge's law clerk, and he suspected they had met and discussed this matter. He further concluded that the law clerk was assigned to this case specifically, would likely have written the order, and may have even slipped
this by the judge. Sometime later Max admitted to me that they had met this judge many times at Rutgers Law School events. I rather doubted that, but it is what he said. Q. And I'd like to go through this in order. "I received a call from an investigator." Do you know what that's talking about?
A. I don't. But I -- you know, when $I$ saw that, of course $I$ became very concerned, you know. Is he having people follow me?

You know, he's clearly saying that he has an investigator that told him something about my girlfriend. What he's saying here $I$ know isn't true, but I don't -- you know, I mean, what would you think about this? This is -that's terrifying. That's frightening.
Q. Had you ever met this judge at a Rutgers Law School event?
A. I have never met Judge Kugler, no.
Q. Did you ever --
A. To answer your question directly, no. And, no, I've never met him at any event.
Q. Did you ever admit to Mr. Rote that you had met this judge at a Rutgers Law School event?
A. Not at all.
Q. I'd like to turn to paragraph 4 of the same page.
A. Okay.
Q. At this point Mr. Rote is speaking about a letter he sent.

What is this about?
A. Well, here he's saying that, you know, he has an emotional way about him, that, you know, causes him to do things; in this case fire off a letter challenging the why of dismissing his case with prejudice, and brought to his attention the conclusions reached -- again, we have the investigator in here. I have no idea what the investigator has to do with the judge. I don't know how that ties together, but I'm just saying the investigator is mentioned again.
(Reading) Judge Kugler was not very happy with me, and what was to follow became one of the most entertaining period -- periods of my life, in the courtroom anyway.
(Reading) Judge Kugler ordered me to New Jersey to stand trial for contempt -- to be clear, he's talking about himself -- and interference of the court. He demanded that I be -- he be there in person some 30 days after his notice. So I hired yet another attorney, paid him $\$ 10,000$, and he went about the business of what he claimed was trying to keep me out of jail -- meaning keep Tim out of jail.
Q. And how did it make you feel -- well, let me back up. Were you present at that hearing when that happened?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And what happened?
A. Mr. Tim Rote very nearly went to jail, in my opinion. Q. Did he appear entertained to you at that point?
A. Oh, no, not at all. He appeared quite frightened.
Q. And what about this was troubling to you?
A. Well, the investigator thing mentioned again, the fact that he would consider something like this entertaining. There's -- you know, that's -- that's not a theme or anything that $I$ would ascribe to, you know, what this was going on.

Also, his willingness to do something like this to a judge. He's publishing his website about me. I'm trying to do everything $I$ can to anonymize myself, to get the website taken down. If he's willing to do these things to a judge and a law clerk as, you know, it comes up in here, if he's willing to do, you know, things like that, what protection do I possibly have against this individual if, you know, he's willing to do things like this?

The judge can call him in front of him and say, "Hey, why shouldn't you go to jail," and he hires an attorney to get him out of that. I don't have that option. So this is -- you know, this is his behavior escalating and definitely causing me a lot more fear at this point.
Q. Turning now to paragraph 5, this same exhibit, same page, can you read this out loud for the jury.
A. (Reading) By this time $I$ wondered if Max was setting up private websites for these judges to watch their porn. How that would have worked is that a private website would be set up for the exclusive use only, content provided by the hosting
person, and the only thing the judge would need to do is access the site with his login ID and password. But I digress.
Q. Did you ever set up private websites for judges to watch porn?
A. Of course not.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Your Honor, I have a matter for the Court.

THE COURT: Over here.
(The Court, counsel, and Mr. Rote confer off the record.)

THE COURT: You may proceed.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Turn to paragraph -- I'm sorry, Exhibit 18.

MR. ROTE: Say that again.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Exhibit 18.
THE WITNESS: Oh, that's the one you handed me,
right?
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Go to page 7.
A. Chapter 90 is Exhibit 18?
Q. 18 , yes.
A. Okay. I'm going to put it in the book.
Q. Page 7. Are you there?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. A demonstrative of this. This is the first paragraph, first sentence.
(Reading) The first act of perjury was, as just noted, that he now admits but first denied that he was, in fact, the person who downloaded the porn.

Do you know what this is about?
A. I don't know what this is about. I do want to mention this is from the website that we're still on. It's from the website. This is out there for people to see.

No, I never downloaded any porn. Mr. Rote has a better description of how to do things like this than $I$ do, which I just read.

You know, he's saying now -- and this is, you know, the most major problem I have with this website that's out there. He's saying that I now admit that I downloaded porn.

I did not download any porn working for him. I did his work for him. That's what I did. And I did the work of our company for him. I never downloaded any porn. I certainly did not admit to anyone that I downloaded porn.

And these are the kind of things that he's able to do on this website. And this is the recourse $I$ have. Out in the world, I don't have any.
Q. Turn now to Exhibit 12, page 184. I'm going to put up a blowup of the second paragraph here.

It says that (reading) Since $M$ is not the only one
who would benefit from contacting Judge Jones, I attempted to add to the lawsuit the other parties that also benefit; namely, Linda Marshall, Chester Marshall, Sandra Ware, and Joel Christiansen.

Do you know what lawsuit he's talking about here?
A. He had filed a lawsuit against myself, in addition to
these people: Linda; her husband, Chester; Sandy, my fiancee; and Joel Christiansen, for defamation, I believe.
Q. And just to clarify, who is Linda Marshall?
A. Linda Marshall is my attorney that represented me in the arbitration.
Q. And who is Chester Marshall?
A. Chester Marshall is Linda's husband.
Q. And who is Joel Christiansen?
A. You are Joel Christiansen. You're my attorney.
Q. At the bottom here, it says it probably -- well, (reading) Judge $H$ quickly denied the motion to add the parties under diversity arguments, meaning that some of the parties are residents of Oregon and should not be added. However, insofar as the matter itself is properly in the federal court, it probably could have been allowed with respect to Sandra Ware.

What did that mean to you?
A. Legally, I have no idea. But what it looks like it means is that he came pretty close to being able to file a lawsuit
against Sandra Ware, my fiancee.
Q. Turn to page 258. I'm going to put up a portion of the first paragraph.

This reads (reading), I am now on the watch list. The efforts to have the U.S. Marshals Service tell me why I'm on the watch list have been met with great resistance. It's the kind of silent, let's not talk about it behavior you'd expect of child molesters, not the U.S. marshals.

What is this about?
MR. ROTE: Objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. How did you feel when you read this?
A. Even more scared than before.
Q. Why?
A. According to Tim Rote, this is something that he put out on the Internet, that he is now on a watch list with the U.S. Marshals Service for some conduct that he has done out in the world. This makes him feel much more dangerous to me. Q. Go to page 85, the same exhibit. And I'm going to put up a portion from paragraph 4.
A. Okay.
Q. I'll read this. It says (reading), Weeks pass. One workday your children's school is closed because of snow. They are at home playing outside with your best friend's
children, having a great time. Your friend comes by and asks if you can watch her children while she runs to the store, and of course you agree to do so. Happy to do so. But soon after your friend heads to the store, the weather turns worse, and it is the best if the children come inside. You get them inside, and they are all soaked and cold and freezing. You get some warm towels and get the wet clothes off them as best you can, being a mom to all four children.

Your ex-employee notifies you the next day that she observed you inappropriately touching your neighbor's children and calls on you to cease and desist from such behavior, attaching a photograph of you wrapping a towel and giving a hug to one of the children. You immediately notify your neighbor and share the e-mail. You also immediately notify the police.

Do you know what this is about?
A. This is a passage, again, from Tim Rote's website that he wrote.

What I believe this is trying to do is make some analogy to the process of the arbitration that we went through. As far as its content, this is an analogy he chose from an endless amount of analogies that a person could choose; and, you know, he chose something like this. He's back to this theme of this kind of subject matter, which I find a bit disgusting.
Q. Do you know why he used the term, "inappropriately
touching your neighbor's children"?
A. I have no idea why he would say something like that.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Your Honor, I have a matter for the Court.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, we're going to take our midday recess at this time. We'll be in recess -- let's say until 1:15.

Remember the instruction telling you not to talk about the case, et cetera. And don't look up information about the case, those kinds of things.

Jennifer will escort you out and tell you how to get back into our jury room and space after lunch.

So I'll see you in about 55 minutes. Thank you.
Go ahead and finish exiting the courtroom, please.
(The jury leaves the courtroom.)
THE COURT: What's your matter for the Court?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: The "inappropriate touching your children" gets to that letter, that same topic. That's why my client is afraid of what he's seeing on the Internet.

The letter discusses pedophilia, I mean, specifically touching children. It's a message to my client. It's a threat.

THE COURT: When you're talking about "the letter," you're talking about Exhibit 22?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: 22.
THE COURT: So that's not just the letter. It actually has an order to show cause.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yeah. I mean, we could just -just 2 and 3 ?

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We could do pages 2 and 3, just that one letter. And, in fact, I'd be fine redacting all but that one paragraph.

THE COURT: Which paragraph?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: The one, two, three, four -- fifth paragraph on the first page.

THE COURT: The one that begins with "This, of course"?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No. "Our diagnostic review." And I'd actually like the attachment, too. It's referenced in this paragraph.

THE COURT: Do you care about the fifth paragraph?
MR. ROTE: I think it's consistent with what we've represented in the blog, Your Honor, so no.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MR. ROTE: It's consistent with what we represented in the blog, notwithstanding any reference to a pedophile site. But no, I don't care.

THE COURT: Okay. So if you're going to redact
everything except for paragraph No. 5, the defense has no objection.

Is that correct?
MR. ROTE: Correct.
THE COURT: You've got it.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Great.
THE COURT: Thank you. I'll see you in about 50
minutes.
We are in recess.
THE WITNESS: I just --
THE COURT: You may step down.
THE WITNESS: Sorry.
THE COURT: No problem.
(A lunch recess is then taken.)
(The Court, counsel, the parties, and the jury
reconvene. The witness retakes the witness stand.)
THE COURT: You may proceed.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, we left off with the sentence,
"inappropriately touching your neighbor's children."
Can you -- can you turn to Exhibit 22. It's actually the version I gave you -- the version I gave you.
A. I don't have it here.
Q. Here (handing).
A. Thanks.
Q. Do you recognize that document, Mr. Zweizig?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And without getting into the -- the contents of it, what is it?
A. It is a letter from Tim Rote to Judge Kugler.
Q. What's the date on that letter?
A. It's May 22nd, 2005 .
Q. And are you familiar with that letter?
A. I am familiar with this letter.
Q. And other than the redactions on there, is that an accurate copy of the letter that you're familiar with? A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: And we'd offer Exhibit 22, redacted.

MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Can you please read the unredacted paragraph from that letter for the jury.
A. It says (reading), Our diagnostic review -- sorry. Our diagnostic review of the computer plaintiff used in New Jersey provides a history of information on what plaintiff may have been doing with his time. One page follows. The information was recovered from a hard drive plaintiff attempted to destroy by reformatting it prior to returning it to us. Note that
plaintiff had been downloading video from a --
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you.
"Note that plaintiff" -- and I couldn't hear the word.
THE WITNESS: Pardon me.
(Reading) Note that plaintiff had been downloading
video from a pedophile site. Is it possible that plaintiff had some contact with your clerk?

He's talking about my contact with a judge's clerk somewhere on a pedophile website.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, I'd like to turn back to this screen here, Exhibit 12, page 175. Do you have a hard copy exhibit in front of you? Can you get that in front of you?
A. 170 ?
Q. Yeah.

Page 174 I actually want you to look at.
A. Okay.
Q. What date was this published?
A. February 6th, 2016 .
Q. Okay. Moving on, turn to page 85, please.
A. I have it.
Q. Okay. We're going to look at paragraph 4, the last paragraph there.
A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?
Q. Paragraph 4, the final paragraph.
A. Right.
Q. Let me get this to --
A. I'm sorry. Did you want me to read it?
Q. No, I'm sorry. I'm going to put it on the blowup for the jury.
(Reading) My blog is examining the abuse of civil procedure, arbitration, and even litigation itself, which may taint the legacy of all involved, including me. It's the road we are on, and it affects Bill Crow, Linda Marshall, $M$, and Robert E. Jones.

Who is "M" here?
A. That's me.
Q. And for the jury, who is Bill Crow?
A. Bill Crow is the arbitrator at the arbitration.
Q. And why did this -- reading this bother you?
A. Well, because it's just more indication that -- you know, of what he's going to do. You know, he's going to --
Q. What's that?
A. Well, which is, you know, tarnish people's reputation, make their legacy, their -- you know, what's your legacy? It's your -- you know, it's what you've done. It's your meaning in life. It's, you know, the kind of person you've been able to represent yourself to the world to be. And he's going to take control of that for myself.

And what this is showing here, you know, anybody that
ever gets in contact with me or tries to help me, he's going to do that to them, too.
Q. Turn to page -- page 2 of 4, please. I'm looking at the paragraph -- that top paragraph of that page.
A. I see it, yes.
Q. (Reading) What are we going to do, question mark. Well, we are going to publish, disseminate, write our Congressional delegation, challenge our media to critically evaluate this issue, raise the awareness, and send out one million e-mails. What jumped out at you when you read that?
A. Sending out a million e-mails. You know, also writing our Congressman. Challenging the media to critically evaluate the issue, I imagine that means news stories.

You know, it's just a -- it's just a campaign. This guy is never going to stop. You know, it's just a campaign that he's going to have against me for the rest of my life. This thing has been over my head for a while now, and it -he's just going to keep going, and he's going to escalate it. Q. Turn to page 101.
A. (Pause) Yes. I'm sorry. I have it.
Q. Top paragraph (reading): I am happy to announce that the screenplay based on this arbitration is in its final stage of editing. Soon this will have a larger voice. And as of right now, there is both a fiction version and one based on a true story with no hedging on names, places, and process.

How did you feel when you read this?
A. You know, I think how anybody would feel. Yeah, I mean, this is -- you know, I'm being stalked and terrorized at a pretty high level here. And, you know, he's saying no hedging on names. So names will be wherever he publishes this stuff. It will have a larger voice. He's just -- it's hard to put into words. I mean, it's really -- you know, I can't live like this. You know, seriously, I can't -- I can't live like this.

You know, imagine you had -- you've asked me how I feel, right? I don't want to mess up again. You know -- you know, you have a life. You know, imagine you leave a job, which is what happened, you know. And then that job just follows you around forever. Your boss follows you around forever and wants to say whatever he wants to say, and now he wants to publish whatever he wants to publish about you.

And there's just no peace, $I$ mean, just not at all. Every -- every day in my life $I$ deal with -- if there's not a new edit to it, if there's not a new thing coming up, you know, I'm always thinking about it. I'm thinking if somebody is going to find it, you know, and then I'm going to have to deal with that. Then I'm going to have to answer for this stuff that $I$ never did.

And, you know, human nature, right? You know, as soon as something is said, well, you have to do something to
turn that around, to do something with that. You know, it's -- you know, whoever speaks first, the next person speaking has to challenge that.

I should not have to challenge any of this. I've been through this. I've been through an arbitration. I won. I'm done. I don't work for that gentleman anymore, and I don't want anything to do with him. Tim Rote and I should not know each other. I should be able to go through days of my life without thinking about the name "Tim Rote."

This has been, you know, 13, 14 years now. You know, there's no reason that he and I should have contact anymore, you know, especially since we had a contract that said what our dispute resolution process was. And whatever he wants to say about that or however he wants to twist it, it certainly wasn't this.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 38, please.
A. 38 ?
Q. Yes.
A. Sorry. I got it.
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes. This is a Google search for my name again.
Q. And what's the date of that printout?
A. That's 1-11 this year, 2018.
Q. And is this an accurate representation of what you saw on the Internet when you Googled your name?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 38 into evidence. THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. ROTE: I don't have Exhibit 38, I don't think. (Pause) No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I'll publish this for the jury. BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Can you describe for the jury what you see here.
A. There's a Google search here on this page that has a lot of results, and this is three of the results taken out of that page that you have here. They do appear on this page as they appear here, one right next to the other.

And what this is showing, the first one, is a -- when we talked about those user forums for problem resolution, this is something posted by me. I don't -- I don't think I'm helping anybody in these; $I$ think $I{ }^{\prime} m$ trying to get help in both of these. And then, you know, they're posted by me. And they're findable in a Google search by my name because I used my name, you know, in those forums.

Then right after that, there's this Chapter 90, you know, (reading) Employees desperate for a $\$ 1$ million payday can be enticed by an unscrupulous attorney to lie, cheat, steal, and destroy in an effort to prevail -- prevail on a claim. Sorry.
(Reading) This blog has spent an extraordinary amount of time weighing the evidence and exposing the lies. Let's use this time to bring it all together.

And then it goes on, and my name is, you know, down there. My name is in bold on this page because of the Google search. It's not because of anything else, to be clear.

You know, the top two results is how I used to be able to live on the Internet, you know, with my name. You know, now I don't do that anymore. I use an alias for forums or, you know, things like that. And I used to like not to do that because, you know, people could seek me out in other areas and, you know, there's contact there, there's networking. And I don't dare do that now. Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 40, please. Do you recognize that document?
A. I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is also a Google search for my name, but with the word "programming" added, so if someone were to look for me and then put the word "programming" after that.
Q. And what's the date of this?
A. This is January 9th of this year, 2018.
Q. And is that an accurate copy of what you found on the Internet when you Google searched your name?
A. It is, yes, sir.
Q. All right.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 40 into evidence. MR. ROTE: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. I'll publish this for you, Mr. Zweizig.

Can you describe for the jury here, briefly, what you see.
A. This is one of the chapters from the website again. And this is talking about -- Tim Rote, at some point during the arbitration, accused me and on his website accuses me of trying to start a competing company. That was, in fact, another employee of Northwest Direct; and he's ascribing those actions to me here.
Q. And Chapter 90 -- can you do me a favor and turn back to Exhibit 18? What's the title of that chapter?
A. "The Summary of Evidence, Perjury, and Cybercrime."
Q. And what date was that published?
A. Um --
Q. Not printed, but published.
A. August 30th, 2017.
Q. Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit 14, please.
A. I just noticed something about this. Should I comment on this?
Q. Please do.
A. Okay. It also -- it also says that $I$ was demoted. I was never demoted at work.
Q. Okay. I actually also want to -- the word "programs," it appears as though that's in bold font. Can you explain why you think that is?
A. The search word used was "programming." That may be in bold because of Google, or it may be in bold because that's on the website like that. I believe Google might do what's called kind of a Soundex search, where close words that may be close to that -- I don't know. I'd have to look at the website and see if that was bolded.
Q. Turn to Exhibit 14, please.
A. Okay. I've got it.
Q. What is this document?
A. The print is small.

This is Timothy Rote's LinkedIn page.
Q. And can you tell what date that was printed?
A. That was printed June 13th, 2017.
Q. Is this an accurate copy of Mr. Rote's LinkedIn profile when -- when you saw it?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 14.
MR. ROTE: No objections.
THE COURT: Received.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. How many connections are listed with Mr. Timothy Rote on that LinkedIn profile, at the top right, next to his name?
A. It's very small. Sorry.

It just says 500 plus.
Q. And in the middle of that, where it says "experience," can you tell the jury what experience it lists for his current job?
A. Yes.
Q. Sorry. It's small print.
A. That's all right. As I get older -- novelist;
screenwriter; owner, Rote Enterprises; owner, Rote \& Company.
Q. Does it say where that business is located? Can you tell?
A. It says Los Angeles for novelist, screenwriter.
Q. Okay. Turn to Exhibit 15, please.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you recognize this?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. This is also a LinkedIn page.
Q. And what date was that printed?
A. This was June 13th, 2017.
Q. And is that an accurate copy of what you saw when you visited that site?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 15.
MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, can you just describe briefly for the jury what we're looking at.
A. On the LinkedIn page Mr. Rote is promoting the -- some of the chapters out of the website that he put up that we've been talking about, First Duty Portland website, I believe. I think this was the second website.
Q. And can you turn to Exhibit 16, please.
A. 1-6?
Q. 1-6.
A. Got it.
Q. Do you recognize that?
A. I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This looks like one of the chapters. It's not listed as a chapter, but it says "Arbitration Be Damned."
Q. And what date was that printed?
A. This was printed June 13th, 2017.
Q. Is that an accurate copy of what you saw on the Internet that day?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 16.

MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. What is concerning to you about this, Mr. Zweizig?
A. I'm going to need to read it a little bit.
Q. Go ahead.
A. Pause) Most concerning to me is that he's, you know, going to re-talk about the arbitration. He's saying it's a cautionary story.
(Pause) I'm sorry. It's tough to see. I'm sorry to take the time to do this.
(Pause) And he's making a -- you know, a claim here that the arbitration was, you know, invalid in some way. Q. Does that link -- or does that article contain a link to the -- the website he's been publishing?
A. Yeah. Actually, I'm sorry. I didn't see the bottom here. This is -- yeah, this is one of the printouts from the LinkedIn page, not the -- it looks like one of the chapters, but it's printed from the LinkedIn -- his LinkedIn site.
Q. And can you turn to Exhibit 42, please.
A. I'm there.
Q. Do you recognize this?
A. Yes. This is a Twitter account.
Q. And what's the --
A. Tim Rote's Twitter account.
Q. And what's the date on that?
A. That's January 9th, 2018, this year.
Q. Okay. And this is what you saw when you visited this website on that date?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: All right. We'd offer Exhibit 42. It's the Twitter account.

MR. ROTE: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, does this account also link to the website Mr. Rote was writing about you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Turn to Exhibit 43.
A. Got it.
Q. Do you recognize this?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. It's a Facebook page for Tim Rote, and it references Sitting Duck Denver. It's listed as Sitting Duck Denver. It says that all over it, which is a different website that also references --
Q. I'll get into that.
A. Okay.
Q. What's the date on this?
A. January 9th, again this year, 2018.
Q. And is this what you saw when you visited the Facebook page --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- on that date?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: All right. Offer Exhibit 43. MR. ROTE: No objections.

THE COURT: Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, does Exhibit 43 link to the website as well?
A. Yes. Um, yes. Yes, it does.
Q. Turn to Exhibit 37.
A. Got it.
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is the -- I had said before that there was 97
chapters on the page and one other page. This is the one other page. There's a press release, what Tim Rote called a press release, that he posted on the site. He --
Q. Mr. Zweizig?
A. Yes.
Q. Actually, take a closer look.
A. What's that?
Q. This is a different exhibit. This looks like an e-mail.
A. Okay. Yes, you're right. I saw all the -- I thought this was that.

Okay. Yes, this is an e-mail.
Q. And do you recognize it?
A. Hold on a second. Let me make sure I do.
(Pause) Yes, I do. Sorry.
Q. What's the date of this e-mail?
A. This is January 6th, 2018.
Q. Is this an accurate copy of the e-mail?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 37.
THE WITNESS: Do you want me to clarify what this was, since $I$ said it was a press release? It's not.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We'll get into it.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ROTE: I have some objection to this, Your Honor, because --

THE COURT: That's okay. Hang on to your objection.
I don't have the exhibit in front of me. I don't
have a copy of it. We'll take it up later when we're in recess.

MR. ROTE: Okay.
THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. So what -- how did you feel when you saw this?
A. Can $I$ say what it is?
Q. Yeah, please.
A. Okay. Yeah. This is an e-mail sent out to -- you know, it looks like about 40 people here. I didn't count them. It looks like about 40. This is sent to senators; news agencies; and the Oregon State Bar; USDOJ, Department of Justice, dot gov, sent out to a lot of different agencies. And this is an e-mail about the arbitration that we went through.
Q. And what's the subject of the e-mail?
A. "Pending trial on cybercrime and the fraud triangle." It's about this proceeding. The subject is about this proceeding.
Q. So, Mr. Zweizig, as you've seen this website go up and Google search results, social media and all of this, can you describe for the jury, what -- what harm this has caused you. A. Yeah. I touched on it a little bit before. You know, I can't get out from under this thing. You know, I can't be myself. I can't just live my life. You know, I don't have the easiest life in the world. Everybody's got challenges, you know, and that's fine. You know, I'm pretty good at taking care of my own challenges and everything.

But, you know, this is one $I$ can't control. Somebody has taken my identity. They're saying whatever they want. They're saying, you know, horrible things, not nice things, you know, at all, not something I would want to have to
explain to anybody for any reason and shouldn't have to. And this -- you know, it's like a dark cloud that just follows me all the time. You know, I'll be, you know, sitting somewhere, just trying to relax, and it's here. I don't know where it's going to go. I worry about how big it's going to get. There's -- you know, he keeps escalating and escalating, saying he's going to do more and more things and publicize it more and more places. So I worry about that on one level.

You know, on another one, just what's already out there -- there's 97 chapters of this out there on a second website. I believe the first one went to 89 or 90 chapters before he took that down. You know, I -- while I'm doing my workday, when I go out to lunch, if, you know, it looks like he's putting up more chapters, you know, I'm not going out with people, you know, to lunch like I would like to do maybe.

And I'm, you know, sitting somewhere in like a Wendy's out here -- do you have Wendy's? Okay. I'll be sitting in a Wendy's or something like that and I'm looking at my iPad and I'm hitting "refresh." And sometimes it will come down, and then I'm happy. Okay. Maybe he's come to his senses. Maybe, you know, he's not going to do this to me any more. And then, of course, it goes right back up. It was down because there was revisions being made.

And it's just constant, all the time. I watch this
affect my family. You know, sometimes $I$, you know, will ask Sandy what's wrong, and she's like, you know, just -- you know, she just has to say the word "just," and I know what's wrong. You know, it's this stuff hanging over both of our heads. There's no reason for this, you know. And it's -- it just invades everything. It invades my entire quality of everything.

And, you know, I'm a strong personality. I have good ego. I love people. I love interacting with people. I like helping people. I would help anybody with anything in the world. It's just the kind of person $I$ want to be.

And I have to be guarded. You know, I have to -- how much can $I$ share about myself? You know, how much -- I can't say, "Go to the Internet," you know. I can't put up, you know, web pages about my music, you know, or anything like that because I can't have that presence. You know, I can't have it.

In my -- in the world that we live in today, a very large piece of that has been taken away from that. And in the real world, off of the computers, as I'm walking around with people, I've got to worry about, you know, if they're going to Google my name or did Google my name and find this stuff. And I never know what they're thinking, you know, or what they saw, or what $I$ have to answer for or never get the chance to answer for. And that could be anybody. And it -- it's just
out there. And, you know, $I$ want to be done with it. I want to be done with this -- this man.

You know, go live your life, you know. We had a case. You made a bad business decision to let me go. There was a dispute resolution process in that, and $I$ won, and it's over. Let it be over. You know, go be whoever you want to be. Let your former employee be whoever he wants to be. You know, you were my employer. You had some, you know, specific duties to keep my, you know, things confidential, certainly be truthful to my actions in your company. You've done none of that. Go away. You know, what you've done to me is awful. Believe me, whatever you've wanted to do, I guarantee you've accomplished way more than you thought you possibly could. You've hurt me. You've hurt my fiancee. You've hurt my attorneys. You've hurt everybody you wanted to. I don't know if there is anybody left for you to hurt. And I certainly don't want you to know anybody new in my life, because I know what you're capable of.

So I don't know if that gets it across. It's bad. It's bad. I wouldn't -- I wouldn't wish this on anybody, you know. I -- I just -- I really wouldn't. This is -- it sucks. Sorry. I don't know what else to say about it. MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No further questions. THE COURT: Cross-exam.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROTE:
Q. Mr. Zweizig, I would like you to turn to Exhibit 1, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.
A. I have it.
Q. Can you tell us the name at the top of that page, your employer?
A. Northwest Direct Teleservices.
Q. Northwest Direct Teleservices only, not the names of any of the other corporate entities?
A. This page says "Northwest Direct Teleservices, Inc." only.
Q. You agree that was your employer?
A. You had many companies.
Q. That's not what I asked.
A. There was a lot of legal talk back and forth. You're having me answer something $I$ don't understand. You mentioned through a lot of these processes that there are umbrella companies to other companies. So I can't answer that question.
Q. You can answer who your employer was.
A. My employer, via this contract, says "Northwest Direct Teleservices, Inc." I don't know if that's inclusive of everything that you had.
Q. Thank you.
You looked to the -- Hold on. Please turn to

Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.
A. I have it.
Q. Can you please describe the name of the claimant at the top.
A. Northwest Direct Teleservices, Inc.
Q. No other corporate entity has been identified besides that?
A. Not listed on this document, no.
Q. They are the employer that you sued in this case, in the arbitration?
A. I remember a lot of the people, and there were a lot of your companies on there.

You're asking me something that $I$ don't understand. I'm telling you that $I$ agree with you that it says "Northwest Direct Teleservices, Inc." on this page. I agree with that. Q. This is the plaintiff's exhibit, and it is the Opinion and Order of the arbitration, and there are two parties identified, Northwest Direct Teleservices and Max Zweizig, correct?
A. I agree with that, yes.

MR. ROTE: Your Honor, we have a couple of
impeachment exhibits that $I$ feel like we need to do a sidebar on.

THE COURT: Do you have other questions that you can ask before we get to those exhibits?

MR. ROTE: Certainly.
THE COURT: Why don't we go through that. And then at the end, we can take a break and talk about those. MR. ROTE: Okay.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, you testified that -- that you provided a spreadsheet during the course of your complaint to me via e-mail. Is that consistent with what you remember?
A. I don't think I said -- Today?
Q. Today.
A. We can see what I said. I said I informed you about it. Q. You informed me about it via e-mail, claiming that you received a spreadsheet via e-mail. Is that what your testimony was?
A. Yeah. I think I said I sent you a letter. I don't know if $I$ said $I$ sent you a letter or e-mail.
Q. And in that letter you claimed to have received that spreadsheet evidence in an e-mail from an employee?
A. Yeah.

We talked about this at the arbitration. This is something we've already gone through.
Q. You agree, don't you, that you never turned over that e-mail?
A. I don't remember.
Q. You don't remember?
A. No. It was 10 years ago. And we've already gone through that, and the case is over.
Q. Nonetheless, I have an opportunity to cross-examine you on your testimony today.
A. I don't remember.
Q. In the course of -- in the course of your evaluation of the blog, were you ever offered the opportunity to -- to -Did I ever offer you the opportunity to modify any component, anything that was written by me on the blog, to modify any representation made by the blog.
A. Outside of a couple of communications that you found a way to make to me, since I worked for you, I have not spoken with you.
Q. Did $I$ offer to your attorney, Mr. Christiansen, an opportunity to tell me precisely what you wanted to modify from the blog?
A. I believe you did.
Q. I'd like to have you turn to --
A. I have no interest in working on this thing with you.

That's abusive. Why would you have me work on this website that you put up about me with you? I shouldn't know you, sir. MR. ROTE: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, I'd like you to turn to Defendant's Exhibit
595.

MR. ROTE: Do you have that?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No.
THE COURT: He does not have your exhibits up there.
MR. ROTE: I'm going to have to turn to the clerk. MR. CHRISTIANSEN: He doesn't have it.

MR. ROTE: He doesn't have it? Okay.
Attorney 2.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Your Honor, objection. He's publishing it.

THE COURT: Yeah. Can you take that down?
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. So, Mr. Zweizig, let's focus on some of your testimony. Did you testify that you did not, in fact, destroy any computer programming at your -- at your last day? Is that what you testified today?
A. I didn't destroy anything. I sent you all of the programming in a zip file in an e-mail. This was already covered. And you said, "Thanks."
Q. When the -- when the blog was rebranded and --
A. Can you explain to me what that means?
Q. Sure. When the blog was -- Sitting Duck Denver was taken offline and it was relabeled, there was a period of time in which your name was redacted from the blog. Do you recall that?
A. No. It's not redacted today.
Q. It was redacted from the blog. And when it was redacted from the blog, your search results did not show any activity with respect to the blog?
A. Sometimes they did; sometimes they didn't. That's how it goes. You can take a page down; it's still going to stay. Or you can make edits to the page, and it will still stay for a while.
Q. But it won't link to anything, will it, Mr. Zweizig?
A. Yes, it could. It's called caching.
Q. But you admit that when it was rebranded to a different blog name and your name was redacted, that you didn't show up in the Google results?
A. I think I already answered that.
Q. What was your answer?
A. Sometimes it did; sometimes it didn't.
Q. So let's talk about a couple of Google searches on the defendant's exhibits.

First I want to go to, I think, Exhibit 25, Plaintiff's Exhibit 25.

Excuse me, no. Plaintiff's Exhibit 546 --
Defendant's Exhibit 546. Excuse me.
THE COURT: Has that been received already?
THE CLERK: No.
THE COURT: It has not?

How about if $I$ give him my copies of the exhibits, so that he has them.

MR. ROTE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: (Handing).
THE WITNESS: Were you finished with plaintiff's
exhibits?
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. No, we're not finished, but --

THE COURT: You can just set them aside there. I
think you have some room on the side.
THE WITNESS: Is it okay to put them on the floor?
THE COURT: Yes. That's your space right now.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Which exhibit did you want him to refer to?

MR. ROTE: Defendant's Exhibit 546, which I think is the same as Plaintiff's Exhibit 25.

THE WITNESS: On the listing on the outside of these books, I do not see 546 .

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. I have it now published.

THE CLERK: It hasn't been received.
MR. ROTE: I'd like to offer this.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. I'd like to examine you on this document. This is the
source by which you referred to the other corporate entities in your Complaint.
A. Okay.
Q. Is it? Do you know?
A. I see one --
Q. Do you see the corporate entities down below?
A. It's not up there. It's up here.

I see two -- I see a very small part of something.
It says "License Agreement" at the top.
Q. Okay. Let's go back down to --
A. I'm not trying to be difficult. I can't answer your questions.
Q. -- down to page 5.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see all the entities that signed that agreement?
A. Okay.
Q. Is it your contention that all of these entities were your employer?
A. Like I said, you had a lot of corporations with umbrella corporations. I don't remember the specific names -- specific names, sorry. It's in my document. It's in my Complaint.

You had a myriad of them. They're all your companies.
They're all you.
Q. Well, they're not all me.
A. Okay.
Q. The Northwest Direct Teleservices Corporation is identified on page 5 as one of the entities signing this agreement. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. Okay. And you are not yet -- or you don't understand that your Complaint is based, in part, on this representation from your side that all of these entities were your employer? A. Yeah, I believe that we listed every entity that you had as my employer.
Q. But again, you agree that your employer in the contract and your employer in the arbitration opinion was Northwest Direct Teleservices?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Asked and answered.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You can answer the question.
THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. But you agree that the entity that was your employer in your employment agreement and in the arbitration opinion and award was Northwest Direct Teleservices only?
A. It's right there on the page.
Q. That's a yes?
A. Yes. Except I don't understand your umbrella corporation strategy, sir, so $I$ don't know if it's a subsidiary on the page. I don't understand whether it's a parent corporation on
the page. I agree with you completely as to what is on the page.

Again, I'm not trying to be difficult. I think you're trying to lead me somewhere. I don't know. I don't understand what you're trying to do.

MR. ROTE: I'd like to offer Defendant's Exhibit 546.

THE COURT: Any objection to 546?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No objection.
THE COURT: Received.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. In your testimony, you indicated that you were under the impression that the arbitration was confidential somehow or there was some confidentiality associated with it?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you tell me about that?
A. Yeah. Before we could even begin, there were what were called protective orders that were thrown back and forth by both sides, mainly you. You were the one worried about keeping that confidential, from my recollection of that. And we couldn't even get started. We couldn't even get started with depositions or anything until that was all nailed down.

And absolutely I thought that was confidential and absolutely $I$ thought that was an employment proceeding, which would make it part of my employee record.
Q. Which part of it was confidential?
A. I thought the whole thing was confidential.
Q. The whole thing?
A. Why would it not be? Yeah.
Q. Do you believe you have a right to confidentiality with respect to everything that happened in the arbitration?
A. I had an expectation of confidentiality with respect to everything that happened in the arbitration. I'm not a lawyer.
Q. You have indicated that -- that the social media -LinkedIn, Facebook, other social media accounts -- have in the last two years compromised your ability to engage in social media interactions? Is that a fair statement?
A. Sure it is.
Q. What about prior to the time the blog was written? Would -- no LinkedIn account, no Facebook account, nothing in evidence that you had anything of that nature prior to the time the blog was written?
A. As I say, I think I've spoken to some of the things. I used to use my real name in multiple forums. And, yes, I did use my real name on the Internet, and I used real e-mail addresses out in the world that reflected my real name. I no longer do that is what I said.

So, yes, it has -- I'm not sure what you're asking there, but it changed my behavior.
Q. Let me make it more specific. Do you have a LinkedIn
account now?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Have you ever, at any time, had a LinkedIn account?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. When did you stop?
A. I don't remember exactly when it was. It was a - somewhere around a couple years ago.
Q. Somewhere around a couple years ago?
A. Contemporaneous, yes, with you putting up the blog, I took down --
Q. You took down your LinkedIn account?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did you have a Facebook account?
A. I think I still do have a Facebook account. I keep no content on it.
Q. No content.

Any other social media accounts?
A. Not that $I^{\prime} m$ aware of, no.
Q. You -- The computer that you used while an employee, returned on your last day, was that a 60-gig hard drive, do you recall?
A. I don't remember.
Q. There was also one that crashed in May 2003. Was that the 120-gig hard drive?
A. I don't remember.
Q. You don't remember that either?
A. No, sir.
Q. You had mentioned to -- in your cross -- in your direct examination that there were 96 chapters, 97 chapters of the blog. I did the same thing, I think, in my opening. But what of these chapters were directly related to the arbitration? A. Many of them. I don't have a calculation of that.
Q. You don't know how many?
A. I don't know how many. But $I$ know that you have a chapter that clearly says, "Why Am I Blogging?" And it pretty clearly states that you're doing this because of the arbitration. Q. In your direct testimony you indicated that you were not -- did not organize a competing company. Do you recall the name of that company?
A. That was a company that Paul tried to organize, and it was called something Results. It was S Results.
Q. Superior Results Marketing perhaps?
A. Sure.
Q. And it's your testimony that you were not a -- you were not an organizer of that company?
A. No. It was Paul Bauer (ph).
Q. It was Paul Bauer?
A. Uh-huh.

Again, this is -- this is arbitration, things that have already been decided.
Q. Nonetheless, if --
A. And this is -- are you -- so you're speaking about the company. This is company business, right?
Q. Well, Superior Results Marketing is what you testified about. I'm just curious as to what your testimony was.
A. Okay.
Q. On your Exhibit 18, Chapter 90, with respect to perjury, Plaintiff's Exhibit 18 --
A. (Pause) Got it.
Q. You refute committing any acts of perjury in and during the arbitration?
A. Sir, I don't remember my testimony during the arbitration.
Q. You --
A. I'm not going to knowingly commit perjury anywhere.
Q. You indicated in an exhibit raised here, with respect to Chris Cox, an e-mail you received. Do you recall -- and he made a specific reference in that e-mail. You have that now in evidence about the fact of a shutdown that happened after your last day with the company.
A. Do you have a question?
Q. The question is: Do you recall a shutdown of the company after the last day?
A. After my last day --
Q. Yes.
A. -- do I recall a shutdown of the company?
Q. Yes.

THE COURT: You have to make sure that you let him finish his question before you start responding.

Similarly, if he starts responding, you need to stop speaking. Otherwise my reporter can't make an accurate record of what's happening.

Can you ask your question again, please.
MR. ROTE: Sure.
I'm going to -- I'd like to get Chapter 86, "The Shutdown," in right now, Your Honor.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection, Your Honor. This is published again.

THE COURT: You shouldn't publish it until it's been received into evidence.

And you were asking a question about whether he recalls the shutdown. Do you want to ask that question again?

MR. ROTE: I do.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. In the blog, I write quite a bit about the shutdown. Do you recall a shutdown post-employment, after your last day of employment in 2003?
A. Sir, I did not keep tabs on your company after my last day of employment. I don't recall anything one way or the other about it.
Q. There were a lot -- excuse me. There were a lot of this
type of data discussed in the arbitration itself. You don't recall any evidence being put on about the shutdown?
A. Okay. You didn't ask me that.

Yeah, I recall evidence being put on about the shutdown. I believe at one point you mentioned it was a week-long shutdown. At another point you mentioned it was a 10-day shutdown. Somewhere you mentioned that it was for a few days. You've been all over the map on this shutdown. Q. Can you tell me -- You are a FoxPro programmer expert. You are doing other than that today?
A. Yes.
Q. And tell us -- tell me a little bit more about what you're doing in terms of your programming skills.
A. I'm a systems analyst and a programmer.
Q. What database programming are you using today?
A. JavaScript, FoxPro.
Q. FoxPro still?
A. Sure.
Q. Are you offering your services as an independent consultant or are you an employee?
A. I'm an employee.
Q. Can you identify the employer?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Everybody that you come in contact with
that $I$ know, you hurt. I am not asking you for economic damages. And I am going to ask you, sir -- You have mentioned on your website that you have emotional control issues. So I'm going to ask you --

MR. ROTE: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
THE WITNESS: Please withdraw the -- would you please
withdraw the question?
THE COURT: Just a minute. Just a minute.
When $I$ say "sustained," you must stop talking.
THE WITNESS: I apologize.
THE COURT: We'll just leave it at that.
You can ask your question.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Please identify your employer.

THE WITNESS: It's my belief that if $I$ do that, that Mr. Rote is going to do something to interfere with that employment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll take that up during the recess.

You can go on to another area.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. During the course of the arbitration, there was a lot of forensic reports provided and forensic testimony. I'm not
attempting to get that in. I just want to ask if that is your recollection.
A. It's my recollection, along with the component that $I$ did not get to examine everything you got to examine.
Q. That's not what I asked.
A. That's my recollection.
Q. You hired a forensic expert by the name of Justin McCann (ph) ?
A. Yeah. I do -- I feel like we're relitigating the arbitration.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you. THE WITNESS: I feel like we're relitigating the
arbitration with the company, Northwest.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Your attorney can object for you.
A. Okay.
Q. So there was a lot of testimony about that, correct?
A. There was testimony about that. The amount, I don't know. There was a lot of testimony about a lot of things, sure. I mean, okay.
Q. Did the arbitrator, in his opinion and award, contemplate the forensic evidence?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. The arbitrator's opinion and award is one of the issues that $I$ raise significantly here in this blog. And can you tell me -- I want to focus on -- let me just focus on components of the arbitration after the evidence was issued and considered.

Do you recall Arbitrator Crow recusing himself?
A. Yeah. There was definitely something that happened with that, yes.
Q. Do you recall that he was -- he was challenged because he didn't disclose his relationship with Linda Marshall?
A. Yeah. You did that. I think people professionally work together. But you chose to do that, sure.
Q. And after the recusal, then he re -- he agreed to continue as the arbitrator. Is that also accurate?
A. He did. He consulted the rules, consulted the law, and found there were no grounds for what you were saying and continued.

MR. ROTE: Your Honor, I'm struggling with the arbitration opinion and how $I$ can cross-examine on this.

THE COURT: The opinion is in evidence.
MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: Trying to figure out why an arbitrator ruled, beyond what's in an opinion, he's not going to be able to tell you that.

MR. ROTE: I'm trying to direct a specific piece.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. The arbitrator, in the opinion and award, for example, decided not to admit that evidence, not to consider that evidence. Is that your memory?
A. I don't know how to answer that.

Look, there's an opinion and award. We had a case. It's done. It's many years ago. What he wanted to consider in there or what he did -- I agree with the judge.
Q. Over the last 10,12 years, have you been actively engaged in IT services, employment services?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You've worked for multiple employers? Even though you don't want to tell us who they are, you've worked for multiple employers?
A. I've worked for multiple employers. I don't want to tell you who they are.
Q. The industries in which these employers exist?
A. Teleservices, some.
Q. Teleservices?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. What else besides teleservices?
A. Health care.
Q. Okay. We have -- I'd like to refer you to an exhibit.

MR. ROTE: I don't know if I offered 86 as an
exhibit, Your Honor.
THE COURT: 86?
MR. ROTE: 86.
Excuse me, 593, "The Shutdown," Defendant's
Exhibit 593.
THE COURT: You did not offer that. That's part of the blog?

MR. ROTE: That is part of the blog.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No.
THE COURT: Received.
You can now publish it to the jury.
MR. ROTE: Exhibit -- Defendant's Exhibit 595, is
that accidentally published already?
THE COURT: That has not been received yet.
MR. ROTE: Okay.
THE COURT: Are you offering 595?
MR. ROTE: I'd like to just cross him first on it,
Your Honor.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. I'd like you to refer to the Defendant's Exhibit 595. Do you have it?
A. I have it in front of me. I have part of it in front of me here.
Q. Can you tell us what that says, what -- the first
paragraph from me to you.
THE WITNESS: Okay. I don't know the rule on this. Am I allowed to see the whole exhibit or -- as he shows me a piece of that? When do I address that?

THE COURT: You're allowed to look at the whole thing.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I would like to see the whole exhibit if we're going to present -- Can everybody see the whole exhibit?

THE COURT: No. You get to see the whole exhibit.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: I assume you have it in your notebook there. That will make it easier for you.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Sorry. I forgot about this.
(Pause) I do not see 595 listed in the books. What I have on my screen is a small part. It says 595.

THE COURT: It's apparently in a notebook. It's kind of hard to navigate. Look through there and see if you can find it.

Can you help him, Jen? He's looking for 595.
THE CLERK: (Indicating).
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
May I have a minute to look at it?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I thought it was more
pages.
Okay. I see it. It's a piece of an e-mail. It's incomplete. It's an incomplete e-mail exchange.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Would you please describe what -- First of all, let's confirm, this is an e-mail between -- from me to you?
A. It is. This is also talking about -- this is discussing reasons for termination. It's in here.

I mean, that's something that's been decided.
Q. I'm asking a specific question.
A. I understand that. But you're giving me evidence that we, I believe, have already gone over in the arbitration; and these matters have been decided.

THE COURT: Mr. Zweizig, I want you just to listen to his question and answer his question and trust that your lawyer will do his job.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. The e-mail from me to you, this is document 595. You see that, the top of 595?
A. I see it, yes.
Q. Do you see that it's representing that "I'm sure that we can work out some kind of public statement for public consumption"?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection, relevance. It's an
e-mail from 2003.
THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. All right. This particular document was after you filed a complaint with the Department of Justice?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection, relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.
This was way before the blog ever took place, correct?

MR. ROTE: Way before the blog, but after he had already filed his complaint with the Department of Justice. THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. I want to ask you about one of the chapters in the blog that is in evidence here, Plaintiff's Exhibit -- I believe Plaintiff's Exhibit 12. This would have been on page --
starting at page 25, Chapter 7, "The 120-Gig Hard Drive."
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: What page?
MR. ROTE: I have it as page 25.
THE WITNESS: I see it.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. So "The 120-Gig Hard Drive" goes into great detail about a hard drive recovered from you in 2003, right after your
termination, right after your last day, just before your last day. "The 120-Gig Hard Drive," does this refresh your recollection as to the hard drive that crashed in May 2003? A. I don't remember which hard drive crashed. I know that you didn't produce one of these hard drives, so if you're about to go talking about the content of this hard drive -Q. That's not what I asked you. I --
A. -- that's --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. One at a time, please.

THE WITNESS: I spoke out of turn. I'm sorry. THE COURT: Go ahead and ask your question.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. You referenced during your examination that the information in this hard drive was -- that you did not, in fact, download porn; you did not, in fact, engage in any of these activities?
A. I did not download porn.
Q. This hard drive was cross-referenced through a forensic report that identified you as only -- the only user.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Can you tell me, Mr. Zweizig, why the $120-\mathrm{gig}$ hard drive would have had all of this information on it? Is it your
position that you didn't have exclusive possession? MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Are you taking issue in your plaintiff's -- in your testimony with the content of this blog chapter, "The 120-Gig Hard Drive," in its entirety?
A. Can you say that question again?
Q. Are you taking issue with the content of the blog post in its entirety?
A. Anything disgusting that you found on any hard drive that you go and post on the Internet, I am taking issue with.
Q. Every one?
A. Yes. Any disgusting thing, yes.
Q. The 120-gig hard drive -- Let me just ask you this question. There were some 1900 Fox profiles found that had been reformatted. Do you recall reformatting?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You can answer the question, the last part of the question.

THE WITNESS: It was our -- okay. I need to -- I will answer that question. But I don't remember which hard drive you didn't turn over, which means I also don't remember which hard drive was reformatted.

It was the policy of our company, if a hard drive crashed, you did something to reformat or destroy it or something. It had client data on it.

So, yes, there was a reformatted hard drive. When you picked it up at my house, I told you it was reformatted. A hard drive was reformatted. I don't know if that refers to this hard drive.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. You don't know if it was a $120-\mathrm{gig}$ hard drive or a $60-\mathrm{gig}$ hard drive?
A. No. I don't remember.
Q. But you do agree that you reformatted it?
A. You keep saying "it." There was a hard drive reformatted. Q. That's -- The hard drive was reformatted. You reformatted a hard drive?
A. I reformatted a hard drive, yes.
Q. And it's your -- Why did you do so?
A. Because the hard drive crashed, as far as being able to be used. And I reformatted it. You knew -- it was our policy. You reformat something so that the credit card information -we didn't keep numbers. If we did, they were encrypted. But any credit cards or personal information on a hard drive would not be available to anyone.
Q. On that reformatted hard drive, there were, as you just indicated, some 500,000 --
A. No, I did not indicate that.
Q. Did you indicate that --

> THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Wait for the question. THE WITNESS: Sorry, sir.
> THE COURT: Go ahead.

BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Did you just testify that there was confidential customer information on that hard drive?
A. No, I did not. I said that it was our policy to do that, and I gave you the reasons why.
Q. You had mentioned in your testimony now that there was data that was -- or files that were unencrypted, and that was -- did I misunderstand?
A. I said if we got credit card numbers, they were encrypted is what I said. I don't know if any of that information was on any of your hard drives.
Q. The programming that you did for the company, can you describe it in any detail?
A. Today? Not really.
Q. You would agree that programming was necessary to process the amount of data that we had daily?
A. Yes.
Q. And that in the -- in the absence of that programming, the company might have to shut down until it recreated it?
A. I gave you your programming. You sent me back an e-mail
that said, "Thanks." You got it.
This was -- we've been through this.
Q. I'm asking you a direct question. You agree that if that programming was not there, that the company would have to shut down to re-create it?
A. I absolutely do not agree.
Q. You do not?
A. No, I don't. I was in a similar situation when $I$ started for your company. There was nothing. There was not a thing. It was a running train. We were doing calls, we were doing everything. And I used my skill, without programming, to get your files out and get everything done. It depends on the skill of your workers.
Q. Tell me how you did that.
A. Tell you how I got your files out?
Q. Tell me how you did that, yes.
A. Okay. Your data was there. I'm familiar with data. There is an incoming layout. There is our dialer layout that we had at the time, at Northwest. And then there is a fulfillment layout back to the client and perhaps some reporting files necessary.

I came to your Dyersville facility, and I worked nonstop for two days to make sure that you had no slowdown, that you were able to do work, and telemarketers were able to come to work. As I was going through that, while I was
looking at the state that everything was in -- Again, this is when I started. This is kind of the same situation you're talking about, but this is when I started. I want to be clear about when this was.

You know, it was hard. It wasn't easy. You had nothing. You had no programming. Whoever left -- the person I didn't meet was a friend of yours. You said that. I never met that person. They're gone. They left no programming. They left no way to do anything. It was up to me to get it done.

And I'm telling you, at one time I pushed back in my chair for a minute, and I asked your center coordinator, I said, "What was your plan B if I didn't come aboard?" And she said you had already had a meeting with them, and Dyersville would have shut down.

So can it shut down? It can. But I'm not going to agree that it has to. It depends on the skill of the people you bring on board.
Q. Again, you were using Visual FoxPro?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Visual FoxPro was the database reporting program?
A. Yes. Yes, that's what $I$ used to do that job, yeah.
Q. The servers for the dialers and switch, that was a Unix-based system, do you recall?
A. Yeah, I think it was. I think everything was.
Q. So that data had to be imported into tables in order to be processed; is that an accurate statement?
A. The data needed to come from the Windows environment and then be in -- yeah, and the dialer had an import feature that you would import.
Q. The data had to be imported to a Windows-based system; is that accurate?
A. Well, you asked me about the dialers. Dialers are Unix, so it had to be imported into Unix for that process.
Q. So the FoxPro programming was not taking the -- was not importing the data from the dialer to a Windows-based server or computer?
A. I believe you asked me about putting the records on the dialer. For that, for later, after the dialing, sure, it needs to come off of there, and the opposite of that happens. Q. It would be more accurate to call that exporting, then, as opposed to importing, then, right?
A. Sure. Importing, exporting, right.
Q. So exporting from the Unix dialer to a Windows-based machine so that FoxPro can be used to generate those reports?
A. Or anything, sure, yeah.
Q. Anything.
A. Excel.
Q. Excel, yeah, anything at all.

And so those programs, then -- Do you recall where
you would have done that work?
A. I worked for you for about a year and a half. The situation we were just talking about, I flew to Dyersville, Iowa to accomplish that work.
Q. You worked from your home remotely in New Jersey?
A. I did.
Q. For -- it was about a year or so?
A. I'll take your word for that. I don't remember. But fine.
Q. You would process -- You were the lead programmer; is that accurate?
A. I was IT director for your company.
Q. And would you say you were the lead programmer as well?
A. Yeah.
Q. And based on the document we see with respect to your contract, you were making $\$ 90,000$ back then?
A. That's correct.
Q. And today's dollars, it's maybe $\$ 150,000$ ?
A. I don't know.
Q. Would you agree with that?
A. I would have to look that up. I don't know. I would not agree that $\$ 90,000$ ten years ago is $\$ 150,000$ today. I don't think that's the case.
Q. So if we had correspondence that said there was no transfer of programs, you would disagree with that conclusion,
that you hadn't --
A. We went through this, had an arbitration. During that arbitration, there was evidence. Part of the evidence was I sent you an e-mail with a zip file of your programs. You acknowledged it and said, "Thanks."

You didn't acknowledge it and say, "Hey, there's no programming here" or "What do I do with this?" or anything. You knew that those were your programs.
Q. No such evidence here today.
A. I don't know. I don't know what you're talking about. I know I gave you your programs. I know you asked me for programming on certain other things, and I told you, "I just do the work."

It's not all -- you know, you seem to have this mind -- and again, we're going back into another case here. But you seem to have a mind-set that, you know, there's a button to push and a program, you know, and it just does everything. There's -- you know, if that were true, you wouldn't have to hire skilled and specialized people to do these tasks.
Q. The reporting programs back then were not automated? A. I don't remember.
Q. The references you made to my LinkedIn account, most of those are -- Tell me what concerns you about the chapters that are disputing issues with respect to the bar. How does that
affect you?
A. Well, one of the ways it does affect me is if people look up things regarding those chapters, subject matter in those chapters, is yet another way where they're going to find the chapters about me. So there are non-targeted things also out there on your website that might bring people there, and there's my name; and, you know, it's going to be smeared up. Q. Do you agree that your name is not included in most of those chapters?
A. I don't know if it's most.
Q. The chapters that I referred to in the LinkedIn account your attorney brought up, those chapters were about attorneys as opposed to you.
A. Okay. Great. You're delineating your website as some chapters are this, some chapters are that. I don't know if I'm going to join you in that, because as people go to a website, they go to a website and they go to the whole thing. You know, I mean, that's our computer experience. You know, I might Google something about programming, and then I know way more than $I$ want to know about koala bears in 10 minutes because it takes you somewhere else.

So, I mean, you're trying to make this separation that, you know, okay, they're only going to see this. That's part of my concern. Look at what I'm sitting with (indicating). This is a lot of volume, you know. So I don't
know what part that somebody is going to go to. I don't know, you know, the bottom of that thing. It would go to random chapters. It wouldn't go to sequential chapters. I don't know how you set that up, but it would go to random chapters. So when they're done reading whatever they want to read about the bar, PLF, you know, "Arbiters Be Damned," or whatever you have up there, you know, then the chapter, "Our History With Max Zweizig," pops up, and then there is something prominently for them to click for.

So, yeah, I do have a problem with how your LinkedIn chapter is related to chapters not related to me. I think there's a pretty small path between -- you know, how that could affect me.

MR. ROTE: Your Honor, I'm kind of at that point when --

THE COURT: You don't have anything else other than the things we need to talk about?

All right. Members of the jury, we'll call this our afternoon recess. We'll be in recess for about 15 minutes. The lawyers and I will do some work while you're in your room, okay?
(The jury leaves the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Mr. Zweizig, you can step down.
THE WITNESS: I guess I'll just leave this.
THE COURT: Yeah. You're not done testifying yet,
but you can step down for now. It's okay. Step down.
Okay. Mr. Rote, I have some notes down here, but why don't you remind me of those things that you wanted to introduce and I said we need to talk about this outside the presence of the jury.

MR. ROTE: Yeah. I think we're at -- we'll soon be at a point here where $I$ have some impeachment testimony with respect to Mr. Zweizig, but one of those -- multiple of those are still forensic reports, so we're -- like the 120-gig forensic report, they've introduced evidence that I have submitted components of that or discussed components of that, for which he has denied any existence of, but that forensic report was, in fact -- is, in fact, impeachment evidence.

So I'm just asking this question, whether or not we have at this stage --

THE COURT: Is your notion that you can simply introduce as an exhibit a forensic report?

MR. ROTE: No. I would do it in conjunction with my blog, which the plaintiff has examined him on.

THE COURT: So when you testify, that would be your exhibit when you testify?

MR. ROTE: It is correct, although he has refuted the existence of that information on a chapter.

THE COURT: But he's not someone that can authenticate that forensic report. I don't even know if you
can, but -- I don't know if you can, but he can't. It doesn't come in through him. It might come in through you.

Do you understand?
MR. ROTE: Yeah, I think $I$ understand. But some of this was -- Well, okay. So --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you for just a moment, if $I$ might. If it's something that's in the blog, the whole blog is in. But if it's something that is not part of the blog, then $I$ need to look at it separately.

If it's not part of the blog, you're saying you want him to identify and authenticate a forensic report. I'm just guessing here, but I'm thinking that's not his -- that's not his -- he's not a forensic expert. He doesn't get to do that.

MR. ROTE: Yeah. So -- so the issue is he's denied the existence of this material that I've included in my blog. And the source of that material, even the attachment from the Judge Kugler letter and the reference in that paragraph, comes from that forensic report.

THE COURT: I know. Again, if you want to get into evidence the rest of Judge Kugler's letter, I will consider that, because part of the letter is in. You want the rest of it. I will consider letting the rest of it in. That's different, however, than a forensic report itself.

Do you understand what I'm saying?
MR. ROTE: Yeah, okay.

So if I'm kind of following this correctly, at some point in time during my direct testimony on Chapter 7, on "The 120-Gig Hard Drive," I'm going to be outlining all of this evidence, the source of which I'm going to reference to a forensic report.

THE COURT: Yeah. I told you that you get to explain why you wrote things on the blog, and I will let you explain why you wrote things on the blog.

Does that mean you get to automatically introduce a forensic report? No. There's more to it than that, and you know that.

MR. ROTE: Yeah. I'm trying to understand how I accomplish that, I guess.

THE COURT: Yeah. You may not be able to do that. Sometimes that happens.

MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: Sometimes what happens is you don't have a forensic expert that can authenticate this report and what it means because you weren't particularly offering it for what it says, and that is that "Our report shows that he did certain things." You may not be able to do that. I don't know, but you may not be able to do that.

On the other hand, if you want to say, "This is what my blog said, and this is why I said it," have at it. I told you you would be able to do that.

MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay? Do we understand each other?
MR. ROTE: We do. I'm still struggling with how to
impeach some of his testimony in the absence of getting that in.

THE COURT: Sometimes the impeachment is your testimony.

MR. ROTE: Yeah, okay.
THE COURT: And then the jury is left with trying to figure out how to weigh witness testimony. That's their job. That's what they do.

There was another exhibit I think that you had referenced that we had put on hold, and I don't want to forget that. I want to make sure you had an opportunity to be heard about that one as well.

MR. ROTE: I think there was an Exhibit 5 --
THE COURT: 540? No?
MR. ROTE: 560, maybe, e-mail to modify.
THE CLERK: You said you were going to take up 37
later, and 594.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say it again, Jennifer.
THE CLERK: Exhibit 37 you said you'd take up later, and then 594 is what $I$ wrote down later.

THE COURT: So 37 would be a plaintiff's exhibit.
THE CLERK: Right. You started going there and said
you'd take it up later.
THE COURT: And 594 would be a defense exhibit.
THE CLERK: Correct.
THE COURT: So let's talk about defense exhibits.
594, is that the document that showed all the
different entities?
MR. ROTE: No. That was 525.
THE COURT: Okay. So what's 594?
MR. ROTE: I think it was 595. I think it was 560
and 595, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I don't have those exhibits anymore,
Jennifer.
MR. ROTE: But I think you ruled on 595. It was an e-mail that was sent to him, to Mr. Zweizig, in November 2003, offering --

THE COURT: Oh, yeah. So what was the other one you wanted?

MR. ROTE: 560 .
THE COURT: (Pause) Oh, my goodness.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I have no objection to this.
That's fine.
THE COURT: So 560 you don't have any objection to?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: The letter, no, I don't. E-mails,
two e-mails, no objection.
THE COURT: Is that the one we were waiting on was

560, Mr. Rote?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I don't have copies of exhibits. Can you pull it up, so we can make sure we're looking at the same thing?

I think it's 595, right?
MR. ROTE: 595 was ruled on.
560 has to do with the offer to compromise the -modify the blog.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Can you pull it up so 1 can see it?

THE COURT: This one is from December 16 th of 2016.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: 560? No objection.
THE COURT: Does that resolve your problem, Mr. Rote?
MR. ROTE: It resolves the problems I can think about at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. So 560 will be received.
MR. ROTE: Excuse me, Your Honor. Did we make a
decision about 590 --
THE COURT: 594?
THE CLERK: 594 was prior to the blog, you said, and then you didn't rule.

THE COURT: Yeah. No. I told him that wasn't coming in, the one prior to the blog.

THE CLERK: Okay.
MR. ROTE: 599, did we previously discuss that, the

Secretary of State? It was part of my direct.
THE COURT: I don't think you offered 599.
MR. ROTE: 599, I did not, during Mr. Zweizig's. I think we touched on it this morning. I just want to make sure I can --

THE COURT: You can offer it in your case in chief. He's not going to be able to identify this. That's outside his testimony.

MR. ROTE: Right. I think that is, by and large, it.
I think 602 has to do with forensic reports already in the public domain, but $I$ think that is a neutralized point, since they're not now going to argue that the media protective order is -- they're not arguing now that the media protective order precludes the publishing of forensic reports, so -- at least, $I$ think that's correct, is it not?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We have not offered that exhibit. THE COURT: The exhibit would be the protective order. That was not offered into evidence.

MR. ROTE: Right.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: Does that solve all of the issues that you were worried about and I said, "Let's take a break and we'll take them up at that point"?

MR. ROTE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any other -(The Court and the clerk confer off the record.)

THE COURT: So 37 has not been offered yet?
MR. ROTE: 37 is the e-mail to Carol Bernick.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: It's your e-mail to 50 people with a long description.

MR. ROTE: So the issue there, in my mind, is that the e-mail itself was an exhibit that $I$ wanted to put on with respect to -- or --

THE COURT: Hang on a second.
MR. ROTE: Yeah.
THE COURT: I think we're talking about your 37. Do you have any objection to your 37?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: What's that?
THE CLERK: We don't have it. We never got it from you.

THE COURT: That's okay. My question is: Do you have an objection to your 37 coming in?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: My own?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No.
THE CLERK: We do not have them.
THE COURT: That's another issue.
Were you offering 37?
MR. ROTE: No. I was objecting to it because it was
correspondence from Carol Bernick sent over to

Mr. Christiansen. That's a line of -- a topic that you had already ruled that we were not going to --

THE COURT: All right. So now let me take a look at it.
(Pause) Had you offered this?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.

THE COURT: (Pause) Mr. Rote, you're objecting to this? Have you seen it?

MR. ROTE: Yeah. I wrote it.
So my objection is only that -- I withdraw my objection.

THE COURT: Okay. 37 will be received.
Do you have further questions in your
cross-examination or are you finished?
MR. ROTE: I think I'm done, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So when the jury comes back,
just say, "I have no further questions."
I'll give you an opportunity for redirect. And then we'll be done with plaintiff's case. All right? Let's take a break. How about -- let's give ourselves about 10 minutes.
(A recess is then taken.)
(The Court, counsel, and the parties reconvene.)
THE CLERK: Court is back in session.

THE COURT: Mr. Rote, I want to remind you about something that we began to talk about, and you forgot and I forgot to mention; and that is you wanted to cross-examine about who the plaintiff's present employers were, and that was one of the things $I$ said we would take up during the break. And I forgot to give you a chance to talk about that and for me to think about it.

But I've now thought about it. Is there anything else you want to tell me about that?

Do you remember the question?
MR. ROTE: Yeah, I think I remember the question. He didn't want to answer the question, who the employers were, who the employers were over the last 12 years. And I understand his concern. But by the same token, to the extent he's going to argue that it's interrupted his business life, $I$ think we have a right to know who those employers are.

THE COURT: So here's what I'm thinking about that.
But before I tell you that, is there anything,
Mr. Christiansen, you want to tell me on on that?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: He's not going to say directly that it's impacted his -- this particular job, no.

THE COURT: And you're not asking for economic damages. I get that. You're only asking for pain and suffering damages.

So to the extent that you want to ask about former
employers, $I$ 'm not going to let you ask him to identify them for you.

On the other hand, if you want to explore, "How long have you worked there?," you know, "Were you by and large successful at working there? You got to go to work each day? You were successful with that particular employer?," I think that is relevant to whether or not there was emotional distress, because somebody who is incapable of getting to work each day is in a different position than someone who is able to go to work each day, notwithstanding this blog that was deeply troubling to the plaintiff as an employee or as an independent contractor.

So I will let you ask those kinds of questions if you're interested, but $I$ will not let you ask questions identifying who the employer was or anything around the edges that would lead you to know who the employer was.

MR. ROTE: Got it.
THE COURT: Do you understand?
MR. ROTE: I do.
THE COURT: And with that, do you want to ask those kinds of questions?

MR. ROTE: I do.
THE COURT: So then I'll let you finish up with that.
Then we'll do redirect, and then we'll proceed.
Go ahead, Mr. Zweizig.
(The witness retakes the witness stand.)
(The jury enters the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Mr. Rote, you may proceed.
BY MR. ROTE: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Zweizig, I want to go back to this question of your employment, and I want to have you explain to us how many employers you've had in the last -- let's just call it the last five or six years.
A. That would be two.
Q. Two employers?
A. Yes.
Q. And your -- Do you go to work every day? Is it a remote job? What is it?
A. One was a combination. One wasn't.
Q. Currently your employment is which one?
A. Go to work.
Q. It is go to work.

And you're able to continue to work through the blogging activity, the blog posts, without any difficulty?
A. It affects my concentration, and it affects, like I said, how I set up e-mail addresses and things like that. But I'm able to do my job, yes.
Q. You haven't lost work because of it?
A. I've not lost any wages because of it.

MR. ROTE: That's all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Redirect?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may step down.
THE WITNESS: Do I take these?
THE COURT: No. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thanks.
THE COURT: Call your next witness.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We rest.
THE COURT: Mr. Rote, you're up.
MR. ROTE: Up there?
THE COURT: Yes. If you're ready to testify, step on up, raise a hand and be sworn.

You're welcome to take whatever documents with you
that you think you may need to help your testimony, so you don't have to kind of be going back and forth.

## TIMOTHY ROTE

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been first duly sworn, is examined and testifies as follows:

THE CLERK: Please have a seat and state your name and spell it.

THE WITNESS: My name is Timothy Rote, R-o-t-e.
THE COURT: Mr. Rote, you don't need to ask yourself questions and then answer them. You can simply make a
statement about the evidence that you want to share with the jury.

MR. ROTE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
So I wrote this blog because we had been so significantly harmed by an arbitration that went sour. The first part of being able to analyze that and to showcase that was to do a deep dive in the evidence, and I've done precisely that. And so I dove into the testimony. I dove into the forensics work. And so, for example, I'm going to start diving into some of it right now and explaining why $I$ wrote that particular chapter.

With reference, however -- the chapters, even though there are 96 of them, there's only a small number -- maybe 25 percent of these actually have to do with the arbitration. And so with that, I think, though, I want to jump right in and start talking about some of that evidence.

Do I have a --

THE COURT: I don't think so. I don't think you can control the video system from there.

MR. ROTE: How do I bring up an exhibit?
THE COURT: If you want to go back, you can just testify from there. You can -- I don't know how else to do it.

Can you bring it up for him, an exhibit for him?
THE CLERK: No. It's on his laptop.

THE COURT: Yeah, you're going to have to go back and testify from there. I apologize.

MR. ROTE: It's okay.
(There is a brief pause in the proceedings.)
MR. ROTE: So at various stages of the blog -- it's an evolutionary piece. At various stages of the blog, I changed what $I$ was writing. But in -- in essence, the first part, the first page of the blog is called "About." And when I reference "About," I talk about the fact that -- that this -- this arbitration was an event that ended up being in front of an arbitrator who was compromised in many respects, who was losing his cognitive skills. And $I$ address some of that and how he was exploited, in that page about the blog.

Page 2 is called "The Sting," and in that $I$ reference precisely what $I$ believe this whole con was by Mr. Zweizig and attribute it to his -- his fiancee's attorney -- his fiancee, who is also an attorney.

But in that, I make it very clear that the components of what I'm addressing are that there is an element of -- of belief that he made a knowingly fake complaint to the Department of Justice, that the evidence of that is substantially provided in this blog, and that he used that to hide behind his ultimate intention, which was to not provide the programs that we needed to survive.

He claimed, as you saw in his testimony -- we have

FoxPro programs that we needed in order to process data. And those FoxPro programs were nowhere to be found after his termination.

We hired forensic experts ad nauseam. We had two. He had one. We looked for the data. We evaluated and examined him during the arbitration. And the point consistently was he simply did not turn that material over, those FoxPro programs.

The forensic experts that dealt with those issues were specifically hired to find evidence that the forensic programs, the FoxPro programs, were put -- were on the hard drive that he returned to us on his last day of employment, which was a 60-gig hard drive.

In addition, he maintains we had taken a position in the arbitration that he was fired beforehand, before he even filed his complaint, and that we provided that evidence, which was my computer, and the Outlook Express e-mail account by which I sent that termination e-mail.

Forensic experts looked at that, and $I$ represented in the blog what those conclusions were. I'm not going to restate them now. Even though I've written them, I think that may be beyond the scope. But the issue was that we were doing a deep dive into this various evidence that we put on in the arbitration and had been summarily dismissed by the arbitrator.

If you refer to or see the arbitrator's opinion, which I think is Plaintiff's Exhibit -- Defendant's Exhibit 505 --

THE COURT: Mr. Rote, until you offer an exhibit, they don't get to see it. It's not being published.

MR. ROTE: But if $I$ reference a plaintiff's exhibit that's already in --

THE COURT: If it's already in, they get to see it and you can publish it to them. If it's not yet been received, they cannot see it. And if you don't offer it, they will not be able to consider it in closing arguments.

MR. ROTE: I understand.
THE CLERK: It's 3.
MR. ROTE: 3.
So Plaintiff's Exhibit 3--
THE COURT: I think that's been received.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes.
THE COURT: You can go ahead and publish that to the
going to consider that evidence.
He therefore concluded that because Mr. Zweizig -because $I$ had sent Mr. Zweizig an e-mail inquiring about how he was doing right before he filed a complaint, that that somehow was an indication that $I$ hadn't fired him, in spite of the testimony of three people with the company, in spite of the forensic evidence by our experts, our two experts, and his single expert, who all concluded that he had, in fact, been fired.

So we get back to even if that were not the case, even if he hadn't been fired before he had filed his complaint, even if he had filed a legitimate complaint in good faith, at the end of the day, on his last day no programming could be found, and we shut down.

It should have ended his complaint. It should have ended his damages. You can't burn down the barn on your way out and expect that the employer doesn't cut off your damages. That's the whole point. And we incurred a substantial amount of money losses, $\$ 100,000$ in lost revenue, $\$ 25,000$ to replace the -- to replace the programming.

And even in Mr. Zweizig's testimony, he confirmed that he did not -- he did not transfer programs over to the employer.

That being the case -- that's what I've written in the blog -- there was no justification for the arbitrator to
decide that we didn't preserve evidence, because there was nothing there to preserve. When your IT programmer, head of the IT department, puts on evidence that he did not transfer programs, then very clearly there was nothing that we destroyed, nothing that should have precluded the arbitrator from finding that he was the cause of the shutdown.

There was no dispute by the arbitrator that -- that we had shut down. He had only decided to dismiss all of our evidence. And he had decided that -- and I think if you look at the tone of his writing in the opinion and award in this exhibit, you're going to see him poking at me and making statements that $I$ think were out of character.

I want to address a couple of very specific items, the 120-gig hard drive, which $I$ have written in this -- in this blog. And the exhibit is Exhibit 12, starting at page 25.

The significance of what Mr. Zweizig provided to us on his last day is he gave us a computer, a Sony VAOI computer, had a 60-gig hard drive in it. And he returned to us a hard drive that he claimed had been -- that crashed in May 2003. That hard drive is the 120-gig hard drive, and it was used exclusively by him. No one else ever used it.

After the shutdown and we had forensic examiners take a look at this hard drive, that's where we discovered the porn, the FoxPro programs, 1,900 FoxPro programs that he did
not transfer over to us on his last day, 500,000 records, customer confidential information unencrypted in his hard drive, on his hard drive, and a reformat date on the day before he was terminated.

He represented to us that he had reformatted this hard drive after it had crashed to protect it. But, in fact, we did have forensic evaluation done on that. And, as I've written, he did not reformat that until the day that he returned it to us.

So all of that information -- his e-mail account was there for e-mails prior to about May 6th, 2003. His -- the FoxPro programming files, 1,900 of them, were there, and he destroyed those. Obviously the evidence of the porn was all there. But in addition to all of that, there was programming that we found in a file-sharing arrangement, which was peer-to-peer, which meant that he was sharing files at a site or with people directly; and while he was doing so, his computer was wide open.

Now, he was the IT director of the company and responsible for maintaining and protecting our data, wherever it is. And yet he was opening up his computer to upload files and download files from a number of different sources. It could have been between individuals. It could have been to a site.

So that was a very material component. But mostly it
was material with respect to the FoxPro programs and the existence of an e-mail; and that $I$ discussed extensively in Chapter 7 here, "The 120-Gig Hard Drive."

Now, in addition -- let me get us to Chapter 11. Chapter 11 addresses what happened to M's e-mail. When he returned the computer to us with the 60-gig hard drive, he maintained in testimony that the e-mail, all of his e-mails, sent and received e-mails from May -- middle of May 2003 until November 13th, 14th, 2003, were on that hard drive in an Outlook Express account. But we found no evidence that he used that e-mail -- he used that computer for e-mail.

So from May 2003 to November 2003, he was sending and receiving e-mail from another hard drive altogether, which he did not turn over for forensic evaluation during the arbitration.

It was key, because as you may recall in the testimony, he provided to me an e-mail and -- with his Complaint, and with his Complaint had a letter attached claiming that he had received the spreadsheet of evidence of our overbilling from another employee. He never turned that e-mail over at that time, nor did he turn that e-mail over during the course of the arbitration in discovery.

At no time did he corroborate the existence of this spreadsheet, at no time. Nobody from our company knew anything about it, and that's what we testified to. Only
via this e-mail would he be able to corroborate the fact that that spreadsheet was ours, and he chose not to provide that e-mail.

Now, he provided hundreds of others in hard copy form, not that e-mail. And he didn't provide the -- the Outlook Express PST account. So a very material point. And with respect to what he decided to keep and what he decided to provide, that was key evidence.

My e-mail is discussed on -- what happened to my e-mail is discussed in Chapter 12. It starts on -- it starts on Chapter -- it starts on page 41 of Exhibit 12 . It was our position that he had been terminated on October 2nd, 2003, via e-mail, and then a letter was sent to him.

Obviously he wanted to do forensic examinations of my computer, and we had two of our experts do the same. I turned over my computer with the Outlook Express PST account that had the e-mail terminating him, didn't hide it. We didn't destroy it. None of that evidence was destroyed.

Forensic evaluations -- the forensic experts had every opportunity to determine and refute whether or not that e-mail was sent. And they confirmed that the e-mail was sent October 2nd, 2003, three weeks before he filed his Complaint.

Now, even though the arbitrator didn't like the fact that that was true and eliminated his claims, to summarily dismiss his forensic expert, which agreed with our forensic
expert, just because it went against us, was a good chunk of why I wrote this entire blog.

Not only was it our evidence that he dismissed when our experts presented it, he also dismissed evidence contrary to Mr. Zweizig if it was his expert that actually said it. And in this case -- this is an example where the experts agreed that he had been terminated prior to the time that he had filed his Complaint.

And so a good chunk of putting down the evidence for what happened to the e-mail, what was the spreadsheet about, we dove in -- I dove in to what the spreadsheet represented in another element of the blog, in another chapter.

And the bottom line is that the spreadsheet represented about $\$ 400$ of adjustments a month in which we -we invoiced $\$ 400,000$. That's roughly claiming that -- that we were committing racketeering for going 55.05 miles per hour in a 55-mile-per-hour zone, not 55 miles per hour, not 60 , but, you know, 55.05 miles per hour. That was his representation of evidence that we were racketeering.

We also discuss in the blog the fact that Mr. Zweizig's Albany, Oregon attorney filed a Complaint on his behalf, and that Complaint was filed without any review of evidence whatsoever. He filed that Complaint based on his conversation with Mr. Zweizig's New Jersey attorney. And after the Oregon Department of Justice requested evidence and
no evidence was provided and the investigation was shut down, he found out that Mr. Zweizig's New Jersey attorney was Mr. Zweizig's fiancee, Sandra Ware.

So no evidence provided to the Oregon Department of Justice, a spreadsheet that represents $\$ 400$ in adjustments in a month in which we billed $\$ 400,000$, an arbitrator who didn't disclose his relationship with Linda Marshall, his former partner.

I go into a great deal of detail in the early stages of this blog. We're very critical of the arbitrator. And he's a man who lives in my community. I've known him a while, not intimately, not strongly, but I've known him a while. I met with him a year ago to talk to him about the status of the blog and what I've written and to get some idea from him on what was actually going on in his mind at the time.

I recorded that conversation, I had a witness there, and we openly spoke about this. And the bottom line was that he didn't have what he would describe as the energy to go through the evidence. He was angry that I had challenged his efficacy, his -- his position, his credibility.

But what -- what you need to understand, in part, is that in order for us to challenge whether or not this arbitration could be appealed by virtue of his failure to disclose that he was a prior partner with Linda Marshall, which is considered an issue, a potential conflict -- he has a
duty to disclose that. In order for us to challenge that issue on appeal, we had to raise it with him during the arbitration. And it upset him.

So in spite of the fact that his cognitive skills weren't up to snuff, his temper was still strong; and he responded very strongly by coming back into the case and dismissing all of our evidence.

I think it would be helpful to talk a little bit about the fact that Linda Marshall came into this case, the arbitration, just about a year before we went to the hearing. And so from 2003 to 2005, we were in New Jersey. 2005, we - we started the arbitration. And we were the plaintiff seeking damages. Mr. Zweizig was the defendant. And his counterclaims were for retaliation and past compensation, et cetera.

That went on -- this arbitration went on a really long time. And we -- we pay the arbitrator by the hour to do this. It wasn't fair to us. It wasn't fair to Mr. Zweizig. It cost both of us money to have this arbitrator engaged, and it went on and on and on.

Mr. Zweizig's attorneys he replaced three times. I think Linda Marshall was the fourth attorney since starting this in Portland. We talk about that.

The significance of it is that Mr. Zweizig wrote a letter to the arbitrator and asked for an extension of time
and -- and a referral. And it's my belief now, based on my conversation with Mr. Crow, that he did, in fact, refer the case to Linda Marshall.

We were told about that time that his cognitive skills weren't up to speed by his -- his legal secretary, who told one of my attorneys, a gentleman by the name of Jeff Edelson. We took issue with that, because we probably should have strongly thought about removing him as an arbitrator at that point.

He's a man of -- he's an elder statesman. He's a man of, I think, great integrity. And even when $I$ challenged the fact that he did not disclose this critical issue to us, it wasn't with the intent of trying to suggest that he was a bad person. It was an intent to get on the record that he didn't do something that he should have known, that he should have done. He should have known it. He was the chairman of this region's disciplinary board for the Oregon state Bar, and he was ascending to the chairmanship of the entire state.

So we have a gentleman who is an elder statesman, whose skills were not as good as they used to be. He had trouble discerning some of the truth from the fiction, some of the lies and the perjury from the truth. And we had Linda Marshall, his former partner, who came into this arbitration and did not disclose to us either about the extent of her relationship with Mr. Crow.

At some point in time -- and I cover this pretty extensively in the blog, that an attorney who wants to put on dishonest evidence does so at a significant risk. An attorney could be disbarred for that. And so the significance of that is that -- that she had a consciousness, I think, of where Mr. Crow was in terms of his skill sets, in terms of his cognitive skills. I think that she knew that she was going to run a lot of things past him. And, in fact, she introduced evidence that had to do with litigation 10 years earlier. And so we did not -- and so we had to make this challenge. But at the essence of this blog is about the fact that this arbitration gets compromised.

Arbitrations are more difficult to appeal than a case like this. There are very limited circumstances in which an arbitration can successfully be appealed, displays of absolute bias and a few other reasons. But that is very difficult evidence to put on, even though we thought we had an extremely good case for that.

So we did put on that evidence. We tried to set the arbitration aside, to vacate the judgment. And we talk about the evidence that we put on in the blog.

Most significantly was that after his recusal, that he came in and again dismissed everything from our side, dismissed the forensics, dismissed the testimony of eight people, citing instead that -- deciding instead that

Mr. Zweizig had been retaliated against.
So -- so the critical nature of all of this is that
I decided, after Mr. Zweizig's employer was no longer in
business, that $I$ was going to write this story.
We've been subjected to cybercrime three times, and the last time in 2009, went to a trial in 2014. And ultimately we just haven't been able to protect the company. So I decided to shut down the company altogether after 2014.

Mr. Zweizig's former employer, NDT, was dissolved in 2015, February 2015. The evidence I'm going to put on that, I'm going to start putting on some of that right now.

If we could look to the Defendant's Exhibit -- I think it's 599.

THE CLERK: It hasn't been received.
MR. ROTE: It hasn't been received.
This is a document that is from -- a copy of a document from the Oregon Secretary of State showing the dissolution date for Northwest Direct Teleservices, Mr. Zweizig's employer.

THE COURT: Any objection to 599?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It's received. You may publish it.
MR. ROTE: Okay.
So the significance of that is that $I$ wanted to avoid circumstances precisely like we're in right now. I wanted to
talk about this case. I wanted to talk about the arbitration. I wanted to write about it. But I wanted to do it. And if Mr. Zweizig was going to challenge it, I wanted him to --if he was going to sue for it, sue me for defamation. And then we could present the evidence, all of it, as it came into the arbitration.

This is not the case here, where he's choosing to now sue me as assisting a corporation or a group of corporations that are now out of business. And it's an incredibly important point in terms of -- in terms of his ability to do so.

His employer, Northwest Direct Teleservices, as he already testified, both when he was examined on the opinion of the arbitrator, as well as on his employment agreement, he was employed by Northwest Direct Teleservices. The opinion and order from the arbitrator was with respect to Northwest Direct Teleservices and Mr. Zweizig. No other corporations have been involved.

Excuse me. Did the plaintiff put on his Exhibit 25, license agreement?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No, but no objection.
MR. ROTE: No objection?
THE COURT: 25 is received.
MR. ROTE: Thank you, Your Honor.
The license agreement is a document of my doing. I
wrote -- I wanted to be able to access litigation material for each of these corporations. So Mr. Zweizig's former employer, Northwest Direct Teleservices, wasn't the only active business that we had. And each of those active businesses, at one time or another, had litigation; and they had unique litigation, and none of it applied to Mr. Zweizig. Only Northwest Direct Teleservices applied to Mr. Zweizig.

So we entered into an agreement with these entities, where $I$ was going to be able to use material from litigation associated with any of these entities.

Now, Mr. Zweizig's litigation is associated with Northwest Direct Teleservices. The last cybercrime event we had was with Northwest Direct Marketing and Northwest Direct Teleservices both, and it included a cybercrime case that was against Silicon Valley Bank. That was the last of our events.

But it is material to know that these are not the same entities. They are unique entities. They have separate obligations. They have separate contracts. And only Northwest Direct Teleservices was Mr. Zweizig's employer, and they were the only party that owned the e-mail evidence and other element -- other evidence in the arbitration. So no other entity owned that evidence with respect to Mr. Zweizig. And they licensed it to me for a percentage of whatever revenue $I$ generate from this activity.

In the beginning I anticipated that the blog could be
used to generate revenue. I decided not to generate revenue from the blog. To do that, I would have needed to simply make it a private blog associated with a particular website, go out to the marketplace and find people that wanted to advertise on it. And I decided not to do that. I've used it instead to help me develop some of my material for my novel and other things that $I$ have written.

The novel is a fictionalized version of my
experience. It's not -- it has no individuals identified in it that in any way, shape, or form are associated with Mr. Zweizig or my company. It is a John Grisham-esque type of novel. I also generated -- still in the process of generating a screenplay, but that's decidedly more difficult than $I$ thought it would be.

So we do not -- this license agreement doesn't pretend to provide -- it's intended to provide e-mail evidence and other transcript evidence, information that $I$ had, that we had generated that was property owned by those companies.

Blog -- blog 86 deals with the shutdown.
I think that -- is that a unique exhibit of yours or is it in Exhibit 12?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Exhibit 12 .
MR. ROTE: So blog Chapter 86 again goes back to the shutdown, but it is a longer chapter than $I$ typically write. And in that chapter $I$ go to great detail to identify the
program extensions, the programming, the material, the FoxPro programs that we expected to find on our servers in Eugene and Dyersville, Iowa, and on Mr. Zweizig's computer that we did not find. They're the same programs, six months earlier, that we found on the $120-g i g$ hard drive that was reformatted, the same extensions.

They included 1900 FoxPro programs on that destroyed hard drive, and probably would have expected to see 40 or 50 of these on his 60-gig hard drive, which he returned to us his last day. And because of that -- I've written extensively in this blog post that because of that, we shut down. But in arguing that, $I$ wanted to make sure $I$ identified all of the programs that we would have expected to find and didn't find. Now, we have an extraordinary amount of forensic evidence on this. It can't come into this trial as yet. But I did identify forensic reports that we had. So by reference, in Chapter 4 of the blog, where $I$ identify the forensic reports, and each time $I$ talk about this category, Chapters 11, Chapters 12, this chapter, I identify forensic reports that were issued in order to identify the source of our materials.

I did that because, for credibility purposes, I wanted to make sure it was clear that we had that evidence, that we put that evidence on, and that the arbitrator's dismissal of that evidence was -- was why we have this blog,
was why I talk about these issues, which is why it is so risky to arbitrate against a bar association that does not appear to want to make these disclosures, even though they're required to do so.

Much of my analysis and how $I$ went by analyzing a lot of this I refer to in Chapter 13 of the blog.

And I have -- I have a JPEG on that, Your Honor. Can I bring that up? It's not offered as an exhibit, just as testimony support.

THE COURT: I'm not sure what it is that you're trying to show, so I can't --

MR. ROTE: It's -- it's a visual of the fraud triangle. It's just a JPEG of the fraud triangle.

THE COURT: You can use it during closing argument. If it's not evidence, you shouldn't be using it.

MR. ROTE: Okay.
So in computer forensics, in computer fraud, the elements that are discussed in Chapter 13 about the fraud triangle, there are three points to the fraud triangle. The first, at the top, is that an individual must feel like he or she is in extreme financial need or emotional need that can't be satisfied by some other means, they can't find a way to solve their problem.

The second point of the triangle, down below and to the left, is the opportunity to do something and get away with
it, the opportunity to get away with stealing something or destroying something that satisfies the first top prong of opportunity.

The third point to the fraud triangle is justification that -- that the party engaged in the fraud has the opportunity, has -- has the need, and then justifies their behavior in the third point.

My position in this blog is that Mr. Zweizig had some need, emotional need, financial need; I'm not sure what. He had the opportunity to hurt his employer by shutting it down in retaliation. And the third prong is that he justified it through his complaint that he was somehow -- that the company was overbilling.

He justified it, and so he did it. His justification came before he shut us down. But the analysis as to why he did it is first addressed, in my mind, from an analysis perspective, in Chapter 13 of the blog.

I also have the same analysis for Linda Marshall, who is the attorney who represented him. Remember that they were pursuing a million dollars in damages. She had an opportunity to get away with something because Bill Crow, the arbitrator, wasn't on his game. He was 79 years old. He wasn't on his game.

Now, that doesn't mean that all 79-year-olds aren't on the game. We know that Judge Jones here is 90 years old
and still going strong. But it all happens to us at some point in time and differently.

He wasn't on his game. So she had the opportunity to put on testimony that she know to be -- she knew to be a lie, perjurious testimony. And she knew that Mr. Zweizig had destroyed evidence.

And the third part of that triangle, the justification is the same as his, which is that we're a bad person, I'm a bad person, the company is a bad person, because we -- even though they provided no corroborated evidence, because we had overbilled clients by, according to them, $\$ 400$ in a month in which we billed $\$ 400,000$. The spreadsheet evidence had no clients identified, and we only billed once a month.

So no invoices, no other evidence, $\$ 400$ versus $\$ 400,000$, but we were bad people; and so that was their justification, aside from the economic gain that she expected to have from the litigation.

Mr. Crow's analysis is entirely different, and his analysis is really just about his -- his inability to go back through and spend a lot of time with the evidence and so forth. He -- after he was reinstated, after he joined again, he spent maybe a day looking at 10 days of evidence and just didn't have the stamina to do it, so he decided to come back in and find in favor of Mr. Zweizig.

In -- in the blog, I do add some transcripts. I did redact Mr. Zweizig's name substantially and sought to do so a number of times.

I did want to now refer to an exhibit. I believe this has already been offered in, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Has it been received?
THE CLERK: What's the number?
MR. ROTE: 560 .
THE CLERK: It was offered. I don't have it noted as received.

THE COURT: Do you have any objection to 560?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No objection.
THE COURT: It's received.
MR. ROTE: Exhibit -- Defendant's Exhibit 560 is about, oh, December 16th, 2016. So Mr. Zweizig filed his lawsuit here against me and the corporations on Christmas Eve, 2015. So this is just about a year later.

And I'm reaching out to counsel, saying, "If there's something that you want me to change about the blog, engage me with specificity. Tell me precisely what you want. Is it redacting Max's -- Mr. Zweizig's name? Is it something else? I don't want to take down the blog in its entirety, but $I$ am more than interested in talking to you about what you might be interested in, in terms of mitigation any of your concerns -mitigating any of your concerns."

Up until the time of this trial a couple weeks ago, I had actually never met Mr. Christiansen in person. This has been going on two years. It was always my hope that we would come to a point where we could agree on what would be in and what would be out, understanding that $I$ wanted to, nonetheless, critically analyze the evidence and, nonetheless, critically evaluate the arbitration itself.

Mr. Zweizig, as -- as a component of this, is not that important. It's not that important. It's more important to analyze the problem with the arbitration, the evidence that was dismissed, what we put on, and to get to the bottom line of a critical analysis of arbitration. That never happened.

So I feel like that, as an individual responsible for writing this product and reaching out to them, to do this, that $I$ took steps to showcase what would happen. I did a couple of things. I took the blog in its form at that time and $I$ rebranded it. That means $I$ shut down the Sitting Duck Portland site and $I$ reopened a different site, the First Duty of Portland, First Duty Portland, which -- and when I did that, I redacted Mr. Zweizig's name from the blog posts, all of them. I redacted his name from the transcripts and forensic evidence that we attached. I took all of it out to see if that would meet their need.

They didn't demand that. They didn't ask for it.
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But I did it to show them that I'm willing to act in good faith to do this. But you still need to come to the table and tell me with specificity if that's going to meet your needs.

They did not, so $I$ stopped doing that after a while. And Mr. Zweizig has pointed out in his direct testimony and through their exhibits, his name now appears on Google search. But for a period of time, for a long period of time, it did not. And I want to go to those exhibits right now.
(Pause) Excuse me. I'm just trying to find my place here, Your Honor.

Defense Exhibit 578.
THE COURT: Is there any objection to 578?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No objection.
THE COURT: It's received. You may publish it.
MR. ROTE: So the first page of 578 shows, as the plaintiff has shown, through Google search, that Mr. Zweizig -- I need to publish this -- that Mr. Zweizig does show up on Google search; in fact, in first position. But later -- but later he does not. The -- what shows up when you search his name is that he is -- provides guitar lessons, he is engaged in the IT community.

And what else shows up is the case histories, the case with -- against his former employer. All of that litigation shows up. But the reference to the blog goes away.

And why that's significant is that if he, with his -- in all sincerity, if he wanted to engage me to eliminate his name from association with this blog or any blog, that is something that we could have come to an agreement on. I had already done so. The fact that they will not, with specificity, however, communicate that need is an issue of mitigation. Pages 2 through 8 of that blog showcase that -- of the Google search showcase that.

Now, Google and other search engines are slow to publish information about blogs.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Objection.
(Pause).
THE CLERK: Objection.
THE COURT: I know. I'm thinking.
Your objection is overruled.
You may proceed.
MR. ROTE: The Google and other search engines don't -- what they often grab will be chapter names, et cetera. They don't do a good job of searching contents of the chapter itself. And so when we redact his name or when we remove his name from a chapter or when we don't identify him as a tag, then if we don't tag his name, then search engines have a difficult time associating him in any way, shape, or form with this blog.

And so we have not tagged his name, even as we
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removed certain redactions. There is still a lot that have been redacted. We haven't tagged his -- his name in association with any particular chapter, all the chapters. But he is right now -- for example, as they provided, Chapter 90, the perjury, has his name prominently presented throughout this document; and a search engine will pick up on that eventually.

The only way to eliminate that is for that blog to shut down, to rebrand. And that's why we rebranded in the first place. That's why we shut down Sitting Duck Portland and went to the First Duty Portland, was to eliminate any association. And even if they showed up on Google search, if you were to click it, it would go nowhere. It would not go to the blog because the blog was shut down.

So it is a misrepresentation to say that we have shown no concern for Mr. Zweizig. But we have a greater concern for the issues that arose in the arbitration, all of the perjury, all the forensics, all of the compromise.

It took seven years and $\$ 300,000$ in legal fees for us to litigate this. And, in the end, an arbitrator decided to dismiss our case, dismiss our facts, dismiss our evidence, because he trusted solely the representations of Linda Marshall, Mr. Zweizig's attorney, and he was angry that we had challenged the fact that he didn't disclose this.

That is -- represents a chunk of the blog, 30, 35
chapters of the blog. It's about that. The rest of the blog is what happened in kind of a consternation relationship between Mr. Zweizig's attorney -- attorneys and me. I think they raised the fact in their exhibit that there was a defamation claim. I filed it in Clackamas County and -- based on statements that they made. Those statements aren't getting into this case.

But litigation is kind of a fluid, disastrous thing, as Mr. Zweizig has testified. It's not just fluid and painful to him. It is painful to all of us involved. And it can't be discounted as something that is unrelated, because what $I$ wrote with respect to the arbitration soon became issues that I wrote about even in this trial -- not this trial per se, in this litigation, in a defamation claim in Clackamas County, in the bar association's involvement.

You recall that the Linkedin exhibit that Mr. Zweizig brought on, there were three of those that were published about when the bar lies. And I'm critical of what the bar association does. I'm critical of the fact that we have ethical canons of behavior by attorneys that are abused consistently without punishment.

One of those that I talk about in Chapter 90 specifically is Linda Marshall's duty to be honest with the tribunal, to be honest with the arbitrator.

Under canon 3.3, an attorney is not supposed to lie
on behalf of his or her client. Advocacy is not lying. Advocacy is something different. An attorney owes a duty, in Chapter 90 -- and $I$ think we should probably go to that at this stage.

Is that also Exhibit 12? Did you find it? MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Which chapter?

MR. ROTE: 90.
THE CLERK: Exhibit 18.
MR. ROTE: Exhibit 18?
And this has already been accepted, I think, right? THE COURT: I think so, too.

MR. ROTE: (Pause) So on page 12 of Exhibit 18, Plaintiff's Exhibit 18, it specifically includes Rule 3.3, candor towards the tribunal. And when you evaluate, look at that evidence, you'll see that an attorney has a duty of honesty to the Court, a duty of honesty to the arbitrator, to not put on false evidence, to not engage in testimony that she knows to be perjurious. She has a duty of care for the credibility of the justice system. And she breached that. Linda Marshall breached that. She has a duty of honesty even if it's not in her best -- even if it's not in her client's best interests.

And so a substantial part of not disclosing her relationship with the arbitrator to us, putting on evidence which she knew to be dishonest, putting on testimony which she
knew to be dishonest and inconsistent with her own forensic expert's conclusions, was something that $I$ focused on seriously in the blog.

All in all, our detail of evidence that we outline in the blog, we had some six forensic reports, three forensic experts providing most of these. Two of those forensic experts were for my company, Northwest Direct Teleservices. One was for Mr. Zweizig. And they evaluated my computer, my e-mail. They evaluated Mr. Zweizig's 60-gig hard drive that he returned to us. They evaluated the 120-gig hard drive that had been reformatted by Mr. Zweizig.

All of this $I$ discuss in great detail in the blog. The forensics starts on Chapter 4 of the blog, the 120-gig hard drive on Chapter 7, a detail of the analysis for Mr. Zweizig's e-mail account in Chapter 11. Chapter 12 is an evaluation of the forensics in my e-mail and my computer. And throughout, this blog is peppered the analysis from the forensics and from the testimony.

We had -- we had a client testify. We had three executives testify. We had two other employees testify. There was no dispute by the arbitrator that we shut down. What was at issue in the opinion was whether or not we preserved evidence to show that. The preservation question was one I think I addressed already in part, which was that at least with respect to the FoxPro programs that Mr. Zweizig had
in his possession on his last day, he testified that he had -- he transferred no programs over. Nothing came over, so nothing was found.

And, again, on his e-mail that he used from May 2003 to November 2003, on the 60-gig hard drive, his e-mail account was installed the day before he returned the computer. And none of his e-mail from May to November 2003, none of it was found on his computer. He did produce a lot of hard copies of it. But the account itself was not -- the PST account, the digital form of that was not.

So I -- I am sensitive to the fact that -- I should say that I am compelled, in part, by the fact that cybercrime is such a significant issue these days and that it ultimately shut us down, that we had to suffer it three times. The second time was Mr. Zweizig, the third time another IT person from outside the company that broke into our network and destroyed software. And the first time we suffered, it was an IT manager who reset the passwords on our servers to try to extort a raise.

So we've suffered through this cybercrime multiple times. And the fact that we invested so much time and money and ran into an arbitration that was so compromised was the ultimate stimulation to beginning the blog.

Again, the blog took on a life and on topics that we're not discussing here today, not relevant to this case. A
lot of cybercrime material has been published in there, a lot of ethical mandates of attorneys, a lot of evidence of wrongdoing. But that is the essence of why I wrote the blog.

The companies, again, that -- that were part of this affiliated group of companies, the Northwest Direct companies that the plaintiff has referred to, are each unique and separate companies. I was the president for these companies. Most of them dissolved well before the blog started. Only one -- only two were alive at the time the blog was started. And that company, Northwest Direct Marketing, shut down afterwards. Rote Enterprises is an LLC that is not in the business of BPO, business processing outsourcing, or teleservices, as they would call it. Rather, it was a holding company that held these -- these shares in these corporations. So I think that's my direct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Cross-exam. MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Please. Could I have you on the stand for it? MR. ROTE: Oh, of course. (Defendant Rote takes the witness stand.) MR. CHRISTIANSEN: One second. (There is a brief pause in the proceedings.)
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BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
Q. Mr. Rote, can you turn to Exhibit 3 in the plaintiff's exhibit binder. It's a white binder up there.

THE CLERK: (Handing).
THE WITNESS: Got it.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. This is the opinion and order from the arbitrator deciding the case?
A. Yes.
Q. Your company appealed that order, correct?
A. The company did appeal this order.
Q. And that went to the federal court?
A. It went to this U.S. District Court, to Judge Papak.
Q. And in support of that motion, you submitted a declaration, right?
A. I probably did. I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall attaching or filing a large number of documents in support of that motion?
A. I believe I did prior to the time counsel entered, and then the relevant ones were then refiled by counsel.
Q. Okay. And Mr. Zweizig also contested the arbitration award as well, right?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And he contested it because this award declined to provide
any clause for attorney's fees; isn't that correct?
A. Any award for attorney's fees, yes.
Q. So the company was not obligated to pay any attorney's fees?
A. That's correct.
Q. You said he had three attorneys on the case during that -- that arbitration?
A. I think I testified that he had three before Linda Marshall. He may have had four while in Oregon.
Q. In your Exhibit 560 -- and this is the e-mail exchange where you offered to invite Mr. Zweizig to identify his concerns with your blog -- you put a line at the bottom of that, that e-mail, that said, "As you know, allegations of crime follow you for a lifetime." Isn't that correct?
A. They followed me, yes.
Q. You referred to tags, Mr. Rote. I want to ask you a few questions about that.

This website is published on WordPress, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's -- that's a site you can log into to post this content?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't pay for this website, do you? You don't pay WordPress?
A. No. It's free.
Q. And when you log in -- you mentioned tags in the context of how this website shows up on Google. And you said that if you put a tag for something, it's more likely to show up on Google, right?
A. I believe that's accurate, that I have -- I believe that the search engines will pick up the tag lines.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 4, please. And I'd like you to turn to page 9. This is the end of the first chapter on this website.
A. I'm there.
Q. Do you see at the bottom, there's a tag for Max Zweizig?
A. I sure do.
Q. And there's a tag for Sandra Ware?
A. I do.
Q. Mr. Rote, you said you took steps to eliminate the association with Mr. Zweizig's name so it didn't appear on Google, correct?
A. No. I said that I rebranded the blog to disconnect the search engine component with the Sitting Duck Portland blog. And when I rebranded it, I redacted Mr. Zweizig's name from the content.
Q. And what date did you do that? When?
A. I don't recall. I would guess it was a year ago or so.
Q. Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit 18. I'd like you to turn
to page 3.
A. Which page?
Q. 3 .
A. I'm there.
Q. Mr. Zweizig's name is all over that, isn't it?
A. Yes. I no longer redacted as of this time.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 40, please.

And this is a Google search result for Mr. Zweizig's
name, isn't it?
A. That is correct, for Chapter 90.
Q. And so the fourth result down there, that's Chapter 90, isn't it?
A. Chapter 90, the exhibit we just looked at.
Q. And that provides a link to the First Duty Portland, correct?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Mr. Rote, you said that Rote Enterprises is a company that has nothing to do with -- with Mr. Zweizig's employment, right?
A. Only Northwest Direct Teleservices has anything to do with Mr. Zweizig's employment.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 47.

THE CLERK: That has not been --
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: It has not?

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Mr. Rote, do you have that in front of you?
A. I do.
Q. This is a press release, isn't it, Mr. Rote?
A. It is.
Q. And you published this on the website?
A. Multiple websites.
Q. And you published this on January 12th, 2018?
A. Correct.
Q. And the title of this press release is "Civil Trial of Author Exposing Attorney and Arbitrator Corruption."
A. Correct.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Repeat it again.
"Civil Trial" _-
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Sorry. "Civil Trial of Author
Exposing Attorney and Arbitrator Corruption."
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Is this an accurate printout of what you put on your website?
A. I think it is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Offer Exhibit 47.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. ROTE: None.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.
MR. ROTE: No. Sorry.
THE COURT: Thank you. That's all right.
Received.
BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN: (continuing)
Q. Please turn to page 3, Mr. Rote.

At the bottom of this press release, you put contact
information, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that your e-mail there, where it says
"Tim@roteenterprises.com"?
A. It is.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Mr. Rote, do you have anything else you want to add?

MR. ROTE: I don't think so, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may step down.
Does the plaintiff wish to offer any evidence in rebuttal?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No.
THE COURT: Members of the jury, you've heard all the evidence that you're going to hear in this case. It's 4:30. I think that if we get into closing arguments and instructions, it will be probably around 6:00 by the time we're done. And I try just to work business hours, so I'm
going to let you go home for the evening. We will begin at 9:00 with closing arguments. I will then instruct you, and you will begin your deliberations.

With that, I'm going to send you home. Please remember the precautionary instruction that directs you not to talk about the case with anybody until you begin your deliberations at the end of the trial.

Jennifer will escort you into your room, answer any of your questions. I will see you tomorrow at 9:00.

Thank you very much.
(The jury leaves the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Elisabeth, my clerk, I believe provided you with copies of the proposed jury instructions. I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to review those instructions or not. It's my intent to give those instructions as they have been provided to you. That's point 1.

Point 2, I am dubious about whether or not punitive damages are available for this type of a case. I will cite to you Wheeler v. Green; it is found at 286 Or 99; Paul v. May Department Stores, 292 Or 131. You may also want to look at Lewis v. Oregon Beauty Supply, 302 Or 616.

And those cases together, in my mind, call into question whether or not punitive damages are available in this type of a case. It doesn't mean the case doesn't -- that the
jury doesn't deliberate. I just think we may be taking punitive damages off the table as part of what they can do in this case.

And basically what those cases are talking about -the first one talks about defamation. I recognize this isn't a defamation case. But if you look at the other cases, they talk about cases that are like defamation cases, where the allegation of misconduct is speech, and whether or not you can get punitive damages where the alleged misconduct is speech.

And in this case the alleged misconduct is the blog, which equals speech. So that's why I am very dubious that punitive damages are available in this context.

Anything else from the plaintiff before we depart this evening?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: No. But $I$ will talk about that tomorrow, because we might also want to amend our prayer, so I'll --

THE COURT: Yeah. What would happen is I would just take punitive damages off the table, you all argue about emotional distress damages, and that's all the jury would deliberate on.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: And we would just want to amend our Complaint to conform with the evidence then.

THE COURT: Okay.
Anything else from your side, Mr. Rote, that we need

```
to talk about before tomorrow morning?
```

MR. ROTE: I don't think so, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Then that's all for now. I'll see you tomorrow.

Why don't you get together at 8:30, so that we can wrap up this issue about whether or not punitive damages are in or out of this case -- I think they're out -- and then anything else that we need to talk about before we bring the jury in at 9:00 for closing arguments.

Have a pleasant evening.
MR. ROTE: Thank you.
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Thank you.
(The proceedings are adjourned on January 16, 2018

```
                                    --000--
I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-titled cause. A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature or digitally signed signature is not certified.
```

/s/ Nancy M. Walker
2-22-19
$\overline{N A N C Y ~ M . ~ W A L K E R, ~ C S R, ~ R M R, ~ C R R ~}$

| \$ | 11 [9]-24:19, 37:12, | 141:25, 238:13 | 90:18, 93:7, 94:24, | $32_{[1]}$ - 76:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$10,000 [1] - 120:17 | 118:10, 205:4, | 220:15 | 98:16, 99:6, 99:20, | 341 [1]-113:15 |
| \$100,000 [1] - 202:19 | 205:5, 216:19, | 17 [4]-24:25, 42:5, | 212:10, 220:17 | 35[1]-224:25 |
| \$150,000 [2] - 181:18, | 227:15 | 72:13, 238:14 | 2016[3]-131:19, | 37 [12]-144:12, |
| 181:22 | 12 [26]-24:20, 37:20, | 170 [1] - 131:14 | 190:11, 220:15 | 145:11, 188:19, |
| \$25,000 [1] - 202:19 | 38:3, 38:6, 50:18, | 174[1]-131:16 | 2017 [6]-112:19, | 188:22, 188:24, |
| \$300,000 [1] - 224:19 | 50:23, 50:25, 101:7, | $175[4]-64: 25,79: 24$, | 115:7, 138:21, | 192:3, 192:4, |
| \$400[4]-207:14, | 101:10, 113:14, | 114:19, 131:12 | 139:18, 140:22, | 192:12, 192:13, |
| 208:5, 219:11, | 114:7, 117:2, | 17th [1]-2:3 | 141:21 | 192:18, 192:24, |
| 219:15 | 123:23, 131:12, | 18 [18]-25:1, 42:18, | 2018 [9]-1:5, 135:23, | 193:13 |
| $\$ 400,000[4]-207: 15,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:10, 173:16, } \\ & \text { 194:13, 203:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 101:7, 101:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:22, 143:2, } \\ & \text { 144:1, 145:8, 234:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38[4]-135: 16, \\ & 135: 17,136: 2,136: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 208: 6,2 \\ & 219: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 206:10, 206:11, | 122:14, 122:16, | $238: 13,238: 14$ | $3: 15-\mathrm{cv}-02401-\mathrm{HZ}[1]-$ |
| \$5,000 [1] - 89:5 | 215:21, 215:22, | 122:21, 122:22, | 21 [1]-25:4 | 1:4 |
| \$67,500 [1]-88:10 | 216:19, 226:5, | 138:16, 163:7, | 22 [9]-25:5, 46:17, | 3rd [2] - 90:18, 92:24 |
| \$75,000 [2] - 66:23, | 226:12, 227:15 | 163:8, 226:8, 226:9, | 46:19, 47:2, 47:7, |  |
| 88:1 | 12-minute [1] - 54:19 | 226:12, 226:13, | 127:25, 128:1, | 4 |
| \$75,375 [1] - 89:6 | 120-gig [20]-10:15, | 232:25 | 129:21, 130:13 |  |
| \$90,000[2] - 181:16, | 11:6, 13:3, 22:4, | 184 [1]-123:23 | 22nd [1] - 130:7 |  |
| 181:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:24, 173:17, } \\ & \text { 173:24, 174:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19[10]-25: 2,43: 2, \\ 43: 13,43: 17,43: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23rd [2] - 99:5, 99:13 } \\ & \text { 24790 [1] - 2:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 12,33: 19,48: 5, \\ & \text { 48:8, 48:17, 95:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| ' | $\begin{aligned} & 174: 24,175: 6, \\ & 175: 15,176: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:1, 44:6, 44:9, } \\ & \text { 101:7, 101:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25[11]-16: 19,72: 2, \\ 155: 19,155: 20, \end{gathered}$ | 96:1, 96:2, $96: 8$, 96:15, 96:18, 106:8, |
| '07 [1] - 37:7 | 185:9, 187:3, | 1900 [2] - 175:16, | 156:17, 173:17, | 106:13, 119:23, |
| '08[1]-37:7 | 203:14, 203:21, | 216:7 | 173:19, 198:13, | 125:21, 131:22, |
|  | 205:3, 216:5, | 1:15 [1] - 127:8 | 203:16, 213:19, | 1:25, 133:3, |
| I | 227:10, 227:13 |  | 3:23 | 216:17, 227:13, |
|  | 12th [3]-98:16, 98:25, | 2 | 258 [1] - 125:2 | 232:8 |
| Is [1]-239:11 | 34:8 |  | 25th [1]-115:7 | 40 [9]-31:1, 33:6, |
|  | 13 [8]-24:21, 38:9, | 2 [16]-24:5, 30:1, | 26 [1]-117:2 | 105:9, 137:14, |
| 1 | 114:24, 115:11, | 30:12, 30:14, 30:20, | 27 [4]-25:16, 51:6, | 138:2, 146:4, 146:5, |
| $1{ }^{\text {[16] - 1:15, 1:20, }}$ | 217:18, 218:17 | 106:13, 118:11, | 27th [1] - 94:24 | 41 [1] - 206:11 |
| 23:23, 24:3, 29:4, | 131 [1]-236:21 | 128:5, 128:7, 133:3, | 286 [1] - 236:20 | $42[2]-142: 20,143: 6$ |
| 29:8, 29:23, 80:3, | 13th [4]-139:18, | 154:8, 199:14, | 292[1] - 236:21 | $43[3]-143: 14,144: 6$, |
| 80:11, 80:19, 107:6, | 140:22, 141:21, | 223:7, 236:18 | 2nd [5] - 95:22, 96:16, | 144:10 |
| 112:17, 136:22, | 205:9 | 2-22-19 [1]-239:11 | 99:12, 206:12, | 47 [2]-233:22, 234:23 |
| 150:3, 150:4, 236:17 | 14 [24]-24:22, 38:17, | 20 [10]-25:3, 38:19, | 206:22 | $48{ }_{[1]}$ - 70:18 |
| 1,875 [1] - 88:14 | 39:10, 39:17, 39:23, | 43:14, 44:11, 49:11, |  | 4:30 [1] - 235:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1,900[2]-203: 25, \\ & 204: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 3,40: 5,40: 9 \\ & 40: 15,40: 20,40: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:15, 49:17, 78:20, } \\ & 101: 7,101: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4th }[3]-93: 6,93: 10, \\ & 94: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1-11 [1] - 135:23 | 48:19, 49:2, 49:6, | 2000 [1] - 20:3 | 3[23]-24:8, 30:22 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 1-6[2]-141: 12, \\ 141: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 9,64: 12,68: 3, \\ & 69: 11,70: 1,73: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2001[1]-65: 15 \\ & 2003[20]-65: 16,70: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 10,31: 15,31: 21, \\ & 31: 24,32: 4,32: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 5 |
| 10 [18]-24:18, 36:25, | 135:10, 138:22, | 161:23, 164:21, | 32:13, 50:6, 50:13, | $5^{[16]}-1: 15,24: 13$, |
| 37:6, 37:10, 41:24, 55:1, 70:9, 99:16, | 139:12, 139:22 <br> 14-year-old [1] - 41:2 | 173:1, 173:25, 174:3, 189:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:22, 87:4, 128:5, } \\ & 128: 7,151: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 21,34: 11,34: 14, \\ & 96: 20,96: 24,97: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:1, 70:9, 99:16, } \\ & 99: 24,100: 1,100: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14-year-old }{ }_{[1]}-41: 2 \\ & \text { 14th }[1]-205: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:3, 189:14, } \\ & \text { 203:21, 204:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:7, 151:1, } \\ & \text { 201:13, 201:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 20,96: 24,97: 11, \\ & 97: 15,108: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 100:8, 153:1, | 15 [13]-24:23, 33:10, | 205:8, 205:9, | 201:15, 230:3, | 108:23, 121:20, |
| 169:10, 183:20, | 40:25, 41:10, 41:14, | 205:12, 206:12, | 233:1, 233:3, 235:6 | 129:1, 157:13, |
| 193:22, 211:9, | 55:1, 55:3, 75:21, | 206:22, 209:11, | 3.3 [2]-225:25, | 158:2, 188:16 |
| 219:23 | 76:2, 99:14, 140:15, | 228:4, 228:5, 228:7 | 226:13 | 50 [3]-129:7, 192:5, |
| 10-6 [1] - 97:5 | 141:1, 184:19 | 2005[5] - 20:4, 71:4, | $30[7]-29: 18,29: 21$, | 216:8 |
| 10-day [1] - 165:7 | 15-cv-2401 [1] - 23:13 | 130:7, 209:11 | 76:11, 76:18, | 500 [1]-140:5 |
| 10-minute [1] - 54:19 | 150 [3] - 64:25, 70:9, | 2009 [1]-212:6 | 120:16, 224:25 | 500,000 [2]-176:25, |
| 100,000-per-week [1] | 79:24 | 2011 [1]-19:21 | 301 [1]-2:8 | 204:1 |
| -65:6 | 16 [10]-1:5, 23:18, | 2014[3]-73:19, | 302[1]-236:22 | 503 [1]-2:9 |
| 1000 [1]-2:8 | 23:24, 24:24, 41:16, | 212:6, 212:8 | 30th [3]-20:3, 112:19, | $505[1]-201: 3$ |
| 101[1]-133:19 | 41:24, 42:3, 141:11, | 2015[13]-67:14, | 138:21 | $525[1]-189: 7$ |



38:19, 41:8, 41:23,
41:24, 43:14, 65:9,
73:3, 90:6, 90:11,
105:6, 112:21,
112:23, 115:22,
153:1, 161:7, 161:8, 169:8, 181:22,
208:13, 221:1,
232:24
agree [24]-4:12, 52:19, 53:18, 55:18, 55:21, 126:3,
150:12, 151:14,
151:15, 151:20,
152:22, 158:10,
158:18, 159:1,
169:9, 176:12,
177:20, 178:3,
178:6, 179:17,
181:20, 181:22,
183:8, 221:4
agreed [3] - 168:14,
206:25, 207:7
agreement [14] - 66:2, 80:16, 80:17, 92:8,
108:3, 157:15,
158:3, 158:19,
213:14, 213:20,
213:25, 214:8,
215:15, 223:4
Agreement [1] - 157:9
ahead [15]-24:2,
26:13, 47:6, 49:16,
54:7, 94:21, 96:5,
104:11, 127:15,
142:6, 174:12,
177:5, 195:25,
201:18
aided [3] - 46:7, 62:6,
63:16
aiding [2] - 62:17, 63:13
aircraft [1] - 37:21
aka [1] - 1:13
al [2]-23:13, 26:5
Albany [1] - 207:21
alias [1] - 137:9
alive [1] - 229:9
allegation [1] - 237:8
allegations [3] - 18:6,
67:16, 231:13
alleged [5] - 10:22,
52:3, 102:19, 237:9, 237:10
alleging [2] - 100:23, 103:20
allowed [6] - 17:13,
28:4, 87:21, 124:21,
171:3, 171:5
almost [1] - 76:9

| ```alone [2] - 37:1, 55:14 altering [1] - 66:12 alternative [1] - 16:24 altogether [2] - 205:13, 212:8 amend [2] - 237:16, 237:22 amount [6] - 126:22, 137:1, 167:18, 177:21, 202:18, 216:14 analogies [1] - 126:22 analogy [2]-126:20, 126:21 analysis [10]-73:11, 217:5, 218:15, 218:16, 218:18, 219:19, 219:20, 221:12, 227:14, 227:17``` |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

analyst [1] - 165:14 analyze [4] - 103:21, 198:6, 221:6, 221:10 analyzing [1] - 217:5 Andrea [3]-24:21, 38:9, 53:23
Angeles [1] - 140:14 anger [1] - 89:4 angry [5] - 71:15, 71:16, 92:6, 208:19, 224:23
Ann [1] - 25:10
announce [1] - 133:21 anonymize [2] -
111:11, 121:9 answer [24] - 6:11, 25:21, 25:24, 27:18, 57:8, 81:25, 104:10, 119:18, 134:22, 148:24, 148:25, 150:16, 150:18, 150:20, 155:15, 157:11, 158:15, 169:6, 172:15, 175:20, 175:23, 194:12, 197:25, 236:8
answered [5] - 45:17, 57:5, 57:6, 155:14, 158:13
answering [1] - 28:13
answers [2] - 27:16,
60:22
anticipate [1] - 27:23 anticipated [1] 214:25 anyhow [1] - 28:19 anyway [4] - 4:3,
$18: 16,77: 15,120: 12$ apartment [1] - 33:25
apologize [3] - 116:5, 166:11, 199:2 apparent [1] - 89:4 appeal [3]-209:2, 211:13, 230:12 appealed [3] - 208:23, 211:15, 230:11 appear [7]-28:13, 99:14, 120:25, 136:12, 136:13, 217:2, 232:17 appearance [1] 60:23

## APPEARANCES [1] -

 2:1appeared [10] - 29:18,
34:22, 36:12, 36:23, 37:18, 38:15, 39:7, 41:7, 42:25, 121:1
appearing [1] - 42:16 applications [1] 66:13 applied [2] - 214:6, 214:7
applies [3]-59:1, 59:11, 59:12
apply [2] - 26:22, 55:15
appointment [1] 48:11
appreciate [1] - 47:12
approach [1] - 80:6
approached [1] 59:18
appropriate [3] - 16:1, 16:2, 16:4
April [3]-20:3, 20:4, 115:7
Arbiters [1] - 184:6
arbitrate [1] - 217:2 arbitration [114] 3:22, 3:23, 4:1, 4:4, 5:4, 5:5, 5:11, 5:14, 6:2, 7:2, 8:8, 8:11, 16:20, 18:4, 50:20, 51:14, 51:16, 51:17, 51:19, 51:21, 51:22, 66:2, 66:4, 66:5, 69:13, 69:15, 71:4, 72:4, 72:11, 72:12, 72:22, 73:13, 74:6, 74:11, 74:15, 85:2, 85:16, 85:17, 86:2, 86:5, 86:10, 86:15, 87:10, 87:25, 90:8, 92:2, 92:9, 94:7, 94:16, 94:18, 94:19, 101:25, 116:1,
124:11, 126:20, 132:7, 132:14,

133:22, 135:5, 138:11, 142:8,
142:13, 146:8, 151:10, 151:17, 152:20, 158:11, 158:19, 159:12, 160:5, 160:7, 162:6, 162:11, 162:24, 163:11, 163:12, 165:1, 166:24, 167:10, 167:13, 168:5, 168:20, 172:12, 182:2, 182:3, 198:5, 198:14, 199:10, 200:6, 200:15, 200:24, 205:15, 205:22, 208:23, 209:3, 209:10, 209:12, 209:16, 210:23, 211:12, 211:15, 211:20, 213:1, 213:6, 214:21, 221:7, 221:10, 221:12,
224:17, 225:12,
228:22, 230:22,
231:7
Arbitration [1] -
141:19
arbitrations [1] 211:13 arbitrator [50] - 6:3, 7:13, 11:12, 66:7, 66:15, 66:16, 69:9, 69:10, 69:16, 70:3, 70:15, 71:5, 71:13, 72:23, 73:2, 73:13, 74:10, 85:21, 85:25, 86:12, 86:25, 88:21, 88:25, 107:16, 132:14, 167:21, 168:15, 168:23, 169:3, 199:11, 200:25, 202:25, 203:5, 203:7, 206:23, 208:6, 208:10, 209:17, 209:19, 209:25, 210:8, 213:14, 213:16, 218:21, 224:20, 225:24, 226:16, 226:24, 227:21, 230:8
Arbitrator [3] - 168:7, 234:11, 234:16 arbitrator's [6]-8:12, 71:23, 168:2, 201:1, 201:21, 216:24
arbitrators [1] -

117:21
Arbitrators [1] - 107:7
area [3]-21:4, 32:19,
166:21
areas [1] - 137:12
argue [4]-27:8,
191:12, 194:15, 237:19
argued [1] - 70:2
arguing $[3]-6: 7$,
191:13, 216:12
argument [8] - 12:13, 17:1, 18:21, 19:12, 19:17, 19:18, 48:22, 217:14
arguments [7]-56:4, 61:24, 124:18, 201:11, 235:23, 236:2, 238:9
Army [1] - 36:20
arose [1] - 224:17
arrange [1] - 28:1
arrangement [1] 204:15
Art [1] - 30:7
article [2] - 111:22, 142:14
ascending [1] -
210:18
ascribe [1] - 121:6
ascribing [1] - 138:13
aside [3] - 156:9,
211:20, 219:17
assembly [1] - 54:8
asserted [1] - 66:10
assigned [1] - 118:24
assist [2] - 9:19, 60:23
assistant [2] - 33:23,
35:16
assisting [1] - 213:8
associate [2] - 42:8, 42:21
associate's [3] 29:12, 35:17, 36:19
associated [6] -
112:9, 159:13,
214:10, 214:11,
215:3, 215:10
associating [1] -
223:23
association [6] -
217:2, 223:3, 224:3, 224:12, 225:19, 232:17
Association [2]-33:1, 36:10
association's [1] -
225:15
assume [2]-36:4, 171:12
assumed $[1]-68: 1$
assure [1] - 71:9
assures [1]-28:9
Astoria [2] - 29:9
attached [6]-10:7, 12:7, 13:8, 82:19, 205:18, 221:23
attaching [2]-126:12, 230:18
attachment [6] 10:13, 11:5, 11:9, 11:21, 128:16, 186:16
attack [5] - 72:20,
112:4, 117:22,
117:23, 118:9
attacked [1]-72:7
attacks [3] - 73:18,
73:23, 102:2
attempted [2]-124:1, 130:24
attempting [1] - 167:1
attendance [1]-28:6
attention [5]-60:16,
69:16, 71:16, 106:5, 120:5
attention-span [1] 106:5
Attorney [2]-234:11, 234:16
attorney [45] - 14:9,
16:21, 65:20, 66:6,
68:9, 69:9, 69:11,
69:17, 71:14, 72:8,
72:10, 72:23, 73:13,
74:7, 82:20, 86:9,
89:15, 90:16, 91:19,
102:22, 102:23,
107:20, 120:17,
121:16, 124:10,
124:15, 136:23,
153:14, 154:8,
167:15, 183:12,
199:16, 199:17,
207:21, 207:24,
208:2, 209:22,
211:2, 211:3,
218:19, 224:23,
225:3, 225:25,
226:2, 226:15
Attorney's [1] - 65:22
attorney's [3]-231:1,
231:2, 231:3
attorneys [13]-61:24,
72:6, 72:7, 85:22, 149:15, 183:12, 209:21, 210:6, 225:3, 225:20,
229:2, 231:6
attribute [1] - 199:16
attributing ${ }_{[1]}-10: 23$
August [2] - 112:19,
138:21
authenticate ${ }_{[3]}$ -
185:25, 186:11,
187:18
Author [2]-234:11, 234:15
Authority [2] - 31:11, 32:3
authorized $[1]$ - 63:25
automated [1] -
182:21
automatically ${ }_{[2]}$ 46:23, 187:9 available [5] - 52:1, 176:23, 236:19, 236:24, 237:12
Avenue [2]-2:3, 2:8
aviation [1] - 39:13
avoid [5]-4:1, 4:9,
58:13, 70:13, 212:24
award [15] - 6:4, 7:13,
7:14, 8:12, 8:14,
11:13, 158:20,
167:21, 168:2,
169:3, 169:7,
203:10, 230:23,
230:25, 231:2
awarded [3]-87:25,
88:21, 89:5
aware [1]-161:18
awareness [1] - 133:9
awful [5]-6:20, 67:16,
92:15, 117:24, 149:11
B

B-o-I-i-n [1] - 24:20
bachelor ${ }_{[1]}$ - 42:11
bachelor's [6] - 30:5,
36:19, 38:20, 41:3,
42:20, 43:4
bad [14]-29:22,
30:18, 34:13, 102:3,
103:18, 104:18,
149:4, 149:19,
149:20, 210:13,
219:8, 219:9, 219:16
bailiff ${ }_{[1]}$ - 26:7
bands [1] - 76:12
Bank [1] - 214:15
bar [8] - 38:23,
182:25, 184:6,
217:2, 225:15,
225:18
Bar [5] - 14:1, 38:23,
146:6, 210:17
barn [1]-202:16


17:22, 18:6, 18:7,
18:12, 18:15, 20:5,
20.8, 20.15

21:21, 22:7, 51:24,
52:3, 52:4, 52:8,
59:10, 67:7, 67:8,
67:13, 67:15, 67:16,
67:25, 69:2, 69:7,
71:19, 71:25, 72:16,
72:17, 72:21, 73:11,
105.12, 108:10

132:6, 137:1, 153:7,
153:9, 153:10,
153:16, 154:20,
154:22, 154:24,
155:2, 155:3, 155:4, 160:17, 160.14,

162:5, 164:19
168:3, 170:7, 170:8,
173:8, 173:10,
173:14, 175:6,
175:9, 185:19, 186:10, 186:15,
187:7, 187:8,
187:24, 190:8,
190:20, 190:23,
195:10, 196:19,
8:4, 199:5, 199:6
109:22, 200:20
202:25, 203:15,
207:2, 207:12,
207:20, 208:10,
211:1, $211: 2$
214:25, 215:2,
215:3, 215:19,
215:23, 216:11,
216:17, 216:25,
217:6, 218:8,
8:17, 220:1
221:17, 221:21,
$222.25,223.3$
223:7, 223:24,
224:8, 224:14,
224:25, 225:1
227.5

227:17, 228:23,
228:24, 229:3
229:8, 229:9,
231:12, 232:19,
232.20, 237:10

Blogging [2] - 97:20,

| 162:10 | bringing [1] - 8:5 | 166:14, 166:23, | 48:24, 50:12, 50:19, | 64:24, 78:23, 79:14, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| blogging [1] - 196:19 | brings $[1]-67: 3$ | 167:14, 168:1, | 51:15, 51:23, 51:24, | 81:9 |
| blogs [2]-51:25, | broke [1] - 228:16 | 169:2, 170:20 | :5, 52:6, 52:11 | CEO [1] - 81:21 |
| 223:10 | broker ${ }_{[1]}$ - 41:3 | 172:4, 172:18 | 2:21, 52:24, 55:8, | certain [5] - 58:1 |
| blow [1] - 118:13 | brother [3] - 42:7, | 173:3, 173:13 | 56:3, 56:10, 56:11 | 182:12, 187:21, |
| blowing [5] - 7:10, | 42:8, 42:11 | 173:21, 174:13, | 57:12, 57:14, 57:22, $58: 18,58: 24,58 \cdot 25$, | $201: 23,224: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 4,50: 3,50: 7 \text {, } \\ & 82: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { brought [10] - 7:18, } \\ & 7: 23,43: 24,66: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:23, 175:4, } \\ & \text { 176:8, 177:6, 196:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 18,58: 24,58: 25, \\ & 59: 2,59: 4,59: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { certainly }[8]-72: 6, \\ & \text { 103:18, 109:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| blowup [5] - 112:16, 114:10, 117:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:15, 69:22, 71:16, } \\ & 120: 5,183: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 230: 2,230: 7,234: 1, \\ & 234: 19,235: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 8,59: 12,59: 17, \\ & 59: 19,59: 25,60: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:19, 135:14, } \\ & \text { 149:9, 149:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 123:24, 132:4 | 225:17 |  | 60:21, 61:20, 62:2 | certified [1]-239:8 |
| board [3] - 81: | build [1] - 31 | C | 5, 62 | certify [1] - 239:3 |
| :18, 210:17 | built [1] - 76:21 |  | 64:16, 65 | cetera [3]-127:10, |
| boats [1] - 37:25 | bunch [8]-15:11 | caching [1] - 155:10 calculation [1]-162:7 | 65:25, 66:3, 66:8, | 209:15, 223:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { bold [5] - 106:21, } \\ & \text { 137:5, 139:4, 139:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 20,25: 21,92: 22, \\ & 94: 11,102: 2, \end{aligned}$ | calculation [1] - 162:7 <br> Cameron [5] - 24:5, | 67:1, 67:3, 67:18, <br> 68:21, 68:22, 69:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { chair [2] - 29:3, } \\ & 179: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { bolded }[3]-106: 20, \\ 107: 13,139: 11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 108:25, 109:8 } \\ \text { burden }[3]-62: \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 14,30: 1,34: 16 \\ & 53: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 84:18, 85:24, 89:22, 89:23, 90:2, 107:5, | chairman [1] - 210:16 chairmanship [1] - |
| Bolin [4]-24:20, | 62:19, 63:14 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { campaign [2] - } \\ 133: 14,133: \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:24, 120:4, } \\ & \text { 120:5, 127:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 210:18 |
| $\begin{gathered} 37: 20,50: 18,53 \\ \text { book }[1]-122: 23 \end{gathered}$ | burn [1] - 202 <br> Burnside [1] - | camping [1] - 37:17 | 127:11, 149:4, | challenge $[8]-87: 20$, $133: 8,135: 3,135: 4,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { books [2] - 156:19, } \\ & \text { 171:15 } \end{aligned}$ | business [39]-37:14, 39:14, 42:20, 45:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canby }[1]-30: 23 \\ & \text { candor }[1]-226: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:9, 153:2, 169:7, } \\ & \text { 181:23, 182:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 208:22, 209:1, } \\ & \text { 211:11, 213:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| boss [3] - 81:1, 81:4, | 46:5, 46:7, 51:10, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { cannot }[5]-3: 13, \\ 57: 6,61: 6,201: \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:6, 193:20, } \\ & \text { 202:10, 202:24, } \end{aligned}$ | challenged [5] - |
| 134:14 | $62: 3,62: 5,62: 7,$ <br> 62:17, 62:22, 63:18, | $\text { canon }[1]-225: 25$ | 207:6, 209:6, 209:9, |  |
| 132:15 | $63: 20,64: 16,64: 20,$ | canons [1]-225:20 | :3, 211:13, | . |
| bottom [13]-106:23, | 64:21, 64:22, 65:6, | capable [1] - 149:18 car [2] - 37:24, 37:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 211:18, 213:1, } \\ & \text { 213:7, 214:14, } \end{aligned}$ | challenges [9] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:24, 107:2, } \\ & \text { 107:4, 124:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 65:14, 66:13, 67:5, | car [2] - 37:24, 37:25 card [2] - 176:20, | 222:23, 222:24 | 25:22, 28:4, 28:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 4,124: 16, \\ & 2: 16,184: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 78:22, 81:18, 81:20, | 177:1 | 4:21, 225:7 | 3:16, 146:19, |
| 207:13, 208:17, | :18, 140:13 | cards [1] - 176:22 | 230 | 21 |
| 1:12, 231:12 | 9:4, 163:3 | care [8]-26:8, 32:23, |  | challenging [3] - 8:20, |
| 232:12, 235:7 | :15, 212:4 | 3:23, 128:18, | 236:6, 236:19, <br> 236.25, 237:3, | 120:4, 133:12 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { box }[4]-23: 18,23: 22, \\ 48: 1,117: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 213:9, 214:3 } \\ & 229: 12,235: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:24, 146:21, } \\ & \text { 169:23, 226:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 237:6, 237:10, 238:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { chance }[4]-103: 24, \\ 148: 24,194: 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\text { BPO }_{[1]}-229: 12$ | businesses [3] | career [2] - 70:23 | Case [1] - 23:13 | change [2]-64:6, |
| Brandon [2]-25:3, | 63:21, 64:17, 214:4 | 102:2 | cases [14]-26:25, | 220:19 |
| 44:11 | businesses's [1] - 67:6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Carol }[5]-14: 4,25: 16, \\ 51: 9,192: 4,193: 1 \end{gathered}$ | 27:3, 31:14, 31:15, <br> 31:17, 39:14, 39:18, | changed [4]-113:9, 113:10, 160:24 |
| 226:20 | button [1] - 182:17 | carpenter [1]-37:1 | 111:6, 236:23, | 199:7 |
| breadth [1] - 68: | BY [65] - 75:15, 78:15, | case $[156]-5: 2,5: 7$, | 237:4, 237:6, 237:7 | CHAP [1] - 30:6 |
| break [5] - 64:5, | 80:10, 80:24, 84:1, | $6: 6,7: 10,7: 18,7: 23$ | categories [1] 101:16 | Chapter [31] - 96:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:3, 191:23, } \\ & \text { 193:21, 194:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:8, 87:15, 91:16, } \\ & 94: 1,96: 11, ~ 97: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:20, 9:18, 10:17, } \\ & \text { 11:10, 14:12, 17:24, } \end{aligned}$ | category [1] - 216:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 19,98: 2,107: 6, \\ & \text { 108:23, 136:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Bret [3]-24:16, 36:7, | 98:6, 98:23, 99:11, | 23:2, 23:12, 25:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { caught [2] - 102:23, } \\ & \text { 107:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 138:15, 163:7, |
| 53:23 | 100:10, 101:13, $104: 12$ 115:15, | 26:4, 26:8, 26:24, | caused [3] - 72:6, | 164:9, 173:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { bridge [2]-18:24, } \\ & 75: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:12, 115:15, } \\ & \text { 116:20, 122:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 27:1, 27:9, 27:10, <br> 27:24, 28:22, 30:13, | $114: 12,146: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:2, 205:3, 205:4, } \\ & \text { 205:5, 206:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| bridges [1] - 75:22 | 122:19, 125:12, | $32: 8,32: 9,32: 11,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { causes }[3]-50: 2 \\ 52: 5,120: 3 \end{gathered}$ | 206:11, 215:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { brief }[4]-53: 19, \\ & 74: 21,199: 4,22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:18, 130:17, } \\ & \text { 131:10, 136:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 6,33: 9,33: 11, \\ & 33: 18,34: 7,34: 10 \end{aligned}$ | causing [1] - 121:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 17,217: 6 \\ & 17: 18,218: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { briefly [4]-29:5, } 8$ | $138: 5,140: 1,141: 2$ | 36:1, 36:4, 37:9, | caution [1] - 49:3 | $24: 4,225: 22$ |
| 138:7, 141:5 | 142:3, 143:10 | , 38:7, 40:8, | cautionary [1] - 142:9 | $26: 3,227: 13$ |
| bring [11]-6:17, | 144:9, 145:24 | 40:10, 40:11, 40:14, | CD [1] - 103:23 | 27:14, 227:15 |
| 11:15, 17:12, | 152:5 | 41:9, 41:10 | -ROM [1] - 103:23 | 233:10, 233:11, |
| 116:17, 137:3, | 153:24, 154:12, | 41:13, 42:2, 43:10 | ase [1] - 126:11 | 233:13 |
| 179:18, 183:6, | 7, 156:20, | 5:1, 45:2, | center [2]-79:19, | chapter [33] - 6:25, |
| 198:20, 198:24, | 156:24, 158:17, | 45:19, 45:20, 45:22, | 179:12 | 95:16, 95:18, 96:24, |
| 217:8, $238: 8$ | 159:10, 164:18, | 46:11, 47:16, 47:17, | centers [5]-64:23, | 97:15, 98:8, 106:17, |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 硣:10 | 126:23, 168:13, | 189:20, 189:23 | 225:5, 225:1 |  |
| 7:10, 109:4, | 206:2 | 190:2, 190:9, | aimant $[1]$ - 151 | 12:14, 12:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:14, } 113: 12, \\ & 122: 21,138: 16, \end{aligned}$ | chosen [2] - 52:10, 102:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 190: 12,191: 1 \\ & 192: 5,192: 14 \end{aligned}$ | claimant's [1]-89:3 claimed [6] - $50 \cdot 9$ | 17:12, 51:11, 64:12, 79:10, 82:17 |
| 141:19, 162:9, | Chris [8] - 115:4 | 22:19, 192:21 | 16, 120 | 7:20, 127 |
| 175:6, 184:7 | 5:20 | 194:20 | 2:17, 199:2 | 176:3, 178:20 |
| 184:11, 185:2 | 116:1, 116:1 | 197:2, 197:8 | 203:20 | 6:1, 227:1 |
| 198:11, 207:12, | 116:19, 116:2 | 201:17, 212:21 | claiming [4]-116:1, |  |
| 5:24, 215:2 | 63:16 | 215:2 | 152:12, 205:19 |  |
| 216:19, 223:18 | CHRIStiansen | :12, 222:1 | 207:15 | 65:20 |
| 223:20, 223:21 | - 3:11, 3:14, 3:1 | 223:11, 226:6 | claims [21] - 8:2, | , 2 |
| 4:3, 226:6, 232:9 | 6:11, 6:13, 6:24 | 229:18, 229:22 | , 39:25, 40:1, | 219:13 |
| Chapters [2]-216:19 | 7:10, 7:16, 8:3, 8:9, | 230:2, 230:7, | 0:21, 46:6, 62:6, | lose [7] - 54 |
| chapters [47] - 13:4, | 8:18, 8:25, 9:8, 9:10, | 233:24, 234:1 | 2:11, 62:13, 66:10, | 60:1 |
| 13:8, 20:10, 22:3, | 9:24, 10:3, 10:7, | :15, 23 | 6:11, 68:17, 85:3, | 124:25, 139:9, |
| 72:2, 95:13, 95:14, 95:15, 95:19, 96:16, | 10:16, 10:22, 11:20, 11:25, 12:12, 12:18, | $4: 23,235$ | 5:13, 86:16, 86: | 139:10 |
| 98:14, 98:24, 99:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 25, \\ & \text { 12:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 237:15, 237:2 | 86:19, 86:20, <br> 115:25, 206:2 | closed [4] 718 : |
| 99:14, 101:2, 101:3 | 14, 15:25, 17:1 | 238:12 | clarify [2] - 124: | loser [1] - 144:23 |
| 104:1, 106:6, | 19:6, 20:23, 26:15, | Christi | 145:12 | closing $[6]$ - |
| 114:12, 138 | 45:13, 53:9, 64:10 | 2:2, 2:2, 7:3, | class [1]-44:15 | 201:11, 217:14 |
| 141:8, 141:18 | 74:23, 75:15, 78:15, | 4.5, 14.7, | clause [2] - 85: | 相 |
| 142:18, 144:18 | , 80:10 | 4:14, 14:16, | 231:1 | clothes [1] - 126:7 |
| 147:11, 147:12, | 80:19, 80:24, 83:2 | 12, 26:15, | cle | cloud [1] - 147:2 |
| 147:15, 162:4, | 84:1, 87:4, 87:8, | 4:8, 124:14 | 0:14 | club [1] - 37:25 |
| 162:6, 173:14, | 87:15, 90:21, 90:25, | 124:15, 153:14, | 3, 199:1 | clubs [11]-31:3, |
| 182:24, 183:3, | 91:6, 91:13, 91:15, | 193:2, 194:19, 22 | 216:23 | 34:20, 35:19, 36:21, |
| 183:4, 183:5, 183:9, | 91:16, 93:12, 93:16, | Christmas [1]-220:16 | clearly [9] - 9:15, 61:6, | 7:2, 37:16, 37:25, |
| 183:11, 183:12, | :20, 94:1, 95:2 | chunk [5] - 14:6 | 0:8, 102:4, 103:14, | 8:13, 41:5, 41:20, |
| 183:15, 184:3, | 96:6, 96:9, 96:11, | 16:20, 207:1, 207:9 | 10, 162:10, | 42:14 |
| 184:4, 184:11, 198:12, 224:3, 225:1 | 97:10, 97:14, 98:3, | $24: 25$ | 203:4 | code [3] - 66:12, 70:7, |
| 198:12, 224:3, 225:1 | 98:6, 98:20, 98:23, | church [3] - 31:3 | clerk [11] - 6:21, 9:15, | 72:9 |
| character $[1]-203: 12$ | 99:7, 99:11, 99:24 | 3:8, 44:1 | 9:18, 118:22 | coerced [1] - 63:17 |
| charge $[2]$ - 63:4, | 100:5, 100:10 | circuit ${ }_{[1]}$ - $31: 21$ | 8:24, 121:11, | cognitive [5] - 74: |
| 65:12 charged [1] - 71:6 | 101:6, 101:10 | Circuit [4]-32:2, 33:7, | 31:7, 131:8, 154:5, | 99:12, 209 |
| charged [1] -71:6 | 101:13, 104:12 | 33:8, 38:25 | 192:2, 236:12 | 10:4, 211:7 |
| charges $[1]-71: 5$ chat ${ }_{\text {[1] }}-59 \cdot 10$ | 115:11, 115:12, | circumst | CLERK ${ }_{\text {[00] - 22:20, }}$ | cold [1] - 126:6 |
| chat ${ }_{[1]}-59: 10$ cheat $[1]-136: 23$ | 116:20, 122:7, | 61:11, 21 | 23:1 | collect [7] - 66:25 |
| cheat $[1]-136: 23$ check [1]-53:17 | 122:13, 122:16 | 12:25 | 24:3 24:5, 24:8, | 89:9, 89:12, 89:1 |
| check $[1]-53: 17$ Cherry $[1]-75: 24$ | 122:19, 125:12, 127:4, 127:18, | circumstantia | 4:12, 25:9, 25:16, | $9 \cdot 1$ |
| Cherry ${ }^{[1]}$ - $75: 24$ Chester $[4]$ - 124:3, | 127:4, 127:18, <br> 128:1, 128:4, 128 | 56:16, 56:18, 5 | \%:8, 74:25, 75:7 | collecting [1] -67:2 |
| Chester [4]-124:3, 124:7, 124:12, | 128:1, 128:4, 128:7, <br> 128:11, 128:15, | cite $[1]-236: 19$ | 91:8, 91:14, 96: | colleg |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:7, 124:12, } \\ & \text { 124:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:11, 128:15, } \\ & 129: 6,129: 18, \end{aligned}$ | citing $[1]-211: 2$ citizen $[1]-1: 6$ citizen [1] - 1:6 | $8,100: 1,155: 24$, 6:22, 171:21, | $32: 23,35: 2,35$ $35: 18,37: 22,3$ |
| Chicago [2]-116:2, | 130:13, 130:17, | citizen's [1] - 62 | , | 5:18, 37:22, |
| 116:7 | 131:10, 136:2, | city [1] - 81:10 | 8:25, 189:3 | 49:12, 49:13 |
| chief ${ }_{[1]}$ - 191:6 | 136:7, 136:8, 138:2, | City $[2]-33: 7,35: 15$ | 0:20, 190:24 | College ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - 32:21 |
| child [2] - 42:21, 125:8 | 138:5, 139:22, | Civil $[3]-234: 10$, | 2:15, 192:22, | collisions [1] - 39:1 |
| children [13] - 36:5, | 140:1, 141:1, 141 | 234:14, 234:15 | 3:25, 197:21, | Ilusion [1] - 14 |
| 42:10, 42:20, 126:1, | 141:25, 142:3 | civil [7] - 26:24, 27:3, | 8:25, 201:13 | mbat [1] - 111: |
| 126:2, 126:5, 126:8, | 143:6, 143:10 | 30:15, 36:4, 43:10 | 220:7, | mbination $[1]$ - |
| 126:10, 126:13, 127:2, 127:19, 127.2, |  | 132:6 | 20:9, 223:13, | 196:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:2, 127:19, } \\ & \text { 127:22. 129:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $145: 14$ 145:24, 149:23 | Clackam | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 226:8, 230:5, 233:23 } \\ & \text { clerks }[11-11: 1 \end{aligned}$ clerks [1] - 11:1 | comforta 28.20 |
| Children's ${ }_{\text {[1] - }}$ - $30: 7$ | 154:6, 154 | :5, 225:1 | ck [2] - 184: | $\text { coming }[18]-6: 23$ |
| children's [2]-36:22, | 158:13, 159:8, | claim [15]-8:1, 8: | $24: 13$ | $13: 5,13: 15,18: 7$ |
| 125:24 | 164:11 | 12:10, 40:13, 41:11 | clicked [2] - 94:1 | :10, 18:16, 20:25, |
| choose [1] - 126:23 |  | 46:9, 63:16, 66:17, | 06:18 | 21, 21:23, 21:24, |
| choosing $[1]-213: 7$ chose $[4]-126 \cdot 21$ |  | 22:12 | clicker [1] - 93:19 | 2:13, 22:14, 92:21, |
| chose [4] - 126:21, | 175:2, 175:18, | 136:25, 142:12, | client [19]-6:20, 7:18, | 100:20, 134:19, |



[^0]

68:18, 96:14, 104:14, 105:18, 112:9, 121:25, 126:21, 161:15, 161:16, 174:6, 175:6, 175:9, 231:22, 232:22 contention [1] 157:17 contents [3] - 115:3, 130:3, 223:19 contested [2] 230:22, 230:25 context [4]-17:24, 108:6, 232:2, 237:12 continue [2]-168:14, 196:18
continued [1] - 168:18 continuing [63]-
32:22, 78:15, 80:10, 80:24, 84:1, 87:8, 87:15, 91:16, 94:1, 96:11, 97:14, 98:6, 98:23, 99:11, 100:10, 101:13, 104:12, 115:15, 116:20, 122:13, 122:19, 125:12, 129:18, 130:17, 131:10, 136:8, 138:5, 140:1, 141:4, 142:3, 143:10, 144:9, 145:24, 152:5, 153:24, 154:12, 156:7, 156:20, 156:24,
158:17, 159:10, 164:18, 166:14, 166:23, 167:14,
168:1, 169:2,
170:20, 172:4,
172:18, 173:3,
173:13, 173:21,
174:13, 174:23,
175:4, 176:8, 177:6,
196:4, 230:7, 234:1,
234:19, 235:5
contract [9]-51:10,
66:3, 84:22, 85:2,
135:12, 150:21,
158:10, 181:16
contractor [1] -
195:12
contracts [1] - 214:18 contradicted [1] 57:23
contrary [1]-207:4
contribution [1]-28:9 control [9]-26:9,
47:20, 55:12, 56:24,


| 127:24, 128:2, | 197:5, 197:7, 197:9, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 128:6, 128:10, | 197:11, 197:24, |
| 128:13, 128:18, | 198:18, 198:21, |
| 128:21, 128:25, | 199:1, 201:4, 201:8, |
| 129:5, 129:7, | 201:16, 201:18, |
| 129:11, 129:13, | 212:20, 212:22, |
| 129:17, 130:16, | 213:23, 217:10, |
| 131:2, 136:3, 136:6, | 217:14, 220:6, |
| 138:4, 139:24, | 220:11, 220:13, |
| 141:3, 142:2, 143:9, | 222:13, 222:15, |
| 144:8, 145:18, | 223:14, 226:11, |
| 145:23, 149:24, | 229:16, 234:13, |
| 151:24, 152:2, | 234:17, 234:24, |
| 153:23, 154:4, | 235:1, 235:3, |
| 154:11, 155:23, | 235:14, 235:17, |
| 155:25, 156:4, | 235:21, 236:12, |
| 156:9, 156:12, | 237:18, 237:24, |
| 156:14, 158:14, | 238:3 |
| 159:7, 159:9, 164:2, | court [32]-31:6, |
| 164:13, 165:24, <br> 166:6, 166:9 | 31:13, 31:14, 31:19, <br> $32 \cdot 7,33: 5,33: 14$ |
| 166:12, 166:19, | $33: 17,34: 22,36: 23$ |
| 167:11, 167:24, | 37:18, 38:1, 38:15, |
| 168:21, 168:23, | 38:23, 39:7, 41:7, |
| 170:2, 170:6, 170:9, | 42:16, 42:25, 43:25, |
| 170:11, 170:15, | 44:2, 44:3, 50:9, |
| 170:17, 171:5, | 50:19, 51:11, 56:11, |
| 171:10, 171:12, | 59:24, 66:20, 87:18, |
| 171:17, 171:24, | 120:15, 124:20, |
| 172:14, 173:2, | 193:25, 230:13 |
| 173:7, 173:12, | Court [28]-3:2, 9:16, |
| 174:9, 174:12, | 23:4, 23:8, 32:2, |
| 174:22, 175:3, | 33:7, 33:8, 39:1, |
| 175:19, 177:3, | 40:17, 48:21, 53:5, |
| 177:5, 184:16, | 55:6, 56:7, 59:21, |
| 184:23, 184:25, | 60:11, 61:9, 66:21, |
| 185:16, 185:20, | 72:9, 122:8, 122:10, |
| 185:24, 186:6, | 127:5, 127:17, |
| 186:19, 187:6, | 129:15, 192:2, |
| 187:14, 187:17, | 193:24, 226:16, |
| 188:2, 188:6, 188:9, | 230:14, 239:13 |

Courthouse [1]-2:8
courtroom [12] - 23:4,
26:7, 54:3, 54:11,
55:2, 58:8, 120:12,
127:15, 127:16,
184:22, 196:2,
236:11
courts [1] - 31:22
cover [1] - 211:1
covered [1] - 154:19
coworkers [2] - 88:25, 105:1
Cox [4]-115:4, 115:6, 115:9, 163:16
crafts [1] - 38:14
crashed [7]-161:23,
174:3, 174:4, 176:2, 176:18, 203:20,
204:6

| ```crazier [1]-116:8 create [2]-47:22, 178:5 credibility [3] - 208:20, 216:22, 226:19 credible [1] - 16:11 credit [3]-176:20, 176:22, 177:14 crime [1] - 231:14 criminal \([7]\) - 26:24, 26:25, 27:1, 34:6, 34:9, 41:10, 68:4 critical [6] - 208:10, 210:12, 212:2, 221:12, 225:18, 225:19 critically [4] - 133:8, 133:12, 221:6, 221:7 critique [1] - 74:13 crochet \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(35: 20\) CROSS [2]-150:1, 230:1 cross [14] - 18:24, 21:2, 61:19, 61:20, 61:22, 149:24, 153:3, 162:3, 168:20, 170:18, 174:19, 193:15, 194:3, 229:17 cross-exam [2] - 149:24, 229:17 cross-examination [2] -21:2, 193:15 CROSS- EXAMINATION [2] - 150:1, 230:1 cross-examine [6] - 61:19, 61:20, 61:22, 153:3, 168:20, 194:3 cross-referenced [1] - 174:19 crossing [1] - 39:13 crow [3] - 210:2, 210:25, 211:6 Crow [8] - 66:7, 86:13, 132:9, 132:13, 132:14, 168:7, 218:21 Crow's [1] - 219:19 CRR \({ }^{[2]}\) - 2:7, 239:12 CSR [3]-2:7, 239:12, 239:13 curious [1] - 163:5 current \({ }_{[1]}\) - 140:7 customer [2] - 177:7, 204:2 cut \({ }_{[1]}\) - 202:17 Cybercrime [1] - 138:17``` | ```cybercrime [9] - 73:18, 73:22, 146:10, 212:5, 214:12, 214:14, 228:12, 228:20, 229:1 cycle [1] - 14:19 D dad [1] - 34:19 daily [4]-79:7, 81:23, 113:11, 177:21 damages [25] - 7:14, 7:15, 7:16, 11:13, 15:17, 16:13, 17:25, 18:1, 62:16, 63:12, 166:2, 194:23, 194:24, 202:16, 202:17, 209:13, 218:20, 236:19, 236:24, 237:2, 237:9, 237:12, 237:19, 237:20, 238:6 Damned [2] - 141:19, 184:6 dancers [1] - 29:15 dangerous [1] - 125:19 Daniel [1] - 25:12 Danielle [1] - 25:12 dare [1] - 137:13 dark [1] - 147:2 data [19]-78:12, 78:13, 79:8, 82:10, 82:16, 165:1, 176:3, 177:12, 177:21, 178:17, 180:1, 180:3, 180:6, 180:11, 200:1, 200:5, 204:20 database [2] - 165:15, 179:21 DATE [1] - 239:12 date [28]-20:1, 90:17, 94:24, 95:2, 95:21, 95:23, 96:13, 97:2, 97:4, 97:21, 98:12, 98:15, 130:6, 131:18, 135:22, 137:21, 138:18, 139:17, 140:21, 141:20, 143:1, 143:4, 143:25, 144:5, 145:7, 204:3, 212:18, 232:23 dates [3]-96:12, 96:17, 112:17 daughter [3]-36:9,``` | 37:14, 41:18 <br> daughters [1] - 36:16 <br> David [3] - 25:1, 36:9, 42:18 <br> DAY [1] - 1:20 <br> days [12]-47:17, <br> 49:11, 70:9, 97:5, <br> 97:6, 113:6, 120:16, 135:8, 165:8, <br> 178:23, 219:23, <br> 228:13 <br> deal $[11]-21: 16,70: 2$, 71:1, 71:5, 71:6, 71:19, 73:23, 134:18, 134:22, 201:22, 208:9 <br> dealing [1] - 109:10 <br> deals [1]-215:19 <br> dealt [3]-36:4, 73:25, 200:9 <br> dearly [1] - 114:18 <br> December [2] - <br> 190:11, 220:15 <br> decent [1] - 109:22 <br> decently [1] - 110:6 <br> decide [12]-52:14, <br> 55:13, 55:15, 56:11, <br> 56:22, 57:15, 58:11, <br> 58:21, 58:24, 60:21, 79:12, 203:1 <br> decided [16] - 18:2, 18:7, 162:25, 169:4, 172:9, 172:13, 203:8, 203:9, 206:7, 212:3, 212:8, 215:1, 215:5, 219:24, 224:20 <br> decidedly ${ }_{[1]}-215: 13$ deciding [6] - 56:2, <br> 57:12, 57:14, 60:24, 211:25, 230:8 <br> decision [7]-52:12, 60:13, 66:8, 74:7, <br> 86:1, 149:4, 190:18 <br> decisions [1] - 82:14 <br> declaration [1] - <br> 230:16 <br> declined [1] - 230:25 <br> dedicated [1] - 84:22 <br> deep [3]-44:23, <br> 198:7, 200:23 <br> deeper [1]-44:19 <br> deeply [1] - 195:11 <br> defamation [12] - 6:2, <br> 11:10, 14:15, 14:22, <br> 15:1, 124:8, 213:4, <br> 225:5, 225:14, <br> 237:5, 237:6, 237:7 <br> DEFENDANT [1] - 2:4 defendant [16] - |  | ```denies [1] - 62:12 Denver [3] - 143:20, 154:22 deny [1] - 72:20 denying [1] - 58:17 depart [1] - 237:13 department [1]-203:3 Department [17] - 43:6, 43:19, 43:20, 43:21, 65:21, 70:4, 70:18, 73:24, 82:23, 146:6, 173:5, 173:11, 199:21, 207:25, 208:4, 236:21 deposition [3]-86:6, 86:7, 116:13 depositions [1] - 159:21 deputy [2]-23:4, 26:7 describe [22]-8:15, 75:18, 78:21, 84:3, 85:6, 85:16, 86:14, 88:3, 91:17, 94:2, 100:11, 105:20, 106:25, 118:16, 136:9, 138:7, 141:5, 146:15, 151:3, 172:5, 177:18, 208:18 description [2] - 123:11, 192:6 desist [1] - 126:11 desk [1] - 65:2 desperate [1] - 136:22 destroy \([7]\) - 86:18, 130:24, 136:24, 154:14, 154:17, 176:2, 206:17 destroyed \([7]\) - 67:21, 203:5, 204:13, 206:18, 216:7, 219:6, 228:17 destroying [2] - 66:12, 218:2 destruction [3] - 71:11, 72:13, 85:9 detail [14]-4:15, 14:8, 22:6, 71:19, 71:20, 71:21, 72:14, 173:24, 177:18, 208:9, 215:25, 227:4, 227:12, 227:14 detailed [1] - 55:11 details [3] - 67:10, 67:12, 84:3 deteriorating \({ }_{[1]}\) - 74:12 determination [1] -``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| 176:4, 176:6, 176:7 176:9, 176:10, | E | economic [3] - 166:1, 194:22, 219:17 | employees [6] - 37:15, 39:19, 65:1, 79:22, | $\begin{aligned} & : 7,64: 8,65: 17, \\ & : 21,72: 15,72: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13, 176:14, 15, 176:16 | e-mail [75] - 15:15 | economics [1]-38:21 <br> Edelson 11 -210:7 | E | :15, 79:9, 82:4 |
| 176:18, 176:22 | 110:25, 115: | edges [1] - 195:15 | 36:2 | 88:24, 152:3, |
| 176:24, 177:8 | 115:6, 115:8 | edit $[2]$ - 15:18, 134:19 | employer [41]-20 | 2:13, 224:20, |
| 200:12, 200:13 | 115:17, 115: | editing [1] - 133:23 | 1 | 232:9, 236:7 |
| 20 | 126:14, 144:2 | or [1] - 42 | 7:3, 47:4, 59:14 | ended [8]-33:14, |
| 203:20, 203:2 | 7, 14 | editorialize [1] - 112 | 9:16, 64:16, 69:5 | 81:1, 81:3, 82 |
| 203:24, 204:3, | :8, 146 | edits [1] - 155:7 | 70:5, 71:8, | 83:14, 199:10 |
| 204:6, 205:6, 205:9, | 152:8, 152:12, | education [6] - 32:22, | 3:17, 149:8, 150:7, | :15, 202 |
| 205:13, 216:5, | 退:13, 152:16 | education 56$]-32.22$, $32: 24,35: 11,35: 16$, | 50:12, 150:20, | ending $[1]-4: 19$ |
| 216:8, 216:9, 227:9, | 152:18, 152:23 | 42:11 | 50:21, 151:9, | endless [1]-126:22 |
| 227:10, 227:14, | 154:18, 160:20 | efficacy [1] - 208:20 | 7:18, 158:7 | energy [2] - 38:11, |
| :5 | 163:16, 163:17 | efficiency $[1]$ - 38:11 | 8:9, 158:10 | 208:18 |
| drives [4]-103:21, | 172:2, 172:3, 172:6, | effort [4] - 9:19, 89:1, | 1, 158:11 | forced |
| 103:22, 174:5, | 172:19, 173:1, | 136:24, 201:22 | , 166:1 | forcement [1] - 11:7 |
| 177:16 dubious | 177:25, 182:4 | effort [ []-89:12 | 95:6, 195:15 | engage [ 5 - 160:11, |
| dubious [2] - 236:18 <br> 237:11 | 188:18, 189:14, <br> 192:4, 192:5, 192:8, | 110:16, 125:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:16, } 202: 1 \\ & 02: 23,2123 \\ & \hline 10 \end{aligned}$ | 174:16, 220 223:2, 226: |
| Duck [9] - 91:23, 94:5, | 196:21, 200:17, |  | 212:9, 212:19, | engaged [8] - $7: 19$, |
| 43:20, | 200:18, 202:3 | eight [6] - $23: 15$, | 3:12, 214:2, | 62:21, 68:9, 117:17, |
| :22, 221:18 | 204:10, 205:2 |  | 4:19, 218:1 | 69:10, 209:19, |
| 224:10, 232:20 | 205:5, 205:7 |  | 222:24 | 218:5, 222:22 |
| dude [2]-116:2, | 205:11, 205:13 | eith eit | Employers [1] - 39:12 | engaging [1] - 62:21 |
| 116:6 | 205:17, 205:21 | 85:21, 162:1, 210 | employers [15] - | engine [ $[3]$ - 112:7, |
| due [3] - 15:12, 48:20, | 206:1, 206:3, 206:5, | elder [2] | 6:20, 46:21, 73:17, | 22:6, 232:20 |
| 50:9 duly $[2]-75: 4,197: 18$ | 206:9, 206:10, 206:13, 206:17, | 2 | 74:4, 169:13 | ngineer [1] - 43:7 |
| duly [2] - 75:4, 197:18 | 20 | electronic [1] - 59 | 69:15, 169:14 | engines [4]-223:9, |
| During [2]-107:21, | 206:21, 207:10 | element $[4]-8: 4$, | 9:18, 194:4 | 223:17, 223:22 |
| 108:5 | 214:20, 215:16 |  | 4:12, 194:13 | 232:7 |
| $22: 5,27: 23,55: 2$ | 227:16, 228:4, | 咗 | $\text { 196:7, } 196: 10$ | joy [6] - 30:9, 36 |
| $58: 5,59: 2,64: 4,$ | 228:5, 228:7, | elementary [1] - 36:17 | ployment 4 | $43: 8$ |
| 64:5, 69:12, 69 | 231:10, 231:1 | nts [3]-62:19, | 3.6.7.23.20.12 | htening |
| 88:15, 92:15, 1 | 235:10 | 63:15, | 16, 50:2, 50:20, | 34:14 |
| 115:25, 138:10, | [1] |  | 10, 62:23, 22 | sure $[1]$ - 60:6 |
| 152:7, 163:10, | e-mails [11] - 15:21, | 232:16 | 63:1, 63:6, 63:9, | nter $[1]$ - $24: 10$ |
| 163:12, 166:19, | 103:14, 105:13 | eliminat | 63:13, 63:19, 63:23, | entered [3]-89:17 |
| 166:24, 174:14, | 111:8, 133:9 | 206:24 |  | 214:8, 230:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 182:2, 187:2, 191: } \\ & \text { 194:5, 200:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:11, 189:2 } \\ & \text { 189:24, 204: } \end{aligned}$ | Elisabeth [1]-236 | 66:3, 80:16, 80:17, | ENTERPRISES |
| :14, 205:22, | 205:7, 205:8 | embarrass [2] - 27:9, | 2:5, 88:10, 88:2 |  |
| 209:2, 217:14, 231:6 | E-r-d-t [1] - 25: | 89:1 | 2:5, 102:9 |  |
| duties [7]-55:10, | E-s-t-r-a-d-a [1] | emotional [10] - 7:12, <br> 8:19, 16:13, 17:24, | 7:21, 108:5 | 233:17 |
| 79:1, 79:2, 79:7, | 24:21 | 8:19, 16:13, 17:24, | 8:19, 159:2 | enters [] - 1 |
| 81:23, 84:6, 149:9 | E-v-a-n-s [1] - 25:5 | 120:2, 166:3, 195:7, | 4:20, 164:21, | entert |
| Duty [8] - 114:2, | Eager [2] - 76:24, 77:4 | 237:20 | 4:23, 166:18, | 20:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 114: 3,114: 8,14 \\ & 201 \cdot 19 \end{aligned}$ | early $[3]-32: 14,33: 4$, | employed [4] - 64:25, | 9:11, 196:6 | ntertaini |
| 224:11, 233:14 | easier [4]-24:7 | :15, 101:23, | 233:1 | 120: |
| duty $991-55: 13,72: 8$, | 25, 100:14 | 213:15 | 33:2 |  |
| 209:1, 225:23, | 171:13 |  | employment-related |  |
| 226:2, 226:15, | easiest ${ }_{[1]}$ - 146:19 | 46:23, 46:24, 47:3 | ${ }^{11}$ - $62: 10$ | 207:2, 210:18 |
| 226:16, 226:18, | easily [1] - 112:6 |  | empty [2] - 103:2 | $\text { entirely }[2]-47: 2$ |
| 226:20 | East [1] - 36:25 | 138:13, 149:7, | 112:12 | 219:19 |
| Dyersville [5] - 79:21 178:22, 179.14 | Eastern [2] - 38:24, | 152:18, 159:24, | encrypted [2] - | entirety [4]-16: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:22, 179:14, } \\ & \text { 181:3, 216:3 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 161:19, 165:20, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 176:21, 177:14 } \\ \text { end }[24]-22: 9,55: 10, \end{gathered}$ | $175: 7,175: 10$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { easy [3] - 49:6, 92:9, } \\ & 179: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:21, 195:11, } \\ & 205: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  | 220:22 |


| 46:3, 46:4, 46:5, <br> 46:7, 62:4, 62:5, <br> 62:7, 62:17, 63:18, 63:20, 67:5, 69:5, 150:10, 157:1, <br> 157:6, 157:15, <br> 157:17, 158:2, <br> 158:7, 189:6, 214:8, 214:10, 214:17 <br> entity [5] - 62:22, <br> 151:6, 158:8, <br> 158:18, 214:22 <br> 180:3 <br> environmental [2] - <br> 30:25, 31:11 <br> equal [1] - 56:22 <br> equals [1] - 237:11 <br> equipment [1] - 76:22 <br> equivalent $[1]-88: 11$ <br> Erdt ${ }_{[2]}$ - 25:1, 42:18 <br> Eric [1] - 25:11 <br> Erin [2]-24:17, 36:15 <br> error [1] - 58:13 <br> escalate [1] - 133:18 <br> escalating [3] - <br> 121:18, 147:6, 147:7 <br> escort [3]-54:24, <br> 127:12, 236:8 <br> especially [3] - <br> 102:12, 112:2, <br> 135:12 <br> esque [1] - 215:11 <br> essence [3]-199:7, <br> 211:11, 229:3 <br> estate [2] - 34:1, 41:3 <br> Estrada [3]-24:21, <br> 38:9, 53:24 <br> et $[5]-23: 13,26: 5$, 127:10, 209:15, <br> 223:19 <br> ethical [2] - 225:20, 229:2 <br> ethics [1] - 72:9 <br> Eugene [3]-64:23, <br> 79:20, 216:2 <br> evaluate [5]-133:8, <br> 133:12, 201:20, <br> 221:7, 226:14 <br> evaluated [4] - 200:5, <br> 227:8, 227:9, 227:10 evaluating $[1]-72: 22$ <br> evaluation [5] - 72:19, <br> 153:6, 204:7, <br> 205:14, 227:16 <br> evaluations [1] - <br> 206:19 <br> Evans [2]-25:5, 46:17 <br> evans [1] - 46:18 <br> Eve [1] - 220:16 |  | 208:4, 208:19, <br> 209:7, 211:3, 211:9, <br> 211:17, 211:19, <br> 211:21, 212:10, <br> 213:5, 214:20, <br> 214:21, 214:22, <br> 215:16, 215:17, <br> 216:15, 216:23, <br> 216:24, 216:25, <br> 217:15, 219:6, <br> 219:10, 219:13, <br> 219:15, 219:21, <br> 219:23, 221:6, <br> 221:11, 221:23, <br> 224:21, 226:15, <br> 226:17, 226:24, <br> 227:4, 227:23, <br> 229:2, 235:18, <br> 235:22, 237:23 <br> Evidence [1] - 138:17 evolutionary [2] - <br> 72:5, 199:6 <br> ex [1] - 126:9 <br> ex-employee [1] - <br> 126:9 <br> exact [1] - 28:15 <br> exactly [2]-83:1, <br> 161:6 <br> exam [2]-149:24, <br> 229:17 <br> examination [4] - <br> 21:2, 162:4, 174:14, 193:15 <br> EXAMINATION [3] - <br> 75:14, 150:1, 230:1 <br> examinations [1] - <br> 206:14 <br> examine [11] - 61:19, 61:20, 61:22, 71:20, 71:21, 153:3, 156:25, 167:4, 168:20, 194:3 <br> examined [5] - 75:5, 185:19, 197:19, 200:6, 213:13 examiners [1] 203:23 <br> examining ${ }_{[1]}-132: 6$ example [11] - 4:21, <br> 6:5, 13:2, 14:13, <br> 21:15, 21:24, <br> 103:17, 169:3, <br> 198:9, 207:6, 224:4 excel [2] - 180:23, 180:24 <br> except [3]-54:13, 129:1, 158:23 exception [1] - 84:15 excerpt ${ }_{[1]}$ - 106:9 exchange [2] - 172:3, | 231:10 <br> exclusive [3]-9:3, 121:25, 175:1 exclusively [2] 108:13, 203:22 excuse [11] - $35: 3$, 43:22, 47:6, 49:16, 155:21, 155:22, 164:25, 170:4, 190:17, 213:19, 222:10 executives [1] 227:20 exercise [4]-25:22, 28:4, 38:14, 53:12 exercising [1] - 53:15 exhibit [56] - 4:7, 4:8, 6:25, 19:9, 19:19, 19:24, 20:2, 20:21, 22:2, 57:1, 57:5, 57:6, 81:7, 90:13, 91:1, 93:8, 99:8, 112:18, 121:20, 125:20, 131:12, 144:25, 145:19, 151:16, 156:14, 163:15, 169:24, 170:1, 170:13, 171:3, 171:8, 171:9, 171:10, 185:17, 185:21, 188:12, 188:24, 189:2, 191:16, 191:17, 192:8, 198:20, 198:24, 201:4, 201:6, 201:21, 203:11, 203:15, 215:20, 217:8, 220:4, 220:14, 225:4, 225:16, 230:4, 233:13 <br> Exhibit [114]-19:21, 19:25, 20:2, 79:25, 80:3, 80:11, 80:19, 83:15, 83:23, 86:22, 87:4, 90:12, 90:21, 93:23, 95:7, 96:1, 96:15, 96:18, 96:20, 97:11, 97:15, 97:18, 98:12, 98:20, 99:2, 99:8, 99:16, 99:24, 100:8, 106:8, 106:13, 108:14, 112:11, 112:16, 113:14, 114:7, 114:24, 115:11, 117:2, 118:10, 122:14, 122:16, 122:21, 123:23, | 127:25, 129:21, 130:13, 131:12, 135:16, 136:2, 136:4, 137:14, 138:2, 138:16, 138:22, 139:12, 139:22, 140:15, 141:1, 141:11, 141:25, 142:20, 143:6, 143:14, 144:6, 144:10, 144:12, 145:11, 150:3, 150:4, 151:1, 153:25, 155:19, 155:20, 155:21, 155:22, 156:16, 156:17, 159:6, 163:7, 163:8, 170:5, 170:13, 170:21, 173:15, 173:16, 188:16, 188:22, 201:2, 201:3, 201:15, 203:15, 206:11, 212:12, 213:19, 215:21, 215:22, 220:14, 222:12, 226:5, 226:8, 226:9, 226:12, 226:13, 230:3, 231:10, 232:8, 232:25, 233:7, 233:22, 234:23 <br> Exhibits [1] - 101:7 exhibits [28]-3:24, 4:6, 4:18, 5:13, 14:14, 15:11, 15:12, 15:13, 15:15, 21:23, 22:12, 26:9, 55:21, 60:14, 105:19, 113:22, 151:22, 151:25, 154:4, 155:18, 156:1, 156:6, 189:4, 189:11, 190:2, 222:7, 222:9 exist [1] - 169:18 existence [5] - 185:12, 185:23, 186:15, 205:2, 205:23 exiting [1] - 127:15 expect $[3]-111: 14$, 125:8, 202:17 expectation [1] 160:6 expected [5] - 14:4, 216:2, 216:8, 216:13, 219:17 expects $[1]-61: 16$ expedite [1]-101:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { expenses [1] - 88:20 } \\ & \text { experience [19] - } \\ & \text { 29:13, 29:20, } 30: 17, \\ & 34: 8,34: 12,35: 23, \\ & 40: 6,41: 12,43: 12, \\ & 49: 21,50: 11,50: 21, \\ & 51: 21,52: 13,71: 10, \\ & 140: 6,140: 7, \\ & 183: 18,215: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 211:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { far [8] - 42:16, 49:4, } \\ & 81: 25,83: 1,109: 6, \\ & \text { 113:16, 126:21, } \\ & 176: 18 \end{aligned}$$\text { fast }[1]-100: 25$ | ```204:15 filed [30] - 11:10, 14:15, 14:21, 17:6, 17:8, 19:21, 66:1, 83:8, 83:12, 83:13,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:3, 128:12, } \\ & \text { 135:2, 136:14, } \\ & \text { 147:12, 155:19, } \\ & \text { 170:18, 170:25, } \\ & \text { 197:18, 198:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | F |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | F-i-I-I-i-s [1] - 25:3 |  |  |  |
|  | F-r-i-e-d-s-t-r-o-m [1] - | fast-forward [1] | 33:19, 83:20, 84:18, | 199:7, 199:8, |
|  | 24:24 | 0:2 | 19, 85:12, 92:19, | 20, 218: |
|  | Facebook [7] - 42:24, | father [1] - 36:4 | 24:6, 173:4 | 218:16, 222:16, |
|  | 1 | favor [4] - 66:17 | 173:11, 200:16, | 19, 224:10, |
| experiences [6] - <br> 32:7, 33:16, 37:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:10, 160:15, } \\ & \text { 161:13, 161:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 66:23, 138:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 4,202: 11, \\ & 2: 12,206: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 228:17, 232:9, 237:5 } \\ & \text { fit }[1]-47: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $38: 5,42: 1,44$ | facility [1] | able [1] - 7 | 207 | Fitness [1] - 44: |
| expert [8] - 165:9 | fact [46]-9:23 | fear ${ }_{[1]}-121: 19$ | 207:22, 207:23, | five [5]-35:25, 37:13, |
| 167:7, 186:13, | 47:22, 51:15, 52:4, | feature [2]-59:10 | 220:15, 225:5 | :5, 99:13, 196 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:18, 202:8, } \\ & \text { 206:25, 207:1, 207:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 20,58: 2,67: 11 \\ & 69: 22,70: 12,70: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 180: | $\begin{array}{r} \text { files }[9]-79: 10 \\ 177: 12,178: 1 \end{array}$ | five-year-old [1] - $37: 13$ |
| expert's [1]-227:2 | 74:4, 74:5, 82:8 |  | 178:15, 178:2 | flatbed [1] - 76:21 |
| experts [14]-10:14, | 82:11, 110:14, | 212:10 | 204:1 | flattering [1] - 109:7 |
| 69:21, 103:24, | 12:3, 123:5, 128:8, | federal [4]-50:8 | 204:21, 204:2 | flew [1]-181 |
| 200:4, 200:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:12, 154:14, } \\ & \text { 163:18. 174:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 118:22, 124:20 $230: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { filing }[3]-84: 5,84: 15, \\ & 230: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { floor }[3]-47: 9,54: 7, \\ & 156: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200:19, 202:7, } \\ & \text { 206:15, 206:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 185:13, 199:9 | 230:13 | is [2] - 25:3, 44:11 |  |
| 207:4, 207:6, 227:6, | 2:8, 204:6, 206:1, | 39:24 | finagling [1] - 111:3 | fluid [2]-225:8, 225:9 |
| 227:7 | 206:23, 207:20, | fe | final $[4]-66: 22$, | fly [3]-77:18, 116:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { explain }[8]-5: 8 \text {, } \\ & \text { 21:12. 139:4. 147:1. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:4, 209:9, 210:2, } \\ & \text { 210:12, 211:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 231:1, 231:2, 231:4 | 116:19, 131:2 $133 \cdot 22$ | 116:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:12, 139:4, 147:1, } \\ & \text { 154:21, 187:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 210:12, 211:8, } \\ & \text { 211:11, 222:19, } \end{aligned}$ | fellow [4]-56:10, | 133:22 <br> financial [2] - 217: | focus [4]-39:20, |
| 187:7, 196:6 | 3:5, 224:24 |  | 218:9 | [1] - 227 |
| explaining ${ }_{[1]}$ | 225:4, 225:19, | 113:10 | findable [1] - 136:19 | focuses [1] - 68 |
| 198:10 | 8:11, 228:12 | few | fine $[7]-48: 17,84: 13$, | folder [1] - 107:7 |
| exploited [1] - 199:13 | 228:21 | , 61:13, 88: | 88:7, 128:8, 146:20, | folks [1] - 65:2 |
| explore [2]-21:4 | factor [1] - 63:8 | 2:2 | 181:9, 189:2 | follow [7] - 52:1 |
| 195:3 | factors [3] - 57:25 | 11:1 | finish [3] - 127:15 | $5: 17,85: 2,109: 6,$ |
| export [1] -79:8 | 58:1, 63:23 | 231:17 | 164:3, 195:23 | 9:8, 120:11 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { exporting }[3]-180: 16, \\ 180: 18,180: 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { facts [11] }-26: 22, \\ 55: 13,55: 14,55: 15, \end{array}$ | fiancee [11] - 68:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { finished }[4]-37: 1, \\ & \text { 156:5, 156:8, 193:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 231:14 } \\ & \text { followed }[3]-73: \end{aligned}$ |
| expose [1] - 72:25 | 16, 55:21, 56:2, | $2: 17,107: 2$ | $\text { Fir }[1]-2: 6$ | followed [3] - 73 $231: 16$ |
| exposed [2]-59:1, | 10, 56:19, 57:14 | $: 16,124:$ | [1] -120 | following $[7]-45: 19$ |
| 60:10 | 4:2 | $: 1,149: 1$ | fired $[8]-8: 19,50: 7$ | $45: 21,56: 1,61: 20$ |
| Exposing [2]-234:11, | failure [3]-74 | 9:16, $208: 3$ | 84:17, 88:17, | $62: 19,63: 14,187: 1$ |
| 234:16 | :9, 208:23 | fiancee's [1] - 199:16 | 00:15, 202: | follows [7]-72:24, |
| exposing [1] - 137:2 | fair [5]-52:24, 60:7 | fiction [2]-133:24, | 202:9, 202:1 | $5: 5,130: 2$ |
| Express [4]-200:17, | 160:12, 209:18 | 210:2 | First [9] - 114:2 | 34:14, 147:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 205:10, 206:6, } \\ & 206: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fairness [3] - 27:1 } \\ & 28: 10,60: 9 \end{aligned}$ | fictionalized [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:3, 114:8, 141:9, } \\ & \text { 172:5, 221:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 197:19 |
| extension [1] - 209:25 | faith [2]-202:13 | 215:8 <br> field [2]-78 | $\text { 21:20, } 224$ | nt [1] - 139:4 <br> od [2] - 33:2, 36: |
| extensions [2] - |  | 109:2 | 233:14 | $\text { OR }[3]-1: 2,2: 2,$ |
| 216:1, 216:6 | fake ${ }_{[1]}$ - 199:20 | fifteen [1] - 30 | first [52] - 7:18, 20:5, | for-profit [6] - 1:7, |
| extensively ${ }_{[4]}$ | falls [1]-11:17 | fifth ${ }^{2}$ [ - 128:1 | 20:8, 23:1, 23:3, | 1:10, 1:11, 45:24, |
| 67:22, 205:2, 211:2, | fa |  | 45:1, 46:15, 50:17, | 46: |
| 216:10 | :24, 107:25 | fight [3] - 84:23 | 1:5, 67:13, 74:22, | foregoing [1] - 239:4 |
| extent $[7]-3: 24$, |  | $87: 16,87: 2$ | $75: 4,75: 9,94: 4,$ | forensic [80]-4:21, |
| 11:14, 12:4, 19:18, | falsely [1] - 33:13 | figure [2] - 168:2 | $95: 12,100: 21,$ | 4:22, 6:6, 10:14, |
| 194:14, 194:25, | familiar [6]-81:23 |  | 101:18, 101:2 | $21,11: 6,11$ |
| 210:24 | $110: 1,130: 8,130:$ | figured | 06:17, 107:1 | 11:14, 11:15, |
| extort [1] - 228:19 | 130:11, 178 | $\text { file }[9]-82: 23,8!$ | 08:16, 110:4 | $3,11: 21,11: 23,$ |
| extraordinary ${ }_{[2]}$ | family [9]-37:17, | 02:9, | 11., | $2: 1,12: 5,12: 7,$ |
| 137:1, 216:14 | 13, 59:16, 68:8 |  | 13:22, 113:23 | $2: 25,13: 1,13: 3,$ |
| extreme [1] - 217:21 | 102:16, 103:2, | $2: 4,204: 15$ | $123$ | 9, 18:11, 18:16 |
| extremely ${ }_{[2]}-27: 19$, | 117:23, 118:9, 148:1 | file-sharing [1] - | 123:2, 123:3, 123:4, | 18:20, 18:21, 18:22, |


| ```19:11, 19:15, 19:20, 21:11, 21:16, 21:17, 22:2, 22:4, 22:10, 69:20, 71:17, 71:20, 166:25, 167:7, 167:22, 174:19, 185:9, 185:10, 185:12, 185:17, 185:25, 186:11, 186:13, 186:18, 186:23, 187:5, 187:10, 187:18, 191:10, 191:14, 200:4, 200:9, 200:10, 200:19, 201:24, 202:7, 203:23, 204:7, 205:14, 206:14, 206:19, 206:25, 216:14, 216:16, 216:17, 216:19, 221:23, 227:1, 227:5, 227:6 forensics [7]-198:9, 211:24, 217:17, 224:18, 227:13, 227:16, 227:18 forever [2]-134:14, 134:15 forget \({ }_{[1]}\) - 188:13 forgot [4]-171:14, 194:2, 194:3, 194:6 form [5] - 206:5, 215:10, 221:17, 223:24, 228:10 former [11] - 10:19, 69:5, 73:9, 94:8, 149:7, 194:25, 208:7, 210:23, 212:9, 214:2, 222:24 forth [4]-150:15, 159:17, 197:15, 219:22 forty [1] - 38:3 forty-six [1] - 38:3 forum [1]-17:2 forums [5] - 110:1, 136:15, 136:20, 137:9, 160:19 forward [3] - 74:24, 100:25, 112:11 fought [5] - 84:25, 87:11, 87:13, 87:17, 88:16 foundation [1]-13:18 four [10] - 35:22, 37:14, 54:15, 54:16, 85:12, 95:20, 96:16, 126:8, 128:11, 231:9 fourteen [1] - 64:12``` | ```fourth [2]-209:22, 233:11 Fox [1] - 175:16 FoxPro [18]-165:9, 165:16, 165:17, 179:19, 179:21, 180:10, 180:20, 200:1, 200:2, 200:8, 200:11, 203:25, 204:12, 205:1, 216:1, 216:7, 227:25 fraud [11]-39:14, 72:11, 88:17, 146:10, 217:12, 217:13, 217:17, 217:18, 217:19, 218:4, 218:5 fraudulent \([1]-89: 23\) fraudulently \([1]\) - 65:19 Fred [1] - 44:13 free [3]-34:21, 51:4, 232:1 freezing [1] - 126:6 Friday [1] - 48:21 Friedstrom [2] - 24:24, 41:17 friend [4]-65:11, 126:1, 126:4, 179:7 friend's [1] - 125:25 frightened \({ }_{[1]}\) - 121:1 frightening \([1]\) - 119:14 front [15]-23:24, 24:6, 28:24, 50:16, 54:12, 54:14, 54:15, 121:15, 131:13, 145:19, 170:23, 199:11, 234:2 fucks [1] - 10:5 fulfillment \([1]\) - 178:20 full [2] - 113:2, 113:6 fun [1] - 76:7 \\ G``` ```G-o-s-s-e-t-t [1] - 25:16 gain [1]-219:17 game [4]-218:22, 218:23, 218:25, 219:3 games [1] - 44:15 gaming [2]-42:15, 42:24 garden [1] - 35:20 gardening [2] - 30:9, 41:6 Gay [1] - 117:8 gay [1] - 117:14``` ```G-o-s-s-e-t-t [1] - 25:16 gain [1]-219:17 game [4]-218:22, 218:23, 218:25, 219:3 games [1] - 44:15 gaming [2]-42:15, 42:24 garden [1] - 35:20 gardening [2] - 30:9, 41:6 Gay [1] - 117:8 gay [1] - 117:14``` |  | ```71:1, 71:5, 71:6, 71:19, 71:20, 71:21, 72:14, 73:23, 92:22, 125:6, 126:1, 129:6, 173:24, 183:14, 201:22, 208:9, 210:11, 215:25, 227:12 greater [2]-102:24, 224:16 green [2]-78:6, 236:20 Grisham [1]-215:11 Grisham-esque [1] - 215:11 grounds [1] - 168:17 group [4] - 42:22, 95:17, 213:8, 229:5 guarantee [1] - 149:12 Guard [1] - 36:20 guarded [1] - 148:12 guess [12]-33:25, 57:8, 78:20, 101:6, 112:23, 113:2, 113:21, 118:16, 184:24, 187:13, 232:24 guessing [2] - 93:22, 186:12 guilty \({ }^{[1]}\) - 27:2 guitar \([7]-33: 4,34: 4\), 76:11, 76:13, 109:14, 109:22, 222:21 guy [2] - 10:5, 133:15 gym [1] - 30:6``` <br> H <br> H-a-r-t [1] - 25:10 <br> H-a-r-w-o-o-d [1] - <br> 24:12 <br> H-i-g-h-t-o-n [1] - 24:23 <br> half [2]-92:18, 181:2 <br> hand [28] - 6:7, 6:8, <br> 26:1, 45:4, 46:4, <br> 46:11, 46:13, 47:16, 47:24, 50:4, 50:5, 50:16, 51:1, 51:19, 51:20, 51:23, 52:6, 52:9, 52:17, 52:20, 52:25, 53:25, 71:18, 75:1, 116:17, 187:23, 195:3, 197:12 <br> handed [1] - 122:17 <br> handing) [6] - 80:9, 90:13, 112:13, 129:24, 156:4, 230:5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Health $[2]-31: 11$, | histories $[1]-222: 23$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| hospital $[1]-37: 22$ |  |  |  |
| 32:3 |  |  |  |
| hisar |  |  |  |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:20, 45:7, 47:6, } \\ & \text { 47:9, 47:19, 47:21, } \\ & \text { 48:14, 49:21, 54:1, } \\ & \text { 54:6, 54:7, 54:24, } \\ & \text { 55:2, 55:6, 55:8, } \\ & \text { 58:7, 59:3, 59:18, } \\ & \text { 60:15, 60:20, 61:2, } \\ & \text { 64:2, 69:2, 75:18, } \\ & \text { 78:21, 82:5, 84:3, } \\ & \text { 85:16, 86:14, 91:1, } \\ & \text { 91:4, 91:17, 93:16, } \\ & \text { 93:24, 94:2, 100:6, } \\ & \text { 100:9, 100:11, } \\ & \text { 101:15, 105:19, } \\ & \text { 106:25, 118:14, } \\ & \text { 121:21, 127:6, } \\ & \text { 127:13, 127:16, } \\ & \text { 129:15, 130:19, } \\ & \text { 132:5, 132:13, } \\ & \text { 136:7, 136:9, 138:7, } \\ & \text { 140:7, 141:5, } \\ & \text { 146:15, 170:12, } \\ & \text { 184:18, 184:22, } \\ & \text { 185:5, 188:9, } \\ & \text { 193:17, 196:2, } \\ & \text { 198:2, 201:19, } \\ & \text { 235:21, 236:11, } \\ & \text { 236:13, 237:1, } \\ & 237: 20,238: 9 \\ & \text { Justice } 111]-65: 21, \\ & 70: 4,70: 19,73: 24, \\ & 82: 23,146: 6,173: 5, \\ & 173: 11,199: 21, \\ & 207: 25,208: 5 \\ & \text { justice [6] - 29:21, } \\ & 30: 18,34: 9,62: 15, \\ & 72: 25,226: 19 \\ & \text { justification [5] - } \\ & 202: 25,218: 5, \\ & 218: 14,219: 8, \\ & 219: 17 \\ & \text { justified [2]-218:11, } \\ & 218: 14 \\ & \text { justifies [1] - 218:6 } \\ & \text { Justin [1] - 167:7 } \end{aligned}$$\mathbf{K}$ <br> K-a-u-f-f-m-a-n $[1]-$ <br> 24:8 <br> Karen $[1]-25: 4$ <br> Kauffman $[3]-24: 8$, <br> 24:10, 30:23 <br> keep [16] - 43:16, <br> 48:2,58:10, 58:14, <br> 58:20, 60:19, <br> 109:11, 120:18, <br> 120:19, 133:18, <br> 149:9, 161:14, <br> 164:22, 176:13, | 176:21, 206:7 <br> keeping $[1]-159: 19$ <br> keeps $[2]-118: 6$, <br> 147:6 <br> Kenneth $[5]-24: 8$, <br> 24:12, 30:22, 32:17, <br> 48:8 <br> kept $[1]-77: 25$ <br> Kevin $[3]-24: 3,29: 8$, <br> $53: 22$ <br> key $[5]-70: 6,70: 7$, <br> 205:16, 206:8 <br> kidding $[1]-84: 9$ <br> kind $[34]-3: 1,4: 6$, <br> $5: 18,11: 16,31: 18$, <br> $33: 11,39: 9,41: 9$, <br> 44:2, 46:20, $50: 3$, <br> 52:22, $64: 1,64: 3$, <br> $77: 17,77: 18,77: 22$, <br> 96:12, 108:12, <br> 111:4, 123:20, <br> 125:7, 126:24, <br> 132:22, 139:9, <br> 148:11, 171:17, <br> 172:23, 179:2, <br> 184:14, 187:1, <br> 197:15, 22:2, $225: 8$ <br> kinds $[7]-31: 17$, <br> $79: 13,104: 14$, <br> 105:11, 127:11, <br> 195:13, 195:21 <br> knowing $[2]-68: 14$, <br> $74: 7$ <br> knowingly $[2]-$ <br> 163:14, 199:20 <br> knowledge $[3]-56: 9$, <br> $101: 1,114: 22$ <br> known $[5]-111: 4$, <br> $208: 11,208: 12$, <br> $210: 15,210: 16$ <br> knows $[3]-9: 19,63: 8$, <br> $226: 18$ <br> koala $[1]-183: 20$ <br> Kubler $[1]-6: 14$ <br> Kugler $[9]-5: 17,5: 25$, <br> $8: 16,18: 5,119: 16$, <br> $120: 10,120: 13$, <br> 130:5, 186:17 <br> Kugler's $[1]-186: 20$L <br> L-a-d-d $[1]-24: 3$ <br> LA $_{[1]}-44: 14$ <br> labels $[1]-77: 15$ <br> Labor $[2]-39: 18$, <br> 39:20 <br> Labrador $[1]-34: 2$ <br> lack $[3]-71: 15,71: 21$, <br> $71: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ladd [5] - 24:3, 24:4, } \\ & \text { 29:4, 29:8, 53:22 } \\ & \text { ladies [2]-64:11, } 69: 2 \\ & \text { laid }[2]-70: 10,114: 19 \\ & \text { Lake }[1]-38: 18 \\ & \text { Lane }[1]-65: 21 \\ & \text { language }[1]-21: 17 \\ & \text { laptop }[1]-198: 25 \\ & \text { large }[5]-84: 22, \\ & \text { 148:19, 191:9, } \\ & \text { 195:4, 230:18 } \\ & \text { larger }[3]-79: 4, \\ & \text { 133:23, 134:6 } \\ & \text { last }[41]-25: 14,32: 1, \\ & 35: 24,37: 5,37: 6, \\ & 64: 2,67: 13,67: 15, \\ & 70: 8,70: 19,73: 19, \\ & 75: 9,105: 17, \\ & \text { 110:14, 111:1, } \\ & \text { 131:22, 154:15, } \\ & \text { 160:11, 161:20, } \\ & \text { 163:19, 163:22, } \\ & \text { 163:23, 164:20, } \\ & \text { 164:22, 169:10, } \\ & \text { 174:1, 175:20, } \\ & \text { 194:13, 196:7, } \\ & \text { 196:8, 200:12, } \\ & \text { 202:13, 203:18, } \\ & \text { 204:1, 212:6, } \\ & 214: 12,214: 15, \\ & 216: 10,228: 1 \\ & \text { late }[1]-15: 12 \\ & \text { laundry }[2]-66: 10, \\ & 66: 14 \\ & \text { law }[24]-9: 17,11: 7, \\ & 26: 23,29: 10,29: 13, \\ & 39: 9,44: 3,44: 5, \\ & 46: 8,52: 15,52: 19, \\ & 55: 16,55: 18,56: 21, \\ & 59: 1,60: 6,62: 1, \\ & 62: 8,62: 22,118: 21, \\ & 118: 22,118: 24, \\ & 121: 11,168: 16 \\ & \text { Law }[3]-119: 2, \\ & 119: 15,119: 21 \\ & \text { lawsuit }[20]-17: 5, \\ & \text { 17:7, } 31: 8,49: 22, \\ & 49: 23,50: 2,83: 8, \\ & 83: 9,83: 12,83: 13, \\ & 83: 19,84: 3,84: 18, \\ & 85: 14,92: 19,124: 2, \\ & 124: 5,124: 6, \\ & 124: 25,220: 16 \\ & \text { lawyer }[6]-38: 20, \\ & 56: 25,57: 1,61: 7, \\ & 160: 8,172: 16 \\ & \text { lawyers }[4]-28: 3, \\ & 45: 5,53: 2,184: 20 \\ & \text { layout }[3]-178: 18, \\ & \text { 178:20 } \end{aligned}$ | ```lead [4]-159:4, 181:10, 181:13, 195:16 learn [6] - 29:6, 49:20, 60:5, 64:15, 68:9, 104:23 least [5] - 17:12, 43:14, 76:11, 191:15, 227:25 leave [5] - 54:10, 61:1, 134:12, 166:12, 184:24 leaves [4]-55:2, 127:16, 184:22, 236:11 lectern [1] - 74:20 left [16] - 23:23, 25:15, 29:21, 30:18, 34:13, 61:1, 104:2, 115:24, 116:16, 129:19, 149:16, 179:6, 179:8, 179:9, 188:9, 217:25 legacy [3]-132:8, 132:20 legal \([7]-3: 8,13: 19\), 59:23, 85:3, 150:15, 210:5, 224:19 legally [1] - 124:24 legitimate [1] - 202:12 Legos [1] - 42:24 length \([2]-13: 2\), 58:15 lengthy \([1]\) - \(92: 9\) less [2]-41:8, 76:18 Lesson [1] - 110:14 lessons [1] - 222:21 letter [56]-6:14, 6:17, 7:14, 8:13, 8:15, 8:20, 9:10, 9:11, 9:21, 10:1, 10:6, 10:7, 10:9, 10:11, 11:5, 11:8, 11:20, 11:24, 12:8, 12:11, 12:16, 12:20, 12:21, 18:9, 19:1, 82:10, 90:16, 90:17, 90:19, 91:17, 91:19, 92:24, 119:25, 120:4, 127:19, 127:21, 127:24, 128:2, 128:8, 130:5, 130:6, 130:8, 130:9, 130:11, 130:19, 152:15, 152:16, 152:17, 186:17, 186:20, 186:21, 189:23, 205:18, 206:13, 209:25 letters [1] - 88:24``` | ```letting [1] - 186:22 level [4]-81:21, 81:25, 134:4, 147:9 Lewis [1] - 236:22 liability [3]-1:12, 46:5, 62:4 Liability [1] - 39:12 License [1] - 157:9 license [6] - 31:16, 69:4, 213:20, 213:25, 215:15 licensed [1]-214:23 licensing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 31:12 lie [3] - 136:23, 219:4, 225:25 lied [1] - 115:25 lies [4] - 109:8, 137:2, 210:22, 225:18 life [13]-64:13, 120:12, 132:22, 133:16, 134:12, 134:18, 135:9, 146:18, 146:19, 149:3, 149:17, 194:15, 228:24 lifetime [1] - 231:14 light \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(57: 25\) likely [3] - 27:5, 118:25, 232:4 limited [5]-1:12, 56:12, 56:14, 211:14 limiting \([1]\) - 21:22 limits [1] - 63:24 Lincoln [1] - 50:8 Linda [27]-14:7, 14:22, 25:2, 43:2, 66:6, 72:11, 74:7, 86:11, 90:16, 91:19, 124:3, 124:7, 124:9, 124:10, 132:9, 168:11, 208:7, 208:24, 209:9, 209:22, 210:3, 210:22, 218:18, 224:22, 225:23, 226:20, 231:8 Linda's [1] - 124:13 line [6] - 108:5, 193:2, 207:13, 208:17, 221:12, 231:12 lines [1] - 232:7 link [9]-106:18, 107:4, 142:14, 143:11, 144:10, 155:9, 233:14 Linkedln [18] - 105:2, 139:16, 139:19, 140:3, 140:20, 141:7, 142:18, 142:19, 160:10,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



|  | ```minimum [1]-58:15 minute [6] - 53:1, 53:2, 166:9, 171:23, 179:12 minutes [10]-27:7, 55:1, 55:3, 55:9, 75:21, 127:14, 129:8, 183:20, 184:19, 193:22 misconduct [4] - 89:3, 237:8, 237:9, 237:10 misinterpretation [1] - 11:2 misleading [2]-8:3, 12:22 misled [1] - 73:10 misrepresentation [1] - 224:15 misrepresentations [1]-12:19 misrepresented [2] - 6:15, 9:11 misrepresenting \({ }_{[1]}\) - 10:20 misrepresents [1] - 12:14 miss [1] - \(35: 2\) missed [2]-49:14, 105:16 missing [2] - 34:23, 49:11 misunderstand \({ }_{[1]}\) - 177:13 misunderstood \({ }_{[1]}\) - 96:10 mitigate [4] - 16:2, 16:7, 17:21, 109:11 mitigated [1] - 15:17 mitigating \([1]\) - 220:25 mitigation [3]-17:23, 220:24, 223:6 model [1] - 77:3 modify \([5]\) - 153:8, 153:9, 153:15, 188:18, 190:8 mold [1] - 4:14 molesters [1]-125:8 mom [4] - 42:7, 42:8, 42:12, 126:8 moment [2]-117:5, 186:6 moments [1] - 61:13 Monday [2] - 48:23, 48:25 money [12]-71:2, 71:6, 78:10, 78:11, 89:10, 89:15, 89:24, 92:10, 202:19, 209:19, 228:21 monotone [1] - 78:5``` | ```month [5]-115:22, 207:14, 208:6, 219:12, 219:14 months [5] - 88:10, 88:11, 112:21, 112:23, 216:4 morality [2]-104:19, 104:20 morals [1] - 104:14 morning [7]-19:4, 23:10, 26:11, 27:24, 64:11, 191:4, 238:1 Mosman [1] - 22:25 Mosman's [1] - 23:2 most [15]-23:16, 68:6, 70:5, 79:19, 84:12, 115:5, 120:11, 123:14, 142:7, 182:23, 183:8, 183:10, 211:22, 227:6, 229:8 mostly [1] - 204:25 mother [2]-29:10, 29:13 mother-in-law [2]- 29:10, 29:13 motion [4]-19:21, 124:17, 230:15, 230:19 motive [2]-63:8, 63:11 mountain [1] - 39:3 mouth [2]-30:18, 34:13 move [11]-25:14, 28:23, 44:25, 45:18, 54:23, 64:13, 74:20, 90:21, 106:4, 111:12, 112:11 moved [1] - 84:20 movies [2]-26:25, 37:3 moving \({ }_{[1]}-131: 20\) mpeg [1] - 10:5 MR [367] - 3:11, 3:14, 3:16, 4:11, 4:14, 4:20, 5:1, 5:6, 5:15, 5:20, 5:22, 5:25, 6:11, 6:13, 6:24, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 7:12, 7:16, 8:3, 8:9, 8:12, 8:18, 8:25, 9:8, 9:10, 9:24, 10:3, 10:7, 10:13, 10:16, 10:22, 11:2, 11:5, 11:20, 11:25, 12:4, 12:9, 12:12, 12:18, 12:21, 13:1, 13:7, 13:12, 13:16, 13:20, 13:24, 14:2, \(14: 25,15: 2,15: 5\),``` | 15:9, 15:14, 15:25, 16:2, 16:5, 16:7, 16:16, 17:7, 17:11, 18:14, 18:18, 19:6, 19:9, 19:23, 20:13, 20:16, 20:23, 21:6, 21:11, 21:15, 21:20, 21:25, 22:9, 22:15, 22:17, 26:15, 26:20, 45:13, 45:16, 53:9, 53:11, 64:10, 69:1, 74:23, 75:15, 78:15, 80:6, 80:9, 80:10, 80:19, 80:22, 80:24, 83:23, 83:24, 84:1, 87:4, 87:6, 87:8, 87:15, 90:21, 90:23, 90:25, 91:6, 91:13, 91:15, 91:16, 93:12, 93:14, 93:16, 93:20, 94:1, 95:25, 96:3, 96:6, 96:9, 96:11, 97:10, 97:12, 97:14, 98:3, 98:4, 98:6, 98:20, 98:21, 98:23, 99:7, 99:9, 99:11, 99:24, 100:3, 100:5, 100:10, 101:6, 101:9, 101:10, 101:11, 101:13, 104:8, 104:12, 115:11, 115:13, 115:15, 116:20, 122:7, 122:13, 122:15, 122:16, 122:19, 125:10, 125:12, 127:4, 127:18, 128:1, 128:4, 128:7, 128:11, 128:15, 128:19, 128:22, 129:4, 129:6, 129:18, 130:13, 130:15, 130:17, 131:10, 136:2, 136:4, 136:7, 136:8, 138:2, 138:3, 138:5, 139:22, 139:23, <br> 140:1, 141:1, 141:2, 141:4, 141:25, <br> 142:1, 142:3, 143:6, 143:8, 143:10, <br> 144:6, 144:7, 144:9, 145:11, 145:14, 145:16, 145:22, 145:24, 149:23, 150:2, 151:21, 152:1, 152:4, 152:5, 153:22, 153:24, 154:2, 154:3, 154:5, 154:6, 154:7, 154:9, | 154:12, 156:3, 156:7, 156:16, 156:20, 156:23, 156:24, 158:13, 158:17, 159:6, 159:8, 159:10, 164:8, 164:11, 164:17, 164:18, 165:23, 166:5, 166:14, 166:23, 167:14, 167:23, 168:1, 168:19, 168:22, 169:1, 169:2, 169:25, 170:3, 170:8, 170:10, 170:13, 170:16, 170:18, 170:20, 172:4, 172:18, 172:25, 173:3, 173:6, 173:10, 173:13, 173:18, 173:19, 173:21, 174:13, 174:21, 174:23, 175:2, 175:4, 175:18, 176:8, 177:6, 184:14, 185:6, 185:18, 185:22, 186:4, 186:14, 186:25, 187:12, 187:16, 188:1, 188:3, 188:8, 188:16, 188:18, 189:7, 189:9, 189:13, 189:18, 189:20, 189:23, 190:2, 190:6, 190:9, 190:12, 190:14, 190:17, 190:25, 191:3, 191:9, 191:16, 191:19, 191:21, 191:25, 192:4, 192:5, 192:7, 192:11, 192:14, 192:19, 192:21, 192:25, 193:7, 193:10, 193:16, 194:11, 194:20, 195:17, 195:19, 195:22, 196:4, 196:25, 197:2, 197:8, 197:10, 198:3, 198:20, 199:3, 199:5, 201:6, 201:12, 201:14, 201:17, 201:20, 212:15, 212:21, 212:23, 213:21, 213:22, 213:24, 215:22, 215:23, 217:12, 217:16, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 220:8, 220:12 | 111:1, 111:9, | 28:18, 35:7, 48:12 | 130:21, 181:5 | 149:10, 206:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $220: 14,222: 14$ | 1:16, 111:2 | 52:14, 53:25, 54: | 7:24, 208:2 | 214:6, 228:7, 234:25 |
| 222:16, 223:11 | $2: 5,112: 2$ | :10, 64:3, 81:7 | 09: | nonetheless [4] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 223:17, 226:6, } \\ & \text { 226:7, 226:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:3, 113:5, 113:6, } \\ & \text { 114:3, 135:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 23,102: 11 \\ & \text { 104:10, 109:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { new }[5]-15: 13,98: 8, \\ 134: 19,149: 17 \end{gathered}$ | 153:3, 163:1, 221:6 |
| 6:12, 229: | 135 | :3,3, 122:1, 142:5, | Newberg [1] | [1] |
| 9:20, 229:22 | 19, 136:20 | :22, 164:4 | 59 | Nordic [1] - 29:15 |
| 0:2, 230:7 | 7:4, 137:5, 137:8, | :22, 184:1 | 5:10, 133:1 | Northeast [3] - 36:8 |
| :24, 234: | 7:18, 137:24 | 5:4, 186:9 | 146: | , 41 |
| 4:15, 234:1 | 0:3, 148:22 | 14, 197:2 | next [10] - 29:25, 54:8, | NORTHWEST ${ }_{[5]}$ |
| 4:23, 234:25 | 0:6, 151:3 | :21, 217:2 | 24, 104 | , 1:9, |
| 5:2, 235:5, | 4:24, 155:1 | :6, 218:9 | 715, 126: | 1:1 |
| 5:13, 235: | 0:19, 160:20 | 24, 222 | 5:2, 136:13 | Northwest [57] - 1:13 |
| 5:20, 237:15 | 0:21, 162:14 | 18, 223: | 0:3, 197 | 23:12, 26:5, 41:17 |
| :22, 238:2 | 7:7, 183:7, 183:8, | 237:25, 238: | 146 | $5: 23,$ |
| 238:11, 238: | 7:21, 197:23 | needed [8]-16 | night $[1]$ - 61 | :17, 64:18, 64:19, |
| $\mathbf{M t}[1]$ - 37:13 | 210:6, 220:2, | 17:4, 19:3, 65: | Nike [1] - 36: | $2,65: 7,6$ |
| multiple [7]-160: | 220:21, 221:2 | 9:2 | ne [2]-88:10, | :9, 66:18, 78: |
| 69:13, 169:14 | 1:22, 222:7 | 200:1, 215:2 | Ninth [1] - $38: 25$ | 21, 78:23, 79:1 |
| :16, 185:8 | 222:21, 223:2 | needs [4]-10:1 | N | 22, 80:25, |
| 228:20, 234:7 | $3: 20,223: 2$ | :13, 180:1 | 30:12, 30: | :3, 86:16, 86:17 |
| Multnomah [3] - 37:6, | 3:22, 223:25 | 222:4 | 0, 30:2 | 7:13, 88:12, 108:8, |
| 41:7, $43: 11$ muscled $11-10: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 224:2, 224:5, } \\ & \text { 232:17, 232:2 } \end{aligned}$ | negotiations [1] 15.24 | 31:15, 31:21, 31:24, | 8:13, 150:8 |
| muscled $[1]-10:$ | $232: 17,232: 2$ |  | 1:10, 32:13 | 0:9, 150:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { music [2] - } 76: 10 \\ & 148: 15 \end{aligned}$ | named [1] - 66: | neighbor [1] - 126 neighbor's [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & : 16,33: 12,33: 19 \\ & 3: 21,34: 11,34: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 21,151: 5 \\ & 51: 14,151: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| musician [1]-33:4 | namely [2] - 67:20 | 126:10, 127: | 16, 34:2 | 8:1, 158:1 |
| must [13]-25:23 | 124:3 | 129:20 | 5:14, 35:2 | 20, 167:1 |
| 1, 52:19, 5 | names [12] - 23:21 | network [1] - 228: | :7, | 8:19, 212:1 |
| 1, 56:14, 5 | 45:8, 45:10, 53:20 | networking ${ }_{[1]}$ | 37: | 3:12, 213:1 |
| 4, 59:1, 5 | 2:1, 133:25 | 137:1 | 7:12, 37:20, 38:3, | 3:16, 214:3 |
| 6, 166:10, 217:20 | :5, 150:9 | neutral [16]-29:22 | 8:9, 38:1 | 4:6, 214:12 |
| myriad [1] - 157:22 | :20, 157:21 | 8, 33:18, 34: | 39:17 | 4:13, $214:$ |
| $\mathbf{M Z}{ }_{[1]}$ - 113:4 | 223:18 | 37:9, 38:5, 40:8, | 40:3, 40:5, 40:9 | 27:7, 229:5 |
|  | Nancy [1]-239:11 <br> nancy [1] - 2:7 <br> NANCY [1] - 239:12 | 41:13, 42:1, 44:8, | 40:15, 40:20, 40:24, | $229: 10,233: 20$ |
| N |  | 46:11, 50:12, 50:24, | 40:25, 41:10, 41:14, | Note [2]-9:13, 131:5 |
| nailed | narrow [1] - 39:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 22,52: 5,52: 2 \\ & \text { neutralized }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $41: 16,41: 24,42: 3,$ | $\text { note }[5]-54: 18 \text {, }$ $60: 21,61: 11,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { name }[114]-26: 6, \\ & 26: 20,29: 8,30: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { National }[2]-33: 1 \text {, } \\ & 36: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:11 } \\ & \text { never [33]-30:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $43: 13,43: 17,43: 20$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 130:25, 131:3 } \\ \text { note-taking [1] - } 60: 21 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 26: 20,29: 8,30: 1, \\ & 30: 22,32: 17,33: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { nature }[8]-40: 12, \\ 46: 9,94: 17,102: 3, \end{gathered}$ | $34: 22,36: 12,36: 23,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 1,44: 6,44: 9, \\ & 4: 11,46: 17,46: 19, \end{aligned}$ | note-taking [1] - 60:21 notebook [2] - 171:12, |
| 36:7, 37:12, 37:20, |  | $37: 18,38: 15,39: 5$ | $47: 2,47: 7,48: 5,$ | 171:17 |
| 40:25, 41:16, 42:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:9, 94:17, 102:3, } \\ & \text { 102:5, 134:24, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 48:8, 48:17, 48:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { noted [4]-114:11, } \\ & 123: 4,201: 24,220: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:18, 43:2, 44:11, | 160:16, 212:2 | 44:16, 51:3, 68:2103:3, 103:18, | 49:2, 49:6, 49:9, |  |
| 46:15, 48:7, 50:17, | nauseam [1] - 200:4 <br> navigate [1]-171:18 |  | 49:11, 49:15, 49:17, | notes [6]-60:18, |
| 51:5, 53:21, 66:6, |  | 103:3, 103:18, $103 \cdot 23,103: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 6,50: 13,50: 18, \\ & 50: 23,50: 25,51: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 60:19, 61:1, 61:3, |
| 66:7, 67:22, 67:25, | navigate [1]-171:18 $\mathrm{ND}_{[1]}-88: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:23, 103:24, } \\ & \text { 119:16, 119:18, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 61:5, 185:2 <br> nothing [13]-84:6, |
| 68:4, 68:10, 75:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NDT [5] - 3:3, 20:1, } \\ & 20: 14,87: 11,212: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 123:10, 123:18, | 51:9 |  |
| 75:9, 75:10, 77:3, |  | 133:15, 134:23,139:2, 148:23 | nobody [1] - 205:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nothing [13]-84:6, } \\ & \text { 85:18, 117:22, } \\ & \text { 160:15, 178:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 77:4, 82:18, 86:12 | near [2] - 29:9, 75:23 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { nomen } \\ 111: 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 90:6, 91:22, 93:6, | nearly [1] - 120:24 | 148:24, 152:22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:15, 178:9, } \\ & \text { 179:6, 203:2, 203:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 93:10, 94:3, 94:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { necessarily }[2]-58: 3 \text {, } \\ & 109: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 179:7, 192:15,205:20, 221:2, | non [2]-33:14, 183:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 203: 5,228: 2,228: 3, \\ & 233: 18,235: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 96:25, 99:19, 99:22, |  |  | non-jury [1] - 33:14 |  |
| 100:12, 100:18, | $\begin{gathered} \text { necessary [3] - 58:6, } \\ 177: 20,178: 21 \end{gathered}$ | 221:12 <br> New [20] - 6:1, 8:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non-targeted [1] - } \\ & \text { 183:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 233:18, 235:13 } \\ \text { notice }[3]-108: 10, \end{gathered}$ |
| 106:17, 106:20, |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 116:16, 120:16 } \\ \text { noticed }[1]-138: 23 \end{gathered}$ |
| 107:6, 107:7, | $\begin{gathered} \text { need }[51]-3: 7,9: 5, \\ 15: 3,16: 10,16: 23, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 9,66: 2,68: 10, \\ & 71: 3,75: 17,75: 20 \end{aligned}$ | noncompete [1] |  |
| 107:13, 108:24, |  |  | 108:3 | noticed [1] - 138:23 <br> notifies [1] - 126:9 |
| 109:4, 110:11, | 17:3, 18:9, 18:17,18:18, 19:7, 23:15, | 75:24, 77:12, 83:13, | one [13] - 42:14, <br> 57:17, 70:13, 82:3, | notify [3] - 60:11, |
| 110:15, 110:16, |  | 83:19, 84:18, |  | $126: 13,126: 14$ |
| 110:19, 110:20, | 23:18, 25:24, 28:6, | 107:22, 120:13, | 86:19, 108:3, | notion [3]-52:17, |


| 52:18, 185:16 | 193:11, 193:12, | 57: |  | 230:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| notwithstanding | 212:20, 212:2 | offi | 200:5, 203:22, | ordered [2]-59:20, |
| 23, 195: | 13:22 |  | , |  |
| vel [3]-215:6, | 20:11, 220:12 | Office [1]-65:22 | 227 | orders [1] - 159:17 |
| 5:8, 215:12 | 222:13, 222:14 | Official [ $[1]$ - 239:13 | 27:24, 229 | REGON [2]-1:2, 1:8 |
| novelist [2]-140:11, | 223:11, 223:13 | offline [1] - 154:23 | 29:22, 237 | Oregon [46] - 1:6, 1:6, |
| 140:14 | 223:15, | often [4]-31:21, 44:4, |  | :7, 1:8, 1:10, 1:1 |
| November [10] 65:15, 97:3, 99:20 | objections [3] - 56 :5, 139:23, 144:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 113:9, 223:18 } \\ \text { old }[6]-37: 13,74: 11, \end{gathered}$ | ongoing [2]-69:24, 116:25 | 14:1, 29:9, 31:1, |
| 100:13 | obligated [1] - 231: | 77:16, 78:5, 218:22, | OOO[1]-239: |  |
| 4, 205:9 | obligations [1] - | 218:25 | open [6]-27:16, | , 35:15, 38:2 |
| 205:12, 228:5, 228:7 | 214:18 | Old | 27:18, 58:20, 70:18, | 9, 43:6, 43:21 |
| nowhere [2]-200:2, | observed [1] - 126:10 | older [3] - 10: | 89:22, 204:18 | 5:23, 46:1, 65:21, |
| 224:13 | obviously [5] - 38:22, |  | opened [1] - 21 | , 70:18, 79:2 |
| number [13] - 9:12, | 40:17, 70:25, | missions [1] - 12 | opening [12]-21: | , 81:12, 83:11, |
| 39:24, 58:3, 58:14, | 204:13, 200 | once [2] - 77:5, 219:13 | 21:8, 22:6, 54:21 | 2, 83:14, 84:20, |
| 89:6, 95:16, 105:21, | occupation [3] - 29:11, 30:3, 42:7 | one $[121]-5: 22,6: 7$, $6: 18,6: 25,7: 5,7: 25$, | 61:14, 61:17, 64 68:24, 105:22, | $4: 24,85: 1,87: 17,$ 24:19, 146:6, |
| 4:22, 220:3, | occurred [1]-63:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o. 10, o. 11, r.o, 1.20, } \\ & \text { 10:14, 11:21, 11:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $162: 5,204: 2$ | 207:21, 207:25, |
| 20:7, 230:18 | October [20] - 90:18 | 12, 17 | openly [1] - 208:17 | 4, 210:17 |
| numbers [2]-176:21, | 92:24, 93:6, 93:10 | 22, 19 | opinion [22]-8:12, | 212:17, 231:9, |
| 177:14 | 94:3, 95:22, 96:16, | 6:20, 29:15, | 8:16, 58:18, 87:22 | 236:22, 239:13 |
| nurse [1] - 30:25 | 97:5, 97:16, 98:1, | 3:2, 34:13, | 20:24, 158:11, | organization ${ }_{[1]}$ - $30: 8$ |
| Nutrition ${ }_{[1]}$ - 33:1 nutrition [1] - 33:2 | 98:7, 98:8, 98:16 | 35:24, 51:14, 51:18, | 158:19, 167:21 | organizations [12]- <br> 32.25 34:3, 34:20 |
|  |  | 52 |  | 32:25, 34:3 |
| 0 | 206:22 | 63:16, 69:5, 69:6, | 201:1 | , 41 |
| oath [3]-25:23, 26:1, | 1:21 | 77:5, | 203:10, 213:13 | organize [2] - 162: |
|  | offer [3 | 79:4, 79:5, 79:1 | 213:15, 227:22 | 162:15 |
| object [2] - 57:3, | 15:22, 16:15, 17:21, | 79:20, 81:19, 85:21, | 230:8 | organized [1] - 95:15 |
| 167:15 | :23, 8 | 88:13, 88:22, 94:7, | Opinion [1] - 151: | organizer [3]-77:20, |
| objecting [2] - 192:25, | 90:21, 93:12, 95:25, | 9, 97:21, | opinions [1]-201:25 | 77:22, 162:20 |
| 193:8 | 97:10, 98:3, 98:2 | 9:2, 100:17, | opportunity [19] - 5:9, | organizing [1] - 42:10 |
| objection [72] - 57:4, | 99:7, 99:24, 101:4, | 1:3, 103:20, | 57:19, 60:8, 102:12, | original $[1]$ - 239:6 |
| 57:5, 57:7, 80:21, | 101:7, 115:11, | 103:21, 105:23, | 153:3, 153:7, 153 | originally [1] - 19:13 |
| 80:22, 83:24, 87:5, | 130:13, 136:2, | 113:14, 113:23, | 153:15, 188:14, | Oswego [1] - 38:18 |
| 87:6, 90:22, 90:23, | 138:2, 139:22 | 115:5, 117:5, | 193:19, 206:20, | otherwise [2]-59:5, |
| 93:13, 93:14, 96:2, | 141:1, 141:2 | 118:22, 120:11, | 217:25, 218:1, | 164:5 |
| 96:3, 97:12, 98:4, | 3:6, 144:6 | 22:17, 123:25, | 8:3, 218:6 | ourselves [1]-193:22 |
| 98:21, 99:9, 100:2, | 145:11, 153:8, | 25:23, 126:13, | 18:10, 218:20 | utbound [1] - 65 |
| 100:3, 101:8, | 153:14, 156:23, | 28:8, 128:9, | 219:3, 236:14 | outcome [3] - 57:22, |
| 101:11, 104:9, | 159:6, 170:6, 190:7 | 28:13, | opposed [2]-180:17, | 86:14, 87 |
| 115:12, 115:13, | 191:6, 201:4, |  | 183: | outer [1] - 36:8 |
| 125:10, 129:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:10, 234:23, } \\ & \text { 235:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 133:24, 136:13, 136:14, 138:9, | opposite [1]-180:15 option [11-121:17 | outline [5] - 3:21, |
| 130:15, 136:3, <br> 136:5, 138:3, 141 | 235:18 offered $[18]$ - 15:12 | 136:14, 138:9, | option [1] - 121:17 | 61:15, 72:14, 72:16, 227:4 |
| 142:1, 143:8, | 15:17, 16:22, 16: | 44:18 | $\text { oral }[1]-48: 2$ |  |
| 145:16, 145:18, | 17:13, 19:24, | 147:9, | orange [1] - 78:6 | $\text { outlining }[1] \text { - 187:3 }$ |
| 153:22, 154:9, | 103:13, 153:7, | 147:12, | Order [ ${ }_{[1]}$ - 151:17 | Outlook [4]-200:17, |
| 159:7, 159:8, <br> 164:11, 165:23, | 169:25, 191:2, <br> 191:16, 191:18 | 157:5, 158:2, | order [25] - 15:6, 16:9, | 205:10, 206: |
| 166:5, 167:23, | $\text { 192:3, 193:6, } 217$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:18, 161:23, } \\ & \text { 164:23, 165:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 9, 24:1, | 206:16 |
| 170:9, 172:25, | 220:5, 220:9, 231:11 | 168:2, 173:14, | 57:10, 86:24, 86:25, <br> 87:2, 87:22, 118:25, | outside [13]-28:1, 52:13, 58:6, 60:10, |
| 173:2, 173:6, | offering [8] - 14:21, | 174:5, 174:9, | $9: 4,128: 3,180: 1,$ | 63:19, 63:22, 82:2, |
| 173:12, 174:21, | 15:20, 74:14 | 175:13, 179:11 | 191:13, 191:14, | 25:25, 153:11 |
| 175:2, 175:18 | 165:19, 170:17, | 185:8, | 191:18, 200:1, | , |
| 189:20, 189:22, | 187:19, 189:15 | 188:15, 189:16, | 208:22, 209:1, | 191:7, 228:16 |
| 189:24, 190:12, 192:13, 192:18, | 192:24 | 189:25, 190:11, | 213:16, 216:20, | utsource [1] - 64:24 |
| 192:13, 192:18, | offers [3] - 16:2, 16:3, | 190:23, 194:5, | 230:8, 230:11, | outsourcing [1] - |


| :12 | 235:6 | 228:12, 229:4, 237:2 | pay $[7]-60: 16,88: 13$, | Perjury ${ }_{[1]}-138: 17$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| overbilled [1]-219:11 overbilling [4]-65:19, | pages [10]-11:6, 11:8, 18:20, 69:21 | participate $[1]$ - 49:12 | 1, 209:17, 231:3, | perjury [11]-71:11, |
| overbilling [4]-65:19, 82:8, 205:20, 218:13 | 11:8, 18:20, 69:21, <br> 95:17, 105:22 | participation 62:25, 63:7 | payday [1] - 136:22 | 72:13, 74:6, 74 <br> 123:3, 163:7, |
| come [1] - 27: | 88:7, 148:15 | particular [17] - 6:24, | Payne [1] - 25:11 | 163:10, 163:1, |
| overly [1] - 61: | 2:1, 223 | 21:4, 23:19, 47:23 | $\mathrm{C}_{[1]}-44: 13$ | 10:22, 224:5 |
| overrule [1] - 57:4 | Paget ${ }_{[1]}$ - 26:6 | 49:7, 49:22, 51:23 | peace [ ${ }^{\text {] }}$ - 134:17 | 224:18 |
| overruled [4]-158:14, | paid [2] - 66:25, | 52:5, 52:11, 62:4, | pedophile [4] - 9:14, | permission [3]-21:2, |
| 165:24, 175:19, | 120:17 | 109:3, 173:4 | 128:23, 131:6, 131:9 | 90:25, 100:5 |
| 223:15 | pain [1] - 194:23 | 94:21, 195:6 | pedophilia [2]-6:21, | permits [1]-56 |
| owes [1] - 226:2 <br> own [14]-37:14, 60:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { painful }[2]-225: 9, \\ & 225: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 198:11, $215: 3,224: 3$ particularly $[1]$ - | 127:21 | permitted [1]-57:2 <br> perpetrated ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 61:3, 66:11, 67:25, | painting [1] - 30:9 | 87:1 | peer-to-peer [1] | 72:11 |
| 74:4, 75:4, 99:22, | $\text { panel }[3]-23: 8,26: 2,$ | parties [20]-3:2, 16:6, 23:8, 25:17, 28:4, | 204:16 | person [22]-9:4, <br> 10:17, 32:20, 5 |
| 146:21, 192:19, | ner [1] - 3 | 29:6, 40:17, 45:2, | ending $[1]-146: 10$ | 70:17, 32:20, 59:8, |
| 197:18, 227:1 | Papak [1] - 230:14 | 55:6, 55:21, 56:4, | 47:25, 54:17, 59:14, | , 123:5, |
| owned [6] - 33:13, | paper [ 27 - 28:15, | 58:6, 60:7, 85:2 | 66:13, 70:10, 71:1, | 22, 1 |
| 51:10, 64:19, | 28:19 | 24:2, 124:17, | 79:3, 79:4, 79:12, | :2, 148:11 |
| 214:20, 214:22, 115:18 | paragraph [28]-72:1, | 124:18, 129:15, $\text { 151:17. } 193: 24$ | 81:24, 82:15, | 179:6, 179:8, |
| $\begin{gathered} 215: 18 \\ \text { owner [3] - 64:18, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 13,114: 10, \\ & 119.12 \end{aligned}$ | 151:17, 193:24 partner [5]-69:11, | 102:10, 102:20, 104:17, 105:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 210:14, 219:9, } \\ & 221: 2,228: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| owner ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 140:12 | 118::3, 18: 121:20, | 208: | 05:9, 105:14 | ersonal $[5]$ |
| owning [1] - 33:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 14,123: 1, \\ & 123: 24,125: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 210: 23 \\ & \text { party }[20]-15: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:1, 119:8, 123:9, } \\ & \text { 124:7, 137:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 7,102: 2,112: 4, \\ & 176: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| P | 125:21, 128:9 | 17:13, 17:16, 27:3, | 146:4, 147:16 | ersonality [ $[1]-148: 8$ |
| P-a-r-s-e--I-1] - 24:15 | 128:18 | 2:11, 33:10, 36:13, | 151:1 | 20 |
| P-a-y-n-e [1]-25:11 | :1, 130:18, | 39:6, 39:7, 44:16, | 68:12, 179:17 | perspective [3] - 11:3, |
| page [67] - 11:25, | 1:22, 131:23 | 7:1, 60:8, 61:7 | 82:19, 183:2 | 19:5, 218:17 |
| 72:1, 95:17, 106:8, | 1:25, 133:4, | 61:16, 61:17, | 83:6, 183:16, | pertinent ${ }_{[1]} 1$ 112:17 |
| 106:13, 106:16, | 3:21, 171:1 | 214:20, 218 : | 92:5, 202:6, | ph ${ }_{[1]}$ - 167:8 |
| 107:5, 108:17, | 186:17 | pass [2]-46:16, | 204:17, 211:25, | ph) [1] - 162:21 |
| 112:17, 113:15, 117:2, 118:11, | pardon [1] - 131:4 <br> parent ${ }_{[1]}$ - 158:2 | 125:23 passage $[3]$ - $8: 18$ | 215:4, 219:16 | ist [1] y ${ }_{[1]}$ - 41 |
| 119:23, 121:20, | parents [3] - 34:17 | 06:15, 126:17 | 112:1, 132:19 | Philadelphia [2] |
| 122:20, 122:24, | 34:18, 44:12 | passions [1] - 33:2 | peppered [2]-102:2, | 65:10, 75:2 |
| 123:23, 125:2, | parity ${ }_{[1]}$ - 104:5 | password [1] - 122:2 | 227:17 | phone |
| 125:20, 128:12, | Parsell [3]-24:15, | passwords [1] - | per [4]-207:16 | 77:17 |
| 130:23, 131:12, | 35:14, 53:23 | 228:18 | 207:17, 207:18 | photograph [1] |
| 131:16, 131:20, 133:3, 103:4, | part [51] - 5:12, 7:21, | $\text { past }[2]-209: 14 \text {, }$ | 225:13 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 126:12 |
| 133:19, 136:10, | 9:22, 10:12, 11:24, <br> 13:9, 13:10, 15:15, | $\text { path }[4]-73: 8,107:$ | perceived [1] - 89:3 <br> percent [2]-16:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pick [3] - 65:2, 224: } \\ & 232: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 136:12, 137:5, | 19:12, 46:5, 53:8, | 184:12 | 198:14 | picked [2] - 34: |
| 139:16, 140:20, | 53:14, 57:16, 62:5, | Paul $[4]$ - 162:15 | percentage ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 176:5 |
| 141:7, 142:18, | 66:1, 66:9, 70:11, | 162:21, 162:22 | 214:23 | picture [7]-9:21, |
| 143:19, 144:3, | 72:6, 72:16, 73:11, | 236:20 | peremptory [1] - | 97:1, 109:2, 109:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:18, 144:19, } \\ & \text { 150:6, 150:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 84:22, 105:24, 106:2, 114:19, | Pause [16] - 88:9, $106: 12.117: 6$ | 53:12 | 109:13, 109:16 |
| 151:15, 155:6, | 157:8, 158:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:12, 117:6, } \\ & \text { 133:20, 136:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{m}[1]-64:$ | piece [8]-28:15 |
| 155:7, 157:13, | 159:24, 159:25, | 142:7, 142:10, | 107:14 | 148:19, 169:1, |
| 158:2, 158:21, | 170:6, 170:8, | 142:12, 145:6, | perhaps [4] - 44:3, | 171:4, 172:2, 199:6 |
| 158:25, 159:1, | 170:23, 171:16, | 163:9, 171:15, | 101:9, 162:17, | pilot [1] - 39:4 |
| 159:2, 173:16, | 175:20, 182:3, | 189:19, 193:6, | 178:20 | place [9]-7:19, 10:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 173:17, 173:18, } \\ & \text { 173:19, 199:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 183:24, 184:1, | 193:8, 222:10 | period [6] - 88:10 | 25:18, 52:3, 78:4, |
| 199:13, 199:14, | 186:8, 18 186:21, 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 226:12 } \\ & \text { pause }[5]-53: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 88:14, 120:12 | 113:7, 173:8, |
| 203:15, 206:11, | :6, 199:8, | $74: 21,91: 12,199: 4$ | $\text { periods }[1] \text { - } 120: 12$ |  |
| 222:16, 226:12, | 208:21, 219:7, | 229:23 | perjurious [2]-219:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { places }[4]-75: 23, \\ & 105: 3,133: 25,147: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 232:9, 233:1, 233:2, | 226:23, 227:24, | Pause) ${ }_{[11}$ - 223:12 | 226:18 | Plaintiff $[1]-1: 4$ |

plaintiff [44] - 9:13,
9:15, 26:11, 45:11,
45:19, 46:6, 46:8,
53:8, 61:18, 62:2, 62:6, 62:8, 62:9,
62:10, 62:11, 62:16, 62:18, 62:20, 62:23, 62:24, 63:6, 63:10,
63:12, 63:14, 63:18, 64:9, 65:8, 130:21,
130:22, 130:24, 131:1, 131:3, 131:5, 131:6, 185:19, 195:11, 209:12, 213:19, 222:17, 229:6, 235:18, 237:13
PLAINTIFF [2] - 2:2, 26:17
Plaintiff's [14] - 93:23, 95:25, 100:8, 150:4, 151:1, 155:20, 155:21, 156:17, 163:8, 173:15, 173:16, 201:2, 201:15, 226:13
plaintiff's [12]-9:17, 19:5, 61:20, 61:21, 151:16, 156:5, 175:5, 188:24, 193:20, 194:4, 201:6, 230:3
plaintiffs' [1] - 40:18 plan [1] - 179:13 planning [2] - 11:18, 30:3
plans [1] - 64:24
play [5] - 34:4, 34:21,
36:11, 44:15, 116:9
played [1] - 76:12
playing [4] - 41:6,
76:11, 78:7, 125:25
pleasant [1] - 238:10
PLF [3] - 14:7, 14:15, 184:6
plural [1] - 114:16
plus [2]-35:18, 140:5
point [38]-3:9, 11:17, 12:17, 16:11, 20:11, 22:16, 45:1, 78:18, 81:15, 96:14, 105:12, 113:1, 113:2, 113:24, 119:25, 120:25, 121:19, 138:10, 165:5, 165:6, 184:14, 185:7, 187:2, 191:11, 191:24, 200:6, 202:18, 206:6,
210:9, 211:1,
$213: 10,217: 24$
$218: 4,218: 7,219: 2$
$221: 4,236: 16$
$236: 18$
pointed [1] - 222:6 points [4]-28:18, 29:1, 29:6, 217:19 poking [1] - 203:11 police [1] - 126:15 policy [3] - 176:1, 176:19, 177:9 polite [1] - 72:18 pool [2] - 28:6, 44:20
pops [1] - 184:8 porn [15]-7:19, 9:2, 103:19, 121:23, 122:5, 123:5, 123:10, 123:15, 123:16, 123:18, 123:19, 174:16, 174:18, 203:25, 204:13
pornography [4] 68:5, 103:19, 104:15, 104:16 portion [4]-9:7, 17:22, 125:2, 125:21 portions [1] - 11:15 Portland [27] - 1:6, 2:3, 2:9, 32:21, 36:8, 38:10, 38:20, 41:1, 41:17, 42:6, 43:3, 49:15, 91:23, 94:5, 113:23, 114:2, 114:3, 114:8, 141:9, 209:23, 221:19, 221:20, 224:10, 224:11, 232:20, 233:14
position [15]-8:7, 18:12, 52:7, 72:10, 74:3, 74:5, 84:11, 175:1, 195:9, 200:14, 206:12, 208:20, 218:8, 222:19
positions [2]-71:17, 74:17 positive [1] - 35:23 possession [2] -
175:1, 228:1 possible [6] - 9:14, 9:18, 44:22, 45:11, 45:13, 131:6 possibly [3] - 92:7, 121:13, 149:13 post [10] - 20:5, 20:9, 72:18, 110:9, 116:16, 164:20,
$175: 9,175: 12$,
$216: 11,231: 21$
post-employment [1]
$-164: 20$
posted [3] - 136:16,
136:18, 144:20
posting [1] - 110:10
posts [3] - 20:7,
196:19, 221:21
potential [8]-25:25,
28:7, 45:7, 45:8, 46:10, 47:15, 52:23, 208:25
potentially [1] - 48:24 practice [2] - 63:13, 78:1
practiced [1] - 107:20
prayer [1] - 237:16
precaution [1] - 48:20 precautionary [2] -
54:21, 236:5
preceding [1] - 114:11
precisely [5] - 153:15,
198:7, 199:15,
212:25, 220:20
precluded [2] - 14:20, 203:5
precludes [1] - 191:14
preferred [1] - 32:18
prejudice [5] - 6:1, 8:21, 11:12, 57:23, 120:5
preliminary [1] - 54:21
prepared [2] - 14:4,
112:16
preponderance [4] -
27:5, 62:12, 62:20, 63:15
presence [7]-28:2,
28:9, 109:20,
109:21, 109:22,
148:16, 185:5
present [7] - 58:8,
61:18, 61:21,
120:21, 171:8,
194:4, 213:5
presentation [1] 61:8
presented [3] - 61:23,
207:4, 224:5
preservation [1] 227:23
preserve [2]-203:1, 203:2
preserved [1] - 227:23
president [2]-81:21, 229:7
press [9] - 59:14, 105:5, 105:8, 144:19, 144:20,

## 145:13, 234:4, <br> 234:10, 235:7

pretend [1] - 215:16 pretty [13] - 39:20,
49:6, 52:2, 85:23, 102:3, 109:22, 110:6, 124:25, 134:4, 146:20, 162:10, 184:12,
211:1
prevail [2] - 136:24
prevailed [2] - 6:8, 71:13
previously [3] - 14:20,
62:10, 190:25
primarily [3]-39:10,
40:18, 78:13
print [6] - 95:21, 97:2,
97:21, 98:15,
139:15, 140:10
printed [16] - 95:6,
96:15, 97:8, 97:22,
97:25, 98:16, 98:18,
99:5, 99:13, 138:20,
139:17, 139:18,
140:21, 141:20,
141:21, 142:19
printout [3] - 10:4, 135:22, 234:20
printouts [1] - 142:17
Private [1] - 110:14
private [11]-9:1, 9:3, 27:22, 33:10, 56:9, 62:14, 66:4, 121:23, 121:24, 122:4, 215:3
PrivateLessons.com [1]-109:15
Pro [1]-2:5
problem [16]-8:1, 9:23, 10:10, 15:8, 48:10, 84:8, 109:24, 110:2, 110:5, 123:14, 129:13, 136:15, 184:10,
190:13, 217:23, 221:10
problems [4]-5:4,
47:23, 110:8, 190:14
procedure [1] - 132:7
proceed [5] - 122:12,
129:17, 195:24,
196:3, 223:16
proceeding [7] -
36:23, 39:7, 103:13,
104:4, 146:11,
146:12, 159:23
proceedings [9] -
33:5, 53:19, 60:10,
74:21, 91:12, 199:4,
229:23, 238:13,

239:5
PROCEEDINGS [1] 1:21
process [19] - 25:18, 27:17, 28:9, 50:10, 53:14, 78:13, 86:7, 92:9, 92:13, 104:6, 126:20, 133:25,
135:13, 149:5,
177:20, 180:9,
181:10, 200:1,
215:12
processed [1] - 180:2
processes [1] -
150:17
processing [1] -
229:12
processor [1] - 78:12 produce [4] - 79:9,
79:10, 174:5, 228:8 product [8]-69:3,
74:4, 77:17, 103:10, 103:11, 103:15, 221:15
profession [3] - 76:15, 103:6, 103:7
professionally [1] 168:12
Professionals [1] 33:1 profile [3] - 109:12, 139:19, 140:3 profiles [1] - 175:16
profit [6] - 1:7, 1:9,
1:10, 1:11, 45:24,
46:1
profiteer [2] - 100:21,
100:24
program [3] - 179:21,
182:17, 216:1
programmer [6] -
78:12, 165:9, 165:14, 181:10, 181:13, 203:2
programming [31] -
42:15, 42:24, 70:7, 70:9, 76:10, 77:23, 137:19, 137:20, 139:6, 154:15, 154:18, 165:13, 165:15, 177:17, 177:20, 177:23,
177:25, 178:4,
178:11, 179:6,
179:8, 180:10,
182:7, 182:12,
183:19, 202:13,
202:20, 204:12,
204:14, 216:1
programs [28]-32:22,

|  | ```prospective [3] - 23:9, 26:2, 54:10 protect [3]-73:21, 204:6, 212:7 protected [3]-62:21, 62:25, 63:7 protecting [1] - 204:20 protection [1] - 121:12 protective [5] - 15:6, 159:17, 191:12, 191:13, 191:17 prove [4]-27:2, 27:4, 62:18 provide [12]-28:8, 28:12, 86:2, 86:5, 199:23, 206:2, 206:5, 206:8, 215:16, 230:25 provided [21] - 9:4, 11:7, 11:9, 50:9, 71:22, 74:1, 103:23, 121:25, 152:6, 166:25, 199:22, 200:16, 203:17, 205:17, 206:4, 208:1, 208:4, 219:10, 224:4, 236:12, 236:16 Providence [1]-34:19 provides [3]-130:22, 222:21, 233:14 providing [2] - 103:22, 227:6 proving [4] - 62:11, 62:19, 63:14, 63:16 PST [3]-206:6, 206:16, 228:9 public [12]-6:18, 7:18, 10:18, 19:12, 19:20, 52:2, 70:21, 73:12, 104:3, 172:23, 191:11 publication [1]-96:17 publications [1] - 62:13 publicity \({ }_{[1]}\) - 104:22 publicize [1] - 147:8 publish [18]-90:25, 93:16, 94:21, 96:5, 100:5, 133:7, 134:16, 136:7, 138:6, 164:13, 170:12, 201:9, 201:18, 212:22, 222:15, 222:18, 223:10 Publish [1] - 96:6 published [21] -``` |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  | ```193:23 reclaim [1] - 68:21 recognize [20]-45:3, 45:10, 80:13, 83:16, 86:23, 93:3, 95:9, 96:21, 106:15, 115:1, 130:1, 135:20, 137:14, 140:17, 141:15, 142:22, 143:16, 144:14, 145:4, 237:5 recollection [5] - 159:19, 167:2, 167:3, 167:6, 174:3 reconvene [3]-55:7, 129:16, 193:24 reconvened [1] - 238:14 record [9]-23:5, 53:6, 57:11, 122:11, 159:24, 164:5, 192:2, 210:14, 239:4 recorded [1] - 208:16 recording [1] - 76:13 records [2] - 180:13, 204:1 recourse [1] - 123:21 recover [1] - 88:18 recovered [2] - 130:24, 173:25 recreated [2] - 70:9, 177:24 recusal [3] - 69:18, 168:14, 211:22 recused [1] - 69:16 recusing [1] - 168:7 redact [3]-128:25, 220:2, 223:20 redacted [11]-130:14, 154:24, 155:1, 155:2, 155:12, 221:21, 221:22, 224:2, 232:21, 233:6 redacting [2]-128:8, 220:21 redactions [2] - 130:10, 224:1 redirect [3]-193:19, 195:24, 197:1 refer [10]-22:1, 60:16, 156:14, 169:24, 170:21, 201:1, 210:2, 217:6, 220:4 reference [13]-19:18, 21:11, 60:3, 128:23, 163:17, 186:17, 187:4, 198:12, 199:9, 199:14, 201:6, 216:16, 222:25``` | ```referenced [4] - 128:17, 174:14, 174:19, 188:13 references [4]-18:16, 143:19, 143:22, 182:23 referencing \({ }_{[2]}\) - 22:12, 117:13 referral [1]-210:1 referred [4]-157:1, 183:11, 229:6, 231:17 referring [2] - 10:13, 21:23 refers [1] - 176:6 refiled [1]-230:21 reflected [1]-160:21 reflecting \({ }_{[1]}\) - 52:22 reformat [4]-176:2, 176:20, 204:3, 204:8 reformatted [15] - 175:17, 175:25, 176:4, 176:5, 176:6, 176:12, 176:13, 176:14, 176:16, 176:19, 176:24, 204:5, 216:5, 227:11 reformatting \({ }_{[2]}\) - 130:25, 175:17 refresh [2] - 147:20, 174:2 refused [3] - 7:13, 7:14, 11:13 refusing \({ }_{[1]}-8: 14\) refute [2]-163:10, 206:20 refuted [1] - 185:22 regarding [5] - 3:19, 3:21, 33:12, 58:20, 183:3 regards [1] - 18:2 region's [1] - 210:17 registered [2]-30:24, 116:15 rehabilitation [1] - 43:22 reinforce [1] - 8:17 reinstated [1] - 219:22 rejected [1] - 71:18 relabeled [1] - 154:23 relate [1] - 72:2 related [9]-19:9, 45:21, 62:10, 101:19, 102:16, 104:14, 162:6, 184:11 relates [2]-10:18, 114:6 relationship [12]-3:7, 14:7, 20:12, 46:4,``` | ```71:14, 72:23, 82:1, 168:11, 208:7, 210:25, 225:2, 226:24 relax [1] - 147:4 release [8] - 105:5, 105:8, 144:19, 144:20, 145:13, 234:4, 234:10, 235:7 relevance [2] - 172:25, 173:6 relevant [7] - 12:17, 17:25, 58:11, 63:23, 195:7, 228:25, 230:21 relitigate [2]-4:4, 5:12 relitigating [3] - 6:9, 167:9, 167:12 rely [1] - 61:3 remaining [1] - 54:10 remarks [2]-102:18, 102:20 remember [31] - 30:13, 36:1, 60:18, 81:10, 83:1, 85:7, 105:21, 108:20, 116:11, 127:9, 151:11, 152:8, 152:24, 152:25, 153:5, 157:20, 161:6, 161:22, 161:25, 162:1, 163:12, 174:4, 175:23, 175:24, 176:11, 181:8, 182:22, 194:10, 194:11, 218:19, 236:5 remind [2] - 185:3, 194:1 remote [1] - 196:12 remotely \([1]\) - 181:5 remove [3]-74:14, 79:11, 223:21 removed [1] - 224:1 removing [1] - 210:8 Renee [3] - 24:5, 30:1, 53:22 rentals [1] - 34:1 reopened [1] - 221:19 repeat [4]-27:12, 87:12, 131:24, 158:16 Repeat [1] - 234:13 replace [2]-202:19, 202:20 replaced [1] - 209:21 report [33]-4:22, 10:14, 10:21, 11:6,``` | ```12:1, 12:2, 12:6, 12:7, 12:25, 13:3, 18:21, 18:22, 21:16, 21:17, 22:2, 22:4, 59:20, 65:21, 81:1, 82:7, 84:15, 174:20, 185:10, 185:13, 185:17, 185:25, 186:11, 186:18, 186:23, 187:5, 187:10, 187:18, 187:20 reporter [1] - 164:5 REPORTER [14] - 2:7, 3:13, 7:5, 46:13, 50:17, 51:7, 76:25, 87:12, 116:3, 131:2, 167:11, 174:9, 234:13, 234:17 Reporter [1] - 239:13 reporters [1] - 105:7 reporting [3] - 178:21, 179:21, 182:21 reports [35] - 4:22, 6:7, 11:14, 11:15, 11:19, 11:22, 11:23, 13:1, 13:9, 13:13, 13:17, 13:19, 18:11, 18:17, 18:20, 19:2, 19:11, 19:15, 19:20, 21:12, 22:4, 22:10, 71:17, 71:20, 79:10, 82:16, 166:25, 180:20, 185:9, 191:10, 191:14, 216:16, 216:18, 216:20, 227:5 represent [3]-26:16, 39:11, 132:23 representation [8] - 14:16, 72:17, 93:9, 100:16, 135:24, 153:10, 158:6, 207:18 representations [1] - 224:22 represented \({ }_{[14]}\) - 20:17, 26:12, 33:13, 66:5, 69:10, 86:9, 124:10, 128:20, 128:22, 200:19, 204:5, 207:11, 207:14, 218:19 representing [5] - 6:18, 7:17, 26:19, 108:11, 172:22 represents [3]-72:24, 208:5, 224:25 Republic [1] - 64:25 reputation [1] -``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 132:19 | 81:2, 200:21 | River [1] - 65:10 | 164:8, 164:17, | 81:8, 81:9, 82:1, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { request }[2]-58: 16, \\ & 58: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { restrictions }[2]-60: 6 \text {, } \\ & \text { 60:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RMR }[2]-2: 7,239: 12 \\ & \text { road }[4]-15: 21,39: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:18, 166:5, } \\ & \text { 166:14, 166:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 10,83: 2,84: 16, \\ & 88: 16,88: 24,89: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| requested [1] - 207:25 | result [8] - 32:2, 66:2, | 76:22, 132:8 | 167:14, 168:1, | 89:18, 91:20, 91:25, |
| requests [2]-89:17 | 66:20, 94:4, 100:18, | Road [1] - 2:6 | 168:19, 168:22, | 92:17, 101:8, |
| required [4]-52:11, | 100:21, 233:8, | Robert [3]-24:25, | 169:1, 169:2, | 101:23, 103:3, |
| 61:17, 69:24, 217:3 | 233:1 | 42:5, 132:10 | 169:25, 170:3, | 105:21, 108:7 |
| requires [2]-27:17, | resulted [1] - 70:8 | roles [1]-81:14 | 170:8, 170:13, | 108:10, 109:10, |
| 60:6 | results [8]-100:18 | ROM ${ }_{[1]}$ - 103:23 | 170:16, 170:18, | 110:11, 113:24, |
| reread [1] - 73:6 | 100:20, 136:11, | Ron [1] - 36:25 | 170:20, 172:4, | 119:20, 119:25 |
| research [1] - 60:2 | 137:7, 146:14, | Ronald [2]-24:18 | 172:18, 173:3, | 120:24, 122:10, |
| reserved [1]-22:16 | 155:3, 155:13 | 53:23 | 173:10, 173:13, | 123:10, 125:16, |
| reset [1] - 228:18 | Results [4]-162:16, | Room [1] - 2:8 | 173:19, 173:21, | 130:5, 135:7, 135:9, |
| reside [1]-41:18 | 162:17, 163:4 retail [1]-29:11 | room [13]-25:15, <br> $54: 8,54 \cdot 24,59 \cdot 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:13, 174:23, } \\ & \text { 175:4, 176:8, 177:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:10, 140:2, } \\ & \text { 140:12, 141:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| residence [1] - 32:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ret } \\ & \text { ret } \end{aligned}$ | $54: 8,54: 24,59: 10,$ | 184:14, 185:6, | 143:12, 143:19, |
| residing [1] - 33:22 | 96: | 85:19, 85:20, | 185:18, 185:22, | 144:19, 166:17, |
| resigned [1] -69:16 | retaliated [1] - 212:1 | 127:13, 156:10, | $186: 4,186: 14$, $186 \cdot 25,187 \cdot 12$ | 185:2, 190:1, 190:13, 193:8, |
| resistance [1]-125:6 | retaliating [3]-46:8, 62:7, 62:17 | $184: 20,236: 8$ roommate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:25, 187:12, } \\ & \text { 187:16, 188:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:13, 193:8, } \\ & \text { 194:1, 196:3, 197:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { resolution [6]-16:25, } \\ & 84: 23,85: 17, \end{aligned}$ | retaliation [20]-4:8, | roommate [1] <br> rote [1]-6:18 | 188:3, 188:8, | 197:23, 197:24, |
| 135:13, 136:15, | 5:3, 7:2, 12:10, 40:1, | ROTE [203]-1:6, 1:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 188:16, 188:18, } \\ & \text { 189:7, 189:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 01: 4,229: 11, \\ & 29: 21,230: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| 149:5 | 40:13, 40:21, 52:3, | 2:5, 4:11, 4:14, 4:20, | 189:13, 189:18, | $231: 17,232: 1$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { resolve }[3]-16: 23, \\ 19: 3,190: 13 \end{gathered}$ | 62:18, 63:5, 63:16, 63:17, 64:15, 69:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:1, 5:6, 5:15, 5:20, } \\ & 5: 22,5: 25,7: 7,7: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 190:6, 190:14, | 233:17, 234:2, |
| resolves [1] - 190:14 | 17, 71:24, 89:3, | 7:12, 8:12, 10:13, | 190:17, 190:25, | 34:4, 235:6, |
| Resources [2] - 43:7, | 209:14, $218: 11$ retaliatory 11$]-62 \cdot 14$ | 11:2, 11:5, 12:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:3, 191:9, } \\ & \text { 191:19, 191:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 235:14, 237:25 } \\ \text { Rote's }[9]-8: 7,9: 20, \end{gathered}$ |
| respect $1211-8.13$ | retaliatory [1] - 62:14 retired [5] - 29:14 | 12:9, 13:1, 13:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:19, 191:21, } \\ & \text { 191:25, 192:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rote's [9] - 8:7, 9:20, } \\ \text { 15:14, 18:12, 81:14, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { respect [21] - 8:13, } \\ 14: 9,39: 18,40: 20, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { retired }[5]-29: 14, \\ & 30: 24,38: 18,38: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $13: 24,14: 2,14: 25,$ | 192:7, 192:11, | 126:17, 139:16, |
| 103:7, 124:21, | 43:4 | 15:9, 16:2, 16:5, | 192:25, 193:10, | 139:19, 142:25 |
| 155:4, 160:5, 160:6, | retriever ${ }_{[1]}-34: 2$ | 16:7, 16:16, 17:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:16, 194:11, } \\ & \text { 195:17, 195:19, } \end{aligned}$ | roughly [1] - 207:15 row [10]-23:23 |
| 163:7, 163:15, | retry [1] - 3:23 | 18:14, 18:18, 19:9, | $95: 22,196: 4,$ | $23: 24,25: 14,29:$ |
| 181:15, 182:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { return }[4]-35: 8, \\ & 35: 12,59: 23,62: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:23, 20:13, 20:16, } \\ & \text { 21:6, 21:11, 21:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 196:25, 197:10, | 29:5, 48:4, 54:12, |
| 206:7, 213:16, | returned [9]-69:18 | :20, 21:25, 22:9, | 197:17, 198:3, | 54:13, 54:15 |
| 214:22, 225:12, | 161:20, 200:12 | 22:15, 22:17, 26:20, | 198:20, 199:3, | rule [2]-171:2, |
| 227:25 | 203:19, 204:9, | 45:16, 53:11, 69:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:5, 201:6, } \\ & \text { 201:12, 201:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 190:21 |
| respects [1] - 199:11 respond [6]-5:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 205:6, 216:9, } \\ & 227: 10,228: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 22,83: 24,87: 6, \\ & 90: 23,93: 14,96: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 201:20, 212:15, | Rule [1] - 226:13 ruled [7]-21:24, |
| $14: 5,27: 10,59: 19$ | returning [1]-130:25 | 97:12, 98:4, 98:21, | 212:23, 213:22, | 22:13, 66:15, |
| 116:21, 116:24 | revenue [4]-202:19, | 9:9, 100:3, 101:9, | 213:24, 215:23, | 168:24, 189:13, |
| responded [2] - | 214:24, 215:1 | 101:11, 104:8, | 20:8, 220:14 | 190:6, 193:3 |
| 116:22, 209:6 | reverse [1]-69:17 | 15:13, 122:15, | $22: 16,223: 1$ | rules [4]-56:24, 57:2, 58:12 168:16 |
| respondent [2]-89:1, | review [5] - 128:15, | 125:10, 128:19, <br> 128:22 129:4 | 226:7, 226:9, | ruling [7]-22:16, |
| 89:3 | 130:20, 130:21, | $30: 15,13$ | 226:12, 229:20 | $68: 20,86: 1,87: 11$ |
| responding [2] 164:3, 164:4 | reviews [1] - 84:7 | $8: 3,139: 23,$ | 234:25, 235:2, | 87:14, 87:16, 87:21 |
| response [6] - 14:17, | revised [1] - 107:10 | 1:2, 142:1, 143:8, | 235:16, 238:2 | rulings [1] - 3:19 |
| 15:22, 16:10, 16:23, | revisionist [4]-92:22, | 4:7, 145:16, |  | run [3] - 38:13, |
| 17:3, 20:11 | 94:12, 103:17, 109:1 | 50:2 | $3: 6,3: 18,4: 10,7: 3,$ | , 211:8 |
| responsibility [1] - | revisions [1] - 147:24 | 1:21, 152:1 <br> $2: 4,152: 5$ | 7:22, 11:4, 15:17, | $78: 12,178: 10$ |
| 102:8 | Rice [1] - 48:22 | 153:22, 153:24, | 15:19, 16:15, 17:11, | runs [1] - 126:2 |
| responsible [2] 204:20, 221:14 | ride [1] - 39:2 <br> rights [2] - 62:10, 67:5 | 154:2, 154:5, 154:7, | 17:22, 18:6, 19:7, <br> 20:24, 26:19, 26:20 | Rutgers [3]-119:2, |
| rest $[9]-12: 2,54: 3$, | ring [1] - 7:19 | 154:12, 156:3, | :24, 26:19, 26:20, :20, 46:2, 46:7, | 119:15, 119:21 |
| 72:5, 133:16, | risen [1] - 70:14 | 156:7, 156:16, | $: 5,62: 3,64: 19,$ | Rutter [3] - 24:18, 36.25, 53.23 |
| 186:20, 186:21 | risk [3]-72:22, 73:12, | 156:24, 158:17, | 66:19, 67:4, |  |
| 186:22, 197:8, 225:1 | 211.3 | 159:6, 159:10, | 14, 67:17, 68:11, |  |



| ```siding [1] - 46:23 signature [3]-239:6, 239:7 signatures [1] - 111:7 signed [6] - 61:11, 66:3, 67:5, 84:11, 157:15, 239:7 significance [4] - 203:17, 209:24, 211:4, 212:24 significant \([3]-211: 3\), 223:1, 228:13 significantly [3] - 168:3, 198:5, 211:22 signing [2]-158:2, 239:3 silent \([1]\) - 125:7 Silicon [1] - 214:15 similar [2]-106:25, 178:8 similarly [1] - 164:4 simply [8] - 14:10, 22:1, 61:11, 61:15, 185:16, 197:25, 200:7, 215:2 sincerely \({ }^{[1]}\) - 27:11 sincerity [1]-223:2 single [4]-46:24, 72:1, 85:19, 202:8 sit [5] - 17:13, 52:11, 65:2, 85:21, 101:1 site [16]-9:5, 9:14, 105:3, 105:14, 110:14, 122:2, 128:24, 131:6, 140:24, 142:19, 144:20, 204:16, 204:24, 221:19, 231:21 sits [1] - 85:21 sitting [5] - 52:22, 147:4, 147:17, 147:19, 183:24 Sitting [9] - 91:23, 94:4, 113:23, 143:20, 154:22, 221:18, 224:10, 232:20 situation [5] - 33:15, 116:9, 178:8, 179:2, 181:3 \(\boldsymbol{s i x}[6]-38: 3,76: 6\), 112:23, 196:8, 216:4, 227:5 ski \({ }_{[1]}-39: 2\) skill [4] - 178:11, 178:13, 179:17, 211:6 skilled [1] - 182:19 skills [7] - 74:12,``` | ```165:13, 199:12, 209:4, 210:5, 210:20, 211:7 slide [2] - 54:12, 54:13 slipped [1] - 118:25 slow [4]-8:24, 77:1, 116:4, 223:9 slowdown [1] - 178:23 small [10] - 100:15, 107:22, 111:14, 139:15, 140:4, 140:10, 157:8, 171:16, 184:12, 198:13 smeared [2] - 7:22, 183:7 smearing [1] - 10:23 snippet [2]-11:25, 12:5 snow [2] - 39:2, 125:24 snowboard [1] - 36:11 snuff [1] - 209:5 soaked [1] - 126:6 soccer [1] - 41:6 social [7]-43:4, 52:1, 146:14, 160:9, 160:10, 160:11, 161:17 society \({ }_{[1]}-106: 5\) software [4]-42:8, 43:7, 66:12, 228:17 solely [2]-88:25, 224:22 solve [3]-15:8, 191:22, 217:23 solves [1] - 15:4 someone [8]-52:7, 73:9, 73:10, 94:25, 103:16, 137:19, 185:24, 195:9 sometime [2]-57:10, 119:1 sometimes [13]-44:1, 110:23, 113:11, 147:20, 148:1, 155:5, 155:16, 187:15, 187:17, 188:6 somewhat \([1]-8: 19\) somewhere [12] - 54:5, 82:19, 88:1, 106:3, 131:9, 147:4, 147:17, 159:4, 161:7, 161:8, 165:7, 183:21 son [3]-36:17, 38:10, 41:2 Sony [1] - 203:18 soon [5]-126:3,``` | ```133:23, 134:25, 185:6, 225:12 sorry [66] - \(3: 13,7: 5\), 46:14, 48:8, 49:14, 51:7, 76:25, 81:2, 81:5, 83:8, 83:13, 86:7, 86:24, 87:12, 88:9, 88:16, 90:12, 94:14, 95:2, 95:4, 96:10, 97:5, 98:1, 98:2, 99:25, 100:14, 101:20, 104:19, 106:11, 107:2, 116:3, 118:15, 122:14, 128:6, 128:21, 129:12, 130:20, 131:2, 131:24, 132:3, 132:4, 133:20, 135:19, 136:25, 140:4, 140:10, 142:10, 142:16, 145:6, 149:22, 157:21, 167:11, 171:14, 171:25, 172:17, 174:9, 174:11, 177:4, 179:20, 188:21, 234:13, 234:15, 235:1, 235:2 sought \([3]-7: 12\), 9:19, 220:2 sound [1] - 89:6 Soundex [1] - 139:9 sounds [1] - 4:1 sour [1] - 198:5 source [4] - 157:1, 186:16, 187:4, 216:20 sources [1] - 204:22 south [1] - 30:23 Southwest [2]-42:6, 43:3 space [4]-19:20, 63:24, 127:13, 156:12 span [1] - 106:5 speaking [4] - 119:25, 135:3, 163:2, 164:5 speaks [2]-103:8, 135:2 special [2] - 35:15, 56:9 specialist [4] - 30:25, 32:23, 34:19, 76:16 specialized [1] - 182:19 specific [13]-16:10, 22:5, 25:19, 28:11, 28:22, 149:8,``` | ```157:20, 160:25, 163:17, 169:1, 172:10, 203:13 specifically [13] - 5:25, 8:13, 11:13, 13:2, 17:3, 21:17, 89:16, 118:24, 127:21, 200:10, 201:24, 225:23, 226:13 specificity [3] - 220:20, 222:3, 223:5 speech [3]-237:8, 237:9, 237:11 speed [1] - 210:5 spell [2] - 75:8, 197:22 spelled [1] - 113:5 spend [1] - 219:21 spent [3] - 71:3, 137:1, 219:23 spins [1] - 72:16 spite [3]-202:5, 202:6, 209:4 spoken [3]-51:18, 153:12, 160:18 sports [3] - 34:21, 36:11, 36:22 spot [1] - 88:9 spreadsheet [11] - 152:7, 152:13, 152:18, 205:19, 205:24, 206:2, 207:10, 207:11, 207:13, 208:5, 219:12 staff [3] - 7:20, 79:4, 80:1 stage [3]-133:22, 185:15, 226:4 stages [3] - 199:5, 199:6, 208:9 stairs [1] - 74:25 stalked [1] - 134:3 stamina [1] - 219:24 stand [9]-25:25, 26:13, 53:21, 68:22, 120:14, 129:16, 196:1, 229:19, 229:21 start [14] - 5:18, 18:20, 29:3, 29:4, 45:11, 47:25, 48:4, 49:23, 61:13, 138:12, 164:3, 198:9, 198:16, 212:11 started [17] - 20:5, 65:9, 77:23, 79:16, 85:13, 110:12, 113:21, 114:1, 159:20, 178:8,``` | ```179:2, 179:3, 188:25, 209:12, 229:8, 229:9 starting [3]-173:17, 203:15, 209:22 starts [5] - 164:4, 206:10, 206:11, 227:13 State [14] - 14:1, 19:25, 31:1, 31:7, 31:9, 34:18, 38:22, 38:23, 43:6, 43:21, 146:6, 191:1, 210:17, 212:17 state [9]-1:6, 46:8, 50:17, 62:8, 62:22, 75:7, 179:1, 197:21, 210:18 statement [14]-5:4, 21:1, 21:8, 22:6, 61:14, 61:15, 61:17, 64:9, 68:24, 70:21, 160:12, 172:23, 180:2, 198:1 statements [6] - 54:22, 56:4, 62:9, 203:12, 225:6 States [2]-2:8, 36:10 states \({ }_{[1]}\) - 162:11 STATES [2] - 1:1, 1:23 statesman [2] - 210:10, 210:19 status [2] - 39:8, 208:13 stay [3]-84:18, 155:6, 155:7 staying [1] - 18:3 steal [1] - 136:24 stealing [1] - 218:1 steel [1] - 31:4 step [8] - 74:24, 129:11, 184:23, 185:1, 197:3, 197:11, 235:17 Stephen [1] - 24:22 steps [2]-221:16, 232:16 Steve [2] - 38:17, 48:20 still [21] - 4:14, 14:20, 14:25, 54:6, 66:25, 77:5, 79:17, 89:19, 123:8, 155:6, 155:7, 161:14, 165:17, 185:9, 188:3, 209:5, 215:12, 219:1, 222:2, 224:1 stimulation [1] - 228:23 Sting \({ }_{[1]}\) - 199:14``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```stipulated \({ }_{[1]}\) - 15:6 stood [1]-84:25 stop [8] - 16:9, 44:18, 44:23, 68:8, 133:15, 161:5, 164:4, 166:10 stopped \([1]\) - 222:5 store [2]-126:2, 126:4 Stores [1] - 236:21 stories [1] - 133:13 story [6] - 51:4, 74:16, 94:7, 133:25, 142:9, 212:4 straight [1] - 46:20 strangers [1] - 27:15 strategic [1] - 30:3 strategy \({ }_{[1]}-158: 24\) streaming \({ }_{[1]}\) - 42:15 stricken \({ }_{[1]}\) - 57:10 strong [3] - 148:8, 209:5, 219:1 strongly [3]-208:12, 209:6, 210:8 structured \({ }_{[1]}\) - 104:4 struggling [2] - 168:19, 188:3 stuck [1]-87:23 student \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(34: 18\) students [2]-109:15, 109:22 stuff [20]-5:18, 14:23, 67:19, 67:20, 76:9, 78:9, 94:21, 103:19, 103:25, 104:2, 108:3, 110:7, 110:11, 110:21, 111:24, 112:2, 134:5, 134:23, 148:4, 148:22 subject [4]-126:24, 146:9, 146:11, 183:3 subjected \([5]-62: 22\), 62:24, 63:6, 69:8, 212:5 submit [1] - 3:10 submitted [5] - 3:6, 3:11, 3:14, 185:11, 230:15 subpoena [2] - 116:14, 116:15 subpoenaed [2] - 14:1, 14:17 subsequent \({ }_{[1]}-20: 7\) subsidiary [1] - 158:24 substantial [5] - 28:6, 63:8, 73:10, 202:18, 226:23 substantially [3] - 63:24, 199:22, 220:2``` | ```successful [3]-33:9, 195:5, 195:6 successfully [1] - 211:15 sucks [1] - 149:21 sue [3] - 213:4, 213:8 sued [2]-50:8, 151:9 suffer [1] - 228:14 suffered \([3]-73: 18\), 228:17, 228:20 suffering [1] - 194:24 suggest \([1]\) - 210:13 suggested [1] - 65:19 suggesting \([1]-15: 16\) suit [1] - 83:8 sum [1] - 72:21 summarily [3]-69:19, 200:24, 206:24 summarize [2] - 61:24, 71:25 Summary [1] - 138:17 summary [2] - 98:24, 99:12 summer [1] - 39:3 summertime [1] - 37:17 superior [1] - 162:17 Superior [1] - 163:4 Supply [1] - 236:22 support \([7]\)-42:22, 74:16, 80:1, 110:1, 217:9, 230:15, 230:19 supporting [1] - 63:4 supposed [3] - 82:22, 94:18, 225:25 surgical [1] - 48:11 survive [1] - 199:24 suspected [1] - 118:22 suspended [2]-20:6, 20:9 suspension [1] - 31:16 sustain [2] - 57:5, 57:7 sustained [11] - 104:9, 125:11, 153:23, 166:6, 166:10, 167:24, 173:2, 173:7, 173:12, 174:22, 175:3 swears [1]-26:8 switch [1] - 179:23 sworn [6] - 26:2, 54:1, 74:24, 75:5, 197:12, 197:19 system [13]-29:22, 30:19, 33:17, 34:9, 43:25, 61:8, 62:15,``` | ```74:13, 79:11, 179:24, 180:6, 198:19, 226:19 systematically [1] - 73:20 systems [1] - 165:14 Systems [1] - 10:4``` <br> T-h-i-e-m-a-n-n [1] - $24: 14$ <br> T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n [1] - 24:22 <br> table [6] - 85:19, 85:22, 222:2, 237:2, 237:19 <br> tables [1] - 180:1 <br> Tabor [1] - 37:13 <br> tabs [1] - 164:22 <br> $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a g }}[6]-223: 22,232: 4$, 232:7, 232:12, 232:14 <br> tagged [2] - 223:25, 224:2 <br> tags [2]-231:17, 232:2 <br> taint [1]-132:8 <br> talks [3] - 95:16, 101:22, 237:5 <br> tantamount [1]-6:6 <br> targeted [1] - 183:5 <br> tarnish [1] - 132:19 <br> tasks [1] - 182:20 <br> taste [2]-30:18, 34:13 <br> tat ${ }_{[1]}$ - $4: 6$ <br> taught [1]-76:13 <br> Taylor [2]-24:25, $42: 5$ <br> teach [1]-44:15 <br> teaching [1] - 33:3 <br> tech [2]-42:22, 110:1 <br> technician [2]-35:17, 41:19 <br> technologies [1] - <br> 78:14 <br> technology ${ }_{[2]}$ - <br> 76:19, 78:19 <br> telemarketers [2] - <br> 80:1, 178:24 <br> telemarketing [6] - <br> 64:23, 65:1, 77:12, <br> 78:24 <br> teleservices [4] - <br> 169:19, 169:20, <br> 169:22, 229:13 <br> TELESERVICES ${ }_{[1]}$ 1:7 <br> Teleservices [26] - <br> 23:13, 26:5, 45:22, | ```87:13, 108:8, 150:8, 150:9, 150:11, 150:22, 151:5, 151:15, 151:18, 158:1, 158:12, 158:20, 212:18, 213:12, 213:15, 213:17, 214:3, 214:7, 214:12, 214:14, 214:19, 227:7, 233:20 television [1]-26:25 temper [1]-209:5 ten [1] - 181:22 Tennis [1] - 36:10 term [2]-108:11, 127:1 terminated [11] - 70:1, 70:3, 82:6, 83:5, 83:7, 107:14, 107:16, 107:17, 204:4, 206:12, 207:7 terminating \({ }_{[1]}\) - 206:17 termination [6] - 83:9, 84:14, 172:8, 174:1, 200:3, 200:18 terminology \({ }_{[1]}\) - 108:13 terms [7]-19:17, 165:13, 211:6, 213:10, 220:24 terrible [4]-8:4, 12:14, 92:19, 117:19 terrifying [1] - 119:14 terrorized [1]-134:3 test \([1]-42: 8\) testified [10] - 57:20, 69:20, 152:6, 154:16, 163:4, 205:25, 213:13, 225:9, 228:1, 231:8 testifies [2]-75:5, 197:19 testify [13]-58:3, 69:21, 73:2, 154:14, 177:7, 185:20, 185:21, 197:11, 198:22, 199:2, 227:19, 227:20 testifying [3]-54:17, 57:21, 184:25 testimony [50] - 17:15, 55:19, 56:6, 56:17, 57:15, 57:18, 57:24, 57:25, 60:16, 60:24, 60:25, 65:5, 67:11, 86:5, 152:14, 153:4, 154:13, 159:11, 162:12, 162:19,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $38: 4,38: 7,38: 16$ | 156:11, 156:12, | 197:7, 197:9, | 79:16, 85:11, 95:13, | $70: 21,73: 14,77: 19$ |
| 39:9, 39:16, 39:21, | 156:13, 156:14 | 197:11, 197:2 | 95:20, 128:11 | 107:22, 120:8, |
| 40:1, 40:4, 40:6 | 156:18, 156:22 | 19 | :11, 202: | :3, 168:1 |
| 40:11, 40:19, 40:23, | 158:14, 158:16, | 198:18, 198:21 | 206:22, 209:21 | 236:23, 238:5 |
| 41:9, 41:12, 41:15, | 159:7, 159:9, 164:2, | 198:25, 199: | 212:5, 217:19, | toggling [1] - 91: |
| 41:23, 41:25, 42:4, | 164:13, 165:24, | 201:4, 201:8 | 225:17, 227:5 | token [1] - 194:14 |
| 42:17, 43:1, 43:12, | 165:25, 166:6 | 201:13, 201:16 | 227:19, 228:14 | tomorrow [12]-34:25, |
| 43:15, 43:18, 43:24, | 166:7, 166: | 201:18, 212:14 | 231:6, 231: | 47:18, 47:20, 47:22, |
| 44:4, 44:7, 44:10, | 166:11, 166:12 | 212:20, 212:22 | throughout [4] - | 48:6, 48:10, 48:12, |
| 44:17, 45:15, 45:17, | 166:16, 166:19, | 213:23, 217:10 | 58:21, 108:10 | $48: 14,236: 9$ |
| 46:13, 46:14, 46:18, | 166:22, 167:11, | 217:14, 220:6, | 224:5, 227:17 | 237:16, 238:1, 238:4 |
| 47:1, 47:5, 47:8, | 167:12, 167:24 | 220:7, 220:9 | thrown [2]-86:20, | tone [1] - 203:10 |
| 48:7, 48:14, 48:18, | 168:21, 168:23, | 220:11, 220:13 | 159:17 | took [21] - 52:3, 66:20, |
| $48: 25,49: 4,49: 8$ | 170:2, 170:6, 170:9, | $222: 13,222: 15$ | Thursday [1] - 48:11 | $67: 6,71: 17,77: 12$ |
| 49:10, 49:13, 49:16, | 170:11, 170:15, | 223:13, 223:14 | ties [1] - 120:8 | 78:11, 109:16, |
| $49: 18,50: 11,50: 14$ | 170:17, 171:2, | 226:8, 226:11, | Tigard [1] - 37:21 | 112:4, 147:13, |
| $50: 17,50: 21,50: 24$ | 171:5, 171:7, | 229:16, 230:5, | Tim [26]-26:20, 81:5, | 161:9, 161:11, |
| $53: 7,53: 10,53$ |  |  | 88:24, 89:24, 91:25, | 173:8, 201:22, |
| 53:17, 53:20, 54:2, | 171:17, 171:21, | $234: 18,234: 24$ | $104: 25,108: 7$ | $21: 17,221: 23$ |
| 54:12, 55:3, 55:8, | 171:22, 171:24 | 235:1, 235:3, | 110:11, 113:24 | 224:19, 228:24, |
| 68:24, 74:19, 74:22, | 171:25, 172:14 | 235:14, 235:17 | 115:21, 117:12, | 232:16 |
| 74:24, 74:25, 75:7, | 172:17, 173:2, | 35:21, 236:12 | 118:20, 120:19, | tooling [1] - 35:16 |
| 75:9, 75:11, 76:25, | 173:7, 173:12, | 237:18, 237:24, | 120:24, 125:16, | top [15] - 81:21, |
| 77:3, 80:8, 80:21, | 173:20, 174:9, | 238:3 | 126:17, 130:5, | 100:17, 100:18, |
| $87: 7,87: 12,87: 13$ | 174:22, 175:3, | theirs [1]-23:1 | 135:7, 135:9, | 112:17, 133:4, |
| 90:22, 90:24, 91:2, | $175: 19,175: 22,$ | 126:24 | $143: 19,144: 19$ | $140: 3,150: 6,151: 2$ |
| 91:5, 91:7, 91:8, | 177:3, 177:4, 177:5, | themselves [4] | Tim@ | 157:9, 172:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:10, 91:14, 93:13, } \\ & 93: 15, ~ 93: 17, ~ 93: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 184:16, 184:23, 184:24. 184:25. | 13:14, 13:17, 82:14, | roteenterprises. | $217: 20,218: 2$ |
| 93:22, 93:25, 96:2, | $185: 16,185: 20$ |  | com [1] - 235:11 | top-level [1]-81:21 |
| $96: 4,96: 5,96: 8$ | 185:24, 186:6, | therefore [2] - 201:25, | timeline [1] - 83:2 <br> Timothy [8] - 2:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { topic [4]-18:23, } \\ & \text { 47:10, 127:19, } 193: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 97:13, 98:5, 98:22, | 186:19, 187:6, | 202:2 | $24: 19,37: 12,62: 3,$ | topics [1] - 228:24 |
| 99:10, 99:25, 100:1, | 187:14, 187:17, | they've [2]-69:6, | 64:18, 139:16, | total [2]-88:2, 89:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 100: 2,100: 4,1 \\ & 101: 12,104: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 188:2, 188:6, } 18 \\ & \text { 188:17, 188:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $85: 1$ | 140:2, 197:23 | totally [1] - 78:8 |
| 115:12, 115:14, | 188:21, 188:22, | 34:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIMOTHY [3] - 1:6, } \\ & \text { 2:5, 197:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { touched [2] - 146:16, } \\ & \text { 191:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 116:3, 116:5, 122:9, | 188:24, 188:25, | thinking ${ }_{[7]}-134: 20$ | tit [1] - 4:6 | touching [5] - 126:10, |
| 125:11, 127:6, | 189:2, 189:3, 189:4 189:8, 189:11 | 135:9, 148:23, | $\text { title }[7]-81: 22,107: 9$ | 127:2, 127:18 |
| 127:17, 127:24, | 189:16, 189:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:12, 194:17, } \\ & \text { 223:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 109:4, 117:8, | $127: 22,129: 20$ |
| 128:2, 128:6, | 189:22, 189:25, | thinks [2]-35:10 | titled [2] -97:19, | toward [1] - 65:17 |
| 128:10, 128:13, | $190: 11,190: 13$ | $57: 2$ | 239:5 | towards [3] - 25:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:18, 128:21, } \\ & \text { 128:25, 129:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:16, 190:19, } \\ & \text { 190:20, 190:22, } \end{aligned}$ | third [9] - 15:20, | today [32]-23:11, | 102:19, 226:14 |
| 129:7, 129:10, | $190: 24,191: 2$ | 17:13, 17:16, 108:5, | 23:16, 28:8, 64:15 | towel [1] - 126:12 |
| 129:11, 129:12, | 191:6, 191:17, | $9.7$ | 64:18, 67:3, 67:7, | towels [1] - 126:7 |
| 129:13, 129:17, | 191:20, 191:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 218: 11,219: 7 \\ & 228: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:15, 67:17, 68:11, } \\ & 68: 20,71: 8,74: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { town }[2]-77: 9,107: 22$ |
| 130:16, 131:2, | 192:1, 192:3, | Third [1] - 2:8 | $74: 11,89: 19,90: 2$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { traffic [3] - 30:15, } \\ 30: 16,75: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| 131:4, 136:3, 136:6, 138:4, 139:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 192: 10,192: 12, \\ & 192: 15,192: 17 \end{aligned}$ | Thompson [3]-24:22, | 90:5, 101:1, 148:18, | trailer [1] - 77:3 |
| 141:3, 142:2, 143:9, | 192:20, 192:22, | 38:17, 48:20 | 152:10, 153:4, | trailers [1] - 76:21 |
| 144:8, 145:12, | 192:23, 193:4, | [1] - 77:8 | 154:16, 155:1, | train [1] - 178:10 |
| 145:15, 145:18, | 193:8, 193:13, | thoughts [1] - 3:21 <br> thousand [1] - 88.21 | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 10,165: 15 \\ & 77 \cdot 10 \quad 181 \cdot 2 ? \end{aligned}$ | training [1] - 37:23 |
| 145:23, 149:24, | 193:17, 193:25, | $\text { ds [1] }-69: 2$ | $182: 9,228: 25$ | TRANSCRIPT [1] - |
| 151:24, 152:2, | 194:1, 194:17, |  | Today [1] - 152:9 | 1:21 |
| 153:23, 154:4, | 194:22, 195:18, | threat [1] - 127:23 | today's [1] - 181:18 | transcript [7]-5:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 154: 11,155: 23 \\ & 155: 24,155: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 195:20, 195:23, } \\ & 196: 3,197: 1,197: 3 \end{aligned}$ | three [21] - 42:20, | together [13] - 3:3, | 5:25, 15:7, 60:15, $215: 17,239: 4,239: 6$ |


| transcripts [2]-220:1, <br> 221:22 <br> transfer [5] - 89:23, <br> 181:25, 202:22, <br> 203:3, 204:1 <br> transferred [1] - 228:2 <br> travel [3] - 30:9, 43:8, <br> 84:24 <br> treated [2]-58:12, <br> 63:10 <br> trespassing [1] - $41: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trying }[25]-4: 14,5: 13, \\ & 66: 25,83: 14,89: 19 \\ & \text { 107:8, 111:10, } \\ & \text { 120:18, 121:8, } \\ & \text { 126:19, 136:17, } \\ & \text { 138:12, 147:4, } \\ & \text { 157:11, 159:3, } \\ & 159: 4,159: 5, \\ & 168: 23,169: 1, \\ & 183: 22,187: 12, \\ & 188: 9,210: 13 \\ & 217: 11,222: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 100:18, 113:6, 128:11, 137:7, 151:17, 157:8, 160:11, 178:23, 189:24, 196:9, 196:10, 200:4, 202:7, 206:15, 221:3, 227:6, 227:20, 229:9 type [10]-27:24, 30:13, 31:14, 34:7, 36:1, 79:23, 165:1, | 179:24 unlawful [3]-63:8, 63:11, 63:13 unless [3]-21:2, 59:4, 116:16 unredacted [1] 130:18 unrelated [1] - 225:11 unscrupulous [1] 136:23 untrue [2] - 8:2, 103:9 up [116] - 3:5, 3:8, | 232:7, 238:6 upload [1]-204:21 UPS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 42:22 upset [3] - 117:19, 209:3 urge ${ }^{[1]}$ - $60: 16$ USDOJ ${ }_{[1]}$ - 146:6 user [2] - 136:15, 174:20 uses [2] - 67:22, 100:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trial [3] - 234:10, } \\ & 234: 14,234: 15 \end{aligned}$ | Tualatin [1]-44:12 turn [62]-79:25, 80:3, | 215:11, 236:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 19,9: 1,9: 3,22: 9, \\ & \text { 24:4, 24:6, 25:25, } \end{aligned}$ | V |
| trial [30] - 3:9, 4:19, 22:25, 23:12, 27:20, | 80:11, 82:4, 83:15 85:9, 86:22, 90:12 | typically [1] - 215:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:13, 33:14, 46:20, } \\ & 47: 21,50: 5,53: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { vacate }[2]-19: 2 \\ 211: 20 \end{array}$ |
| 9, 35:13, 46:6, | 93:2, 95:7, 96:20, | U | 5 | vacation [2]-88:13 |
| 24, 58:5, 58:21, | 99:16, 103:10, | U.S [5] - 14:18, 125:5, | $74: 25,78: 23$ | 214:1 |
| $58: 23,59: 15,60: 7$, $60: 12,61 / 14,64 \cdot 4$, | 103:14, 106:8, | , 125:1 | 81:25, 83:14, 84:25, | value [1]-28:6 |
| 12, 61:14, 64:4, $7,64: 8,120: 14$, | 108:14, 112:11 | 230:14 | 90:7, 92:21, 93:18, | VAOI [1]-203: |
| 64:7, 64:8, 120:14, 146:10, 212:6, | 113:14, 114:24 | ultimate [2] - 199:23, | 100: | variety [1] - 107:14 |
| 146:10, 212:6, | 117:2, 118:10, | 228:23 | 106:9, | various [3]-199:5, |
| 225:13, 236:7, | 123:23, 125:2, | 74:13, 212:7, 228:13 | $\text { , } 108$ |  |
| $\operatorname{TRIAL}_{[1]}-1: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 129: 21,131: 11 \\ & \text { 131:20, 133:3, } \end{aligned}$ | umbrella [3] - 150:17, 157:19, 158:23 | 109:2, 109:13 110:2, 110:9, | verdict [5]-55:17 |
| 217:13, 217:19, | 133:19, 135:1 | able [2] - 77:10 | 110:25, 111:19, | 59:24 |
| 217:24, 218:4, 219:7 | 135:16, 137:14 | 77:11 | 2:17, 113:1 | version [6] - 10:1 |
| tribunal [3] - 72:8, | 138:15, 138:22 <br> 139:12, 140:15 | ${ }_{\text {unacceptable }}^{\text {69 }}$ [1 | 114:1, 114:10 | 29:5, 129:22, |
| 225:24, 226 tried [7]-6:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:12, 140:15, } \\ & \text { 141:11, 142:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 69:9 | :16, 117 | 133:24, 215 |
| tried [7] - 6:4, 39:1 <br> 68:17, 77:9, 89: | 143:14, 144:1 | 27:15 | 121:2 | versus [3]-23: |
| 15, 211: | 150:3, 150:25, | under [10]-39:11, | 121:25, 122:4, | veteran [1] - 36:20 |
| ries [1] - 133:1 | 153:2 | 3:19, 39:23, 58:12, | 123:23, 125: | 10, 15 |
| trigger [3] - 3:24, 4:2, | 154:5, 174:11, | 62:21, 72:9, 124:18, | 25:20, 127:10 | 52:7, 152:12 |
| 4:6 trouble $21-52 \cdot 20$ | 175:24, 200:7, | 146:17, 159:11, 225:25 | 134:11, 134:1 | 152:13, 206: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { trouble }[2]-52: 20, \\ & 210: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 205:14, 205:21, <br> 230:3, 232:8, 232:9, | 225:25 | 141:8, 145:20 <br> 146:13, 147:1 | 206:12 |
| troubling [2] | $3 \cdot 7$ | 7:11, 88:16, 88:18, | 7:23, 148: | deo [5] - 9:14, 44:15, |
| 195:11 | 3:22, 235: | 8.19, 88.20 | 153:21, 154:4, | 131:1, 131:6, 198:19 |
| true [15]-18:13, 27:5, <br> 27:6, 82:9, 83:3, | turned [3]-152:22 205:20, 206:15 | unencrypted ${ }^{2}$ 2] 177:12, 204:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 155: 12,157: 7 \\ & 161: 9,166: 19 \end{aligned}$ | videos [2]-10:22, |
| 106:7, 107:23, | turning [2] - 100:1 | unfair [2]-71:7 | 79 | (2) - 10:25, |
| 108:2, 108:4, | 121:20 turns |  | 183 | Viking ${ }_{[1]}$ - 29:15 |
| 114:22, 114:23, | turns $[1]-126: 4$ twenties $[1]-33:$ | unfamiliar [1] - 27:14 unfavorable [1] - 52:8 | 183:7, 183:12, <br> 184:4, 184:7, 18 | vile $[3]-8: 3,67: 16$ |
| 2:18, 206:24 | twenty [1] - 76:6 | ortunately | 8:19, 188:2 |  |
| trust $[1]$ - 172:15 | twenty-six $[1]-76: 6$ | 109:10, 110:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:1, 190:3, 190:9, } \\ & \text { 191:24. 194:5. } \end{aligned}$ | violation [3] - 46 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { trusted }[2]-73: 10, \\ & 224: 22 \end{aligned}$ | twice $[1]-6:$ twink [1] - 10 | union [3] - 37:24 <br> 50:19, 77:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:24, 194:5 } \\ & \text { 195:23, 196:2 } \end{aligned}$ | 62:8, 108:2 |
|  | twist [1] - 135 |  | 97:9, 197:10 | $\text { le }[1]-208:$ |
| 210:21, 210:22 | Twitter [3] - 142:23 |  | 7:12, 198:20, | $\text { visited [3] - } 140$ |
| truthful $[1]$ - 14 | 42:25, 143:7 | 15:20, 229: | :24, 199: |  |
| truthfully [1] - 25:24, try [11] 44:21, 47:17, | two [34] - 14:3, 3 | UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:23 |  | ual [2]-179: |
| $\operatorname{try}[11]-44: 21,47: 17,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ::16, 41:8, 47:17, } \\ & 9: 11,62: 22, ~ 63: 18 \end{aligned}$ | United [2] - 2:8, 36:10 University [1] - 34:18 | $22: 19,222$ | 179:2 |
| 24, 104:2, |  | Unix [4]-179:24, | 23, 222 | visual [1] - 217:12 |
| 5:13, 111:3, | 79:4, 79:20, 88:12 | 180:8, 180:9, 180:19 |  |  |
| 228:18, $235: 25$ | 99:6, 100:17, | Unix-based [1] - | 230:4, 232:3, 232:4, | $43: 22$ |


| ```Vogele [1]-2:2 voice [4] - 102:12, 104:4, 133:23, 134:6 volume [3] - 105:17, 105:18, 183:25 voluminous [1] - 105:23 vs [1] - 1:5``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:15 } \\ & \text { website }[90]-6: 15, \\ & 6: 16,6: 25,8: 10,9: 3, \\ & \text { 10:25, 12:12, 12:13, } \\ & \text { 12:19, 12:22, 15:18, } \\ & \text { 59:10, 68:16, 90:7, } \\ & 90: 10,91: 20,91: 22, \\ & 91: 23,91: 24,92: 1, \\ & 92: 2,92: 5,92: 25, \end{aligned}$ | Wells [2]-25:2, 43:2 <br> Wendy's [3] - 147:18, 147:19 <br> Wesley [3] - 32:17, $48: 9,53: 22$ <br> West [1] - 2:6 <br> Western [1] - 38:24 <br> wet $[1]-126: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:12, 145:15, } \\ & \text { 156:5, 156:11, } \\ & \text { 156:13, 156:18, } \\ & \text { 158:16, 165:25, } \\ & \text { 166:7, 166:11, } \\ & \text { 166:16, 166:22, } \\ & \text { 167:12, 171:2, } \\ & \text { 171:7, 171:11, } \\ & \text { 171:14, 171:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { world [11]-9:20, } \\ \text { 104:17, 111:24, } \\ \text { 123:22, 125:19, } \\ \text { 132:23, 146:19, } \\ \text { 148:11, 148:18, } \\ \text { 148:20, 160:21 } \\ \text { worried }[2]-159: 18, \\ \text { 191:23 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | $9$ |  | 171:25, 172:17, |  |
| W-a-l-k-e-r [1]-24:16 <br> W-e-I-I-s [1] - 25:2 <br> wages [1] - 196:24 <br> Wagner [1]-25:12 <br> WAGNER $[1]$ - 25:12 <br> wait [4]-51:7, 177:3 <br> waiting [3]-47:10, <br> 58:9, 189:25 <br> walk [1] - 35:21 <br> walked [1]-114:5 <br> Walker [5] - 2:7, <br> 24:16, 36:8, 53:23, <br> 239:11 <br> WALKER [1] - 239:12 <br> walking [2] - 43:9, 148:20 <br> wall [2] - 110:4, 114:6 <br> wants [14]-9:23, <br> 64:13, 95:17, 104:3, <br> 111:25, 116:9, <br> 134:15, 134:16, <br> 135:13, 135:14, <br> 149:7, 211:2 <br> Ware [14]-68:11, <br> 68:12, 76:4, 76:5, <br> 100:19, 102:17, <br> 103:3, 117:17, <br> 118:21, 124:3, <br> 124:22, 125:1, <br> 208:3, 232:14 <br> warm [1] - 126:7 <br> warrant [1] - 84:14 <br> Washington $[5]$ - $\begin{aligned} & 34: 6,38: 23,38: 24, \\ & 38: 25,48: 23 \\ & \text { watch }[10]-9: 2 \text {, } \\ & 59: 24,60: 23, \\ & 121: 23,122: 4, \\ & 125: 4,125: 6, \\ & 125: 17,126: 2, \\ & \text { 147:25 } \\ & \text { watched }[1]-103: 2 \\ & \text { watching }[3]-36: 22, \\ & 41: 6,60: 22 \\ & \text { water }[2]-36: 11,39: 2 \\ & \text { ways }[2]-102: 18, \\ & \text { 183:2 } \\ & \text { weather }[1]-126: 4 \\ & \text { web }[2]-99: 19, \end{aligned}$ | ```99:13, 101:2, 101:19, 101:22, 102:1, 102:5, 102:15, 102:18, 102:19, 103:7, 104:13, 104:22, 104:24, 104:25, 105:18, 109:17, 113:17, 113:20, 113:23, 113:24, 114:2, 114:8, 117:12, 117:13, 118:1, 121:8, 121:9, 121:24, 123:8, 123:9, 123:14, 123:21, 126:17, 131:9, 138:9, 138:11, 139:8, 139:11, 141:8, 141:9, 141:10, 142:15, 143:4, 143:11, 143:21, 144:10, 146:13, 147:12, 153:20, 166:3, 183:6, 183:14, 183:17, 215:3, 231:19, 231:24, 232:3, 232:10, 234:6, 234:21 websites [5] - 9:1, 101:16, 121:23, 122:4, 234:7 week [9]-66:14, 67:15, 70:10, 70:19, 84:10, 88:13, 105:6, 114:20, 165:6 week-Iong [1] - 165:6 Weeks [1]-125:23 weeks [3] - 113:11, 206:22, 221:1 weeks' \([1]-88: 13\) weigh [2]-58:4, 188:10 weighing [1]-137:2 weight \([4]-56: 22\), 56:23, 58:2, 60:25 welcome [1] - 197:13 weld [1] - \(31: 5\)``` | ```whistle [5]-7:10, 40:4, 50:2, 50:7, 82:6 whistle-blowing [1] - 7:10 whistleblower [4] - 39:21, 39:25, 63:4, 70:13 white [1] - 230:4 whole [19]-6:25, 9:21, 17:20, 18:22, 66:10, 66:14, 109:19, 116:9, 160:1, 160:2, 171:3, 171:5, 171:7, 171:9, 171:10, 183:17, 186:7, 199:15, 202:18 wide [1] - 204:18 wife [13]-29:9, 29:12, 30:24, 32:20, 37:13, 37:21, 37:22, 37:23, 38:18, 38:21, 42:19, 42:20, 48:10 William [1] - 86:13 willing [5] - 103:9, 121:10, 121:11, 121:14, 222:1 willingness [1] - 121:7 Windows [4] - 180:3, 180:6, 180:11, 180:19 Windows-based [3] - 180:6, 180:11, 180:19 windsurf [1] - 39:3 wish [3]-60:18, 149:20, 235:18 withdraw [3]-166:7, 166:8, 193:11 withheld [1] - 70:7 withholding [2] - 66:12, 114:12 WITNESS [43]-75:9, 77:3, 87:13, 91:5, 91:7, 93:18, 93:22, 93:25, 116:5, 122:17, 129:10, 129:12, 131:4,``` | ```175:22, 177:4, 184:24, 197:4, 197:6, 197:23, 230:6, 234:18 witness [31] - 30:10, 30:11, 31:7, 32:7, 33:6, 36:12, 38:1, 38:2, 39:5, 44:16, 45:6, 45:13, 56:17, 57:16, 57:18, 57:19, 60:19, 61:7, 74:22, 75:4, 80:6, 129:16, 188:10, 196:1, 197:7, 197:18, 208:16, 229:21 witness's [6] - 57:20, 57:21, 57:22, 57:24 witnessed \([1]-30: 16\) witnesses [11]-26:9, 45:7, 45:9, 45:12, 55:20, 58:3, 58:4, 60:22, 60:23, 69:20, 85:25 Wizard [1] - 77:20 won [7]-5:14, 86:16, 87:9, 92:10, 94:23, 135:5, 149:5 wondered \([4]-8: 22\), 8:25, 9:1, 121:22 Woodbury [6] - 75:17, 75:19, 75:20, 76:1, 77:8, 77:12 word [10]-72:1, 100:21, 117:15, 131:3, 137:19, 137:20, 139:3, 139:6, 148:3, 181:8 WordPress [2] - 231:19, 231:25 WordPress.com [1] - 114:2 words [5] - 63:9, 72:2, 105:22, 134:7, 139:9 workday [2]-125:24, 147:14 worker \({ }_{[2]}-8: 5,63: 4\) workers [2]-39:11, 178:13 works [2]-25:20, 42:9``` | ```126:4 worst [1] - 104:21 wow [1] - 106:3 wrap [2] - 3:5, 238:6 wrapping [1] - 126:12 write [6]-67:7, 133:7, 164:19, 212:4, 213:2, 215:24 writer [1] - 42:9 writing [12]-42:13, 59:9, 65:13, 91:24, 94:25, 108:11, 116:9, 133:11, 143:12, 199:7, 203:10, 221:15 written [19]-8:10, 20:10, 21:9, 52:8, 60:15, 65:6, 69:3, 101:2, 118:25, 153:9, 160:14, 160:17, 200:21, 202:24, 203:14, 204:8, 208:14, 215:7, 216:10 wrongdoing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 229:3 wrongful [1]-83:9 wrote [15]-4:23, 71:11, 126:18, 187:7, 187:8, 188:23, 193:10, 198:4, 198:10, 207:2, 209:24, 214:1, 225:12, 225:13, 229:3 \begin{tabular}{c} \(\mathbf{Y}\) \\ \hline Y-o-u-s-o [1]-24:13 \\ year \([15]-17: 7,37: 13\), \\ \(73: 2,92: 18,107: 24\), \\ 135:23, 137:22, \\ 143:2, 144:1, 181:2, \\ 181:7, 208:13, \\ 209:10, 220:17, \\ 232:24 \\ Year [1] - 107:6 \\ years [51] - 8:10, 9:17, \\ 29:18, 29:21, 30:12, \\ \hline \end{tabular}``` |


| 31:1, 33:6, 33:8, | 115:16, 129:19, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 33:10, 34:6, 35:25, | 130:1, 131:11, |
| 38:3, 38:19, 41:8, | 138:6, 141:5, 142:4, |
| 41:24, 43:14, 51:10, | 143:11, 144:10, |
| 64:12, 67:13, 68:3, | 144:21, 146:13, |
| 69:11, 70:1, 71:3, | 150:3, 151:18, |
| 71:5, 73:14, 74:11, | 152:6, 153:25, |
| 76:6, 76:11, 76:14, | 154:13, 155:9, |
| 76:18, 78:20, 90:6, | 172:14, 174:24, |
| 90:11, 109:12, | 184:8, 184:23, |
| 135:10, 153:1, | 185:8, 189:14, |
| 160:11, 161:7, | 195:25, 196:5, |
| 161:8, 169:8, | 199:15, 202:2, |
| 169:10, 181:22, | 202:3, 203:17, |
| 194:13, 196:8, | 207:5, 209:13, |
| 211:9, 218:22, | 209:18, 209:24, |
| 218:25, 221:3, | 212:1, 213:3, |
| 224:19 | 213:17, 214:6, |
| YMCA [1] - 42:9 | 214:7, 214:22, |
| young [1] - 10:5 | 215:11, 218:8, |
| younger [1] - 76:20 | 219:5, 219:25, |
| yourself [3] - 60:20, | 220:15, 221:8, |
| 132:23, 197:24 | 222:6, 222:18, |
| yourselves [2] - | 224:16, 225:9, |
| 26:13, 44:24 | 225:16, 227:8, |
| Youso [2]-24:13, | 227:11, 227:25, |
| 33:22 | 228:15, 230:22, |
|  | 231:11, 232:12 |
| Z | $\begin{gathered} \text { Zweizig's [37] - 20:1, } \\ \text { 66:17, 66:23, 67:11, } \end{gathered}$ |
| ```Z-w-e-i-z-i-g [1] - 75:10 zip [2] - 154:18, 182:4 zone [1] - 207:17 ZWEIZIG [2] - 1:3, 75:3 Zweizig[122] - 3:3, 11:10, 15:16, 15:18, 16:20, 18:6, 23:12, 26:4, 26:11, 26:16, 26:17, 45:14, 45:20, 62:2, 64:13, 65:7, 65:9, 65:18, 66:1, 66:5, 66:10, 66:11, 66:24, 67:16, 67:19, 67:21, 67:24, 68:2, 68:3, 68:9, 68:13, 68:17, 68:20, 69:10, 70:1, 70:7, 71:6, 72:18, 72:24, 73:22, 74:23, 75:9, 75:16, 76:8, 90:15, 92:24, 94:8, 96:25, 97:15, 98:7, 98:24, 99:12, 100:11, 100:25, 101:4, 101:14, 102:16, 103:6, 104:13, 104:22, 106:8, 108:24, 109:18, 110:15,``` | 67:22, 69:6, 69:11, |
|  | 69:17, 71:21, 72:3, |
|  | 191:3, 202:21, |
|  | 207:21, 207:24, |
|  | 208:2, 208:3, |
|  | 209:21, 212:3, |
|  | 212:9, 212:19, |
|  | 214:2, 214:11, |
|  | 214:19, 216:3, |
|  | 220:2, 220:21, |
|  | 221:21, 224:23, |
|  | 225:3, 227:9, |
|  | 227:15, 232:17, |
|  | 232:21, 233:5, |
|  | 233:8, 233:18, |
|  | 233:21 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |


[^0]:    206:16, 216:3,
    217:17, 227:8,
    227:16, 228:6, 228:8
    computers [9]-65:13,
    66:12, 67:21, 76:9,
    77:15, 78:4, 78:6,
    109:24, 148:20
    con [1] - 199:15
    concentration [1] 196:20
    concern [4]-183:24, 194:14, 224:16, 224:17
    concerned [3] - 82:13, 109:9, 119:8
    concerning [2] 142:4, 142:7
    concerns [7]-73:5, 105:24, 109:3, 182:24, 220:24, 220:25, 231:12 concluded [4]-6:3, 118:23, 202:2, 202:8 conclusion [1] 181:25
    conclusions [4] 120:6, 200:20, 201:23, 227:2
    conduct [2] - 58:20, 125:18
    confer [5]-23:4, 53:1,
    53:5, 122:10, 192:2 conference [5]-58:7, 58:16, 58:17, 85:19, 85:20
    conferences [2] 58:10, 58:15
    confidential [8] 149:9, 159:12, 159:19, 159:22, 159:25, 160:1, 177:7, 204:2
    confidentiality [5] 94:16, 102:8, 159:13, 160:4, 160:6 confirm [1] - 172:6 confirmed [5]-66:22, 73:5, 87:23, 202:21, 206:21
    confirming [1] - 71:17 conflict [1]-208:25 conflicted [1]-201:25 conform [1] - 237:23 conformed [1] - 239:7 confused [1] - 92:6 confusing [1] - 92:15 confusion [1] - 58:13 Congressional [1] 133:7
    Congressman [1] -

